

Indigenous Consultation Report

Muskrat Falls Project

Submitted to:

Commission of Inquiry Respecting the Muskrat Falls Project

Submitted by:

Nalcor Energy

Submitted on:

August 21, 2018



Table of Contents

1.0	Executive Summary.....	3
2.0	Duty to Consult	4
2.1	Role of Government and the Proponent	4
2.2	Nalcor's Guiding Principles for Consultation	4
3.0	Environmental Assessment Process for the Generation and LITL Projects	5
3.1	Environmental Assessment.....	5
3.2	Environmental Assessment: Generation and LITL Projects	5
3.2.1	Overview	5
3.2.2	Environmental Assessment Timelines	6
3.3	Overview of Groups and Communities Consulted.....	8
3.3.1	Innu Nation	8
3.3.2	Nunatsiavut.....	8
3.3.3	NunatuKavut Community Council (NCC).....	9
3.3.4	Quebec Innu and Naskapi of Kawawachikamach	9
4.0	Approach to Consultation	9
4.1	Overview	9
4.2	Consultation Summaries by Indigenous Community or Group	10
4.2.1	Innu Nation	10
4.2.2	NunatuKavut Community Council (NCC) (Formerly Labrador Metis Nation)	12
4.2.3	Nunatsiavut.....	14
4.2.4	Québec Innu and Naskapi	14
5.0	SUMMARY OF INDIGENEOUS ISUUES AND CONCERNS:.....	16
5.1	Issues Identification	16
5.2	Summary of Responses to Indigenous Questions and Issues and Supporting Documentation .	17
	NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation	55
	Nunatsiavut Government: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation.....	80
	Pakua Shipi: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation	92
	Unamen Shipu: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions-Generation.....	99
	Nutashkuan: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation	105
	Ekuanitshit: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation.....	109

Uashat mak Mani-Utenam: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation	121
Matimekush-Lac John: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions-Generation	127
Naskapi Nation of Kawawachikamach: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation .	131
Innu Nation: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission	133
Labrador Inuit: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission.....	142
NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission	143
Quebec Innu and Naskapi Communities: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission	171
List of Appendices:	189
List of Acronyms:.....	190

1.0 Executive Summary

Nalcor Energy (Nalcor) has been asked to prepare a paper on its consultation with Indigenous groups in relation to the Lower Churchill Project. The information prepared for and provided to the Commission of Inquiry Respecting the Muskrat Falls Project by Nalcor is in relation to Nalcor's consultation with Indigenous groups as part of the Environment Assessment (EA) process for construction of the Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project (Generation Project) and the Labrador-Island Transmission Link (LITL Project).

The Generation Project included the hydroelectric developments at Muskrat Falls and Gull Island as well as the transmission line between Muskrat Falls and Churchill Falls. The LITL Project included the 1,100 km transmission line between Muskrat Falls and Soldiers Pond as well as the Strait of Belle Isle marine cable crossing.

Consultation with Indigenous groups for the Generation and LITL Projects began in 1998. Over the past two decades, Nalcor has consulted and been engaged at varying levels with the following Indigenous groups and communities in Labrador: Innu Nation, NunatuKavut Community Council, (formally called the Labrador Métis Nation), and Nunatsiavut Government. In Quebec, Nalcor consulted with the Innu communities of Uashat Mak Mani-Utenam, Ekuanitshit, Nutaskuan, Unamen Shipu, Pakua Shipu and Matimekush-Lake John and Naskapi Nation of Kawawachikamach.

Throughout the EA for both projects, Nalcor has acted in compliance with the requirements set out in section 4.8 of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Guidelines, the requirements established by the Joint Review Panel (JRP) and with the EIS Guidelines and Scoping Document for Transmission.¹ Nalcor consulted with all Indigenous groups and communities, identified in the EIS Guidelines, for the purpose of familiarizing each group with the Generation and LITL Projects and their potential environmental effects; and for identifying and addressing any issues of concern regarding potential environmental effects of the specific project.

Nalcor's Consultation Assessment Report (CAR), Socioeconomic Environment: Aboriginal Communities and Land Use Component Study and the Generation and LITL Project's EIS provided the results of Nalcor's consultation efforts with the above noted Indigenous groups and communities and contributed to Nalcor's understanding of the interests, values, concerns, contemporary and historic activities, Indigenous traditional knowledge and important issues facing Indigenous groups. In addition, Nalcor has worked to establish and cultivate a relationship with many of the Indigenous groups identified in the EIS Guidelines and by the JRP.

¹ Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Guidelines, Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project, Government of Canada and Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, July 2008. (Appendix A); Report of the Joint Review Panel, Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project, August 2011. (Appendix B); and with the Environmental Impact Statement Guidelines and Scoping Document for Labrador Island Transmission Link, Government of Canada and Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, May 2011. (Appendix C)

2.0 Duty to Consult

2.1 Role of Government and the Proponent

The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador (NL Government) is ultimately responsible for the conduct of Indigenous consultation, has the constitutional mandate to manage lands under its jurisdiction and must develop natural resources in accordance with provincial legislation.² NL Government's Consultation Policy mandates that consultation occur at the earliest possible occasion before land and resource development decisions, which may adversely impact asserted rights, are made. The policy recognizes that while each party has different roles, the consultation process requires the participation of Indigenous organizations, the project proponent and the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador (NL).³

While the NL Government can delegate procedural aspects of consultation to a proponent, it remains responsible for ensuring the delegated consultation is conducted in an effective manner by the proponent. When government decides not to delegate procedural aspects of consultation directly onto a project proponent, it consults directly with Indigenous organizations on land and resource development decisions that have the potential to adversely impact asserted rights. The consultation may occur in a number of forms. There may be general and relationship building consultations, project-specific consultation processes or consultations pursuant to Consultation Guidelines.⁴ For the Generation Project and the LITL Project, the consultation process was delegated to the proponent – Nalcor Energy.

2.2 Nalcor's Guiding Principles for Consultation

While the EIS Guidelines dictated with whom Nalcor should consult, there is a spectrum along which each specific group falls, depending on the assessed strength of the individual group's rights in the project area. Consultation varied not only by group but also by project. Groups outside either of the Generation and LITL Project areas were on the notification end of the spectrum while groups with a vested interest in the Project area were, in varying degrees, near the full consultation end of spectrum. It is important to note that while some groups were closer to the full consultation end this did not necessarily mean that full Consultation Agreements or Impact Benefits Agreements (IBAs) were required.

The mandate for Nalcor's stakeholder engagement is as follows:

- Continue to build, maintain and utilize the support and confidence of project stakeholders
- Continue to inform the people of Newfoundland and Labrador on project progress
- Be transparent and accessible to all stakeholders

² The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador's Aboriginal Consultation Policy on Land and Resource Development Decisions ("The Policy") April 2013. (Appendix D)

³ The Policy, April 2013.

⁴ The Policy, 2013.

- Build employee and contractor advocacy
- Support the business and strategic objectives of the Lower Churchill Project

To support the stakeholder relations objectives of the Lower Churchill Project, Nalcor Energy – Lower Churchill Project has established four principles that are used to guide consultation efforts with stakeholders. These consultation principles are grounded by some of Nalcor's core values and are as follows:

Honesty and trust – we will be factual and sincere when sharing project information and addressing priorities, interests and concerns.

Open communication – we will encourage the public to express opinions and foster a supportive environment where all ideas can be shared respectfully.

Respect and dignity – we will uphold the highest level of integrity throughout the consultation process, recognizing and respecting the opinion, knowledge, culture and abilities of individuals and communities.

Teamwork – we will collaborate with individuals and communities in an effort to ensure balanced perspectives are integrated into project planning and mutual understanding is achieved.

These are the pillars upon which Nalcor structured its engagement with Indigenous groups, communities and all stakeholders.

3.0 Environmental Assessment Process for the Generation and LITL Projects

3.1 Environmental Assessment

Environmental Assessment (EA) is a regulatory review and planning process that is applied to proposed development projects. It is administered by the federal and provincial governments and is used to identify the potential environmental and socioeconomic effects of proposed development projects, to consider and incorporate these issues into project planning and decision making. Indigenous, stakeholder and public involvement is a fundamental aspect of the EA process.

3.2 Environmental Assessment: Generation and LITL Projects

3.2.1 Overview

The EA process for both Projects included; project registration, drafting of EIS Guidelines by the federal and provincial governments, and submission of the EIS by Nalcor. After review of the EIS and other relevant information, both levels of government rendered a decision on whether to release the projects from EA and established the conditions upon which the release was granted. In relation to the Generation Project, both levels of government decided the project was to be reviewed by a JRP. The JRP

is an independent body appointed by both provincial and federal governments to carry out the EA process for the Generation Project.

3.2.2 Environmental Assessment Timelines

Registration:

The EA process for the Generation Project was initiated in December 2006. The registration document described the plans for the Project, and was submitted to the provincial and federal governments and was made available for public review. The information in the document and comments from the public were used by the federal and provincial governments to decide that the Generation Project should be reviewed by a JRP.

The LITL Project was registered under the Newfoundland and Labrador Environmental Protection Act and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act in January 2009 to formally initiate the provincial and federal EA reviews of the Project.

Environmental Impact Statement Guidelines:

The draft EIS Guidelines for the Generation Project were prepared by the federal and provincial governments in December 2007, following consultation with the public. Based on this consultation they were finalized in July 2008.

The EIS Guidelines and Scoping Document for the LITL Project was finalized in May 2011. These Guidelines provided instruction to Nalcor about the contents required in each of the EIS.

Environmental Impact Statements:

Following consultation throughout the province, Nalcor submitted the EIS for the Generation Project. In February 2009, the EIS for the Generation Project was submitted to the JRP.

An EIS for the LITL was prepared by Nalcor following extensive consultation. The EIS for the LITL Project was submitted by Nalcor to provincial and federal governments in April 2012.

Joint Review Panel Process for Generation Project:

In January 2011, the JRP announced it would proceed to public panel hearings for the Generation Project. The 45-day public hearings, administered by the JRP, commenced on March 3, 2011. This submission, which also included a number of other reports, was made available for public review. The hearings provided an opportunity to consider and discuss the findings and conclusions of the EIS and any concerns and questions from key stakeholders and members of the public.

The JRP asked stakeholders, including government agencies and Indigenous groups, if they had questions or wanted more information than was available in the EIS. The JRP used those responses to prepare Information Requests (IRs) which were submitted to Nalcor. Nalcor responded to 166 IRs, which were available to the public.

Once the JRP was satisfied that it had enough information, it scheduled public hearings from March 3 to April 15, 2011. At the hearings, the public and government agencies had an opportunity to express their opinions about the Generation Project. The JRP then prepared a report with recommendations to federal and provincial government ministers.

Following the hearings, the JRP issued its final report in August 2011 with recommendations to the federal and provincial Ministers of Environment. Once the report was filed, the JRP's work was concluded although they could have been called upon by the Ministers to provide additional clarification if required.⁵

EA Release Decision:

In March 2012, the federal and provincial governments responded to the JRP report, releasing Nalcor from the EA process for the Generation Project.⁶

For the LITL Project, Component Studies and requested revisions were submitted to the Department of Environment between May 2011 and March 2013. In May 2013, the EIS for the LITL Project was accepted. In June 2013, Nalcor received provincial release from EA for the LITL Project. In November 2013, Nalcor received federal release from EA for the LITL Project.⁷

Condition of Release/Permits and Approvals:

As a condition of release for both Projects, Nalcor was required to fulfill various commitments outlined in the assessment, including mitigation measures, environmental management and monitoring, and follow up.⁸ Monitoring is required as a condition of a number of the permits, approvals and authorizations. In addition, Nalcor has committed to do follow-up to find out if the EIS correctly predicted the effects of the Projects.

⁵ JRP Report, 2011 as found in Appendix B.

⁶ See news release found in Appendix E.

⁷ See news releases found in Appendix F.

⁸ Additional information is available on the Muskrat Falls Project websites:

<http://muskratfalls.nalcorenergy.com/environment/generation/> and
<http://muskratfalls.nalcorenergy.com/environment/transmission.>

Judicial reviews:

Multiple judicial reviews for the Generation and LITL Projects challenging the adequacy of consultation were undertaken. None of these judicial reviews were successful.⁹

3.3 Overview of Groups and Communities Consulted**3.3.1 Innu Nation**

Innu, formerly known as the Naskapi-Montagnais Indians, are indigenous inhabitants of an area they refer to as Nitassinan, which comprises the eastern portion of the Québec-Labrador peninsula. The approximately 2,200 Labrador Innu reside primarily in two Labrador communities - Sheshatshiu in central Labrador and Natuashish on the north-east coast. The Mushuau Innu resettled from Davis Inlet to Natuashish in 2002-2003. Some Innu also live in other communities within Labrador and on the island part of the province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

The Sheshatshiu Innu and the Mushuau Innu of Natuashish are separate Labrador Innu Bands and each community is a Reserve with an elected Chief and Council. Both communities are represented by Innu Nation in land claims negotiations and on other matters of common interest.

The Innu of Labrador claim aboriginal rights and title to much of Labrador. The Labrador Innu land claim area overlaps the Generation Project area, and is the only such claim in the area that has been accepted for negotiation by both the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

3.3.2 Nunatsiavut

Labrador Inuit are primarily resident in the north Labrador Inuit communities of Nain, Hopedale, Makkovik, Postville and Rigolet, and in the central Labrador communities of North West River and Happy Valley-Goose Bay. The Labrador Inuit Land Claim Agreement (LILCA), signed by the Labrador Inuit, the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador in January 2005, came into effect on December 1, 2005. The LILCA is a modern comprehensive treaty, and sets out the details of land ownership, resource sharing and self-government in the area covered by the LILCA in northern

⁹ Council of the Innu of Ekuanitshit v. Canada (Attorney General), 2013 FC 418 (CanLII); Council of the Innu of Ekuanitshit v. Canada (Attorney General), 2014 FCA 189; Nunatsiavut v. Canada (Department of Fisheries and Oceans), 2015 FC 492; Nunatukavut Community Council Inc. v. Newfoundland & Labrador Hydro-Electric Corp., 2011 NLTD(G) 44; Nunatukavut Community Council Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General), 2015 FC 981; Grand Riverkeeper, Labrador Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General), 2012 FC 1520. See (Appendix G) for summaries of each case.

Labrador. It also resulted in the establishment of the Nunatsiavut Government, which represents the over 6,000 beneficiaries of the LILCA.

3.3.3 *NunatuKavut Community Council (NCC)*

The Labrador Metis Association was established in 1985, and renamed the Labrador Métis Nation (LMN) in 1998. The organization was again renamed the NunatuKavut Community Council (NCC) in February 2010. NCC reports a membership of over 6,000 members, who reside primarily in central Labrador and along its southeastern coast. NCC members have asserted a land claim that covers much of Labrador. On July 12, 2018, the Government of Canada and the NunatuKavut Community Council announced that they would be working together to advance reconciliation and renew their relationship based on recognition of rights, respect, co-operation and partnership.¹⁰

3.3.4 *Quebec Innu and Naskapi of Kawawachikamach*

There are 11 Innu communities and one Naskapi community in Québec. The land claim areas of several of these First Nations extend into Labrador, although these have not been accepted for negotiation by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

The following lists the seven Québec Indigenous groups with whom Nalcor consulted regarding the Generation and LITL Projects:

- Pakua Shipi (Saint- Augustin);
- Unamen Shipu (La Romaine);
- Nutashkuan (Natashquan);
- Ekuanitshit (Mingan);
- Uashat mak Mani-Utenam (Sept-Îles);
- Matimekush-Lac John (Schefferville); and
- Kawawachikamach (Naskapi community).

4.0 **Approach to Consultation**

4.1 **Overview**

Nalcor's approach to planning, undertaking and supporting consultation was both group- and Project-specific, given the nature and location of the proposed development and the type and level of interest by a particular Indigenous community. Nalcor recognized and acknowledged that Indigenous communities and organizations often required additional resources and support when engaging in consultation processes, particularly with regard to large development projects and their EAs. While there was no legal requirement for formal capacity arrangements, Nalcor developed an approach to consultation which included the provision of funding and/or other supports to Indigenous communities

¹⁰ See news release found in Appendix H.

and organizations, where appropriate, to facilitate project-related consultation. Additionally, it was Nalcor's practice, when required or requested, to provide translation of oral presentations in the Indigenous language spoken by the specific group.

Consultation activities for the purpose of issues scoping and the collection of Aboriginal Ecological Knowledge have occurred through the use of various methods such as studies, funding mechanisms and direct consultation with the communities. Sources of Aboriginal Ecological Knowledge included, but were not limited to, land use surveys and interviews, reviews of existing published and unpublished literature and through the provision of information to Nalcor.

Nalcor also conducted an assessment of contemporary traditional land use for a number of Indigenous groups who reside in, and/or claim Aboriginal rights and/or title to the area within or near the transmission corridor for the LITL Project.¹¹

4.2 Consultation Summaries by Indigenous Community or Group

4.2.1 Innu Nation

Consultation and negotiation between Nalcor and Innu Nation has been ongoing since 1998. Innu Nation claim Aboriginal rights and title to much of Labrador. The Innu Nation land claim area overlaps the Generation Project area. This longstanding relationship first included Process Agreements between Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro (Nalcor's predecessor) and Innu Nation. These Agreements established and funded mechanisms for ongoing consultation and negotiations related to both projects. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed between Nalcor and Innu Nation in 2009 and in 2011, the membership of Innu Nation ratified an IBA, which defined how members of Innu Nation would participate in and benefit from the Generation and LITL Projects.

The IBA is the outcome of several periods and processes of discussion and negotiation over 10 years between Innu Nation and Nalcor and its predecessors. On September 26, 2008, Innu Nation and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador announced the signing of the Tshash Petapen Agreement (which translates as the "New Dawn Agreement"), which resolved key issues relating to matters between the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and Innu Nation surrounding the Land Claim and Self-Government Agreement-in-Principle (AIP), the Lower Churchill IBA and Innu redress for the Upper Churchill Hydroelectric Development. These three agreements were ratified by the Innu on June 30, 2011, and signed by the parties on November 18, 2011. The IBA and the Redress Agreement come into effect immediately upon signing. The AIP will form the basis for ongoing treaty negotiations between the Innu, Canada and Newfoundland and Labrador.

¹¹ More detailed information on contemporary traditional land use by these groups and organizations is available in the Socioeconomic Environment: Aboriginal Communities and Land Use Component Study (Nalcor Energy, 2011) at (Appendix I) and Environmental Impact Statement, Labrador Island Transmission Link, Existing Socioeconomic Environment, Volume 3, Chapter 15, Section 15.5.7, p. 15-117-15-151 (Nalcor Energy, 2012), (Appendix J).

The specific nature and provisions of the IBA are and will remain confidential. The IBA does, however, include processes for continued consultation and cooperation throughout the planning, construction and operations and maintenance phases of the Lower Churchill Project. The IBA also includes mechanisms intended to help avoid or reduce potential adverse effects on members of Innu Nation and Innu communities, and for creating and enhancing potential benefits, including compensation. This also includes processes and provisions related to Innu employment, training, business opportunities, workplace policies and conditions, environmental management, revenue sharing and other issues.

Under the previously described Process Agreements, Nalcor and Innu Nation also developed and implemented processes for Innu-led consultations in the communities of Sheshatshiu and Natuashish. These Innu community consultation processes were originally established in 1999 and re-initiated in 2005 and continued to late 2008. With a view to ensuring that such consultation was as effective and meaningful as possible, this consultation was led by Innu Nation at its request, with funding provided by Nalcor. An Innu Community Consultation team comprised of an Innu Consultation Coordinator and Consultation Commissioners in each of the two Labrador Innu communities provided information and conducted ongoing consultation related to the projects. A range of approaches and techniques were used, including community meetings, newsletters, radio programs, drop-in centres, site visits and other mechanisms.

As part of that process, Nalcor participated in community meetings in Sheshatshiu and Natuashish, as requested by Innu Nation, to provide information and updates, answer questions and identify issues or concerns. Nalcor also provided Lower Churchill Project and other information to the Innu Community Consultation Team on an ongoing basis, as well as through workshops, site visits and other forums.

The Innu community consultation process provided a means to both inform the Innu communities and provide a forum in which they could raise concerns about the nature and status of the projects, including the associated environmental and engineering work, and potential environmental and socioeconomic effects. It also served as a forum for Innu Nation to consult with its membership during the IBA negotiations.

The Innu Community Consultation Team provided reports to both Innu Nation and Nalcor on the activities and findings of the consultation process. These and previous reports from past Innu community consultation processes have provided information essential to both the Generation and LITL Project planning and issues scoping for the EA.

For details on Nalcor's consultation with Innu Nation, see EIS Generation, Volume 1, Part A, Chapter 8, Section 8.3.1; Consultation Assessment Report, Supplemental Information to IR JRP 151, Section 3.0; Socioeconomic Environment: Aboriginal Communities and Land Use Component Study, Section 2.0 and Environmental Impact Statement, Labrador Island Transmission Link, Volume 1, Chapter 7, Section 7.2 and EIS, LITL, Volume 3, Chapter 15, Section 15.5.7.1.¹²

¹² Environmental Impact Statement, Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project, Volume 1A, Chapter 8 Section 8.3.1 (Nalcor Energy, 2009), at (Appendix K); Supplemental Information to IR JRP 151, Consultation

Key questions and issues identified by Innu Nation regarding Generation and LITL are addressed in Section 5.0 of this report.

4.2.2 NunatuKavut Community Council (NCC) (Formerly Labrador Metis Nation)

Commencing in Spring 2009, Nalcor proposed to enter into Community Engagement Agreements with the Indigenous communities and organizations in Labrador and Quebec, as a basis for further discussion and cooperation related to its proposed development activities in central and southeastern Labrador.

Nalcor's originally proposed Indigenous Community Engagement Agreements pertained to both the Generation and LITL Projects, to help optimize consultation efficiency and to reduce overall demands on the Indigenous communities and their resources. It was intended, however, that the nature, level and focus of the associated consultation with each group on each project would vary, based on a group's particular interests, location and activities in relation to the Generation and/or LITL Projects. Given the relatively advanced stage of the Generation Project's EA at the time, discussions and activities related to these initial agreements (where concluded) focused primarily on that Project.

The collaborative nature of the Community Engagement Agreements established a cooperative framework, supported by funding, for the exchange of project-related information between Nalcor and each relevant Indigenous group. This was intended to help identify any questions and concerns about the Projects and potential effects, for consideration in planning and for EA process, and to gather additional information on current land use activities and any relevant traditional knowledge. Nalcor recognized that populations living in proximity to the Projects may have traditional and community knowledge which would subsequently be incorporated into the assessment of the effects of the Projects, and their mitigation. The associated work plan of each Community Engagement Agreement saw both parties work jointly in the community to understand and address issues and concerns the community had regarding the two Projects.

Nalcor's consultation activities with NCC for the purpose of issue scoping and gathering Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge included a number of initiatives, including written correspondence, meetings with NCC representatives, the provision of information packages and other data, project presentations and updates, and ongoing discussions and information exchange by telephone, email and through other means. Sources of Aboriginal Ecological Knowledge collected from NCC included, but were not limited to, land use surveys and interviews, reviews of existing published and unpublished literature, and through the provision of information to Nalcor by NCC.

Assessment Report (CAR), Section 3.0 (Nalcor Energy, 2009) found in Appendix L; Socioeconomic Environment: Aboriginal Communities and Land Use Component Study, Section 2.0 as found in Appendix I; and Environmental Impact Statement, Labrador-Island Transmission Link, Volume 1, Aboriginal Consultation and Issues Scoping, Chapter 7, Section 7.2 (Nalcor Energy, 2012) found in Appendix M and EIS, LITL, Volume 3, Chapter 15, Section 15.5.7.1 (Nalcor, 2012) as found in Appendix J.

During spring 2007, discussions were initiated with the executive of the Labrador Metis Nation (LMN), NCC's name at the time. As part of the public review process LMN provided comments on the draft EIS Guidelines. During spring and summer 2008, senior Lower Churchill Project personnel held meetings with representatives of the LMN in Happy Valley-Goose Bay to exchange information about the Projects, the environmental assessment and possible LMN interests. At that time, it was agreed to provide support for initial LMN community consultation on the Projects, based on a jointly developed work plan. These meetings provided a basis for continued and ongoing Project-related discussions and for establishing a working relationship with LMN.

In December 2009, Nalcor and NCC entered into a Community Consultation Agreement to enable and facilitate effective communication and consultation on the Projects. The agreement provided capacity funding to NCC to assist in this communication and in the provision of information to both parties and feedback to Nalcor regarding NCC's concerns about the Projects. The outcome of the December 2009 Community Consultation Agreement between Nalcor and NCC was a report to Nalcor which generally outlined some of NCC members' perspectives and concerns regarding the proposed Projects.¹³ This Agreement expired on March 31, 2010.

Following the conclusion of the 2009-2010 Community Consultation Agreement, negotiations to enter into a Phase II agreement focused on the LITL Project commenced in March 2010. In January 2011, that agreement was signed between NCC and Nalcor, to provide further LITL Project information, and to gather additional information on the questions and concerns of NCC members regarding the LITL Project and its potential effects, as well as on NCC land use activities and knowledge, recognizing that populations living in proximity to the LITL Project may have substantial and distinct knowledge which may be relevant to that Project and its EA.

Under the 2011 Community Consultation Agreement, Nalcor personnel travelled with NCC representatives to 10 Labrador communities where many of the NCC membership reside, to provide LITL Project information through presentations at community meetings. In addition, approximately 150 surveys were conducted with NCC members to identify LITL Project-related issues and questions, and a further 30 land use interviews were conducted. The information and data obtained by Nalcor as a result of the 2011 Agreement was incorporated into the LITL EIS. A draft version of the "Contemporary Land and Sea Uses" report was received by Nalcor on December 16, 2011. The information and data obtained by Nalcor as a result of this Agreement has been incorporated into Chapter 7 of the LITL EIS.¹⁴ An overview of the key questions and issues raised by NCC members regarding Generation and LITL are addressed in Section 5.0 of this report.

¹³ See Appendix 3 in Consultation Assessment Report (CAR) as found in Appendix L.

¹⁴ EIS Generation, Volume 1A, Chapter 8, Section 8.2.2 as found in Appendix K; Consultation Assessment Report, Supplemental (CAR), Section 4.0 as found in Appendix L; Socioeconomic Environment: Aboriginal Communities and Land Use Component Study, Section 4.0 as found in Appendix I; and EIS, LITL, Chapter 7, Section 7.4 as found at (Appendix M) and Chapter 15, Section 15.5.7.2 as found in Appendix J.

4.2.3 *Nunatsiavut*

Although neither of the Projects cross through or near land areas covered by the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement (LILCA), Nalcor was committed to open discussions with the Nunatsiavut Government and the continued provision of project information to the Labrador Inuit. Nalcor began meeting with the Nunatsiavut Government and other Inuit organizations and individuals to provide project information and receive and consider Inuit views on the Projects and its potential environmental effects and benefits in March 2008.

As with all stakeholders, Nalcor engaged directly with Nunatsiavut Government, through the release of information and distribution of information products. The information provided included updates, baseline study descriptions, permits and authorizations - as per the Provincial Aboriginal Consultation Guidelines. Information regarding methylmercury mitigation and effects management strategies and schedules, as well as general information about the Lower Churchill Project was also shared. This provided stakeholders with a significant amount of information pertaining to the Projects.

This “information out” and an “information in” perspective provided stakeholders with information on the Generation and LITL Projects, allowing them to review and consider this information and formulate their questions and issues, and then giving them the opportunity to provide their perspectives to Nalcor for consideration in project planning and the EA for both Projects. The details of Nalcor’s consultation with Nunatsiavut Government can be found in Section 5.0 of the Consultation Assessment Report, and in Chapter 7 of LITL EIS. Nalcor’s understanding of the contemporary land use is detailed in the LITL Component Study at pages 20-27.

An overview of the key questions and issues raised by Nunatsiavut regarding Generation and LITL are addressed later in this report in Section 5.0.

4.2.4 *Québec Innu and Naskapi*

There are 11 Innu communities and one Naskapi community in Québec. The land claim areas of several of these First Nations extend into Labrador, although these have not been accepted for negotiation by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Nalcor also initiated, and continues to seek opportunities to engage in appropriate consultation with the Naskapi Nation of Kawawachikamach, Québec.

To date, Nalcor has been engaged in consultation activities with six Québec Innu communities and one Québec Naskapi community to provide information on the Generation and LITL Projects, and to attempt to identify and discuss the nature of any associated interests and issues. The following lists the seven Québec Aboriginal groups that have been consulted:

- Pakua Shipi (Saint- Augustin);
- Unamen Shipu (La Romaine);

- Nutashkuan (Natashquan);
- Ekuanitshit (Mingan);
- Uashat mak Mani-Utenam (Sept-Îles);
- Matimekush-Lac John (Schefferville); and
- Kawawachikamach (Naskapi community).

Consultation and information sharing initiatives have varied between groups, as discussed above, based on their respective locations, nature and level of their interests, and their responses. Consultation for the purposes of issue scoping and gathering of Aboriginal Ecological Knowledge, has included face-to-face meetings, written correspondence, the provision of Project-related information (including brochures and fact-sheets prepared specifically for this purpose and translated into French), and/or the negotiation and implementation of proposed community engagement agreements through various meetings, conference calls, telephone calls and emails. Sources of Aboriginal Ecological Knowledge included, but were not limited to, land use surveys and interviews, reviews of existing published and unpublished literature, and through the provision of information to Nalcor by the group or community.

In May 2009, several groups (i.e., Pakua Shipu, Unamen Shipu, Nutashkuan, Ekuanitshit, Uashat mak Mani-Utenam, Matimekush-Lac John) were provided with a copy of Nalcor's proposed Aboriginal Community Engagement Agreement, and were invited to review the draft agreement to indicate their response to the terms of the agreement.

In 2010, Nalcor moved forward with planning and attempting to carry out an Indigenous consultation program focused specifically on the LITL Project and its EA.

Almost a year after the initial proposal was tabled, an agreement was successfully finalized with the community of Pakua Shipu on April 29, 2010. The parties developed a jointly agreed upon workplan and work scope for the exchange of information, identification of community concerns and the collection of contemporary land use information pertaining to the LITL Project.

Nalcor's continued consultation efforts, seeking to negotiate consultation agreements so as to identify issues and concerns and to continue to collect land use information, resulted in a second phase Community Engagement Agreement being signed with the Innu of Pakua Shipu, with the objective of continuing consultation in January 2011. Under this agreement, additional information was collected on the LITL Project related issues and concerns, and on any land and resource use in or near the proposed transmission corridors and associated traditional knowledge.

On June 17, 2011, an agreement was signed with representatives of Unamen Shipu allowing for the exchanges of LITL Project information and the collection of land and resource use data.

In addition, although there was no formalized consultation agreement put in place with Naskapi Nation of Kawawachikamach, Nalcor provided this community with Project-related information and opportunities to identify any interests, issues and concerns. Formal consultation agreements were not

finalized with the remaining Québec Innu communities (Nutashkuan, Ekuanitshit, Uashat mak Mani-Utenam and Matimekush-Lac John). Nalcor, however, continued to engage in (or offer) consultation with these groups respecting the LITL Project through the provision of information and, with the agreement of the community, through community meetings, workshops, conference calls, phone calls, and emails, to identify any interests and particular issues and concerns.¹⁵

For more details on the consultation with Québec Innu and Naskapi, see; EIS, Generation, Volume 1, Part A, Sections 8.2.4, 8.3.4 and 8.3.5.2; Project-Related Consultation Activities with Québec Innu and Naskapi Communities, Sections 6 through 13 of CAR; Section 5 through 11 of the LITL, Aboriginal Communities and Land Use Component Study; and EIS, LITL, Chapter 7, Section 7.3¹⁶

An overview of the key questions and issues raised by the groups and communities in Quebec regarding Generation and LITL will be addressed later in this report in Section 5.0.

5.0 SUMMARY OF INDIGENEOUS ISSUES AND CONCERNS:

5.1 Issues Identification

Key issues identified through consultation with the public, including Indigenous groups and communities, were considered in the Generation and LITL Project design and planning and in the development of guidelines, policies and programs, as well as the identification of topics to be addressed in the EIS.

Nalcor identified issues and areas of concern from several sources: direct engagement, correspondence, JRP process submissions, public statements, existing literature, commissioned reports, land claims documentation and similar process EAs and submissions.

Some of the recurring issues identified through consultation with Indigenous groups and communities included:

- Consultation regarding the Churchill Falls project;
- Project effects on the Innu spiritual connection to the land;
- Effects of wage employment on traditional values;
- Availability of country foods (e.g., loss of access, contamination);
- Effects of employment on social problems such as alcohol and drug addiction;
- improved communication on the benefits of the Project to Innu;
- Long term benefits; and

¹⁵ See Chapter 7, EIS LITL, pp.7-10 to 7-14 as found in Appendix M.

¹⁶ For more details on the consultation with Québec Innu and Naskapi, see EIS, Generation, Volume 1, Part A, Sections 8.2.4, 8.3.4 and 8.3.5.2 as found in Appendix K; Project-Related Consultation Activities with Québec Innu and Naskapi Communities, see Sections 6 through 13 of CAR as found in Appendix L; Sections 5 through 11 of the LITL, Aboriginal Communities and Land Use Component Study as found in Appendix I; EIS, LITL, Chapter 7, Section 7.3 as found in Appendix M.

- Training and employment.

5.2 Summary of Responses to Indigenous Questions and Issues and Supporting Documentation

The information outlined below contains a summary of issues raised by Indigenous groups during the consultation process. Each table is organized by group and is separated by project, Generation and LITL. The tables list the key questions and issues, the pertinent section of the EIS and the supporting documentation. All relevant plans, studies and reports in relation to issues raised for the Generation and LITL Projects have been provided in the supporting documentation in Appendix O.

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
Traditional Lifestyle	Fishing	The concern that the harvest of some species will go down because of shoreline effects and changes in distribution	CEAR # 214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume III, Sections 5.5 and Section 5.6</p> <p>IR JRP.80</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan • Fish Habitat Compensation Plan • Baseline Reports
		Need for Sheshatshiu consumption and angling information	CEAR #289	<p>Nalcor completed a Human Health Risk Assessment which included consumption estimates for Sheshatshiu.</p> <p>IR JRP.81</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human Health Risk Assessment Plan • Human Health Risk Assessment Baseline Report
		Need for additional information related to the scope and frequency of monitoring of baseline exposure of humans to mercury and consider concerns raised in determining the fish consumption advisories	CEAR #289	<p>Nalcor completed a Human Health Risk Assessment which included consumption estimates for Sheshatshiu.</p> <p>Nalcor completed a revised methylmercury effects assessment in Spring 2018.</p> <p>IR JRP.82, IR JRP.112, IR JRP. 112S and IR JRP. 141</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human Health Risk Assessment Plan • Human Health Risk Assessment Baseline Report • Revised Methylmercury Assessment
	Hunting	In Innu Nation comments on EIS Conformity Review, issues were raised with respect to the Impact of the Project and environmental changes on the quality, colour and texture of country foods	CEAR #214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP. 70, IR JRP.70S, IR JRP.74</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human Health Risk Assessment Plan • Human Health Risk Assessment Baseline Report

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		<p>In Innu Nation comments on Nalcor's responses to information requests, issues were raised in relation to the impacts of the Project upon the consumption of country foods, taking into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - current harvest levels in the Project influence area, as well as potential future harvest level needs associated with the growing Sheshatshiu population; - the importance of harvest levels in the geographic area influenced by the Project relative to harvest levels in the broader area used by Sheshatshiu members; and - factors influencing harvesting and harvest production in the Project influence area in particular, and those influencing harvesting and production levels in general 	CEAR #289	<p>These issues have been addressed IR JRP.70, IR JRP.70S, IR JRP.74</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human Health Risk Assessment Plan • Human Health Risk Assessment Baseline Report
	Gathering places, sacred areas, spiritual areas	Comprehensiveness of EIS -- Additional shaking site identified by Innu elder in 1999 should be included	CEAR #289	<p>This issue has been addressed IR JRP. 104</p> <p>Nalcor has completed a comprehensive Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment Program in consultation with Innu Nation.</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment
		Significance of rock knoll at Muskrat Falls and need for Proponent to provide information regarding construction alternatives to minimize disturbance to the site	CEAR #289	<p>This issue has been addressed EIS, Volume IA, Chapter 3 IR JRP.26 and IR JRP.26S Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) Agreement and associated agreements</p> <p>Nalcor has completed a comprehensive Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment Program in consultation with Innu Nation.</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Likelihood that the Project will alter or destroy heritage sites, sites used for cultural purposes or flood burial grounds or birth sites and need for a Historic and Archaeological Resources Contingency and Response Plan to address concerns regarding potential for damage to cultural heritage resources	CEAR #214	<p>The effects of the Project on heritage sites and sites used for cultural purposes have been assessed in the EIS. Archaeological studies have been conducted throughout the footprint area of the Project. Results have been analyzed and presented in the EIS. Locations of sites of cultural significance have been taken into account in Project planning</p> <p><i>2006 Historic Resources Overview and Impact Assessment of Muskrat Falls Generating Facility and Reservoir and the Muskrat Falls to Gull Island Transmission Line Corridor, Churchill River Power Project Historic Resources Overview Assessment 1998-2000 Volume 1 Interpretation Summary and Recommendations, Historic Resources Potential Mapping, Volumes I and II, and Historic Resources Overview Assessment (Labrador Component) component studies</i></p> <p>EIS volume III, Sections 6.5, 6.6, 6.7 and 8.1</p> <p>IR JRP.104, IR JRP.144</p> <p>Nalcor has completed a comprehensive Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment Program in consultation with Innu Nation.</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
	Use of territory	Need to fill data gaps in Proponent's analysis of impacts of events such as the construction of the TLH which might have caused a fundamental change in the nature, intensity or distribution of land and resource use in the Study Area by Innu	CEAR #289	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.1/1S, IR JRP.151</p> <p><i>Innu Of Labrador Contemporary Land Use and Harvesting Study Agreement</i>, July 22, 2010</p> <p>Nalcor has under a comprehensive Environmental Effects Monitoring Program in Consultation with the Innu Nation.</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program
		Loss of natural beauty will result from the Project - Proponent should describe the effects of the entire Project, including dams and reservoirs, on landscape and aesthetic quality through the use of words, and images	Radio Broadcast dated May 14, 2008	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume III, section 5.5</p> <p>IR JRP.14</p> <p>Nalcor has under a comprehensive Environmental Effects Monitoring Program in Consultation with the Innu Nation.</p> <p>See Error! Reference source not found.</p> <p>Environmental Effects Monitoring Program</p>
		Flooding of gravesites from Upper Churchill	Newspaper Article November 21, 2006	<p>This issue is beyond the scope of the Lower Churchill Project</p> <p>Nalcor has completed a comprehensive Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment Program in consultation with Innu Nation.</p> <p>See Error! Reference source not found.</p> <p>Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment</p>
		The potential for changes in shoreline habitat to decrease shorebird abundance	CEAR #214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.101, IR JRP.102 and IR JRP.148</p> <p>See Error! Reference source not found.</p> <p>Avifauna Effects Monitoring Plan</p> <p>Wetland and Riparian Plan (to be revised)</p>

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		The effects of the Project on the population of big game animals because of habitat disturbances	CEAR #214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume IIB, Sections 5.7, 5.11, 5.14, and 5.15 Volume III, Sections 5.5 and 5.6</p> <p>IR JRP.101, IR JRP.102, IR JRP. 124, IR JRP.126, IR JRP. 148, IR JRP.154, IR JRP.157</p> <p>See Error! Reference source not found.</p> <p>Black Bear Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan</p> <p>Caribou Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan</p> <p>Species at Risk Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan</p> <p>Moose Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan</p>
		The potential for the Project to affect migratory routes and divert birds from traditional hunting areas	CEAR # 214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume IIB, Section 5</p> <p>IR JRP.94, IR JRP.94, IR JRP.154</p> <p>See Error! Reference source not found.</p> <p>Avifauna Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan</p> <p>Avifauna Management Plan</p>
		Traditional hunting grounds will be lost as a result of flooding	Radio Broadcast October 30, 2006	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.70S, IR JRP. 143</p>
		Nalcor requested to discuss the transformative changes to Aboriginal hunting, trapping and fishing patterns that can result from changes to land access drawing on the literature discussing the experiences of the Cree of Québec and the Innu of both Labrador and Québec	Radio Broadcast dated May 14, 2008	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume III, Section 5.5</p> <p>IR JRP.143</p> <p>See Error! Reference source not found.</p> <p>Socioeconomic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan</p>
		Approach to socio-economic assessment -- need for qualitative information about the character, history and evolution of the Innu over time, and particularly how Innu have been impacted by and responded and/or adapted to previous change	CEAR #214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume IA, Chapter 5. EIS Volume III, Chapter 2</p> <p>IR JRP.143</p> <p>See Error! Reference source not found.</p> <p>Socioeconomic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan</p>

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Need to discuss with Innu Nation with respect to mitigation measures should ice conditions below Muskrat Falls adversely affect access to harvesting areas	CEAR #289	Nalcor agrees See Error! Reference source not found. Ice Formation Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Need to seek the views of elders with respect to proposed relocation of Canada yew	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) Agreement and associated agreements Not applicable to the Muskrat Falls Project (only in Gull Island reservoir area).
		Impact of Project employment, including shift rotation, on ability to engage in traditional activities	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.142 Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) Agreement and associated agreements See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socioeconomic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Increased use of area by non-traditional users due to increased access to area which may decrease harvest available to Innu, result in increased competition for resources and increase risk of theft or damage to traditional camps and equipment	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed EIS, Volume III, Sections 4.7.5, 5.5 and 5.6 IR JRP.72, IR JRP.142, IR JRP.143 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socioeconomic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Methylmercury levels in reservoir fish could cause Innu to lose confidence in quality of other animals and plants	CEAR # 214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA, Section 2.3.7.3 EIS Volume III Section 5.5.5.2 EIS Volume III Section 4.8.3 IR JRP.22, IR JRP.156 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Human Health Risk Assessment Methylmercury Assessment Human Health Risk Assessment Baseline Report

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		The potential to lose wildlife habitat that is significant to animals and humans for subsistence and cultural sustainability	CEAR # 214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume IIB, Sections 5.7, 5.1 and 5.15</p> <p>Volume III, Sections 5.5 and 5.6</p> <p>IR JRP.70S, IR JRP.83, IR JRP.101, IR JRP. 102, IR JRP. 124, IR JRP.148, IR JRP. 154</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black Bear Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan • Caribou Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan • Species at Risk Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan • Moose Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan • Socioeconomic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan • Human Health Risk Assessment • Furbearers Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan • Avifauna Management Plan • Avifauna Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan • LCP No Harvesting Policy • Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan • Fish Habitat Compensation Plan
		The potential for loss of the traditional way of life on the land and the Innu sense of identity, the potential loss of traditional knowledge and the concern that Project conflicts with Innu culture and worldview	CEAR # 214 Radio Broadcast dated May 14	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.142, IR JRP.143</p> <p>Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) Agreement and associated agreements</p>
		Loss of animal life due to flooding	Radio Broadcast, June 22, 2006	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>Volume IIB, sections 5.5.13, 5.14 and 7.0</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs • Environmental Protection Plan
		Potential loss of hunting and trapping gear due to Project. Trappers may lose traps, boats, snowmobiles, cabins and portions of traplines in areas that are flooded	Radio Broadcast May 14, 2008 CEAR #214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP. 110</p>
		Potential loss of cabins due to inundation or destruction due to reservoir flooding, access roads	CEAR # 289	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP. 109</p>

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Desire for Project use of Innu place names (toponymy)	Meeting, October 12, 2000	This issue has been addressed EIS, Volume IB, Appendix IB-A
		Need for study of historical resource use	Meeting, May 31 - June 1, 2000	This issue has been addressed <i>2006 Historic Resources Overview and Impact Assessment of Muskrat Falls Generating Facility and Reservoir and the Muskrat Falls to Gull Island Transmission Line Corridor, Churchill River Power Project Historic Resources Overview Assessment 1998-2000 Volume 1 Interpretation Summary and Recommendations, Historic Resources Potential Mapping, Volumes I and II, and Historic Resources Overview Assessment (Labrador Component)</i> component studies EIS, Volume III, Chapter 6 IR JRP.104 and IR JRP.144 Nalcor has completed a comprehensive Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment Program in consultation with Innu Nation. See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment
		Fear that the Project will have similar negative environmental, social and cultural impacts as the Upper Churchill	Newspaper Article dated November 21, 2005	This issue will be addressed by the JRP Process
		Loss of hunting territory and travel routes will make it more difficult to engage in traditional activities	CEAR #214 CEAR # 289	This issue has been addressed EIS, Volume III, Section 4.7.5, 5.5, and 5.6 IR JRP.142, IR JRP.143 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socioeconomic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Decrease or loss of shoreline access	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed EIS, Volume III, Sections 5.2, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 8.1, and 8.3 IR JRP.34, IR JRP.35, IR JRP.36

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Fear of unsafe conditions deterring use of Project area	CEAR# 214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.154, IR JRP. 36 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Navigation Mitigation and Monitoring Plan
		Impact of changing ice conditions on downstream communities	CEAR # 214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB IR JRP.43, IR JRP.71, IR JRP. 152 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ice Formation Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Preservation of traditional way of life - culture and traditions: the loss of hunting territory and travel routes will make it difficult for Innu to practice their culture; Innu are being pressured to give up the land they have survived on for centuries	Presentation December 9, 2009 CEAR # 214 Newspaper article, October 20, 2008 Newspaper article, September 2, 2008 Newspaper Article, October 6, 2008	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Sections 4.7.5, 5.5 and 5.6 IR JRP.142 and IR JRP.143 Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) Agreement and associated agreements
	Plant harvesting	The potential for flooding to affect vegetation used for medicines or spiritual rituals or to destroy habitat of berries and other plants Effects on trees, grasses, berries and other vegetation that grow along the shoreline, including plants used in Innu medicines -- Need for additional information with respect to the composition, distribution, and abundance of medicinal herbs and plants, the contemporary importance and frequency of practice of medicinal plant gathering activities to the local Aboriginal communities; the percentage of the medicinal plant gathering area(s) that would be lost after impoundment of the dam and clearing of the transmission line corridor; and the distances community members would need to travel to access similar resource areas after impoundment	CEAR #214 CEAR #289	These issues have been addressed IR JRP.70, IR JRP.70S, IR JRP.74
		Herbicide use on cleared areas may affect the quality or abundance of food plants, such as berries	CEAR # 214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB, Section 5.11.2.3; 5.14.8.2 IR JRP.91

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Nalcor is requested to provide its understanding of the interaction of strong Innu medicines with the aquatic ecosystem, and to justify why this interaction has not been considered in the environmental assessment	CEAR Doc # 214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.70S, IR JRP. 143
	Trails and Camps	Need to consider available information with respect to Innu harvesting areas, transportation routes and snowmobile trails in Project area	CEAR #214 CEAR# 289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.71, IR JRP.72, IR JRP.73, IR JRP.109, IR JRP.138, IR JRP.142 and IR JRP.143 <i>Innu Of Labrador Contemporary Land Use and Harvesting Study Agreement, July 22, 2010</i>
		Need for baseline information, and traditional knowledge with respect to Innu camps and cabins	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.109, IR JRP. 143 <i>Innu Of Labrador Contemporary Land Use and Harvesting Study Agreement, July 22, 2010</i>
	Trapping	Need to demonstrate that data collected in relation to furbearers has provided sufficient statistical power to predict the effects of the Project on furbearers and to detect change distinct from natural variation following inundation	CEAR # 214	This issue has been addressed <i>Furbearer Winter Habitat Use, component study</i> <i>Wildlife Habitat Association component study, EIS Volume IIA</i>
		Loss of trapping area due to flooding	CEAR # 214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.109, IR JRP. 110 <i>Innu Of Labrador Contemporary Land Use and Harvesting Study Agreement, July 22, 2010</i>
Social	Education and Training	Issues related to the effectiveness of employment and training initiatives proposed and success of IBAs in other similar situations	Newspaper article, October 20, 2008	This issue has been addressed EIS Vol III, Section 3.6 IR JRP. 13, IR JRP.115, IR JRP.133 Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) and associated agreements Lower Churchill Construction Projects Benefits Strategy Aboriginal Skills and Employment Program (ASEP)

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Need for funding for job-sharing, on-the-job training and related matters; lack of basic education for Innu to receive training to get jobs/qualify for training programs; need for an Innu employment quota; need to ensure employment equity; need to remove impediments to training	CEAR #214	<p>These issues have been addressed</p> <p>EIS Vol III, Section 3.6</p> <p>IR JRP. 13, IR JRP.115, IR JRP.133</p> <p>Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) Agreement and associated agreements</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower Churchill Construction Projects Benefits Strategy <p>Aboriginal Skills and Employment Program (ASEP)</p>
	Family and Community	Potential to increase demands on existing programs and services, potential increase in domestic violence, adverse effects of increased drug and alcohol use upon family and community resulting in a need to develop a complete environmental health assessment framework in order to properly evaluate the risks to the health of the local communities engendered by the LCP (adults and children)	CEAR #214	<p>These issues have been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume III, Sections 4.6 and 4.7</p> <p>IR JRP. 115, IR JRP. 135</p>
		Need to clarify how ASEP training programs and child care allowances and IBA benefits will provide sufficient financial resources for child care, prior to Project commencement	CEAR #289	<p>These issues have been addressed</p> <p>EIS, Volume III, Section 4.7.5, 5.5, and 5.6</p> <p>IR JRP. 135, IR JRP. 137, IR JRP.142 and IR JRP.143</p> <p>Aboriginal Skills and Employment Program (ASEP)</p> <p>Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) and associated agreements</p>
	Health	Impact of elevated mercury levels in fish and applicability of Health Canada guidelines instead of traditional intake tool based on Innu cultural context; Need for follow-up and monitoring in relation to mercury	CEAR #214 Various radio broadcasts - June 22 and December 5, 2006 Task Force	<p>These issues have been addressed</p> <p>EIS, Volume III, Sections 4.7 and 4.9</p> <p>IR JRP.78, IR JRP.82, IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S</p>

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Innu Nation comments on EIS conformité review raised a number of health-related issues associated with the Project including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increased risk of Pandemic - Lack of information about effects of selenium - Increased in mental health issues and lack of information about available services - impact on health as a result of changes in diet resulting from Project-related decline in country food harvest and shift to processed foods - Increase in substance abuse 	CEAR #214	These issues have been addressed EIS Volume III, Sections 4.6, 4.7 and 5.5 IR JRP.81, IR JRP.115, IR JRP.135, IR JRP.140 and IR JRP.142
	Infrastructure, housing, etc.	Innu Nation comments on EIS Conformity Review and Nalcor's responses to information requests raised issues with respect to the impact of the Project upon existing infrastructure, rental accommodations, increased volume in shipping through port, impact on airport and need for additional information in relation to these matters	CEAR #214 CEAR # 289	These issues have been addressed EIS Volume III, Section 4.5 IR JRP. 106, IR JRP. 108, IR JRP.112 and IR JRP.112S
	Other	Innu Nation comments on EIS Conformity Review raised a number of issues associated with the socioeconomic impacts of the Project including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - need for additional demographic information in relation to specific populations and communities in the Upper Lake Melville Area; population rates of growth/decline; age and gender; age and gender structure; ethnic background; and projected population change - trends in labour force population, participation, employment and unemployment, income, highest education attainment levels - economic, social and health infrastructure and services in Upper Lake Melville Area - the effects of large-scale developments upon Aboriginal populations and impacts on VECs - inadequacy of baseline with respect to the social, cultural and economic conditions of Sheshatshiu Innu - substance abuse, family violence and other issues relevant to Sheshatshiu Innu 	CEAR #214	These issues have been addressed <i>Socio-economic Baseline Report, Forecasted Labour Resource Requirements by National Occupation Classification for Generation Projects, and Community Health Study, Current Land and Resource Use in the Lower Churchill River Area</i> Component studies. EIS, Volume III, Chapter 2 IR JRP.13, IR JRP.14, IR JRP.76, IR JRP.115, IR JRP. 130, IR JRP.134, IR JRP. 135, IR JRP.140, IR JRP.143, IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S, IR JRP.164
Economic	Benefits	Nalcor must demonstrate that increased income will support traditional activities and/or promote the purchase of capital equipment in support of traditional activities and that extended rotation work schedules do not impact on the frequency and duration of traditional activities	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed EIS, Volume III, Sections 5.5, and 5.6 IR JRP.39, IR JRP.142

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Need to settle Innu Land Claim prior to Innu consent for Project	Radio Broadcast, May 14. Newspaper Article, October 9, 2007 Newspaper Article, Dated May 21, 2008	This issue has been addressed Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) Agreement and associated agreements
		Desire for Innu to profit from resources in their traditional territory Need for Innu to have financial security	Radio Broadcast, May 14, 2008	This issue has been addressed Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) Agreement and associated agreements
		Need to compensate Innu for Upper Churchill impacts prior to Innu consent to the Lower Churchill Project	Meeting, January 16, 2007 Newspaper Article, May 21, 2008	This issue has been addressed Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) Agreement and associated agreements
		Only Innu leadership or those with businesses will benefit from this Project	Meeting, June 29, 2010	This issue has been addressed EIS, Volume III, Sections 3.7 and 8.1 Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) Agreement and associated agreements Lower Churchill Construction Projects Benefits Strategy
		Need for a fair deal related to the Project	Newspaper Article October 8, 2006	This issue has been addressed Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) Agreement and associated agreements
		Need to consider how proposed reservoir clearing alternatives would be integrated with a Labrador-based lumber mill and pellet production facility, and how the development of these facilities in advance of or in conjunction with the Project would alter its conclusions regarding the preferred reservoir clearing alternative Make available a report on wood disposal methods being prepared for the Department of Natural Resources	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.33 IR JRP.148 -- Appendix A, <i>Reservoir Preparation Plan 2009</i>
		Need for mechanism to monitor predicted Project expenditures and employment projects and to implement an adaptive management strategy if such predictions do not materialize	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP. 164
		Lack of adequate involvement by Innu Businesses in 2007 summer field work	Meeting August 16, 2007	No further action required

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
	IBAs	Request for additional information on the financial model of the project prior to IBA negotiations Need for economic modelling and business study	Letter November 26, 2007 Meeting October 12, 2000	This issue has been addressed and the terms of financial compensation have been agreed to by Innu Nation and Nalcor Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) Agreement and associated agreements
	Jobs	Need for additional information with respect to Innu employment on the Project in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - characteristic differences in Labour force for Upper Lake Melville Area (Sheshatshiu/Mud Lake); - estimates of direct, indirect and induced employment for the Upper Lake Melville area, various segments of the local population and potential Innu labour force for various job opportunities; - literature used and assumptions made in the modelling of EIS employment projections; - accuracy of employment estimates; - estimate of the size of the surplus Upper Lake Melville area labour pool that may be available to take advantage of additional employment opportunities over and above opportunities from the Project 	CEAR #214	These issues have been addressed IR JRP.130
		Need for additional information with respect to Innu employment in Project Workforce in relation to a variety : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact of funding from Canada's Economic Action Plan upon Project labour availability of labour and a detailed adaptive management strategy to ensure that project expenditure and employment predictions materialize; - employment data on other projects; - impact of other projects upon regional employment forecasts; - need for training; - need for information on shift rotation assumptions; - need for Labour Force Study; - need for information in relation to transportation to site, including timing of transportation - mitigation measures to address employee retention and potential loss of workers due to competing industries; decline in levels of income support in Upper Lake Melville as a result of reserve creation 	CEAR #289	These issues have been addressed <i>Forecasted Labour Force Requirements by National Occupation Classification for Generation Projects</i> component study EIS Vol III, Section 3.6 IR JRP.13, IR JRP.133, IR JRP.142 Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) and associated agreements Aboriginal Skills and Employment Program (ASEP) Nalcor Lower Churchill Construction Projects Benefits Strategy

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Need for training strategy and anti-discrimination policies	Meeting Notes June 29, 2010	These issues have been addressed IR JRP.133 Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) and associated agreements Aboriginal Skills and Employment Program (ASEP) Nalcor Lower Churchill Construction Projects Benefits Strategy
		Need for Labour Force study	Meeting Notes October 12, 2000	This issue has been addressed <i>Forecasted Labour Force Requirements by National Occupation Classification for Generation Projects</i> component study EIS Vol III, Section 3.6 IR JRP.13 Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) and associated agreements
		Many of the people that are selling drugs do so because of a lack of other opportunities. The Project and its jobs may help in that regard by providing another option	NL Hydro and Innu Nation Task Force meeting February 13, 2008	Nalcor agrees

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
	Other	<p>A number of issues were raised by Innu Nation in its comments on EIS Conformity Review in relation to the specific types of conservation and demand management programs used to make the predictions in the Marbek Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - comparisons of predicted conservation and demand management estimates for the Province with other jurisdictions, including justifications for differences in per capita estimates - an explanation for why the Marbek Report uses a 19% electricity demand increase over the period 2006 to 2026, while the EIS uses a 32% demand increase over the same period - the potential for conservation and demand-side management to be used in combination with embedded energy and Island generation sources (other than the Project) to meet demand on the Island - the anticipated effect on demand management of including embedded energy, industrial peak demand reductions, and pricing of peak power in the predictions of conservation and demand management savings - the reasons for differences between the achievable electricity savings and the economic electricity savings and justifications for why the latter cannot be achieved 	CEAR #214	<p>These issues have been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.5, IR JRP.25, IR JRP.5S/25S, IR JRP.26, IR JRP.25S, and IR JRP.146</p>
		<p>Need for an indication of the specific sources (including location, capacity, current GHG emissions) to be offset</p> <p>Need for information related to the quantification of offset sources against sources from the construction and operation of the Project</p> <p>Collection of subsequent data to that obtained in 2006 to address issues of concern as well as establish relative trends in and between the watersheds with respect to GHG flux and environmental effects monitoring program for GHG emissions from the future project reservoirs</p>	CEAR #214	<p>These issues have been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP. 7S, IR JRP. 88, IR JRP.146</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Atmospheric Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Need for information in relation to Project planning and design, including: cost of feasible alternatives to the Project; economics of proceeding with only Gull, economics of full reservoir clearing, effectiveness and cost of proposed mitigation measure	CEAR #214	<p>These issues have been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.5, IR JRP.25, IR JRP.5S/25S, IR JRP.26, IR , IR JRP.33 and IR JRP.146</p>

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Need for proponent to provide all information requested by the EIS Guidelines in order to demonstrate that the economic benefits of the Project are real and substantial and sufficient to pay for planned and unplanned mitigation, monitoring and compensation	CEAR #214	These issues have been addressed IR JRP.5, IR JRP.25, IR JRP.55/25S, IR JRP.26, IR JRP.25S, IR JRP.33 and IR JRP.146
		Innu Nation comments on EIS Conformity Review raised a number of issues associated with the approach to socio-economic effects assessment, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the characteristic differences in economy for Upper Lake Melville Area; - clarification of discussion of income support and Project; - detailed information on local economic benefits, economic modelling assumptions; - estimates of money, goods and services associated with the Project to be spent locally, regionally, provincially, nationally and internationally; - criteria for determination of significance of Project effects on economy, employment and business; - estimates of capital expenditures in Upper Lake Melville; - impact on local infrastructure, including local airport 	CEAR #214	These issues have been addressed EIS Volume III, Sections 3.5, 3.7 and 4.5 IR JRP.11, IR JRP. 12, IR JRP.106, IR JRP. 108, IR JRP. 116, IR JRP. 131, IR JRP. 134 and IR JRP. 136
		The EIS presentation of legislation, regulations and policies of relevance to the Project is limited to Provincial and federal legislation and regulations required in relation to construction and operations, as summarized in Appendix 1-B-G. Little information is provided concerning policies potentially affecting the Project, and no information is provided in relation to the transmission, sale or marketing of electricity from the Project	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP. # 146
		Request for additional information and analysis on other developments such as the proposed Aurora uranium mine	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.130, IR JRP.132
Environment	Operations and impacts on habitat	Fish habitat	Meeting Notes July 18, 2000	Project effects to fish and fish habitat were assessed in the EIS. A fish habitat compensation strategy will be prepared and adverse effects to fish habitat will be compensated EIS Volume IIA, Chapters 4 and 7 IR JRP. 20, IR JRP.21, IR JRP.49, IR JRP.50, IR JRP.51, IR JRP.52, IR JRP.89, IR JRP.107, IR JRP.121, IR JRP.153, and IR JRP.156

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Fish mitigation	Meeting Notes July 18, 2000	<p><i>Fisheries Act</i> Authorization is required prior to any Habitat Alteration Damage or Disruption</p> <p>EIS Volume IIA, Chapters 4 and 7 IR JRP.107 and IR JRP. 153</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan • Fish Habitat Compensation Plan
		Need for third party to verify Nalcor's scientific work on fish	Meeting Notes July 18, 2000	<p>The EIS has been reviewed by Government agencies and funded stakeholders. Questions from the reviewers have been responded to through the IR process</p> <p>All work related to the aquatic environment has been undertaken by a third party expert consultant</p>
		Need for studies on fish consumption habits	Meeting Notes July 18, 2000	<p>A fish consumption survey was conducted and the results were incorporated into the EIS</p> <p><i>Fish Consumption and Angling Survey</i> component study</p> <p>EIS, Volume III, Sections 4.7, 4.8, and 4.9</p> <p>IR JRP.1, IR JRP.80, IR JRP.81, IR JRP.82</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human Health Risk Assessment Baseline Report
		Need for fish habitat and productivity study	Meeting Notes May 31 to June 1, 2000	<p>A fish habitat and productivity study has been completed</p> <p>Habitat Quantification component study</p> <p>EIS Volume IIA</p> <p>IR JRP.153</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan • Fish Habitat Compensation Plan

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Need for information on mercury levels in fish	Meeting Notes August 18, 2000	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.156 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Methylmercury Assessment
		The expectation that fishing may become less enjoyable due to changes to the landscape	CEAR # 214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, section 5.5 IR JRP.14
		The possibility that reservoir formation will result in closure of future fisheries	CEAR # 214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Sections 5.5 and 5.6 IR JRP.80 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan Fish Habitat Compensation Plan
		"Before" and "after" ELC information needs to be available for adjacent landscapes with other developments in order to conduct a meaningful cumulative effects analysis	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Section 9.9 IR JRP.97, IR JRP.97S, IR JRP.163
		Based on dated study, suggesting studies to update baseline prior to proposed project - that conditions in the Churchill River may still be changing in response to Churchill Falls Project	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Section 9.9 IR JRP.97, IR JRP.97S, IR JRP.163
	Other	Need to consider the industrial load opportunities in Labrador in the cumulative effects assessment	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Section 9.9 IR JRP.97, IR JRP.97S, IR JRP.163
		All potential additional Transmission Lines should be included for assessment of cumulative effects, pending decision of Regie de l'energie	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Section 9.9 IR JRP.97, IR JRP.97S, IR JRP.163
		Nalcor has not considered the "combine or interact" portion of the definition of cumulative effects	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.97, IR JRP.97S, IR JRP.163
		Nalcor needs to comment on the cumulative effects of the above-noted projects on regional employment forecasts for the Project Full definition of cumulative effects needs to be addressed	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.97, IR JRP.97S, and IR JRP.16

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Explanation of the rationale behind the selection of the KIs for the Communities VEC and specifically how the KI's that were selected address the many issues and concerns raised by the Innu throughout the consultation process and documented in Volume I-A, in Appendix IB-I	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Section 4.3
		Incompatibility between Regional ELC scale and Project area ELC scale	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA, Chapter 2

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
	Impact on biophysical	<p>Innu Nation comments on EIS Conformity Review raised a number of issues in relation to biophysical impacts including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - need to include mature valley forests as a VEC - temporal boundary of each VEC - definition of 'significant effects' in aquatic and terrestrial environments - lack of habitat utilization data and habitat suitability indices - rationale of the lineal boundaries of the ELC - magnitude, geographical extent and frequency in relation to environmental effects on the terrestrial environment - justification of inclusion of only the Lower Churchill River watershed as inclusive of landscape necessary to predict environmental effects of relevant VECs - definition and delineation of riparian wetlands - need for further information in relation to river hydrology, habitat utilization, change in fish distribution and abundance - need for a second-year survey of ringed seals - adequacy of baseline information - discuss the existing knowledge concerning the importance of spring floods for river sedimentation, aquatic and shoreline vegetation, habitat complexity, biodiversity, nutrient supply, water quality and productivity - expand assessment area - need for analysis of downstream effects with respect to ice conditions and access - forest planning process - fish mortality and related data sources - inadequate information on in-stream flow variability - lack of certainty re: impact predators - lack of certainty for impact predictions for fish and fish habitat 	CEAR #214	<p>These issues have been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume IIA, Sections 2.4, 4.11.1.3, 4.13.1.2, 5.4</p> <p>EIS Volume IIB, Sections 5.2, 5.3, 5.9, 5.11</p> <p>IR JRP.4, IR JRP.19, IR JRP.20, IR JRP.21, IR JRP.41S, IR JRP.152, IR JRP.157, IR JRP. 67, IR JRP.82IR JRP.93, IR JRP.123, IR JRP.153, IR JRP. 163, IR JRP.155, IR JRP.56</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs
		Concern about the amount of forest lost, importance of river valley for some habitats, need to implement mitigation through forest planning process	CEAR #214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.148</p>

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Flow changes and fluctuating water levels. If the reservoir does not provide good habitat for trout and salmon, they will die or migrate to other areas	CEAA #214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Table IB-1 IR JRP. 153
		Increased water depth causing loss of plant species and affecting food availability for fish	CEAR # 214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB, Table IB-1 IR JRP.153, IR JRP.89
		Loss of habitat through building of Project-related roads	CEAR # 214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.124
		Proponent does not answer the question but simply states that no plants listed under the legislation were found with respect to environmental effects analysis as KI	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.42
		Impact of rotting vegetation on water quality	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA, Section 4.7.7.2
		Conclusion regarding effects on medicinal and country food plants cannot be reached due to lack of information	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.70, IR JRP.70S
		Strong medicine of plants affecting water quality	CEAR # 214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Table IB-1 IR JRP.148
		The potential for changes in competition between species to cause increases in predation on other species	CEAR # 214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Table IB-1 IR JRP.126
		The potential for flooding and changes in ice and water conditions to degrade habitat (nesting, breeding, feeding)	CEAR # 214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA, Chapter 4 EIS Volume IIB, chapter 5 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avifauna Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		The potential loss of fish and fish habitat through flooding, blocked access, turbine mortalities and nutrient depletion	Radio Broadcast May 14, 2008	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA, Section 4.8.3 and 4.13.1.2 IR JRP.43, IR JRP.50, IR JRP.152, IR JRP.153 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Fish Habitat Compensation Plan

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Water contamination from the Project will impact both humans and animals	CEAR #214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume IIA, Section 2.3.7.3, 4.9.2, 4.14</p> <p>IR JRP.20, IR JRP.21, IR JRP.22, IR JRP.64, IR JRP.78, IR JRP.79, IR JRP.82, IR JRP.83, IR JRP.141, IR JRP.77, IR JRP.156, IR JRP.165</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs Methylmercury Assessment
		Damage caused by flooding from dams	Newspaper article, dated October 8, 2006	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume IIA Section 4.10.2.3 and 4.11.1.3</p>
		Need to ensure the environment is not drastically impacted or negatively affected	Newspaper Article dated November 5, 2007	<p>This issue will be addressed by the JRP Process</p>
		The fish will be contaminated with mercury and the river will become a man-made lake	Newspaper Article January 12, 2009	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>Volume IIA, Section 2.3.7.3, 4.9.2, 4.14</p> <p>IR JRP.20, IR JRP.21, IR JRP.22, IR JRP.141, IR JRP.153, IR JRP.156</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Methylmercury Assessment
		What about that barge that is under the water in the river? How much damage has this caused?	CEAR #289	<p>The designated government authorities have investigated and the incident is now closed</p>
	Impact on flora	With respect to Canada yew, show impact of inundation on Canada yew site and provide examples where transplanting has been successful	CEAR #289	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.103</p>
		Proponent does not answer the question but simply states that no plants listed under the legislation were found with respect to environmental effects analysis as KI	CEAR #214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.8</p>
		Will common plants become rare plants as a result of the Project	CEAR #214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>Volume IIB, Section 5.2</p>
		Need for study on rare plants	CEAR #214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>Volume IIA, Section 2.4, IR JRP.158</p>
		Provide evidence to show that uncommon species (rare or potentially rare aquatic plants) can be successfully reestablished elsewhere in the river basin. Effects on aquatic vegetation generally	CEAR #214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>Volume IIA, Section 2.2.3.1</p> <p>IR JRP.8, IR JRP.89, IR JRP.158</p>

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
	Impact of wildlife	2km study area is not board enough scale to address Innu concerns regarding habitat use of Black Bears	CEAR #214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.9</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Black Bear Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Change in Health – Osprey and Otter: justify the findings of the ecological risk assessment	CEAR #214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.22 and IR JRP.156</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methylmercury Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Current study does not provide the basis for an EEM program unless it is expanded to include a control area. A possible area could be the Goose River, as suggested in the Workslope	CEAR #214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP. 112, IR JRP.112S and IR JRP.164</p>
		Difference in the methods described in report to those described in the Workslope: placement of traps; collar record positions (30m not 2m); delay in investigation of inactive transmitters; difference in the number of bears used in study; failure of telemetry collars unexplained for gathering habitat utilization data	CEAR #214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.9</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caribou Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Species at Risk Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Discussion of the potential adverse effect on brook trout of the loss of access resulting from construction of the Gull Island dam, including discussion concerning the availability of brook trout spawning habitat following river diversion and during operations	CEAR #214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>Volume IIA, Sections 4.11, 4.12, 4.13 and 4.14</p> <p>IR JRP.50, IR JRP.107, IR JRP.153</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Fish Habitat Compensation Plan

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		<p>Innu Nation comments on EIS Conformity Review raised a number of issues with respect to methodology, approach, model input limitations and assumptions and data sources and contents of baseline studies in relation to the impact of the Project on wildlife including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - timing of field studies for terrestrial species - selection of key indicators for Fish and Fish Habitat - justification for selection of indicators of water quality - revision of criterion for geographic extent of effects on aquatic environment - justification for approach to mortality measures - concerns re: sample size for black bear habitat and movement in territory - justification for characterization of fish habitat based solely on flow velocity - include riparian ecosystem as a VEC - provide population estimates for key indicator fish species - need information and analysis concerning the potential effects of parasites on fish health after inundation - lack of detailed habitat and denning information limits predictive accuracy - need for further details concerning the geographical extent of the 'immediate area' from which wildlife will be deterred by construction noise - basis for habitat classifications - need to develop predictive models for key fish and wildlife species, including caribou, black bear and at least one songbird, waterfowl, furbearer and fish species. Identify data gaps, and work required to address data gaps - information presented in the response does not show that sampling effort with respect to benthic invertebrates is adequate 	CEAR #214	<p>These issues have been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume IIA, Chapter 2 EIS Volume IIB, Chapters 5 and 7</p> <p>IR JRP.4, IR JRP.9, IR JRP.87, IR JRP.56, IR JRP.157, IR JRP.121</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs
		<p>George River Caribou Herd: study did not identify important movement corridors in the Project area for the George River Herds and does not determine alternative habitats for the herd. It does not consider the importance of the GR Herd winter range for the Innu or Labrador. Limited information provided to understand the implications of potential changes to the herd</p>	CEAR #214	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume IIB, Section 5.7</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caribou EEMP • Species and Risk EEMP

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		The development of an EEM in relation to caribou will require the identification of an appropriate control area and herd, as well as more complete habitat use information for the caribou herds potentially affected by the Project	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB, Chapter 7 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caribou EEMP Species and Risk EEMP
		Project impacts on the Red Wine Caribou Herd	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB, Section 5.14 IR JRP.93, IR JRP.157 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caribou EEMP Species and Risk EEMP
		Challenge timing of availability of habitat for existing moose that will be affected by the Project and related issues associated with moose	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.92 See Error! Reference source not found. Moose EEMP
		Sampling with respect to benthic invertebrates is inadequate	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA, Section 4.0 IR JRP.53 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Fish Habitat Compensation Plan
		Increased access by boat and snowmobile could affect wildlife	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB, Section 5.9 IR JRP.35
		More information requested including baseline surveys to document nesting activity and alternate habitat	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA, Chapter 2 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avifauna Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Need estimates of abundance and distribution	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA, Chapter 2 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avifauna Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Request further consideration of flow regime influence on formation of riparian ecotypes	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.43, IR JRP.101, IR JRP.152 Wetland and Riparian Plan to be finalized.
		Challenges to basis for KIs, methodology for assessment of effects on warblers	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP. 4, IR JRP. 68
		Suggest that examples are of small scale with no indication of survivors, request other examples of large scale projects, challenge the survey design and suggest that number of inactive colonies related to temporal variation	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB, Section 5.11
		Suggest that use of Wetland Sparrows as KI is based on scant data and there is no discussion of implications on other associated species; thresholds of significance are so high as to 'mask' significant effects; should have used habitats as the KIs	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA, Section 2.4 IR JRP.4, IR JRP.68
		Deficiencies in Innu Nation Task Force workplan for Osprey, Bald Eagle and Golden Eagle Nest Sites in the Lower Churchill River Area. Also, transmission line from Gull Island to Montagnais, Québec have not been surveyed for Raptors	Letter, June 19, 2006	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA, Section 2.4 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avifauna Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan • Avifauna Management Plan
		Previous studies of waterfowl populations in the Project area were inaccurate and new methodological and statistical approaches are required	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA, Section 2.4
		Impact of exhaust on animals	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA, Section 3
		Methylmercury in furbearers	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.22 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methylmercury Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		The potential for reductions in fish populations to result in decreases in wildlife populations	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Table IB-I IR JRP.153
		The potential for sudden increases in water level to drown animals or force them to change travel routes	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB, Section 5.9
		The potential for the Project to add to the decline in caribou herd populations	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB, Section 5.14 IR JRP.157
		The potential for the Project to alter the diet of animals, waterfowl and fish	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB, Section 7.1

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		The potential for the Project to cause animals to die or move away from the area	Meeting June 29, 2010	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA, Chapter 4 EIS Volume IIB, Chapter 5 IR JRP.123, IR JRP.124, IR JRP.125, IR JRP.126, IR JRP.127
		Impact of Mercury on fish and animal health	Meeting, November 21-22, 2007	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB <i>Existing Mercury Concentrations in Osprey and Ecological Risk Assessment</i> component study IR JRP.22 and IR JRP. 156
		Impact of Project on fur-bearers	Meeting, June 29, 2010	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.22, IR JRP. 112, IR JRP.156
		Need for accurate and sensitive Environmental Monitoring of animal health throughout building and after	Meeting Notes June 29, 2010	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S and IR JRP.162
	Operation and Impacts on habitat	Consideration of the upstream hydroelectric facilities, including Churchill Falls; a review of existing literature pertaining to cumulative effects at similar projects across Canada; consideration of the ongoing environmental effects of the TLH Phase 1	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.44, IR JRP.97, IR JRP.97S, IR JRP.163
		Change in Habitat -- conduct further fieldwork to verify the number of active beaver colonies	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S and IR JRP.164 Beaver relocation was determined to be ineffective. A plan to harvest beaver and provide to the community was developed in consultation with the Government of NL and The Innu Nation.
		Dam break mapping, and description of effect.	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.162 A 2010 dam break study will be provided to the Joint Review Panel
		Exclusion of potential transformer fire inside generation station - emergency preparedness information	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.145
		Information concerning effects on fish and fish habitat based on other scenarios for reservoir inundation at different times of the year, including what the Proponent views as the worst-case scenario	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.148
		Information regarding the construction flood, and the capacity of the Churchill Falls Project to manage that flood is required	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.149
		Nalcor is requested to provide further information concerning fish parasites and hydroelectric reservoirs	CEAR#214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.121

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Nalcor is requested to justify why shoreline stabilization at erosion prone areas between Gull Island and Muskrat Falls is not required or, if required, why it is not discussed in the EIS; detailed descriptions of the future fish habitat at a variety of key locations along the River in order to assist more meaningful consultation with and participation by the Innu and the public in general	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed Volume IIA, Sections 4.11, 4.12, 4.13, 4.14 IR JRP.159
		Nalcor is requested to present consequences of accidents, including environmental. Reconsideration of worst-case scenarios for waste, fuel, spills and fires	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.145
		Nalcor is requested to present the information required by the Guidelines with respect to decommissioning	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.40 and IR JRP.150
		Nalcor is requested to explain the environmental effects on the terrestrial environment resulting from a large workforce during construction and a smaller workforce over the long operation period	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB, Chapter 5
		Nalcor is requested to give further consideration to the incremental conversion of shallow, fast-flowing river habitats to deeper, slow flow reservoir habitats in the region due to river regulation, and to specifically discuss the existing knowledge concerning the importance of spring floods for river sedimentation, aquatic and shoreline vegetation, habitat complexity, biodiversity, nutrient supply, water quality and productivity	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.153
		Nalcor is requested to state in the EIS how it intends to address knowledge gaps in the information and where it does not intend to address these gaps to provide a justification for not doing so, including the implications for effects assessment accuracy and reliability	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP. 19 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs
	Operations and impacts on habitat	Appreciative of effort, request maps showing where noise becomes equal to background levels around infrastructure, they identify maps in JRP.87 but would prefer simplified versions	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.87
		Before and after computer simulations requested for 7 locations. Requested to provide a landscape perspective that considers the phenomenological aspects of Innu history and culture	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Section 5.5 IR JRP.14
		Inundation mapping does not include Sheshatshiu	CEAR #214	No interaction found between Sheshatshiu and impoundment
		Request additional simulations, especially at and near the dams	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Section 5.5 IR JRP.14

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Concerns about the potential for construction noise to chase animals away or cause them to leave usual habitats	CEAA # 214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Section 4.8 Volume IIB, Sections 5.10 and 5.11 IR JRP.87 and IR JRP.125
		Nalcor is requested to describe the contents of an ambient air quality monitoring program beginning one year prior to any construction (to establish a yearlong baseline) and then for a minimum of three years into construction along with criteria for determining whether the program should be continued at that time	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.112, IR JRP.164
	Other	Innu Nation comments on EIS Conformity Review raised a number of general technical issues with respect to air quality/GHG emissions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of rationale for the lengths of transects or discussion of statistical power of transects to detect change over time - need to update climate analysis to include electricity demand side options to reduce GHG emissions - question reliance on existing geology data - need to provide GHG emission budget for each phase of the Project - need to update climate analysis to include electricity demand-side options to reduce GHG emissions - unnecessary reliance on 'professional judgement' - question selection of VECs and KIs 	CEAR #214	These issues have been addressed EIS Volume IIA, Sections 3 and 4 EIS Volume IIB, Section 5.2 IR JRP.4, IR JRP.41, IR JRP.116, IR JRP.85, IR JRP.75, IR JRP.85S, IR JRP.46, IR JRP.99, See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Atmospheric EEMP
		The EIS needs to discuss alternative scales for the Project as required by the Guidelines, including proceeding with only a development at Gull Island. This assessment of alternatives should consider the financial benefits, measured in standard financial indicators, and the adverse environmental effects of each alternative, comparing a Gull-only project to a Gull- Muskrat Falls project	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.26 and IR JRP.26S
		Nalcor is requested to replace the definition of ecological or socioeconomic context with one consistent with that normally used in environmental assessment and to redo the environmental effects analysis accordingly. The Proponent is requested to divide the reversibility criterion into three levels, namely reversible, partly reversible or not reversible	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP. 116
		Nalcor is requested to replace the definition of ecological or socioeconomic context with one consistent with that normally used in environmental assessment and to redo the environmental effects analysis accordingly	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.116

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Nalcor is requested to confirm the specific activities involved in upgrading and constructing access roads; describe elements of the environment sensitive to reduced air quality, provide rationale for 5km buffer zone	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.100
		Nalcor is requested to provide clarification of how it has used other environmental assessments to determine the residual effects of the Project and the significance of these effects for each VEC, as part of the rationale required by the Guidelines in relation to its conclusions regarding significance	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.116
		Habitat Assessment methodology is reasonable, but does not account for connectivity between habitats. Connectivity of habitats could be addressed using a process approach	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.23, IR JRP.153
		Innu Nation does not support Nalcor's findings with respect to no measureable effects to fisheries in Lake Melville. Need more information	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP. 43 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aquatic EEMP • Methylmercury Assessment
		Information on currents should be provided	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.43, IR JRP.152 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methylmercury Assessment
		Matrix choice, small Osprey sample size, no tissue samples, no songbirds sampled	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.22
		Objective must be to establish conditions that permit productive use of rehabilitated sites	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.101 and IR JRP.102
		Proponent should acknowledge level of uncertainty related to limited data and ecosystem complexity	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.19
		Study area should be expanded to include Lake Melville	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed Volume IIA, Section 2.3.1 and 2.3.4 IR JRP.43, IR JRP.152 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aquatic EEMP • Methylmercury Assessment
		Suggest definition of sustainable inappropriate	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.4 and IR JRP.116

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Oil and chemical spills	Meeting February 13 -14, 2008	This issue has been addressed Volume IIB, IR JRP.88 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Master Spill Response Plan
		Ice conditions on the River and tributaries	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed Volume IIA, Section 2.3.5 and 4.7.3 IR JRP.43, IR JRP.152 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ice Formation EEMP
		Nalcor requested to provide a detailed table of contents for the Historic and Archaeological Resources Contingency and Response Plan	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.104 Nalcor has completed a comprehensive Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment Program in consultation with Innu Nation. See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment
		Innu land and resource use information is dated. Need current information on Innu cabin sites, water and land trails, important fishing, harvesting and gathering sites. It is not possible to assess project effects on Innu L&R Use	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed <i>Innu of Labrador Contemporary Land Use and Harvesting Study Agreement, July 22, 2010</i>
		Innu Nation anticipates that the EIS will contain preliminary discussion with respect to the future role of ITK in monitoring impacts on valued environmental components and testing impact predictions in a follow-up program	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S and IR JRP.116

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
EA process	Other	<p>Issues associated with the environmental process and JRP proceedings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concern that all relevant correspondence be posted to the CEA registry; - content and format of Plain Language Summary prepared by JRP; - translation of information requests into Aboriginal languages; - ensure that process is understandable and that terminology is clear - need to ensure that funding decisions by regulator are made in a timely fashion to enable Innu Nation to engage effectively with communities and to secure the necessary technical expertise to conduct a thorough technical review - need for dialogue and information to be provided in Innu aimun - need for openness and transparency throughout the environmental process - timing of notice for submissions - concern about advanced registration via the internet - limited resources for reproduction of documents - JRP should have a copier and scanner - concern about presentation format and use of electronic copies - concern about time limit for presentation - concern that videoconferencing will limit participation - concern with scope of Nalcor's examination during hearings i.e Nalcor's request to challenge questions or comments as outside the scope of the JRP's mandate - need or simultaneous translation during hearings - time limit for expert presentations is too short - request that JRP permit off-site questioning by telephone - request a minimum of four days for hearings in Sheshatshiu - request for public hearing session in Natuashish - need to ensure consistency between EIS, legislation and proposed JRP hearing procedures - propose that transcripts and audio files of each hearing session be posted on the CEAA registry with 24 hours - request that JRP consult on the public guidance document prior to finalization - request opening and closing prayer/ceremony - request that meals be provided to participants to avoid long breaks - concern that JRP documents may not be understood by general public or aboriginal persons - request that meetings between Proponent and JRP be open and transparent and that intervenors and counsel have an opportunity to participate - JRP to request the Proponent to provide information concerning the distribution of the potentially significant adverse or positive effects of the Project in an appropriate format - disagree with the JRPs emphasis on "overall environmental effects" with respect to presentations at hearings - disagree with the use of a "cost-benefit" approach. It is inconsistent with the EIS Guidelines, the EIS, and the relevant legislation. - Innu Nation recommends that the JRP develop guidance that is specific to each of three groups: the general public, Aboriginal persons, and those with technical capacity. Guidance should encourage focused and considered reflection rather than generalized comments about "overall environmental effects". Part I of the draft guidance document is misleading, since it suggests that the JRP will consider positive effects ("benefits") in a similar manner to adverse effects ("costs"), which cannot be the case given the requirements of the CEAA. Portions of the draft Public Hearing Process documents contain questions and approaches that are inconsistent with the EIS and with the relevant environmental assessment legislation. The documents also pose questions that appear to be central to the mandate given to the JRP by the Ministers and are therefore solely the responsibility of the JRP. - Need or technical hearings Project Need, Purpose and Alternatives, Aquatic Environment, and Socio-economic Environment - Suggest two new topics to be added to the topic specific and technical hearings: Cumulative Effects and Aboriginal Rights and Title 	<p>CEAR # 380 CEAR #308</p>	<p>These issues relate to the JRP process. No response required by Nalcor</p>

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Request that Nalcor provide, prior to or during the Hearings, information on the status of ongoing regulatory processes in relation to transmission and export of power	CEAR #289	Nalcor has consulted with Innu Nation since 2000 and will continue to consult on an ongoing basis
		Issues associated with review of the EIS Guidelines and participation in Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - that JRP extend the 75 day Public Consultation Period on the EIS due to late confirmation from the CEEA Funding Review Committee regarding funding for Innu Nation to participate in the Joint Review Panel - concern with design of the framework and its application 	CEAR #146	These are issues associated with the environmental assessment process. No response is required by Nalcor
		Challenge use of precautionary approach definition	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.19
		Challenge use of Goose River data	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.42
		Disagreement with use of 'sustainable population' as the criterion for significance	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.4, IR JRP.116
		Challenge conclusion no significant effect from the Project	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.4, IR JRP.116
		Issue regarding the RSF analysis concerns the large number of simplifications to the data prior to and during the analysis	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.157
		Assertion that inadequate information on the implications/risk of a draft Water Management Agreement with CFL(Co) and concern that if the PUB changes the Water Management Agreement, additional information is required on project effects. Require information on in-stream flow variability	CEAR #289	The Public Utilities Board has confirmed the Water Management Agreement. No further action is required
		Lack of information with respect to actual success of previous EEM programs at NL Hydro facilities	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.112
		Lack of information with respect to how the Project could be modified	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Section 3.7 IR JRP.26
		More detail requested, draw comparisons with Upper Churchill and La Grande River as examples of failure, suggest underestimation of this habitat	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.45
		Revised approach for land and resource use baseline proposed by Innu Nation was not accepted by Nalcor	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed. Nalcor and Innu Nation have concluded a contemporary land and resource study agreement and results of this study will be provided to the JRP <i>Innu Of Labrador Contemporary Land Use and Harvesting Study Agreement, July 22, 2010</i>

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Should use consultation by HQ as a model	CEAR #214	Nalcor has conducted a comprehensive community consultation process with Innu Nation since 2000 and continues to consult on an ongoing basis. Nalcor has provided Innu Nation with all relevant engineering and environmental reports associated with the Project and Innu comments have been taken into account in the planning and design of the Project
		Fish consumption survey methods --Telephone surveys are not adequate for the purpose of collecting resource use information	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.79 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none">Human Health Risk Assessment Baseline Study
		Use of magnitude thresholds in EIS based on precedent and not science	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.4
	Participation in follow-up programs	Nalcor to put more effort in determining and studying baseline conditions in the Goose Bay Estuary and Lake Melville for future environmental assessment and possible follow-up and monitoring	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.43 The EEMPs were all subject to the provincial Aboriginal Consultation Guidelines and the terms of the IBA.
		Information concerning the "approach, details, methods, locations and security measures" related to site rehabilitation "Project Construction Restoration Plan" details	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.111
		Innu require additional information as to how baseline will be established, the role the Proponent plays in ensuring local communities have adequate resources in monitoring program; role of Innu communities in the process of adaptive management; role of the Proponent in funding support or local communities to participate in socio-economic monitoring program	CEAR #214	These issues have been addressed IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S, IR JRP.164
		Nalcor requested to describe the proposed approach for each of the monitoring programs contemplated, as required by the Guidelines	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S, IR JRP.164 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none">Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		The study does not provide an adequate basis for development of an environmental effects monitoring program	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S, IR JRP.164 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs
		Need to provide Information with respect to adaptive management strategies	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S, IR JRP.164
		Requested to develop a follow-up program with respect to Aboriginal harvesting activities	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S, IR JRP.164
		Nalcor requested to provide a description of the importance of Happy Valley - Goose Bay as a goods and services centre for the Innu communities and provide program-specific information and evidence that Government will fund the design and implementation of follow-up programs, in consultation with Innu and rationale why Nalcor should not fund socio-economic follow-up	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S, IR JRP.164
		Need to be alerted to mercury levels in fish and animals for consumption	Meeting, June 29, 2010	This issue has been addressed See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic EEMP IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S, IR JRP.164
		Notification of environmental contamination	Meeting, July 8, 2008	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S and IR JRP.164
	TEK consideration	Nalcor to demonstrate how it incorporated and considered Innu Traditional Knowledge in the effects assessment and in the development of mitigation measures and, where the conclusions drawn from scientific and technical knowledge were inconsistent with the conclusions drawn from Innu Traditional Knowledge, to clearly explain and justify its conclusions	Meeting Notes June 29, 2010 Meeting Notes dated July 8, 2008	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.3 IR JRP.148 -- Appendix A, <i>Reservoir Preparation Plan 2009</i>
		Address the JRP's request for ITK inclusion in its assessment of existing and predicted post-impoundment habitat utilization by fish, and to specifically indicate that ATK will be solicited, or if/how the process will allow for incorporation of traditional knowledge into the design of the Habitat Compensation Strategy	CEAR #289	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Section 9.1
		Disagrees that ITK and EIS were in agreement with respect to past and current use of the environment	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.3
		ITK does not agree with EIS with respect to significance conclusions	CEAA #214	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.3

Innu Nation: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		High level of cynicism in the community towards TLU studies. Innu need to know how their information is being used to benefit them	Meeting, July 30, 2010	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Section 9.1 <i>Innu of Labrador Contemporary Land Use and Harvesting Study Agreement</i> , July 22, 2010
		Incorporation of TEK into EA process	Meeting, December 19, 2007	This issue has been addressed <i>Innu Traditional Knowledge Report</i> as incorporated in EIS, Volumes IA, IB, IIA, IIB, and III IR JRP.3
		Show how Innu Traditional Knowledge informed the determination of significant environmental effects on the Terrestrial Environment	Meeting, June 29, 2010	This issue has been addressed EIS, Volumes IA, IB, IIA, IIB, and III IR JRP.3
		Need to integrate traditional knowledge into planning, especially TEK from Elders	CEAR #214	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Section 9.1 IR JRP.3
Asserted ancestral rights	Other	Nalcor should communicate with the Innu of Labrador about the actual and potential impacts of the Project and the IBA upon any claimed, asserted or recognized aboriginal and treaty rights of the Innu of Labrador	CEAR #452	Nalcor has conducted a comprehensive community consultation process with Innu Nation since 2000 and continues to consult on an ongoing basis

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
Traditional Lifestyle	Fishing	Need timelines for fish compensation program. Need adequate valid scientific information considered in fish compensation program	Report submitted February 27, 2008	These issues have been addressed IR JRP.153 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fish Habitat Compensation Plan
	Hunting	Traditional lifestyle impacted by decline in bird populations due to loss of habitat	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB, Sections 5.7, 5.11, and 5.14, IR JRP.16 and IR JRP.70S See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation Avifauna Management Plan Avifauna Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Increased burden on Elders having to travel greater distances in order to hunt for subsistence diet	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB Sections 5.7, 5.10, 5.11 and 5.14, and IR JRP.70S See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socioeconomic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
	Other	Cultural importance of lands and waters in traditional territory	Letter dated January 15, 2007	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of NunatuKavut's interest in the Project area IR JRP.151, IR JRP.2, and IR JRP.1S/2S See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socioeconomic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		NK members will be more affected by the Project than any other groups	Radio Broadcast dated June 10, 2007	
		Quote: "they failed to acknowledge us in any meaningful way and we take exception to that because we used the river more than anyone else during the last two centuries. And it's not that we don't recognize or supersede any other group, but we're interested in partnerships because the river has left an indelible mark on our hearts in Labrador and especially with my family and my people. And I would have to say that if Mr. Williams thinks he can make a deal without acknowledging us, he got another thought coming."	Radio Broadcast aired July 18, 2007	
		Coastal communities of Charlottetown and St. Lewis/Fox Harbour use the interior of the Labrador Peninsular for harvesting and cultural and social activities	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 3, 2010	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB Sections 5.7, 5.10, 5.11 and 5.14, IR JRP.70, IR JRP.70S See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socioeconomic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
	Plant harvesting	Need for further study of impacts on Canada yew used in traditional medicine is important to all local Aboriginal people	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Sections 2.8 and 5.6, IR JRP.103 Not applicable to the Muskrat Falls Project (only in Gull Island reservoir area).
	Trails and Camps	Detailed description for environmental component of local transportation	Report submitted February 27, 2008	This issue has been addressed. EIS Guidelines included this requirement.
	Trapping	Redress for loss of trapping around Upper Churchill	Report by NunatuKavut dated March 8, 2010	This issue is beyond the scope of the Lower Churchill Project
		Need for firm date and acceptable timeline for Nalcor's Trapping Compensation Program	Report by NunatuKavut dated December 18, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Sections 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, and 8.1, IR JRP.109 and IR JRP.110
		NK trappers must be directly consulted and compensation for those trappers affected by the Project must be directly discussed	Report by NunatuKavut dated December 18, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Sections 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, and 8.1, IR JRP.109 and IR JRP.110
		Historical use of land for trapping Chris Montague, president of the LMN, says that land is home to Metis traplines including those of his family	Newspaper article dated May 14, 2006 Meeting Notes dated April 7, 2009 Newspaper article dated May 14, 2006	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB, Sections 5.7, 5.10, 5.11 and 5.14, IR JRP.70, IR JRP.70S See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methylmercury Assessment • Human Health Risk Assessment
Social	Health	Methylmercury levels are projected to be higher than consumption levels recommended by Health Canada Lack of mitigative measures for levels of methylmercury that will be higher than what Health Canada recommends for safe consumption	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	Nalcor will establish exposure to methylmercury by local residents and liaise with government authorities to develop and post fish consumption advisories IR JRP.78; EIS Volume IIA Section 2.3, Volume III Section 4.7, IR JRP.82 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methylmercury Assessment • Human Health Risk Assessment
		Impact of flooding on access to local resources (caribou, fish, and birds) integral to NK diet	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS, Volume IIB Sections 5.7, 5.10, 5.11 and 5.14, IR JRP.70S See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avifauna Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan • Caribou Environmental Effects

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
				Monitoring Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fish Habitat Compensation Plan Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
	Infrastructure, housing, etc.	The Project will compound the issue of lack of affordable housing in Happy Valley-Goose Bay	Report by NunatuKavut dated December 18, 2009	This issue has been addressed. The use of work camps will minimize Project-related housing requirements EIS Volume III Section 4.6.5.3 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socioeconomic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
	Other	Need further information about which segments of the population will experience the benefits of the Project and which will experience the costs, with particular attention to Aboriginal communities	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 3, 2010	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Chapters 3, 4, and 5 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socioeconomic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		"Boom and Bust" effect, which will create a social and economic disaster, not adequately addressed	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III Section 4.0, IR JRP.139 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socioeconomic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
Economic	Benefits	Hydro power to the Coast	Meeting Notes dated January 26, 2010 Meeting Notes dated March 1, 2010 Report by NunatuKavut dated March 8, 2010	This issue is beyond the scope of the Lower Churchill Project. These are system planning initiatives that are carried out by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, and require approval by the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities
		Desire power converter station to be built in Labrador so power and jobs can remain in Labrador	Report by NunatuKavut dated March 8, 2010	This issue is beyond the scope of the Lower Churchill Project
		Power is too expensive for small businesses	Report by NunatuKavut dated March 8, 2010	This issue is beyond the scope of the Lower Churchill Project
		Want the same rates across the Province		Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro rates are approved by the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities
		Want lower rates for home power		
		There are no Project benefits to the South Coast	Report by NunatuKavut dated March 8, 2010	This issue has been addressed
		Without Project benefits South Coast communities will die	Radio Broadcast dated March 26, 2007	EIS Volume III Sections 3.6 and 3.7, IR JRP.146 and IR JRP.1S/2S
		NK want Project royalties, not power subsidies There are no long-	Newspaper article dated May 14, 2006	Community Capacity Agreement has been negotiated

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		<p>term benefits to the South Coast</p> <p>Promise to NK to include them in benefits accruing from the Project</p> <p>Benefits to Labradorians should be greater than short-term jobs</p> <p>"Unless we get benefits from this for our people, we will not submit. We will go as far as opposing it. We're not going along with this until we are included in the process"</p>	<p>Report by NunatuKavut dated June 3, 2010.</p> <p>Newspaper article dated May 15, 2006</p>	<p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socioeconomic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Monthly Benefits Reports Benefits Strategy
		The Project should fund things like schools, hospitals and airports	Report by NunatuKavut dated March 8, 2010	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.146 and IR JRP.147
		The project itself is being held on land which was more extensively used in the last couple of centuries by our people than any other people in the world. So if any development happens, of course, we look towards partnerships, we look towards IBA's and we look forward to our permission to go ahead with the project	Radio Broadcast, dated July 21, 2006	<p>Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of NunatuKavut's interest in the Project area</p> <p>IR JRP.151, IR JRP.2, and IR JRP.1S/2S</p>
		LMN President Chris Montague, "The development at the Grand Falls, which was renamed Churchill Falls, saw no compensation for Labrador's Metis people, despite immense loss of traditional lands. That will not be the case this time around--if we allow the project to go ahead	Newspaper article dated May 14, 2006	Community Capacity Agreement has been negotiated
		"The other thing people are concerned about, of course, is the same old promises that recur in a perennial fashion that big business start in Labrador and that Labradorians will be given first choice and will be included. This has never happened. It's not happening now."	Newspaper article dated March 3, 2008	<p>These issues have been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume III Section 3.7, IR JRP.17</p> <p>Community Capacity Agreement has been negotiated</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p>
		Quote: No, it's not necessarily that we go against the development at all, but we're meaningfully included. We work in partnership with the government and with other groups in the area and that we sure that, and we want to take part in any discussions which make sure that any of the benefits coming from the Lower Churchill, if that project is to go ahead, the primary benefits go to the people of Labrador, whether they be Innu,	Radio Broadcast aired July 18, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benefits Strategy

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Inuit, Metis or any other people		
		"The other thing people are concerned about would be the idea that the power would be shipped through Labrador communities through a tunnel to Newfoundland. We would not get any of the power. It would be shipped out. People are very upset about that. They would not tolerate the project. Not only will they not accept the project they will vigorously oppose the project if our standard of living isn't addressed."	Newspaper article dated March 3, 2008	This issue has been addressed Provincial Energy Plan and IR JRP.146
		As the elected leader of the Metis Nation and of my people I have to reflect the Premier's statement by saying that the Labrador Metis Nation will not been pressured into a project that's not our best option. And I have to say that unless we're more actively involved and unless we're accommodated, we cannot support this project	Radio Broadcast aired May 9, 2006 Radio Broadcast aired May 8, 2006 TV Broadcast aired May 8, 2006	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of NunatuKavut's interest in the Project area IR JRP.151, IR JRP.2, and IR JRP.1S/2S
		He added being able to work and have influence with both the province and the federal government is in line with the Metis' strategy on the Lower Churchill. "One thing is certain; we will not be marginalized for the development on our river." I stick to the fact we've used it more than anyone else over the last two centuries, and we will be affected more than everybody else because our main settlement is on the mouth of the river. And we intend to be included, compensated and consulted	Newspaper article dated June 6, 2007	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of NunatuKavut's interest in the Project area IR JRP.151, IR JRP.2, and IR JRP.1S/2S Community Capacity Agreement has been negotiated
	Business opportunities	Desire for investment in Green Energy such as NK proposed wind farm	Radio Broadcast dated April 17, 2007	This issue is beyond the scope of the Lower Churchill Project
		Chris Montague "We want to work as partners where we take part in the development, where we have a, where we not only have a say, but we also are able to set up business contracts and things like this, much like the other native groups. Not to take away from the other native groups, but to work in concert with them as well."	Radio Broadcast, dated April 11, 2007 Newspaper article dated March 3, 2008	These issues have been addressed EIS Volume III Section 3.7 and Lower Churchill Construction Projects Benefits Strategy Community Capacity Agreement has been negotiated

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Also, if the Lower Churchill project goes ahead, the LMN wants to make sure that Labradorians, including Metis people, are included. The organization wants to be able to set up joint ventures or partner ships in the project itself, Mr. Montague said.		See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benefits Strategy
	IBAs	Need for accommodation (Royalties, IBA's, financial accommodation)	Meeting Notes dated March 1, 2010 Radio Broadcast aired January 29, 2007 Report submitted February 27, 2008. Report by NunatuKavut dated June 3, 2010	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of NunatuKavut's interest in the Project area IR JRP.151, IR JRP.2, and IR JRP.1S/2S Community Capacity Agreement has been negotiated
	Jobs	Project-related job opportunities and long-term employment	Meeting Notes dated March 1, 2010	This issue has been addressed <i>Forecasted Labor Resource Requirements by National Occupational Classification for Generation Project</i> component study. EIS Volume III Section 3.6. IR JRP.13 Community Capacity Agreement has been negotiated
		Desire for members to participate in field work and other Project-related opportunities	Phone call dated March 9, 2010	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Section 3.6 and Lower Churchill Construction Projects Benefits Strategy
		Desire for Proponent to consider bringing back Labradorians who previous left for work to help build the Project	Report submitted February 27, 2008	This issue is beyond the scope of the Lower Churchill Project
		Desire for Proponent to quantify numbers of Labradorians who have left for work and the skill set needed for Project employment	Report submitted February 27, 2008	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Section 3.6, IR JRP.17
		Training: There isn't enough Project money spent on training Need for further information on training	Report by NunatuKavut dated March 8, 2010. Meeting Minutes dated January 20, 2010	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III Sections 3.6 and 8.1, IR JRP.133. Aboriginal Skills and Employment Program (ASEP)
		Concern that Labradorians won't be employed on the LCP Concern that unions will prevent trained NK members from getting jobs	Report by NunatuKavut dated March 8, 2010 Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III Sections 3.6 and 8.1 and Lower Churchill Construction Projects Benefits Strategy

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Want guaranteed jobs for NK		
		Need for more of the required workforce to come from Labrador		
		Need further information about non-trades related Project employment opportunities	Phone call dated March 8, 2010	This issue has been addressed <i>Forecasted Labor Resource Requirements by National Occupational Classification for Generation Project</i> component study. EIS Volume III Section 3.6, IR JRP.64 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none">Monthly Benefits Reports
		There aren't enough permanent Project jobs	Report by NunatuKavut dated March 8, 2010	Permanent Project jobs are a function of the operational requirements of the Project EIS Volume III Section 3.6
Environment	Cumulative effects	Concern that Generation and Transmission Projects are separated	Meeting Notes dated January 26, 2010 Meeting Notes dated April 17, 2007 Report by NunatuKavut dated March 8, 2010 Report by NunatuKavut dated June 3, 2010	Terms of Reference for the Environmental Assessment for the Project, as well as for the Labrador-Island Transmission Link have been established by Canada and Newfoundland and Labrador EIS, Volume IIB Section 5.15, Volume III Sections 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 4.5., 4.6, 4.7, 5.5 and 6.5, IR JRP.97 and IR JRP.163
		Cumulative Effects of Churchill Falls and the Generation Project	Newspaper article dated September 10, 2007 Report submitted February 27, 2008 meeting Notes dated April 7, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA Section 9.9, IR JRP.97 and IR JRP.163
		Extent of Generation Project Effects	Newspaper article dated May 15, 2006 Report by NunatuKavut dated December 18, 2009 Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volumes IIA, IIB and III See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none">Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs
		Cumulative Effects of Generation Project with other projects	Report submitted February 27, 2008	Issue has been addressed EIS, Volume IIA Sections 3.11 and 4.16, Volume IIB Section 5.15, Volume III Sections 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 5.5 and 6.5
	Impact on biophyscial	Impact of Nalcor's sunken barge on the environment	Meeting Notes dated April 7, 2009	The designated government authorities have investigated and the incident is now closed
		Need to create new lake habitat in	Meeting Notes dated	This issue has been addressed

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		compensation for lost river habitat	April 7, 2009	IR JRP.153 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fish Habitat Compensation Plan
		Inability of modelling to accurately predict outcomes of environmental impacts	Meeting Notes dated April 7, 2009	This issue has been addressed <i>Caribou (Rangifer tarandus caribou)</i> component study. EIS Volume IIA and IIB See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs
		Increased access to River will result in decimated fish population	Meeting Notes dated April 7, 2009, 7pm to 10:30pm	This issue has been addressed EIS, Volume III Sections 5.2, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 8.1, and 8.3, IR JRP.35, IR JRP.39, and IR JRP.72 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fish Habitat Compensation Plan Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan
		Changes to River water level	Meeting Notes dated April 7, 2009, 9am to 12pm	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.28
		Trenching in Strait of Belle Isle	Meeting Notes dated January 26, 2010	Issue does not pertain to Project effects
		Harvesting of wood in area to be inundated	Meeting Notes dated March 1, 2010	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA Sections 4.4 and 4.4, IR JRP.6 and IR JRP.148
		Impacts of inundation on environment	Meeting Notes dated March 1, 2010	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs
		Concern around changes to the River (drying up or becoming damaged)	Report by NunatuKavut dated March 8, 2010	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.149 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fish Habitat Compensation Plan Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Concern that roads and quarries will be permanent; concern over amount of roads and quarries required	Report by NunatuKavut dated March 8, 2010	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III Section 5.5, IR JRP.29 and IR JRP.111S LCP Environmental Protection Plan outlines mitigation and rehabilitation requirements.
		Need for studies past the mouth of the Churchill River	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 3, 2010 Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIA Volume II Part A Sections 4.0, IR JRP.43, IR JRP.152 and IR JRP.73, IR JRP.166 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan• Methylmercury Assessment
		Change in sediment flow below Muskrat Falls and impacts on the bridge/causeway	Report by NunatuKavut dated December 18, 2009	This issue has been addressed <i>2009 Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project, Sedimentation and Morphodynamics Study</i> component study See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Impact on fish populations due to loss of breeding grounds	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III Section 4.8, 4.10, and 5.5, Volume IIB Section 7.1, IR JRP.76 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fish Habitat Compensation Plan• Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan
		Further mitigative measures are needed to combat the impact of methylmercury	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.33, EIS Volume IIA, Section 2.3 EIS Guidelines, Section 4.3 and 4.4 and 4.6 EIS Volume III Section 5.5, EIS Volume III Section 4.8 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Methylmercury Assessment• Human Health Risk Assessment
		Impact of Total Suspended Solids on survival of aquatic life	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS volume IIA Section 4.12

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
				<p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fish Habitat Compensation Plan Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan
		How will fish survive in "newly created habitat" when nutrients and oxygen are depleted due to warmer waters	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	<p>This issue has been addressed. The <i>Fisheries Act</i> authorization / compensation process is well known and will be completed after the JRP process</p> <p>EIS Volume IIA Section 4.12</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fish Habitat Compensation Plan Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan
		How will Total Suspended Solids impact the River bottom and Blackrock Bridge?	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	<p>Issue has been addressed</p> <p><i>2009 Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project, Sedimentation and Morphodynamics Study</i> component study</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan
		How will loss of sediment impact the current depositional properties below the mouth of the Churchill River?	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.90</p> <p><i>2009 Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project, Sedimentation and Morphodynamics Study</i> component study</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan
		How will salinity levels be affected by the deepening of the River due to lack of deposition from upstream?	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.43</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan
		Entire Total Suspended Solids section of the EIS is unacceptable	Report by NunatuKavut dated December 18, 2009	Nalcor disagrees
		The Proponent does not fully understand the complexities of	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 3, 2010	More than 40 baseline studies in total since 1998 have been

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Labrador's ecology		<p>conducted to characterize and understand the existing environment</p> <p>EIS, Volume IA Section 9.4</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs
		Need for greater application of the Precautionary Principal	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	<p>The Precautionary Principle has been applied in accordance with CEAA requirements</p> <p>EIS Volume IA Chapter 9</p>
		Rising TSS levels impact on water temperature	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.90</p>
		Need to study impacts past the mouth of the Churchill River	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volumes IA, IB, IIA, IIB, and III, IR JRP.152, IR JRP.43</p> <p>IR JRP.166</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Methylmercury Assessment
		Finer material (i.e. silt) will likely remain in suspension for more than one day; how will this combine with other materials and impact the River bottom and Blackrock Bridge?	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.90</p> <p><i>2008 Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project, Sedimentation and Morphodynamics Study component study</i></p>
		Amount of vegetation cleared should be driven by environmental concerns, not economics	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.148</p>
		Proponent should study changing River flow patterns, water temperatures, salinity, biological systems etc. in Lake Melville and local areas of the Labrador sea	Report submitted February 27, 2008	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume II Part A Sections 4.0, IR JRP.43, IR JRP.152 and IR JRP.73</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Methylmercury Assessment
		Effects of Project on entire marine environment downstream of the Project such as smelt and other fish populations, people movements, mammals and salinity	Report submitted February 27, 2008	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume II Part A Sections 4.0, IR JRP.43, IR JRP.152 and IR JRP.73</p>

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
				See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Methylmercury Assessment
		Increased water surface areas caused by flooding may impact weather, particularly fog, which will adversely affect the local airport	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	Nalcor disagrees. There is no evidence to suggest this concern is valid
	Impact on flora	Impact of inundation on Canadian yew	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III Section 5.6, IR JRP.103 Not applicable to the Muskrat Falls Project (only in Gull Island reservoir area).
	Impact on wildlife	Vegetation should be cleared from flooded areas to reduce mercury levels	Report submitted February 27, 2008 Report by NunatuKavut dated March 8, 2010	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB Section 5.12, IR JRP.148, IR JRP.156 Additional areas have been cleared throughout the reservoir to accommodate this concern. See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Methylmercury Assessment
		Further studies are needed on the Species of Concern, Red Wine Mountain Caribou, in order to determine Project impacts	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB Section 7.3, IR JRP.69, IR JRP.93, IR JRP.157 and IR JRP.112 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Species at Risk Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Migratory patterns of the Red Wine Mountain caribou herd	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB Sections 5.7, 5.11, and 5.14, IR JRP.93 and IR JRP.157 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Species at Risk Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Relocation of beavers	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB Sections 7.1, 5.10, 5.13, IR JRP.128 Beaver relocation was determined to be ineffective. A plan to harvest

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
				beaver and provide to the community was developed in consultation with the Government of NL and The Innu Nation.
		No appropriate mitigative measures for the Species of Concern, Harlequin duck, whose breeding ground on Ashqui will be impacted by River inundation	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB Section 5.10, IR JRP.105 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avifauna Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Decrease in many species numbers due to higher competition/ predation from loss of habitat after inundation	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB, IR JRP.101, IR JRP.102, IR JRP. 126, and IR JRP.148 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs
		Impact of methylmercury in aquatic vegetation consumed by Red Wine Mountain Caribou	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume 11B Section 5.12.2; IR JRP.22, IR JRP.156
		Impact of increased water depth and reduced water flow on formation of Ashqui used by Harlequin Duck for breeding	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume II, Section 5.11 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avifauna Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Based on observations from the Upper Churchill Project, the Lower Churchill Project impacts on the George River caribou are expected to be profound and this must be assessed	Report submitted February 27, 2008	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB Section 5.0 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caribou Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
	Operation and impacts on habitat	Type of cofferdam used during construction phase	Meeting Notes dated April 7, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA Section 4.4
	Other	Want information about how the water flow will be controlled	Report by NunatuKavut dated March 8, 2010	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.28, IR JRP.32 and IR JRP.149
		Mr. Montague said the development would not only impact communities directly on the river, but those in the entire Upper Lake Melville region and possibly the coast. However, he	Newspaper article dated May 15, 2006	The environmental effects of the Project has been assessed. Significant effects are not likely to occur EIS Volumes IA, IB, IIA, IIB, and III,

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		added the full extend would not be known until Environmental Impact Assessments were complete. The ecosystem is going to change its going to cause a chain reaction right up the coast he said		IR JRP.152, and IR JRP.43 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs
		Montague also has concerns about potential environmental issues associated with the Lower Churchill, given the "devastating environment impact" of the Upper Churchill project	Newspaper article dated July 31, 2006	The environmental effects of the Project have been assessed. Significant effects are not likely to occur EIS volumes IIA, IIB and III See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs
		Impacts of Project on aquatic life	Report by NunatuKavut dated December 18, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fish Habitat Compensation Plan Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan
		Lack of information on decommissioning the facility	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 3, 2010	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA Section 4.6, IR JRP.150
		Labrador – Island Transmission Link EIS should be contained within Generation Project's EIS as it is a key part for the rationale for the Project	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB Section 5.15, Volume III Sections 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 5.5 and 6.5, IR JRP.97 and IR JRP.163
		Need further proof that fish spawning in newly created habitat (containing higher levels of methyl mercury and TSS) will have a "suitable" shoreline to lay their eggs and maintain the fish populations	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.153 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fish Habitat Compensation Plan Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan
		Impact of the rise in temperature of the water exiting the hydroelectric stations on the River system as a whole	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA Section 4.12.2.1 IR JRP.43
		Effects of oxygen depletion due to higher water temperatures on current or future fish populations	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA Section 4.12

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
				<p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fish Habitat Compensation Plan Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan
		Need for further study of how methyl mercury will move throughout the river system and past the mouth of the river	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	<p>This issue has been addressed IR JRP.156, IR JRP.112 and IR JRP.112S</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan Methylmercury Assessment
		Southern Labrador unable to use this "clean" power not alleviating any of Eastern Canada's, dependence on fossil fuels or regional contribution to GHG Emissions	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	Issue is beyond the scope of the Lower Churchill Project
		Measurement of Project GHG gas emission reduction need to include the perpetual value losses of the carbon sequestrations of inundated and harvested vegetation, energy and fuel expended to build the Project, decommissioning and remediation of the site, the value of phytoplanktonic differences in the reservoirs and other changes to chemical and energy regimes	Report submitted February 27, 2008	<p>This issue has been addressed <i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i> component study.</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Atmospheric Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Measurement of greenhouse gas reduction due to the Project should be peer reviewed	Report submitted February 27, 2008	<p>This issue has been addressed <i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i> Component study.</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Atmospheric Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Effects of Upper Churchill as far as Groswater Bay and Labrador Sea indicate Project footprint should be wider	Report submitted February 27, 2008	<p>This issue has been addressed IR JRP.152</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan Methylmercury Assessment
		Need information on how tests of sufficiency are determined specifically for when data is insufficient or no longer	Report submitted February 27, 2008	This issue has been addressed. Sufficiency is a matter for the JRP and regulatory bodies to determine

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		representative		EIS Volumes IIA and IIB
		Need for assessment of impacts on biological diversity of aquatic species and populations	Report submitted February 27, 2008	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume IIB</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs
		Need to document genetic diversity within species due to the unique populations and strains resulting from the area's physical or ecological isolation	Report submitted February 27, 2008	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>Volume IIA Section 2.4</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs
		<p>Need for Proponent to assess any alternatives in construction of the Project or alternatives to the Project</p> <p>Need to assess "Run of the River" and Hydro/Wind farm combinations as alternatives, and the environmental effects</p>	Report submitted February 27, 2008	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume IA Chapter 3, IR JRP.26, IR JRP.146 and IR JRP.147</p>
		habitat compensation agreement for fish needs to be signed before construction begins	Report submitted February 27, 2008	<p>Nalcor will comply with appropriate legislation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation Fish Habitat Compensation Plan Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan
		Need information on how the fish closest to the Upper Churchill Generating Station (with increased mercury levels) will be impacted by increasing methyl mercury levels created from the Gull Island Reservoir	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume IIA Section 4.14, IR JRP.20, IR JRP.21, IR JRP.22, IR JRP.156</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fish Habitat Compensation Plan Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan
EA Process	Communication	Increased understanding of consultation relationship	<p>Letter dated July 15, 2008</p> <p>E-mail dated November 12, 2008</p> <p>E-mail dated November 13, 2008</p>	<p>Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of NunatuKavut's interest in the Project area</p>

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
				IR JRP.151, IR JRP.2, and IR JRP.1S/2S
		Need for information about Nalcor's field work and other Project aspects	Meeting Minutes dated January 20, 2010	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.151, IR JRP.2, and IR JRP.1S/2S
		Need for greater communication with NK and accommodation of their needs and concerns	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of NunatuKavut's interest in the Project area EIS Volume IIA and IIB Section 5.9 and 5.11, IR JRP.28, IR JRP.148, IR JRP.151, IR JRP.2, and IR JRP.1S/2S Community Capacity Agreement has been negotiated Nalcor will provide public notices for all impoundment activities.
		Need to inform public at every step of habitat compensation discussions	Report submitted February 27, 2008	
		Need for further descriptions and timelines for initial flooding including investigation and modelling of various dates for flooding and filling	Report submitted February 27, 2008	
		Serious impact of changes in ice to transportation for residents of Mud Lake require Proponent to inform residents about potential outcomes	Report submitted February 27, 2008.	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.76 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation Ice Formation Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Need for the Crown to continually provide information about how the Project impacts NK's Aboriginal rights, titles and interests and what	Report submitted February 27, 2008	Beyond the ability of Nalcor to address
		Need for clear timelines and work plan for consultation and accommodation process	Report submitted February 27, 2008	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of NunatuKavut's interest in the Project area IR JRP.151, IR JRP.2, and IR JRP.1S/2S Community Capacity Agreement has been negotiated
	Other	Need for resources to participate meaningfully in consultation Need to be meaningfully consulted	Letter dated March 18 & May 30, 2008 E-mail dated November 6, 2008 Community Consultation Agreement (December 11, 2009) Meeting Notes dated April 17, 2007,	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of NunatuKavut's interest in the Project area IR JRP.151, IR JRP.2, and IR JRP.1S/2S Community Capacity Agreement

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
			<p>April 7, 2009 & January 26, 2010</p> <p>Phone call dated March 9, 2010</p> <p>Report by NunatuKavut dated December 18, 2009 & April 30, 2010</p> <p>Radio Broadcast dated January 27, April 17, and June 10, 2007</p> <p>Newspaper article February 19, April 23, September 10, 2007, March 3, July 25, 2008, April 17, November 21, 2009</p>	has been negotiated
		Need for greater understanding of the Environmental Assessment process and roles	Meeting Notes dated January 26, 2010	The Environmental Assessment process and roles have been established by the federal and provincial governments. Nalcor's role is as the Project proponent
		Concern that Transmission is being looked at before Generation has been approved	Report by NunatuKavut dated March 8, 2010	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>The transmission line will be assessed as a separate project</p>
		<p>Need for NK input on VECs</p> <p>Project footprint and Valued Ecosystem Components should come to public scrutiny prior to design of Component Studies</p> <p>Need to provide information to the public for review and feedback at intervals such as completion of component studies</p> <p>Due to general lack of availability of information to the public, the Proponent must be able to provide sources of all information at all public meetings</p> <p>Need for greater accessibility of map data</p> <p>Need for the Proponent to consult the public on methodological approaches to component studies</p> <p>Mud Lake should be included in community consultation program</p> <p>Need public involvement in and review of fish compensation program design</p>	<p>Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009</p> <p>Report submitted February 27, 2008</p>	<p>Opportunity for NunatuKavut was provided during development of EIS Guidelines. Capacity funding was made available by Nalcor for consultation with the Proponent, and NunatuKavut was awarded funding to participate in the EA process</p> <p>Nalcor has made an online mapping tool available for all project stakeholders, at their request. Nalcor has issued weekly reports on construction activities to all stakeholders.</p> <p>All EEMPs were issued as per the provincial Aboriginal Consultation Guidelines.</p> <p>All Plans and Reports have been posted to the project website.</p> <p>A community Capacity Agreement has been negotiated.</p>

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Need to follow Aboriginal People's protocols for gathering information		
		Need to balance traditional knowledge and scientific knowledge throughout the life of the Project		
		Need for funding for NunatuKavut communities to meaningfully participate in gathering, compiling and organizing local knowledge and to fully participate in EA process		
		Desire for tripartite Environmental Agreement with NunatuKavut and the Provincial and Federal governments to establish an environmental management regime and monitoring board	Report submitted February 27, 2008	This is a matter for the Federal and Provincial governments
		Need for direct involvement in Project planning	Radio Broadcast dated April 17, 2007	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of NunatuKavut's interest in the Project area IR JRP.151, IR JRP.2, and IR JRP.1S/2S
		Need for further information on Project alternatives such as a comparison of costs, social and environmental effects between the Project and a "Run of River" proposal	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.26 and IR JRP.147
	Participation in follow-up programs	Need for information on how Nalcor's adjacency principal has been applied in the past and how it is currently being applied	Report by NunatuKavut dated December 18, 2009	Past application of adjacency principle is not relevant. Proponent's obligations to provide for local benefits are detailed in the Lower Churchill Construction Projects Benefits Strategy EIS Volume III Sections 3.6 and 8.1 Monthly Benefits Reports have been made available
		Need for information on how mitigation measures are determined to be adequate	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 3, 2010	This issue has been addressed Volume IIB Section 7.1 and 7.3, IR JRP.112 and IR JRP.112S <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation • Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
				Mitigation Programs
		Need for information on how long-term integrity of systems will be determined	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 3, 2010	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S and IR JRP.164
	TEK consideration	Approach to gathering and incorporating TEK in Project	Meeting Minutes dated January 20, 2010 Phone call dated March 9, 2010	In addition to the TEK that has been previously provided by the Aboriginal groups willing to share information and which has been incorporated into the planning of the Project, further insight has been gained through the research undertaken during the compilation of this report EIS Volume IA Section 9.1
Asserted ancestral rights	Recognition of asserted rights and title	Archeological evidence of historical use of area	Meeting Notes dated April 7, 2009 Report by NunatuKavut dated 2010	Archaeological studies have been conducted throughout the footprint area of the Project. Results have been analyzed and presented in the EIS <i>2006 Historic Resources Overview and Impact Assessment of Muskrat Falls Generating Facility and Reservoir and the Muskrat Falls to Gull Island Transmission Line Corridor, Churchill River Power Project Historic Resources Overview Assessment 1998-2000 Volume 1</i> <i>Interpretation Summary and Recommendations, Historic Resources Potential Mapping, Volumes I and II, and Historic Resources Overview Assessment (Labrador Component) component studies</i> EIS Volume III Chapter 6, IR JRP.104 and IR JRP.144 Nalcor has completed a comprehensive Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment Program in consultation with Innu Nation. See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment
		Need to accurately and adequately document NK rights and interests in the LCP EIS, the LCP impact on these rights and interests, and Nalcor's plans to mitigate these in an IBA	Letter dated June 16, 2010	Nalcor disagrees. Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of NunatuKavut's interest in the

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
				Project area A Community Capacity Agreement has been negotiated.
		Clarification of Nalcor's relationship to the provincial Crown's duty to consult in relation to both the Generation and Transmission Projects	Letter dated June 16, 2010	This issue has been addressed
		NK members have traditionally used the River more than any other groups	Radio Broadcast dated June 10, 2017	No response required
		Project would not go ahead without NK approval	Radio Broadcast dated April 17, 2007	No response required
		NK will prevent Project if not included in benefits and planning	Radio Broadcast dated July 16, 2007	No response required
		NK will stop the Project unless they have a formal written agreement with the Province	Radio Broadcast dated February 13, 2007	No response required
		Many archeological sites in the Project area remain unidentified	Report by NunatuKavut dated December 18, 2009	Issue has been addressed <i>2006 Historic Resources Overview and Impact Assessment of Muskrat Falls Generating Facility and Reservoir and the Muskrat Falls to Gull Island Transmission Line Corridor, Churchill River Power Project Historic Resources Overview Assessment 1998-2000 Volume 1 Interpretation Summary and Recommendations, Historic Resources Potential Mapping, Volumes I and II, and Historic Resources Overview Assessment (Labrador Component) component studies</i> EIS Volume III Chapter 6, IR JRP.104 and IR JRP.144 Nalcor has completed a comprehensive Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment Program in consultation with Innu Nation. See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Past archeological studies have been biased and inadequate	Report by NunatuKavut dated December 18, 2009 Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009	<p>Archaeological studies have been conducted throughout the footprint area of the Project. Results have been analyzed and presented in the EIS</p> <p>Archaeological studies were completed by qualified professionals. Origin of artifacts is not an assumption, but rather a scientific conclusion</p> <p><i>2006 Historic Resources Overview and Impact Assessment of Muskrat Falls Generating Facility and Reservoir and the Muskrat Falls to Gull Island Transmission Line Corridor, Churchill River Power Project Historic Resources Overview Assessment 1998-2000 Volume 1 Interpretation Summary and Recommendations, Historic Resources Potential Mapping, Volumes I and II, and Historic Resources Overview Assessment (Labrador Component) component studies</i></p> <p>EIS Volume III Chapter 6, IR JRP.104 and IR JRP.144</p> <p>Nalcor has completed a comprehensive Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment Program in consultation with Innu Nation.</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment
		NK were not consulted on the assumptions made about origins of artifacts	Report by NunatuKavut dated December 18, 2009 Report by NunatuKavut dated June 19, 2009 Report by NunatuKavut dated December 18, 2009	<p>Archaeological studies have been conducted throughout the footprint area of the Project. Results have been analyzed and presented in the EIS</p> <p>Archaeological studies were completed by qualified professionals. Origin of artifacts is not an assumption, but rather a scientific conclusion</p> <p><i>2006 Historic Resources Overview and Impact Assessment of Muskrat Falls Generating Facility and Reservoir and the Muskrat Falls to</i></p>

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
				<p><i>Gull Island Transmission Line Corridor, Churchill River Power Project Historic Resources Overview Assessment 1998-2000 Volume 1 Interpretation Summary and Recommendations, Historic Resources Potential Mapping, Volumes I and II, and Historic Resources Overview Assessment (Labrador Component) component studies</i></p> <p>EIS Volume III Chapter 6, IR JRP.104 and IR JRP.144</p> <p>Archaeological studies were completed by qualified professionals. Origin of artifacts is not an assumption, but rather a scientific conclusion</p> <p>Nalcor has completed a comprehensive Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment Program in consultation with Innu Nation.</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment
		<p>Need for the Proponent to address Project impacts on Aboriginal rights and interests distinct from cultural rights and aspirations</p> <p>Impact of the Project on the Aboriginal right to Self-Government</p> <p>Dimensions of Aboriginal rights and interests in relation to socio-economic rights and titles implementation</p>	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 3, 2010	Beyond the ability of Nalcor to address
		Need for expert assessment and documentation of Aboriginal rights and interests in the Project area and impacted by the Project	Report by NunatuKavut dated June 3, 2010	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume IA/IB, IR JRP.151, IR JRP.2, and IR JRP.1S/2S</p>
		Dramatic negative impacts of the Project on Aboriginal Peoples and their rights, titles and interests	Report submitted February 27, 2008	<p>Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of NunatuKavut's interest in the Project area</p> <p>IR JRP.151, IR JRP.2, and IR JRP.1S/2S</p> <p>All approvals have been subject to</p>

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
				the provincial Aboriginal Consultation Guidelines. A Community Capacity Agreement has been negotiated.
		Proponent should list and describe NK's constitutionally protect rights and titles and address how it intends to protect, enhance their exercise, and compensate for loss of same	Report submitted February 27, 2008	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of NunatuKavut's interest in the Project area IR JRP.151, IR JRP.2, and IR JRP.1S/2S A Community Capacity Agreement has been negotiated.
		Participation of NK in gathering, compiling and organizing information about themselves and the land (archeological, anthropological, ethno-historical, TEK, evidence of Aboriginal Peoples' occupation and use of the lands, practices, customs and traditions present and past, economic, cultural and spiritual value of the lands and their natural resources, and socio-economic baseline data	Report submitted February 27, 2008	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of NunatuKavut's interest in the Project area IR JRP.151, IR JRP.2, and IR JRP.1S/2S
		Project will destroy evidence required to support NK's rights and titles	Report submitted February 27, 2008	This issue has been addressed. Archaeological studies were completed by qualified professionals EIS Volume III Section 6.5 Nalcor has completed a comprehensive Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment Program in consultation with Innu Nation. See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment
		Need for interviews and maps showing sites of cultural and spiritual importance such as burial sites, migration routes, gathering places, calving grounds, spawning areas, nesting areas, critical habitat by species and season, cabin and camp sites, portage routes, culturally important fauna and flora species and their uses	Report submitted February 27, 2008	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.151, IR JRP.2, and IR JRP.1S/2S Nalcor has completed a comprehensive Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment Program in consultation with Innu Nation.

NunatuKavut: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
				See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Muskrat Falls Historic Resources Assessment
		<p>Legal and Constitutional Duty of the Crown to meaningfully consult and accommodate Aboriginal Peoples, distinct from public involvement in the EA process</p> <p>Need for the Crown to act in good faith with the intention of substantially addressing NK's concerns</p> <p>The Crown's Duty continues until Project decommissioning and beyond</p> <p>The Crown must solicit and listen carefully to NK's concerns and attempt to minimize adverse impacts on their rights, titles and interests</p>	<p>Report submitted February 27, 2008</p> <p>Meeting Notes dated April 17, 2007</p> <p>Letter dated January 15, 2007</p> <p>Radio Broadcast dated February 13, 2007</p>	Beyond the ability of Nalcor to address

Nunatsiavut Government: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
Traditional lifestyle	Fishing	TSS levels may increase in Lake Melville during spring which may result in changes in fish productivity in Lake Melville	Report dated December 18, 2009	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.43 and IR JRP.152 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan
		Justification of Proponents view that there will be no impact of concentrations of total phosphorous on food web dynamics and fish populations, including mercury contamination in Lake Melville	Report dated December 18, 2009. Meeting notes from May 14,2008 meeting	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.43, IR JRP.152, IR JRP.156 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan Methylmercury Assessment
	Marine mammal harvesting	Impact of temperature changes on sensitive ice dynamics in Lake Melville which will impact Inuit's ability to carry out traditional activities	Report dated December 18, 2009	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.43 and IR JRP.152 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ice Formation Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Impact of temperature changes on sensitive ice dynamics in Lake Melville which will impact reproductive patterns of ringed seal (there is genetic evidence for natal site philopatry)	Report dated December 18, 2009	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.43 and IR JRP.152 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ice Formation Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan
		Impact of Project on core elements of Inuit traditional values and practices will effect accessibility and quality of country foods for harvesting and subsistence practices	Report dated December 18, 2009	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.43 and IR JRP.152 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socioeconomic EEMP Aquatic EEMP Human Health Risk Assessment Methylmercury Assessment
	Other	Impact on the resources in and adjacent to LISA and one of the Inuit Communities	CEAR submission, February 22, 2008	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S, IR JRP.43 and IR JRP.152 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socioeconomic EEMP Aquatic EEMP Human Health Risk

Nunatsiavut Government: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
Social				Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methylmercury Assessment
		Nalcor did not provide sufficient information regarding traditional land and resource use by Inuit related to the Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project. Impact of Project on Inuit including resource use lands and waters	CEAR submission, February 17, 2010. Letter dated April 22, 2009	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S, IR JRP.43, IR JRP.151 and IR JRP.152 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socioeconomic EEMP
	Health	Need baseline data for MeHG in human population delineated by aboriginal group	Report dated June 19, 2009. Submitted to JRP	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.78 and IR JRP.82 and HHRA See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aquatic EEMP • Human Health Risk Assessment • Methylmercury Assessment
		Emergency planning	Meeting notes from May 14, 2008 meeting	Issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA, Section 2.3.7.3, Page 2-54, IR JRP.145
	Other	The Project should only proceed if it enhances the ability of individual Inuit across generations to participate in the way of life that they desire - whether it is a traditional lifestyle, a wage economy lifestyle or some combination thereof. If the proposed Project does not enhance the quality of life and health of Inuit, then it should not proceed	CEAR submission, June 15, 2010. CEAR submission, June 15, 2010	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.146
		Need for Inuit-specific assessment of socio-economic effects, especially fish consumption	Report dated June 19, 2009. Submitted to JRP	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.112 and IR JRP.112S See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aquatic EEMP • Human Health Risk Assessment • Methylmercury Assessment
		Need for sufficient engagement re: socio-economic benefits or consequences of the Project via meaningful engagement	Report dated December 18, 2009	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Nunatsiavut's interest in the Project area IR JRP.151 See Appendix O - Supporting

Nunatsiavut Government: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
				Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socioeconomic EEMP
Economic	Benefits	Provision of hydro-electric power to remote coastal communities	Report dated June 19, 2009 Submitted to JRP. Executive Meeting notes May 14, 2008 Meeting on Dec 16, 2009 Meeting on April 11, 2008 Meeting on September 16, 2008 Public meeting July 21, 2010 Correspondence dated June 19, 2009 between Marina Biasutti- Brown and Maryse Pineau and Tom Graham	This issue is beyond the scope of the Lower Churchill Project. These are system planning initiatives that are carried out by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and require approval by the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities
		Ensuring benefits for Labrador	Executive Meeting notes May 14, 2008 Meeting on September 16, 2008 Meeting on April 11, 2008 Meeting on September 16, 2008 Meeting July 21, 2010 Public meeting July 21, 2010	This issue has been addressed EIS Vol III Sections 3.6 and 3.7; IR JRP.17, IR JRP.146, IR JRP.147 The Project has developed a Benefits Strategy and issues Monthly Benefits Reports See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower Churchill Construction Projects Benefits Strategy
	IBAs	Consent of Nunatsiavut Government and an IBA is required for Project to proceed	CEAR submission, June 15, 2010 Meeting on September 16, 2008. Meeting July 21, 2010	The Project is located outside treaty lands, and there are no likely effects in the Labrador Inuit Settlement Area (LISA). Therefore, consent of Nunatsiavut Government is not required IR JRP.151
	Jobs	Inuit participation in Project workforce during and after construction	Public meeting July 21, 2010 Correspondence dated June 19, 2009 between Marina Biasutti- Brown and Maryse Pineau and Tom Graham. Report dated June 19, 2009. Submitted to JRP. Report dated December	This issue has been addressed EIS Vol III, Section 3.6; IR JRP.17, IR JRP.146 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower Churchill Construction Projects Benefits Strategy

Nunatsiavut Government: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
Environment	Cumulative Effects		18, 2009	
		Acceptance of significant biophysical residual impact should be evaluated in its cultural context	CEAR Submission June 15, 2010	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume I, IIA and IIB
		Cumulative effects of Upper and Lower Churchill Projects	Report dated June 19, 2009. Submitted to JRP	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Section 9.9, IR JRP.97 and IR JRP.163
	Impact on biophysical	Need to address impact of disposal of untreated sewage into the lower Churchill River at two locations	Report dated June 19, 2009. Submitted to JRP	This issue has been addressed EIS, Volume IA, Section 9.9 The project did not dispose of any untreated sewage at any location.
		Lack of baseline data on Lake Melville	Meeting on September 16, 2008. Meeting July 21, 2010	This issue has been addressed. Baseline studies on Lake Melville were completed. Copies of these studies have been provided to Nunatsiavut Government Components studies, IR JRP. 43, IR JRP.152 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs
		Effects similar to those of Upper Churchill - Affects on waterfowl, fish and Ice conditions	Meeting on April 11, 2008	This issue has been addressed Volume IIB, IR JRP.48, 65, 101, 105, 154, 155 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs
		Concern of impact study's/models being wrong and irreversibly consequences of project impacts	Meeting July 21, 2010	No response required Volume IIA and IIB See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs
		Impacts of Project beyond the mouth of the Churchill River	Report dated June 19, 2009. Submitted to JRP.	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.43, IR JRP.152 and IR JRP.153
		Confirmation of the prediction that the Project will not result in effects past the mouth of the Churchill River.	Report dated December 18, 2009	See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Need for larger study area boundary for the aquatic environment		

Nunatsiavut Government: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		assessment Need for greater justification of the Project boundary and the conclusion that the Project will have "little influence" on the systems past Muskrat Falls		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methylmercury Assessment
		Consideration of marine animals, fish, fish habitat, and water quality as VEC's and inclusion of Lake Melville ecosystem	Report dated December 18, 2009	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>VECs were identified in the EIS Guidelines and IR JRP.43 and IR JRP.152</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Methylmercury Assessment
		Need gap analysis in determination of study area regarding saltwater intrusion, habitat quality and primary production	Report dated June 19, 2009. Submitted to JRP	<p>Issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.43</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Fish Habitat Compensation Plan Methylmercury Assessment
		Impact of reduction of peak high flows from spring runoff including impact on Goose Bay, Lake Melville and other water bodies downstream of the development	<p>Report dated June 19, 2009 Submitted to JRP.</p> <p>Public meeting July 21,2010</p>	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.43, IR JRP.149, IR JRP.152 and Components Study-Salt water intrusion model</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Impact on the lands and waters in and adjacent to LISA and one of the Inuit Communities	CEAR submission, February 22, 2008	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs
		Need gap analysis in determination of study area -Total Suspended Solids	Report dated June 19, 2009. Submitted to JRP	<p>Issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.90</p> <p><i>2009 Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project, Sedimentation and Morphodynamics Study component study</i></p>

Nunatsiavut Government: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
				See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Concern that effects of the Project will be similar to those of Upper Churchill	Meeting on Dec 16, 2009 Meeting on September 16, 2008 Public meeting July 21, 2010	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume I, II and III
		Need for detailed analysis of "exceptions" to blanket statement that the Project will have no influence past Muskrat Falls	Report dated December 18, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA Sections 4.0, IR JRP.43, IR JRP.152 and IR JRP.73, and IR JRP.166 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Methylmercury Assessment
		Need to analyze adverse effects on flow patterns and key seasonal cycling dynamics, particularly during early spring flows, in areas outside the Project footprint such as Lake Melville	Report dated December 18, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA Sections 4.0, IR JRP.43, IR JRP.152 and IR JRP.73 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Project should assume disruptions or changes in spring nutrient and water quality, salinity and temperature regimes	Report dated December 18, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA Sections 4.0, IR JRP.43, IR JRP.152 and IR JRP.73 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Upper Churchill Project resulted in changes to flow in Lake Melville and related environmental consequences. Likely that Lower Churchill will, too	Report dated December 18, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA Sections 4.0, IR JRP.43, IR JRP.152 and IR JRP.73 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Methylmercury Assessment
		Exclusion of Lake Melville from the project footprint	Meeting July 21, 2010	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA Sections 4.0, IR JRP.43, IR JRP.152 and IR JRP.73 See Appendix O - Supporting

Nunatsiavut Government: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
				Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Methylmercury Assessment
		Effects of Project downstream	Correspondence dated June 19, 2009 between Marina Biasutti- Brown and Maryse Pineau and Tom Graham	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA Sections 4.0, IR JRP.43, IR JRP.152 and IR JRP.73, and IR JRP.166 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Methylmercury Assessment
		Changes to salinity of Lake Meville and Grand Lake	Correspondence dated June 19, 2009 between Marina Biasutti- Brown and Maryse Pineau and Tom Graham	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.43, IR JRP. 73 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
	Impact on wildlife	Need to monitor mercury levels in multiple species such as osprey and otter over time	Report dated December 18, 2009	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.22 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methylmercury EEMP
		Effects on Seals Mercury levels in the seals they eat	Meeting on September 16, 2008 Meeting July 21, 2010	Monitoring of mercury will be completed as required for maintaining advisories and follow up. This may include areas below Muskrat Falls EIS Volume IIA Sections 4.0, IR JRP.43, IR JRP.152 and IR JRP.73 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
	Operation and impacts on habitat	Limitations and uncertainty of scientific models and predictions	Report dated December 18, 2009	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.89, IR JRP.153 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Plans
		How the river will look after development	Executive Meeting notes May 14,2008	Issue has been addressed EIS Volume III Section 5.5, IR JRP.14

Nunatsiavut Government: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
				See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Potential effects similar to Upper Churchill in area	Executive Meeting notes May 14,2008	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III Section 5.5, IR JRP.14
		Possible risk of fuel spills and other contaminations during construction	Public meeting July 21,2010	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA Section 2.3, IR JRP.145 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCP Environmental Protection Plan Master Spill Response Plan
	Other	Negative impacts for Rigolet	Meeting on September 16, 2008	This issue has been addressed. No negative effects identified EIA Volume IIA Sections 4.0, IR JRP.43, IR JRP.152 and IR JRP.73 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Methylmercury Assessment
EA process	Communication	Need for two-way information exchange in order to truly understand Inuit interests, values, concerns, contemporary and historic activities, TEK, and important issues and incorporation of these same into EA process	Report dated December 18, 2009	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Nunatsiavut's interest in the Project area IR JRP.151
		Poor communication with community Lack of meaningful consultation in Rigolet Having consultation personnel in the Labrador office to understand the Labrador people Need to familiarize Inuit with the potential environmental effects of the Project Need to propose action to address key concerns raised by Inuit Need to identify issues of concern raised by Inuit	Report dated December 18, 2009. Meeting on Dec 16, 2009 Meeting July 21, 2010 Correspondence dated June 19, 2009 between Marina Biasutti- Brown and Maryse Pineau and Tom Graham	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Nunatsiavut's interest in the Project area EIS Volume IA Section 8.3, IR JRP.15/25/c, IR JRP.151

Nunatsiavut Government: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Clarification of salt water intrusion modelling	Report dated December 18, 2009	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.43 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation • Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
	Other	Very little consultation to date with the Inuit of Labrador on the proposed Lower Churchill project	CEAR submission, February 22, 2008	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Nunatsiavut's interest in the Project area IR JRP.151
		Nalcor should fund a research program that would be led by the Nunatsiavut Government to gather traditional land and resource use in the Project area	CEAR submission, February 17, 2010	
		There is an urgent need to document and share the extensive and valuable knowledge held by Inuit Elders and other local Inuit experts with the JRP as well as with members of the scientific and environmental assessment community trying better to understand the proposed Project and its impacts	CEAR submission, February 17, 2010	
		Need to familiarize Inuit with the potential environmental effects of the proposed project	Report dated June 19, 2009. Submitted to JRP	
		Need for meaningful consultation	Report dated December 18, 2009.	
		Lack of full and fair consideration of "regional views"	Correspondence dated June 29, 2010	
		Need for Nalcor to engage in meaningful community consultation		
		Need for larger workshops on consultation with NG where two-way information exchange occurs rather than information dissemination in order to ensure incorporation of Inuit values, interests, concerns and knowledge	Report dated December 18, 2009	
		Need to include Inuit knowledge and Aboriginal concerns in selection of VEC's	Report dated December 18, 2009	
		The Nunatsiavut Minister of Lands and Natural Resources wants a community hearing in Nain (rather than Hopedale) in addition to the community hearing in Rigolet to allow more beneficiaries to participate in the process	CEAR submission, June 16, 2010	
		Delays in receiving information and participant funding impacting ability	Letter dated April 22, 2009	No response required

Nunatsiavut Government: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		to meaningfully participate in EA processes		
		The geographic distribution of benefits, costs, risks and uncertainties should be evaluated and considered by the panel in a culturally specific context	CEAR submission, June 15, 2010	
		Inuit and their representatives would be the only groups able to appropriately define significant socio-economic benefits, cultural residual benefits and biophysical residual impacts for Inuit	CEAR submission, June 15, 2010	
		For the Project to be approved and proceed, it should ensure that those most directly impacted by the Project (i.e. those who live in or adjacent to the Project footprint area and whose way of life may be most affected by the Project) are supportive to the Project	CEAR submission, June 15, 2010	
		A session on Aboriginal Knowledge (with Aboriginal expert residents) related to the importance of the surrounding environment would be important for the panel hearings	CEAR submission, June 15, 2010	
		We encourage for all of the public hearing sessions to be in person and not by videoconference, for all communities, especially for Rigolet	CEAR submission, June 15, 2010	
		To allow sufficient time to prepare for the public hearings, the Nunatsiavut Government strongly supports and requests that the public hearings be announced at a minimum of 90 days before their scheduled start. Without this notice timeframe, it will make it extremely difficult for the Nunatsiavut Government to meaningfully participate in the public hearings		
		Written transcripts of all public hearings (or, at the very least, executive summaries) should be made available in Inuktitut	CEAR submission, June 15, 2010	<p>Issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.43 and IR JRP.152</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
		Need for verification of the delineation of the study area for the aquatic environmental assessment	Report dated June 19, 2009. Submitted to JRP	

Nunatsiavut Government: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methylmercury Assessment
		Issues regarding the draft EIS guidelines, including scope of study area	CEAR submission, February 22, 2008	This issue has been addressed EIS Guidelines
		The study area should be expanded to include the areas of Nunatsiavut surrounding Lake Melville	Meeting notes from May 14, 2008 meeting Executive Meeting notes May 14, 2008 Meeting on Dec 16, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA Sections 4.0, IR JRP.43, IR JRP.152 and IR JRP.73, IR JRP. 166 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan • Methylmercury Assessment
		Desire to include additional VECs such as marine mammals, fish and fish habitat and water quality as well as Lake Melville ecosystem	Correspondence dated June 19, 2009 between Marina Biasutti- Brown and Maryse Pineau and Tom Graham	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.43, IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S and IR JRP.152 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan • Methylmercury Assessment
	Participation in follow-up programs	Need for monitoring or follow-up programs relevant to effects mentioned in EIS. Need for further information about how holders of Aboriginal traditional and community knowledge including Elders, women and youth, will be involved in monitoring and follow-up programs	Report dated June 19, 2009. Submitted to JRP Report dated December 18, 2009	Nalcor Energy will undertake a comprehensive monitoring and follow-up program, employing an adaptive management process EIS Volume IIB, Section 7.1 and 7.3, IR JRP.43, IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S, IR JRP.151, IR JRP.152 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs
		Desire for methylmercury monitoring downstream to Rigolet	Correspondence dated June 19, 2009 between Marina Biasutti- Brown and Maryse Pineau and Tom Graham	Monitoring of mercury will be completed as required for maintaining advisories and follow up. This may include areas below Muskrat Falls EIS Volume IIA Section 2.3, IR JRP.20, IR JRP.66, IR JRP.78, IR JRP.82, IR JRP. 33, IR JRP. 15/25 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan • Methylmercury Assessment
EA process	TEK consideration	Need to include Inuit knowledge in	Report dated June 19,	Issue has been addressed

Nunatsiavut Government: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		selection of VEC's especially for Lake Melville and Goose Bay. Incorporation of Inuit knowledge into data and determination of Project footprint. Need to meaningfully integrate Inuit TEK into Project planning. Deficiency of incorporation of Inuit knowledge on seals. Study of Land use for Inuit. Amount of work done in Labrador Inuit Settlement Area. Incorporation of Inuit TEK into the project. Incorporation of Inuit TEK into the assessment. Incorporation of Inuit TEK of seals into the assessment. Nalcor has not demonstrated an understanding of the interests, values, concerns, and issues facing Inuit. Incorporation of Inuit TEK into the assessment of cumulative impacts. Need to integrate Inuit TEK into the Project socio- economic assessment. Need to incorporate knowledge from Elders	2009. Submitted to JRP. Report dated December 18, 2009. Meeting on April 11 & September 16, 2008, December 16, 2009 and July 21, 2010. Correspondence dated June 19, 2009 between Marina Biasutti- Brown and Maryse Pineau and Tom Graham	IR JRP.151 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Methylmercury Assessment
	Marine mammal harvesting	Need for Inuit knowledge on marine mammals and other key species and characteristics of the aquatic environment in the area surrounding the Project	Report dated December 18, 2009	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.43, IR JRP.151, IR JRP.152
Asserted ancestral rights	Other	Need for examination of cascading consequences of changes to spring freshwater flow patterns into Lake Melville, part of which is in the marine component of LISA	Report dated December 18, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA Sections 4.0, IR JRP.43, IR JRP.152 and IR JRP.73 and <i>Hydrology</i> component study See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
	Recognition of asserted rights and title	Historical and current use of Churchill River by Inuit	Report dated December 18, 2009	The Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement addresses the matter of Inuit rights EIS Volume III Section 5.5 and 5.6 and IR JRP.151

Pakua Shipi: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
Traditional Lifestyle	Fishing	Mercury in fish	Interviews held during the month of June and July, 2010 in Pakua Shipi, Québec	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume IIA, Chapter 4. IR JRP.20, IR JRP.21, and IR JRP.156</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Methylmercury Assessment
	Hunting	The transmission line to the Island will cross hunting grounds	Meeting held January 15, 2009, Pakua Shipi, Québec	The transmission line is a separate project that will undergo its own assessment
		Project effects on caribou hunting	Hydro- Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	<p>Traditional hunting areas appear to occur outside the Project area. After construction is completed and the Project is operational, the reservoirs, transmission line corridor and surrounding areas will be available for traditional use activities.</p> <p>No interaction found between the Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of the Innu of Pakua Shipi</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caribou EEMP Species at Risk EEMP
	Other	<p>The biophysical and human environments components of the Project will affect all aspects of Innu culture and the practice of that culture.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Innu spiritual connection to the land identity and guardian duty link to the territory Wish to preserve the territory integrity Importance of maintaining access to traditional foods 	<p>CEAR submission, February 27, 2008</p> <p>Meeting held January 27, 2010, Québec City</p> <p>Hydro- Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6</p> <p>Meeting held January 15, 2009, Pakua Shipi, Québec</p> <p>Plain Language Summary Presentation held on June 15, 2010, in Pakua Shipi, Québec</p> <p>Interviews held during the month of June and July, 2010 in Pakua Shipi, Québec</p>	No interaction found between the Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of the Innu of Pakua Shipi

Pakua Shipi: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
Social	Use of territory	Keep all territory-use information confidential	Meeting held January 27, 2010, Québec City	This issue is addressed in the Consultation Agreement with Pakua Shipi
		Will the Innu be able to get the animals and wood in the Lower Churchill Project area before the reservoirs are flooded?	Series of meetings held from June 14 to 16, 2010, in Pakua Shipi, Québec	This issue is beyond the responsibility of the Proponent. Harvesting laws, regulation, and enforcement are established by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
		The Project is expected to reduce the practice of traditional activities due to work schedules	Interviews held during the month of June and July, 2010 in Pakua Shipi, Québec	This issue has been addressed Volume III, Section 4.7 IR JRP.142
		There is now a road to Labrador and we will see more Innu people going to hunt in Labrador, building cabins	Meeting held January 27, 2010, Québec City	This issue is not related to the Project
	Education, training	Help needed to enhance the schooling rate	Hydro- Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue is not related to the Project
		Opportunity to participate in training to work on the Project	Interviews held during the month of June and July, 2010 in Pakua Shipi, Québec	Nalcor has no mandate to offer training programs but, rather, cooperates with government and training institutions
	Family and Community	Divorce and separation may increase because of the distance between partners because of the Project	Interviews held during the month of June and July, 2010 in Pakua Shipi, Québec	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Section 4.7
		The Project is expected to increase crime and delinquency because youth will have a reduced opportunity to go out on the land. Youth will feel abandoned by their parents if they are working away	Interviews held during the month of June and July, 2010 in Pakua Shipi, Québec	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Section 4.7
		Impact on family relations: - Impact on intra-familial communication. - Negative effect on familial relations because of distance and lack of communication. - Impact on intra- and extra-familial forms of violence - Impact of the Project on unions, marriages and risks of divorce	Interviews held during the month of June and July, 2010 in Pakua Shipi, Québec Hydro- Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6 CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	These issues have been addressed EIS Volume III, Section 4.7
	Health	Help needed to address the many health problems	Interviews held during the month of June and July, 2010 in Pakua Shipi, Québec	This issue is not related to the Project
		Impact on drug, alcohol and prescription medication abuse. Based on the	Hydro- Québec, La Romaine Project	These issues have been addressed EIS Volume III, Section 4.7

Pakua Shipi: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		experience on La Romaine construction site, community members affirm that there is a high alcohol and drug consumption on the construction site. Impact on dietary practices. Impact on depressive behavior (because of isolation of workers)	Environmental Impact Study Vol.6 Hydro- Québec, La Romaine Project, MeHydro- Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM94 CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	
	Infrastructure, housing, etc.	Need of housing and community infrastructure	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue is not related to the Project
		The EIS should present Innu-specific accommodation strategies for the work sites	CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Sections 4.7 and 5.6
	Other	Discrimination and racism towards Innu workers	Interviews held during the month of June and July, 2010 in Pakua Shipi, Québec	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Section 4.7
		Alcoholism that might disadvantage Innu candidates	Interviews held during the month of June and July, 2010 in Pakua Shipi, Québec	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Section 4.7
		The Project could lead to an increase in violence and create conflict between Innu communities: - some will receive more money than others. - some will get work and others will be jealous. - some community members will be for the Project whereas others, mainly land users and elders, will not want to see the Project being developed	Interviews held during the month of June and July, 2010 in Pakua Shipi, Québec	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Section 4.7
		The Project is expected to have a negative effect on the status of elders by destroying the traditional territory and its resources	Interviews held during the month of June and July, 2010 in Pakua Shipi, Québec	No interaction found between the Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of the Innu of Pakua Shipi
		Impacts on rumors For La Romaine Project, rumors were going around about the fact that only Innu from certain communities could get hired and this affected the willingness and confidence of people from Pakua Shipi to apply for jobs on the Project	Interviews held during the month of June and July, 2010 in Pakua Shipi, Québec CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	This issue is not related to the Project
		Impact on neighbourhood relations. Impact on mutual aid. Impact on conflict. Impact on community life. Impact on crime and criminality	CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume III, Section 4.7
Economic	Benefits	Economic benefits for the community	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project	Training, jobs, and procurement/contracting opportunities will be

Pakua Shipi: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
			Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	publicly posted by Nalcor
	Business opportunities	Develop business opportunities	Meeting held January 27, 2010, Québec City	Procurement/contracting opportunities will be publicly posted by Nalcor
	IBAs	Desire for an IBA	Meeting held January 27, 2010, Québec City Plain Language Summary Presentation held on June 15, 2010, in Pakua Shipi, Québec CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Pakua Shipi's interest in the Project area
		Need a fair agreement as soon as possible since they need to take the decision whether or not they form a partnership with the five chiefs	Meeting held January 27, 2010, Québec City	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Pakua Shipi's interest in the Project area
	Jobs	Job Opportunities	Meeting held January 27, 2010, Québec City Plain Language Summary Presentation held on June 15, 2010, in Pakua Shipi, Québec Meeting held January 15, 2009, Pakua Shipi, Québec	Employment opportunities will be publicly posted by Nalcor Nalcor has developed a Benefits Strategy and issued Monthly Benefits Reports. See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation • Benefits Strategy
		Language will be a barrier to employment on the Project	Interviews held during the month of June and July, 2010 in Pakua Shipi, Québec	Nalcor understands that this may be an issue
Environment	Cumulative effects	Cumulative effects of existing and future projects	Hydro- Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6 CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Section 9.9 Volumes IIA, IIB and III IR JRP.97, IR JRP.97S, and IR JRP.163
	Impact on biophysical	The Project is expected to have a negative effect on : - the environment. - the Churchill River - quality of drinking water. - Impact on ice formation on lakes	Interviews held during the month of June and July, 2010 in Pakua Shipi, Québec	This issue has been addressed Volume IIA, Chapters 3 and 4. Volume IIB, Chapter 5. Volume III, Sections 5.5 and 5.6. <i>Ice Dynamics of the Lower Churchill River</i> component study. IR JRP.17, IR

Pakua Shipi: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
				JRP.48, IR JRP.116, and IR JRP.71 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs Environmental Protection Plan
	Impact on flora	The Project will affect plants Concern about important or endangered plant species	Interviews held during the month of June and July, 2010 in Pakua Shipi, Québec CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	This issue has been addressed Volume IIA, Sections 2.4. Volume III, Sections 5.5. IR JRP.42, IR JRP.70, and IR JRP.158
	Impact on wildlife	Impacts on wildlife	Meeting held January 15, 2009, Pakua Shipi, Québec Interviews held during the month of June and July, 2010 in Pakua Shipi, Québec	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB, Chapter 5. IR. JRP.17, IR JRP.83, and IR JRP.116 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs Environmental Protection Plan
EA Process	Communication	Information, EIS and interviews should be presented in Innu	Plain Language Summary Presentation held on June 15, 2010, in Pakua Shipi, Québec CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	This issue has been addressed Nalcor has provided a Plain Language Summary of the Project and EIS in Innu aimun and French
	Other	Lack of consultation and consideration of the Québec Innu's interests Duty to consult Consultation is late Method	CEAR submission, February 27, 2008 Meeting held January 27, 2010, Québec City Un frein au projet du Bas- Churchill, Radio-Canada, 5 janvier 2010 L'Alliance stratégique innue clarifie certains points pour une meilleure compréhension des enjeux par les médias et les gouvernements, 17 mars 2010, CNW Telbec	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Pakua Shipi's interest in the Project area

Pakua Shipi: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Financial support for consultation	Meeting held January 27, 2010, Québec City	This issue is addressed in the Consultation Agreement with Pakua Shipi, as well, participant funding was made available by CEEA through the Aboriginal Funding Envelope
		The hydroelectric complex and transmission line should not be assessed independently	Meeting held January 15, 2009, Pakua Shipi, Québec Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, MeHydro- Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM94	The transmission line is a separate project that will undergo its own assessment. Consultation for the transmission line project will be completed separately
		Participation in studies The emergency response plan must be prepared with the concerned Innu authorities The rehabilitation plan must include the considerations of Unamen Shipu and Pakua Shipi Develop, with the Proponent, data collection and analysis methods reflecting the Innu's perceptions and conceptions in the matter Mitigation measures selected jointly and equitably with the Innu of Unamen Shipu and Pakua Shipi drawing the boundaries of the study area	CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Pakua Shipi's interest in the Project area
	TEK consideration	No Québec Innu traditional knowledge of substance	CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Pakua Shipi's interest in the Project area
Asserted ancestral rights	Recognition of asserted rights and title	Recognition of rights and title. Traditional hunting rights in Labrador not recognized. Innu do not recognize borders. Use of the land for many generations	Meeting held January 27, 2010, Québec City Plain Language Summary Presentation held on June 15, 2010, in Pakua Shipi, Québec Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, MeHydro- Québec, La Romaine Project,	This is beyond the ability of Nalcor to address

Pakua Shipi: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
			BAPE submission #DM94	

Unamen Shipu: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions-Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
Traditional lifestyle	Hunting	Project effects on hunting	Meeting held on January 29, 2010, Québec City Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6 Les craintes des Autochtones, Radio-Canada, 28 septembre 2009	This issue has been addressed. No interaction found between the Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of the Innu of Unamen Shipu
	Trapping	Project effects on trapping	Meeting held on January 29, 2010, Québec City Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue has been addressed. No interaction found between the Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of the Innu of Unamen Shipu EIS Volume III, Section 5.5. IR JRP.110
	Other	Preservation and respect of the Innu culture: - Innu spiritual connection to the land. - identity and guardian duty link to the territory - Wish to preserve the territory integrity - Maintain the link between the Innus and the caribou	Actions des Innus du Québec au Labrador - La reconnaissance de nos droits s'impose, 28 avril 2010, CNW Telbec	These issues have been addressed. No interaction found between the Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of the Innu of Unamen Shipu
Social	Education, training	Help needed to enhance the schooling rate	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue is not related to the Project
	Family and community	Impact on family relations: - balance family life and work - Impact on intra-familial communication. - Impact on intra- and extra-familial forms of violence	CEAR submission, February 27, 2008 Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue is not related to the Project
	Health	Impacts on health: - on dietary practices - on drug, alcohol and prescription medication abuse - on depressive behaviour	CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	This issue is not related to the Project
	Infrastructure, housing, etc.	Need of housing and community infrastructures	CEAR submission, February 27, 2008 Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue is not related to the Project
	Other	The EIS should present Innu-specific accommodation strategies for the work sites	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Sections 4.4.1.1 and 4.4.2.1

Unamen Shipu: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions-Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
			CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	
		Economic distress on the reserve	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue is not related to the Project
	IBAs	Impact on crime and criminality. Impact on neighbourhood relations. Impact on mutual aid. Impact on conflict. Impact on rumours. Impact on community life. Impact of the Project on unions, marriages and risks of divorce.	CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	These issues are not related to the Project
		Desire for an IBA	Meeting held on January 29, 2010, Québec City	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Unamen Shipu's interest in the Project area
Economic	Cumulative effects	Necessity to respect the Innu visions on the natural resources development	Meeting held on January 29, 2010, Québec City CEAR submission, February 27, 2008 IR JRP.1S/2S Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6 Droits territoriaux au Labrador: L'Alliance stratégique innue accueille favorablement la création d'une tribune pour régler la question des chevauchements, 30 mars 2010, CNW Telbec	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Unamen Shipu's interest in the Project area
Environment	Impact on biophysical	Cumulative effects of existing and future projects Accessibility and exploitation of numerous resources of Nitassinan by	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Section 9.9 Volumes IIA, IIB and III. IR JRP.97, IR JRP.97S, and IR JRP.163

Unamen Shipu: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions-Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		third party (resort permits, mineral rights, outfitter's licenses, logging permits)		
		Water Water quality loss Pollution (discharge of effluent) into water Extraction and use of fresh water	CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA Sections 4.7, 4.12, and 4.15 EIS Volume IA, Section 4.4, 4.5, and 4.8 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs Environmental Protection Plan
	Impact on flora	Concern about important or endangered plant species	Letter sent on May 17, 2010 CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Section 2.4. IR JRP.42 and IR JRP.158
	Impact on wildlife	Impacts on Fish <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts on fish habitat. Pollution of waters frequented by fish Remedial works including construction of a fish ladder or waterfall. Loss of fish production 	Letter sent on May 17, 2010	This issue has been addressed Volume IIA, Chapter 4. IR JRP.17, IR JRP.116, and IR JRP.153 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fish Habitat Compensation Plan Aquatic EEMP
		Impacts on caribou: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Red Wine Mountain Mealy Mountain Caribou disturbance of habitat The Red Wine caribou herd and the George River herd are one and the same	Meeting held on January 29, 2010, Québec City	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA, Section 2.4. EIS Volume IIB, Sections 5.11 and 5.14. IR JRP.93, and IR JRP.157 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caribou EEMP Species at Risk EEMP
	Operation and impacts on habitat	Use of explosives	Meeting held on January 16, 2009, Unamen Shipu, Québec	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Sections 4.4, 4.8, and 4.11
	Other	Lack of mitigation measures	IR JRP.J1S/2S Les craintes des Autochtones, Radio-Canada, 28 septembre 2009 The Telegram, March 3, 2010	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB, Section 7.1 Volume III, Section 8.1. IR JRP.17 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs

Unamen Shipu: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions-Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
			Letter sent on May 17, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Protection Plan
EA process	Communication	Want to be informed about the Project	Meeting held on January 16, 2009, Unamen Shipu, Québec	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Unamen Shipu's interest in the Project area
	TEK consideration	Nalcor should be more active in answering these concerns	Letter sent on May 17, 2010	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Unamen Shipu's interest in the Project area
	Other	<p>Language barrier: ensure that Aboriginal people understand well the process and that they participate.</p> <p>Present an Innu version of the EIS, even a popularized version so that the Innu communities can adequately disseminate all information on the EIS among their own members.</p> <p>Provide a brief Innu-language summary of the project to make it easier for the members of their respective communities to understand the major components of the project.</p> <p>Participation in studies</p> <p>Respect for Innu place names</p> <p>The specific knowledge of the territory and resources by the Innu of Pakua Shipi and Unamen Shipu should be taken into account on a priority basis in drawing the boundaries of the study area.</p> <p>The rehabilitation plan must include the considerations of Unamen Shipu and Pakua Shipi regarding the various forms the said rehabilitation plan could take</p> <p>The emergency response plan must be prepared with the concerned Innu authorities</p> <p>Financial support for consultation and studies</p> <p>Pay for an Innu translator</p>	<p>Meeting held on January 29, 2010, Québec City</p> <p>CEAR submission, February 27, 2008</p> <p>Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM94</p>	<p>This issue has been addressed.</p> <p>Nalcor has provided a Plain Language Summary of the Project and EIS in Innu aimun and French. Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Unamen Shipu's interest in the Project area</p> <p>This issue has been addressed. Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Unamen Shipu's interest in the Project area. Nalcor has offered capacity funding</p>
		<p>Wish to be consulted</p> <p>Duty to consult</p> <p>Transparency</p>	<p>Meeting held on January 16, 2009, Unamen Shipu, Québec</p> <p>Meeting held on</p>	<p>Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Unamen Shipu's interest in the Project area</p>

Unamen Shipu: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions-Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		<p>Consider concerns</p> <p>Method The hydroelectric complex and transmission line construction projects should not be assessed independently</p> <p>Recognition of rights and title</p> <p>Traditional hunting rights in Labrador not recognized</p> <p>No boundaries</p>	<p>January 29, 2010, Québec City</p> <p>Letter sent on May 17, 2010</p> <p>Letter sent on September 4, 2008</p> <p>Un frein au projet du Bas- Churchill, Radio- Canada, 5 janvier 2010</p> <p>L'Alliance stratégique innue clarifie certains points pour une meilleure compréhension des enjeux par les médias et les gouvernements, 17 mars 2010, CNW Telbec</p> <p>CEAR submission, February 27, 2008</p> <p>Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM94</p>	<p>IR JRP.151</p> <p>The transmission line is a separate project that will undergo its own assessment. Consultation for the transmission line project will be completed separately.</p> <p>This is beyond the ability of Nalcor to address</p>
		The transmission line will cross Innu territory	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM94	The transmission line is a separate project that will undergo its own assessment
Asserted ancestral rights	Recognition of asserted rights and title	<p>The Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - division of the Innu community - Wish to be consulted - Fears to lose aboriginal rights in Labrador 	<p>Québec Innu use caribou hunt to defy Newfoundland deal signed by Innu Nation, The Canadian Press, 20 février 2010</p> <p>Droits territoriaux au Labrador: L'Alliance stratégique innue accueille favorablement la création d'une tribune pour régler la question des chevauchements, 30 mars 2010,</p>	Nalcor acknowledges Unamen Shipu's concern but does not have the mandate to resolve Aboriginal rights and title issues. This is a federal and provincial Crown issue

Unamen Shipu: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions-Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
			CNW Telbec The National Post, March 2, 2010 The Gazette, March 2, 2010 The Globe and Mail, March 2, 2010 The Edmonton Journal, March 4, 2010 CNW Telbec, March 17, 2010 Meeting held on January 16, 2009, Unamen Shipu, Québec CBC News, February 21, 2010 Calgary Herald, March 1, 2010 The Telegram, March 3, 2010 CFGF-FM, February 23, 2010 CBC News, February 22, 2010 The Telegram, February 23, 2010	

Nutashkuan: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
Traditional lifestyle	Hunting	Project impact on hunting	Meeting held on October 22, 2008, Natashkuan, Québec Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	No interaction found between the Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of the Innu of Nutashkuan
	Use of territory	Maintain the practice of traditional activities: - Effects of the opening of the territory - Impacts of the water drawdown operations on the movements of the Innu	Meeting held on January 26, 2010, Québec City Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, Memory #DM45 Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	No interaction found between the Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of the Innu of Nutashkuan. Issues regarding opening of the territory have been addressed EIS Volume III, Sections 5.2, 5.5, and 5.6. IR JRP.35, IR JRP.72, and IR JRP.143
	Other	Wish to preserve the territory integrity	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	No interaction found between the Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of the Innu of Nutashkuan
Social	Family and community	Family-work balance	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6 Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, Memory #DM45	This issue is not related to the Project
	Health	Help needed to address the many health problems	Meeting held on January 26, 2010, Québec City Meeting held on August 6, 2009, Québec City Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue is not related to the Project
	Infrastructure, housing, etc.	Need of housing and community infrastructure	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue is not related to the Project
	Education, training	Help needed to enhance the schooling rate	Hydro-Québec, La	This issue is not related to the

Nutashkuan: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
			Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	Project
Economic	Jobs	Possibility of jobs	Meeting held on October 22, 2008, Natashkuan, Québec	Employment opportunities will be publicly posted by Nalcor Nalcor has a Benefits Strategy and issues Monthly Benefits Reports See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation • Benefits Strategy
	Benefits	Economic benefits for the community	Meeting held on January 26, 2010, Québec City Meeting held on August 6, 2009, Québec City Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	Employment and procurement/contracting opportunities will be publicly posted by Nalcor
	Business opportunities	Develop business opportunities	Meeting held on January 26, 2010, Québec City Meeting held on August 6, 2009, Québec City	Procurement/contracting opportunities will be publicly posted by Nalcor
	IBAs	Possibility of an IBA	Meeting held on January 26, 2010, Québec City	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Nutashkuan's interest in the Project area No IBA required
	Other	Economic distress on the reserve	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue is not related to the Project
Environment	Impact on wildlife	Project impact on wildlife	Meeting held on October 22, 2008, Natashkuan, Québec Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, Memory #DM45	This issue has been addressed EIS, Volume IIB, Chapter 5. IR JRP.17, IR JRP.83, and IR JRP.116 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation • Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs • Environmental Protection Plan

Nutashkuan: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
	Cumulative effects	Cumulative effects of existing and future projects	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Section 9.9 Volumes IIA, IIB and III. IR JRP.97, IR JRP.97S, and IR JRP.163
EA process	Other	Wish to be consulted Duty to consult	Meeting held on October 22, 2008, Natashquan, Québec Meeting held on January 26, 2010, Québec City Un frein au projet du Bas- Churchill, Radio- Canada, 5 janvier 2010 L'Alliance stratégique innue clarifie certains points pour une meilleure compréhension des enjeux par les médias et les gouvernements, 17 mars 2010, CNW Telbec	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Nutashkuan's interest in the Project area
		Upper Churchill Project: - Lack of consultation - Compensation	IR JRP.1S/2S	This issue is not related to the Project
		Financial support for consultation	Meeting held on August 6, 2009, Québec City	This issue has been addressed. Financial support was offered
Asserted ancestral rights	Recognition of asserted rights and title	Recognition of rights and title No boundaries	Meeting held on January 26, 2010, Québec City Meeting held on August 6, 2009, Québec City	This is beyond the ability of Nalcor to address
	Other	Historical occupation of the Project area and use of the Churchill River	Meeting held on January 26, 2010, Québec City Meeting held on October 22, 2008, Natashquan, Québec CEAR submission, March 3, 2008 Meeting held on	Existing data show historical but no contemporary use of the Project area

Nutashkuan: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
			August 6, 2009, Québec City	
		Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) Agreement	IR JRP.1S/2S	Nalcor acknowledges Nutashkuan's concern but does not have the mandate to resolve Aboriginal rights and title issues. This is a federal and provincial Crown issue

Ekuanitshit: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
Traditional lifestyle	Hunting	Community is harassed by the Province, the government and the people who have permits to hunt	Meeting held June 1, 2009, Mingan, Québec	Nalcor has no mandate to resolve this issue
		Project effects on hunting: - caribou hunting; - waterfowl hunting	Meeting held June 1, 2009, Mingan, Québec Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6 Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM75 CEAR submission, February 27, 2008 CEAR submission, June 22, 2009 Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM77	This issue has been addressed. No interaction found between the Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of the Innu of Ekuanitshit
	Fishing	Effects on fishing	Meeting held June 1, 2009, Mingan, Québec	This issue has been addressed. No interaction found between the Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of the Innu of Ekuanitshit
	Trapping	Effects on trapping	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM75 CEAR submission, June 22, 2009	This issue has been addressed. No interaction found between the Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of the Innu of Ekuanitshit
	Other	Effects of the opening of the territory	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue has been addressed EIS, Volume III, Sections 5.2, 5.5, 5.6, and 5.7. IR JRP.35, IR JRP.72, and IR JRP.143
		Noise and air quality near the roads	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM75	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Section 4.8.4.2, EIS Volume IIB, Section 5.10, IR JRP.125, EIS Volume IIB, Section 7.1 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation • Atmospheric EEMP
		Preservation and respect of the Innu	Hydro-Québec, La	No interaction found between the

Ekuanitshit: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		culture: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of services adapted to the Innu culture and tradition - Innu spiritual connection to the land. - identity and guardian duty link to the territory - Wish to preserve the territory integrity - Maintain the link between the Innu and the caribou - Wage employment will conflict with traditional values. - Consider values as oral history in agreements 	Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM50 Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM75 Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM77 CEAR submission, June 22, 2009 December 15, 2009. The Innu of Ekuanitshit Intervenor Request Meeting held June 1, 2009, Mingan, Québec Actions des Innus du Québec au Labrador - La reconnaissance de nos droits s'impose, 28 avril 2010, CNW Telbec CEAR submission, June 22, 2009 Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6 Meeting held June 1, 2009, Mingan, Québec	Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of the Innu of Ekuanitshit
	Trails and Camps	Effects on transportation and navigation routes and corridors	December 15, 2009 The Innu of Ekuanitshit Intervenor Request CEAR submission, June 22, 2009	No interaction found between the Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of the Innu of Ekuanitshit

Ekuanitshit: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
Social	Health	Help needed to address the many health problems: - mental health related to psychosocial pressures (loneliness, responsibilities). - social problem related to the Project participation	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6 Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM50	This issue is not related to the Project
	Education, training	Help needed to enhance the schooling rate	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue is not related to the Project
	Infrastructure, housing, etc.	Need of housing and community infrastructure	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6 Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM50	This issue is not related to the Project
	Family and community	Family-work balance	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6 Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM50	This issue is not related to the Project
		Evaluate and prevent Project effects on children related to the parent's participation on the Project	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM50	This issue is not related to the Project
	Other	Concern about the coming of foreign workers and their effects on social cohesion Concern about the possible development of prostitution and drug selling networks	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM75 Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM50	The construction site is far away from Ekuanitshit. Consequently, no effect on social cohesion related to the presence of foreign workers is anticipated
Economic	Benefits	Economic benefits for the community (royalty payments, commercial involvement and participation in the workforce)	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	Employment and procurement/contracting opportunities will be publicly posted by Nalcor Nalcor has a Benefits Strategy and

Ekuanitshit: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
			CEAR submission, June 22, 2009	issues Monthly Benefits Reports See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation • Benefits Strategy
	IBAs	Want an IBA distinct of the transmission line project	Meeting held June 1, 2009, Mingan, Québec Meeting held January 27, 2010, Québec City CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	No IBA is required. The consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Ekuanitshit's interests in the Project area
	Other	Economic distress on the reserve	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6 Meeting held June 1, 2009, Mingan, Québec	This issue is not related to the Project
		Necessity to respect the Innu visions on the natural resources development	Droits territoriaux au Labrador: L'Alliance stratégique innue accueille favorablement la création d'une tribune pour régler la question des chevauchements, 30 mars 2010, CNW Telbec	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Ekuanitshit's interest in the Project area
Environment	Impact on flora	Existence of medicinal plants on the land	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM77	This issue has been addressed EIS, Volume III, Section 2.8. IR JRP.70, and IR JRP.103
	Impact on wildlife	Effects on fauna	Un frein au projet du Bas- Churchill, Radio-Canada, 5 janvier 2010 December 15, 2009 The Innu of Ekuanitshit Intervenor Request	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIB, Chapter 5. IR JRP.17, IR JRP.83, and IR JRP.116 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation • Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs • Environmental Protection Plan
		Impacts on Woodland Caribou	December 15,	These issues have been addressed

Ekuanitshit: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - disturbance; - cumulative effects; - the proposed mitigation measures are incomplete; - the monitoring and mitigation program is not very detailed - More recent information on the Red Wine Mountains herd's use of the area - The Red Wine caribou herd and the George River herd are one and the same - Nalcor Energy's contribution to the Labrador Woodland Caribou Recovery Team is laudable, but clearly insufficient. <p>Formal commitments by the proponent concerning the control measures planned in order to minimize disturbance of the herds during construction.</p> <p>Mitigation measures and monitoring program for woodland caribou are not sufficiently detailed and should comply with federal and provincial guidelines</p>	<p>2009 The Innu of Ekuanitshit Intervenor Request</p> <p>December 15, 2009 The Innu of Ekuanitshit Intervenor Request</p> <p>Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM75</p> <p>CEAR submission, June 22, 2009</p> <p>CEAR Submission, December 18, 2009</p> <p>The Telegram, March 3, 2010</p>	<p>EIS, Volume IIB, Sections 5.11 and 5.14. IR JRP.93, IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S, IR JRP.157, and IR JRP.163</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caribou EEMP • Species at Risk EEMP
		<p>Consider impacts on Lac Joseph Caribou</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conduct a recent inventory of the Lac Joseph herd - Formal commitments by the proponent concerning the control measures planned in order to minimize disturbance of the herds during construction 	<p>IR JRP.15/25</p> <p>December 15, 2009 The Innu of Ekuanitshit Intervenor Request</p> <p>December 15, 2009 The Innu of Ekuanitshit Intervenor Request</p> <p>CEAR Submission, December 18, 2009</p>	<p>These issues have been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.122</p>
		<p>The estimate of waterfowl use of the study area during the spring migration period was clearly underestimated</p>	<p>December 15, 2009 The Innu of Ekuanitshit Intervenor Request</p> <p>CEAR submission, June 22, 2009</p>	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>IR JRP.65</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avifauna EEMP • Avifauna Management Plan
		<p>Impacts on fish</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - spawning grounds ; - habitats essential; - forage fish dynamics and habitats; - stability of the entire fish food chain; - mercury. 	<p>December 15, 2009 The Innu of Ekuanitshit Intervenor Request</p>	<p>These issues have been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume IIA, Chapter 4. IR JRP.17, IR JRP.20, IR JRP.21, IR JRP.50, IR JRP.51, IR JRP.52, IR JRP.89, IR JRP.107, IR JRP.116, IR JRP.121, IR</p>

Ekuanitshit: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		Impacts of water level and velocity regimes in the reservoirs Define rules for managing reservoir levels to help avoid significant impacts	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM75 Un frein au projet du Bas- Churchill, Radio-Canada, 5 janvier 2010 CEAR submission, June 22, 2009	JRP.153, and IR JRP.156 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none">Fish Habitat Compensation PlanAquatic EEMP
	Impact on biophysical	Impacts on: - water level, velocity and flow regimes during the operating period - quality and diversity of natural environments - adding a very detailed section on operating regime - define the current and future management rules for the Churchill Falls generating station	December 15, 2009 The Innu of Ekuanitshit Intervenor Request Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM75 December 15, 2009 The Innu of Ekuanitshit Intervenor Request	These issues have been addressed IR JRP.32 and IR JRP.149 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none">Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation ProgramsEnvironmental Protection Plan
		Request for an environmental follow-up to measure the positive effects of the mitigation measures applied	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM75	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S, and IR JRP.164 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none">Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation ProgramsEnvironmental Protection Plan
		Will the implementation of the Water Management Agreement result in a different flow in the Lower Churchill River and/or the CF(L)Co tailrace at particular times and places than under current practice?	Responses to the Conseil des Innus de Ekuanitshit (CIE) Requests - Nalcor	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.149
		If so, what is the anticipated percentage difference in the Lower Churchill (sic) River and/or the CF(L)Co tailrace between the flow that will exist after the implementation of the Water Management Agreement and the flow that would otherwise be present?	Responses to the Conseil des Innus de Ekuanitshit (CIE) Requests - Nalcor	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.149
	Operation and impacts on habitat	Loss of habitat - Lack of habitat compensation strategy - Lack of mitigation measures	CEAR Submission, December 18, 2009	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA, Chapter 4. Volume IIB, Sections 5.7, 5.11, and 5.14. IR

Ekuanitshit: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
				JRP.101, IR JRP.102, IR JRP.124, IR JRP.153 and IR JRP.154 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs Environmental Protection Plan
	Cumulative effects	Cumulative effects of existing and future projects	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6 Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM75	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Section 9.9. IR JRP.97, IR JRP.97S, and IR JRP.163
	Other	Concern for the land because during meetings economics dominate	Meeting held June 1, 2009, Mingan, Québec	The EIS presents the environment components, an evaluation of the impact and the mitigation measures related to those components
	TEK consideration	Knowledge of Ekuanitshit not taken into consideration Consult with Innu experts in developing the research methodologies associated with the main VECs identified by the Innu experts	December 15, 2009 The Innu of Ekuanitshit Intervenor Request	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Ekuanitshit's interest in the Project area
EA process	Communication	The Proponent never informed the Innu of Ekuanitshit of its engagement and benefits strategies	CEAR submission, June 22, 2009 CEAR submission, February 27, 2008 CEAR submission, June 22, 2009	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Ekuanitshit's interest in the Project area
	Participation in follow-up programs	Duty to consult should include negotiation of the terms and conditions of an ongoing process of information and exchange on the various Project components	CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Ekuanitshit's interest in the Project area
		Involve the Innu in environmental monitoring	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM75	This issue has been addressed. Nalcor will apply an adaptive management process to monitoring and follow-up programs in consultation with Innu Nation and others. Results of monitoring and follow-up programs will be made available IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S, and IR JRP.164
	Other	Lack of consultation and consideration of	CEAR submission,	Consultation has been undertaken

Ekuanitshit: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		the Québec Innu's interests Duty to consult Consultation is late Method	February 27, 2008 Meeting held June 1, 2009, Mingan, Québec	by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Ekuanitshit's interest in the Project area
		Financial support for consultation and study (land use and occupancy)	December 15, 2009 The Innu of Ekuanitshit Intervenor Request Meeting held June 1, 2009, Mingan, Québec Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM75 Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM77 CEAR submission, June 22, 2009 Un frein au projet du Bas- Churchill, Radio-Canada, 5 janvier 2010 L'Alliance stratégique innue clarifie certains points pour une meilleure compréhension des enjeux par les médias et les gouvernements, 17 mars 2010, CNW Telbec CEAR submission, February 27, 2008 CEAR Submission, December 18, 2009 CEAR submission, April 14, 2010 CEAR submission,	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Ekuanitshit's interest in the Project area. Financial support was offered. As well, participant funding was made available by CEAA through the Aboriginal Funding Envelope

Ekuanitshit: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
			May 25, 2010 CEAR submission, August 19, 2010 CEAR submission, August 19, 2010	
		Multiple solicitations for consultation on different projects in the region	08-6 1301 Meeting held January 27, 2010, Québec City Letter dated March 12, 2010 December 15, 2009 The Innu of Ekuanitshit Intervenor Request December 15, 2009 The Innu of Ekuanitshit Intervenor Request CEAR submission, March 12, 2010 CEAR submission, May 25, 2010 Meeting held June 1, 2009, Mingan, Québec	Nalcor is aware about the constraints related to multiple solicitations for consultation and has been flexible and has offered financial support to the Innu of Québec to facilitate their participation in the consultation process
		The Chief wants to work with the five other chiefs of the Alliance Stratégique Innue	Meeting held January 27, 2010, Québec City	This issue is not related to the Project
		Consult is not consent	Meeting held January 27, 2010, Québec City	No response required
		Integration of interests, concerns and actions of the consultations	IR JRP.1S/2S	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.1S/2S and IR JRP.151
		Integration of interests, concerns and actions of the consultations The EIS Guidelines were not respected	CEAR submission, June 3, 2010 CEAR Submission, December 18, 2009 Letter dated January 6, 2010	This issue has been addressed IR JRP.1S/2S and IR JRP.151 Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Ekuanitshit's interest in the Project area
		Mitigation measures	December 15, 2009 The Innu	These issues have been addressed

Ekuanitshit: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
				See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs Environmental Protection Plan
		Clearly identify mitigation measures Formal commitment to implement these measures The mitigation measures be subject to public review The mitigation measures be included in the conditions attached to government authorizations to carry out the Project	of Ekuanitshit Intervenor Request	EIS, Volume IIB, Section 7.1. Volume III, Section 8.1. IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S, and IR JRP.164 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs Environmental Protection Plan
Asserted ancestral rights	Recognition of asserted rights and title	Nalcor can't legally run the project without a permit concerning their water supply	CBC Radio, January 4, 2010	Authorization to construct and operate will follow release from the environmental assessment process
		Nalcor's offer only suits the proponent	CEAR submission, August 19, 2010	Nalcor has offered financial support. Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Ekuanitshit's interest in the Project area
		Nalcor's offer only suits the proponent Lack details on environmental monitoring program	CEAR submission, August 19, 2010 December 15, 2009 The Innu of Ekuanitshit Intervenor Request	Nalcor has offered financial support. Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Ekuanitshit's interest in the Project area. This issue has been addressed IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S, and IR JRP.164 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs Environmental Protection Plan
		Recognition of rights and title Traditional hunting rights in Labrador not recognized No boundaries	Meeting held June 1, 2009, Mingan, Québec	This is beyond the ability of Nalcor to address
	Other	Historical occupation of the Project area and use of the Churchill River	Meeting held January 27, 2010, Québec City	Existing data show historical but no contemporary use of the Project area, with the exception of the Cache River caribou hunt in

Ekuanitshit: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
			<p>December 15, 2009 The Innu of Ekuanitshit Intervenor Request</p> <p>Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM77</p> <p>Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, BAPE submission #DM74</p> <p>Droits territoriaux au Labrador: L'Alliance stratégique innue accueille favorablement la création d'une tribune pour régler la question des chevauchements, 30 mars 2010, CNW Telbec</p> <p>Actions des Innus du Québec au Labrador - La reconnaissance de nos droits s'impose, 28 avril 2010, CNW Telbec The National Post, March 2, 2010</p> <p>The Gazette, March 2, 2010</p> <p>The Globe and Mail, March 2, 2010</p> <p>The Edmonton Journal, March 4, 2010 VOCM-AM, January 4, 2010 CNW Telbec, March 17, 2010</p>	<p>February 2010</p> <p>Nalcor has undertaken a comprehensive Historic Resources Assessment Program</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic Resources Assessment Program

Ekuanitshit: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
			CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	
		Define role of Nalcor	December 15, 2009 The Innu of Ekuanitshit Intervenor Request Meeting held June 1, 2009, Mingan, Québec Un frein au projet du Bas- Churchill, Radio-Canada, 5 janvier 2010	Clarification provided regarding the role of Nalcor as the proponent of the project
		Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) Agreement - Wish to be consulted - Fears to lose aboriginal rights on Labrador	CBC News, February 22, 2010 CBC News, February 21, 2010 Calgary Herald, March 1, 2010 The Telegram, March 3, 2010 CFGB-FM, February 23, 2010 Meeting held June 1, 2009, Mingan, Québec	Nalcor has no mandate to resolve Aboriginal rights and title issues

Uashat mak Mani-Utenam: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
Traditional lifestyle	Use of territory	Impact of the project on hunting, fishing and trapping - negative impacts on our traditional lands	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6 CEAR submission, June 22, 2009 CEAR submission, February 27, 2008 December 21, 2009 The Innu of Takuaitkan Uashat mak Mani-Utenam Intervenor Request CEAR submission, June 22, 2009 CEAR submission, December 18, 2009	No interaction found between the Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of the Innu of Uashat mak Mani-Utenam
		Lack of information regarding Innu occupation, frequentation and use of traditional territory, including natural resources in the EIS	Letter dated June 16, 2010	No interaction found between the Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of the Innu of Uashat mak Mani-Utenam
		The Project will irreparably transform the natural environment of the traditional lands of the Uashaunnuat, Innu families and ITUM members	CEAR submission, June 22, 2009	No interaction found between the Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of the Innu of Uashat mak Mani-Utenam
	Gathering places, sacred areas, spiritual areas	Identify the Innu heritage sites in the Project area Identify the scope of the damage they may suffer	CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	No interaction found between the Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of the Innu of Uashat mak Mani-Utenam
	Other	Cultural impact Spiritual impact - Innu spiritual connection to the land. - identity and guardian duty link to the territory - Wish to preserve the territory integrity	CEAR submission, June 22, 2009 Actions des Innus du Québec au Labrador - La reconnaissance de nos droits s'impose, 28 avril 2010, CNW Telbec Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	No interaction found between the Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of the Innus of Uashat mak Mani-Utenam
Social	Education, training	Help needed to enhance the schooling rate	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue is not related to the Project
	Health	Help needed to address the many health	Hydro-Québec, La	This issue is not related to the

Uashat mak Mani-Utenam: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		problems Impact on health of the Innu	Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6 CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	Project
	Infrastructure, housing, etc.	Need of housing and community infrastructure	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue is not related to the Project
	Other	Attempt to divide the community with the Innu of Goose Bay	Des Innus en colère, L'Actualité, 1er mai 2010	No response required
Economic	Benefits	Economic benefits for the community	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	Employment and procurement/ contracting opportunities will be publicly posted by Nalcor Nalcor developed a Benefits Strategy and issue Monthly Benefits Reports See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation • Benefits Strategy
	IBAs	Wish an IBA	Meeting dated January 12, 2009, Uashat, Québec	No IBA is required. Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Uashat mak Mani-Uteman's interest in the Project area
	Other	Economic distress on the reserve Economic effects	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6 CEAR submission, June 22, 2009	This issue is not related to the Project
		Necessity to respect the Innu visions on the natural resources development	Droits territoriaux au Labrador: L'Alliance stratégique innue accueille favorablement la création d'une tribune pour régler la question des chevauchements, 30 mars 2010, CNW Telbec	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Uashat mak Mani- Uteman's interest in the Project area
Environment	Cumulative effects	They have been affected by the Upper Churchill Project	IR JRP.1S/2S	This issue is not related to the Project
		Cumulative effects of The Project in combination with other projects	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6 Hydro-Québec, La	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Section 9.9. Volumes IIA, IIB and III. IR JRP.97, IR JRP.97S, and IR JRP.163

Uashat mak Mani-Utenam: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
			<p>Romaine Project, Memory #DM11 Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, Memory #DM44</p> <p>CEAR submission, June 22, 2009</p> <p>Meeting dated January 12, 2009, Uashat, Québec December 21, 2009 The Innu of Takuaiakan Uashat mak Mani-Utenam Intervenor Request</p>	
	Impact on biophysical	Impact on navigable waters. Impact on water quality	CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume IIA Sections 4.7, 4.12 and 4.15. Volume III, Section 5.5</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Navigation Mitigation and Monitoring Plan Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Methylmercury Assessment
	Impact on flora	Irreversible impacts on fauna and flora	<p>L'Alliance stratégique innue clarifie certains points pour une meilleure compréhension des enjeux par les médias et les gouvernements, 17 mars 2010, CNW Telbec</p>	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS, Volume IIA, Chapter 4. Volume IIB, Chapter 5. IR JRP.83 and IR JRP.116</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs Environmental Protection Plan
	Impact on wildlife	Impacts on wildlife: caribou, fish, waterfowl and migratory birds.	<p>CEAR submission, February 27, 2008</p> <p>December 21, 2009 The Innu of Takuaiakan Uashat mak Mani-Utenam</p> <p>Intervenor Request Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, Memory #DM11</p> <p>L'Alliance stratégique innue clarifie</p>	<p>This issue has been addressed.</p> <p>EIS, Volume IIA, Chapter 4. Volume IIB, Chapter 5. IR JRP.17, IR JRP.83 and IR JRP.116</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs Environmental Protection Plan

Uashat mak Mani-Utenam: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
			certain points pour une meilleure compréhension des enjeux par les médias et les gouvernements, 17 mars 2010, CNW Telbec CEAR submission, February 27, 2008 CEAR submission, June 22, 2009	
		The Red Wine caribou herd and the George River herd are one and the same.	The Telegram, March 3, 2010	This issue has been addressed. EIS, Volume IIA, Section 2.4. EIS Volume IIB, Section 5.14. IR JRP.93, IR JRP.157 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caribou EEMP • Species at Risk EEMP
		Impact on mercury accumulation.	CEAR submission, February 27, 2008	This issue has been addressed. EIS Volume IIA, Chapter 4. IR JRP.20, IR JRP.21, IR JRP.22, and IR JRP.156 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan • Methylmercury Assessment
EA Process	Other	Lack of consultation and consideration of the Québec Innu's interests Consultation is necessary Consulted late in the process Method	CEAR submission, June 22, 2009 CEAR submission, December 18, 2009 December 21, 2009 The Innu of Takuaiakan Uashat mak Mani-Utenam Intervenor Request CEAR submission, June 3, 2010 Letter dated June 16, 2010 Letter dated November 10, 2010 Meeting dated January 12, 2009, Uashat, Québec	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Uashat mak Mani-Uteman's interest in the Project IR JRP.2, IR JRP.1S/2S, and IR JRP.151

Uashat mak Mani-Utenam: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
			<p>December 21, 2009 The Innu of Takuaiakan Uashat mak Mani-Utenam Intervenor Request</p> <p>Les craintes des Autochtones, Radio- Canada, 28 septembre 2009 Des Innus de la Côte- Nord sont consultés, Radio- Canada, 12 janvier 2009</p> <p>Un frein au projet du Bas- Churchill, Radio- Canada, 5 janvier 2010</p> <p>L'Alliance stratégique innue clarifie certains points pour une meilleure compréhension des enjeux par les médias et les gouvernements, 17 mars 2010, CNW Telbec</p> <p>Letter dated January 6, 2010</p> <p>IR JRP. 1S/2S</p>	
		Funding of consultation	<p>Letter dated June 16, 2010</p> <p>Letter dated November 10, 2010</p>	This issue has been addressed. Financial support was offered
		<p>Question the need for the project</p> <p>Question the identity of the future buyers and consumers of the energy generated by the Project?</p>	<p>CEAR submission, June 22, 2009</p> <p>December 21, 2009 The Innu of Takuaiakan Uashat mak Mani-Utenam Intervenor Request</p>	These issues have been addressed EIS Volume IA, Chapter 2. IR JRP.5, IR JRP.25, IR JRP.25S, and IR JRP.146
		Question the Proponent's approach and the logic of dividing the generation and transmission projects, when its components cannot be dissociated	<p>CEAR submission, June 22, 2009</p> <p>Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project, Memory #DM11 Meeting dated January 12, 2009, Uashat, Québec</p>	The transmission line is a separate project that will undergo its own assessment

Uashat mak Mani-Utenam: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
			December 21, 2009 The Innu of Takuaihan Uashat mak Mani-Utenam Intervenor Request	
		Staged Environmental Assessment Approach	December 21, 2009 The Innu of Takuaihan Uashat mak Mani-Utenam Intervenor Request	The transmission line is a separate project that will undergo its own assessment
	TEK consideration	Lack of traditional knowledge	IR JRP.1S/2S	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Uashat mak Mani- Uteman's interest in the Project
Asserted ancestral rights	Recognition of Asserted rights and title	<p>Lack of recognition of rights and title by the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador</p> <p>A portion of the area affected by the Project is subject to the aboriginal title, aboriginal rights and treaty rights of the Uashaunnuat</p> <p>Lack of recognition of rights and lack of consent from Innus</p>	<p>December 21, 2009 The Innu of Takuaihan Uashat mak Mani-Utenam Intervenor Request</p> <p>Meeting dated January 12, 2009, Uashat, Québec</p> <p>Request Hydro- Québec, La Romaine Project, Memory #DM11</p> <p>CEAR submission, February 27, 2008</p> <p>Droits territoriaux au Labrador: L'Alliance stratégique innue accueille favorablement la création d'une tribune pour régler la question des chevauchements, 30 mars 2010, CNW Telbec</p> <p>The National Post, March 2, 2010</p> <p>The Gazette, March 2, 2010</p> <p>The Globe and Mail, March 2, 2010</p> <p>The Edmonton</p>	This is beyond the ability of Nalcor to address

Uashat mak Mani-Utenam: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
			Journal, March 4, 2010 CNW Telbec, March 17, 2010 Letter dated November 10, 2010 CEAR submission, June 22, 2009	
	Other	The Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) Agreement - Wish to be consulted - Fears to lose aboriginal rights on Labrador	The Telegram, March 3, 2010 Meeting dated January 12, 2009, Uashat, Québec CBC News, February 22, 2010 The Telegram, February 23, 2010 CBC News, February 21, 2010 Calgary Herald, March 1, 2010 CFGB-FM, February 23, 2010 Letter dated January 6, 2010	Nalcor has no mandate to resolve Aboriginal rights and title issues
		Possession, occupation and use of the territory	December 21, 2009 The Innu of Takuaihan Uashat mak Mani-Utenam Intervenor Request	Existing data show historical but no contemporary use of the Project area, with the exception of the Cache River caribou hunt in February 2010
		Obtaining consent of Innu in order to use the the QNS&L Railway, which is situated within their traditional territory, to transport equipment	December 21, 2009 The Innu of Takuaihan Uashat mak Mani-Utenam Intervenor Request	QNS&L is a common carrier, therefore, the consent of Uashat mak Mani-Utenam is not required

Matimekush-Lac John: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions-Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
Traditional lifestyle	Other	Preservation and respect of the Innu culture :	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project	No interaction found between the Project and <i>Innu Aitun</i> practices of

Matimekush-Lac John: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions-Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identity and guardian duty link to the territory - Wish to preserve the territory integrity - Maintain the link between the Innu and the caribou - Wish to preserve the territory integrity 	Environmental Impact Study Vol.6 Actions des Innus du Québec au Labrador - La reconnaissance de nos droits s'impose, 28 avril 2010, CNW Telbec	the Innu of Matimekush-Lac John
Social	Education, training	Help needed to enhance the schooling rate	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue is not related to the Project
	Family and community	Family-work balance	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue is not related to the Project
	Health	Help needed to address the many health problems	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue is not related to the Project
	Infrastructure, housing, etc.	Need of housing and community infrastructure	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue is not related to the Project
Economic	Jobs	Economic opportunities such as employment	Telephone conversation dated February 10, 2010	<p>Employment opportunities will be publicly posted by Nalcor</p> <p>Nalcor has a Benefits Strategy and issues Monthly Benefits Reports</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits Strategy
	Benefits	Economic benefits for the community	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	<p>Training, employment, and procurement/contracting opportunities will be publicly posted by Nalcor</p> <p>Nalcor has a Benefits Strategy and issues Monthly Benefits Reports</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits Strategy
	Other	Economic distress on the reserve	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue is not related to the Project
		Necessity to respect the Innu visions on the natural resources development	Droits territoriaux au Labrador: L'Alliance stratégique innue accueille favorablement la création d'une tribune pour régler la question des	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Matimekush-Lac John's interest in the Project area

Matimekush-Lac John: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions-Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
			chevauchements, 30 mars 2010, CNW Telbec	
Environment	Impact on wildlife	The Red Wine caribou herd and the George River herd are one and the same	The Telegram, March 3, 2010	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IIA, Section 2.4. EIS Volume IIB, Sections 5.11 and 5.14. IR JRP.93, and IR JRP.157 See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caribou EEMP • Species at Risk EEMP
	Cumulative effects	Cumulative effects of existing and future projects	Hydro-Québec, La Romaine Project Environmental Impact Study Vol.6	This issue has been addressed EIS Volume IA, Section 9.9. Volumes IIA, IIB, and III. IR JRP.97, IR JRP.97S, and IR JRP.163
EA process	Other	Wish to be consulted Duty to consult Consultation is late	Un frein au projet du Bas- Churchill, Radio-Canada, 5 janvier 2010 L'Alliance stratégique innue clarifie certains points pour une meilleure compréhension des enjeux par les médias et les gouvernements, 17 mars 2010, CNW Telbec	Consultation has been undertaken by Nalcor in compliance with the Guidelines and at a level commensurate with Nalcor's understanding of Matimekush-Lac John's interest in the Project area
Asserted ancestral rights	Recognition of asserted rights and title	Recognition of Innu land rights and title in relation to the proposed Lower Churchill Project	Telephone conversation dated February 10, 2010. L'Alliance stratégique innue clarifie certains points pour une meilleure compréhension des enjeux par les médias et les gouvernements, 17 mars 2010, CNW Telbec Droits territoriaux au Labrador: L'Alliance stratégique innue accueille favorablement la création d'une tribune pour régler la question des chevauchements, 30 mars 2010, CNW Telbec The National	This is beyond the ability of Nalcor to address

Matimekush-Lac John: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions-Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
			Post, March 2, 2010 The Gazette, March 2, 2010 The Globe and Mail, March 2, 2010 The Edmonton Journal, March 4, 2010 CNW Telbec, March 17, 2010	
	Other	Tshash Petapen (New Dawn) Agreement - Wish to be consulted - Fears to lose aboriginal rights in Labrador	CBC News, February 22, 2010 The Telegram, February 23, 2010 CBC News, February 21, 2010 Calgary Herald, March 1, 2010 The Telegram, March 3, 2010 CFGB-FM, February 23, 2010	Nalcor has no mandate to resolve Aboriginal rights and title issues

Naskapi Nation of Kawawachikamach: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
Traditional lifestyle	Fishing	Impact on fish migration up Churchill River tributaries	Meeting Notes dated June 8, 2010	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume IIA, Chapter 4. IR JRP.50</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fish Habitat Compensation Plan Aquatic EEMP
	Use of territory	Traditional land use in Labrador	Letter dated March 31, 2010 Letter dated May 22, 2009	No interaction found between the Project and the traditional practices of the Naskapi Nation of Kawawachikamach
Economic	Jobs	Job opportunities for community members	Meeting Notes dated June 8, 2010	<p>Employment opportunities will be publicly posted by Nalcor</p> <p>Nalcor has a Benefits Strategy and issues Monthly Benefits Reports</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benefits Strategy
Environment	Impact on biophysical	Comparison of the Project to the James Bay hydro developments	Meeting Notes dated June 8, 2010	<p>The reservoir is smaller than James Bay in size, being restricted within the valley of the lower Churchill River</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methylmercury Assessment
		Reservoir size; steepness of Churchill River banks	Meeting Notes dated June 8, 2010	Footprint of impoundment less because of relatively steeper slopes, slumping expected to continue as occurs presently
	Impact on wildlife	Impacts on the beaver	Meeting Notes dated June 8, 2010	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS, Volume IIB, Section 5.14. IR JRP.128</p> <p>Beaver relocation was determined to be ineffective. A plan to harvest beaver and provide to the community was developed in consultation with the Government of NL and The Innu Nation.</p>
	Other	Desire that the impacts of the Project will be mitigated to the fullest extent possible and that a monitoring process be implemented	Letter dated May 22, 2009	<p>This issue has been addressed</p> <p>EIS Volume IIB, Section 7.1. IR JRP.112, IR JRP.112S, and IR JRP.164</p> <p>See Appendix O - Supporting Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Effects Monitoring Program and Mitigation Programs Environmental Protection Plan

Naskapi Nation of Kawawachikamach: Issues of Concern and Proposed Actions - Generation				
Category	Sub Category	Issue	Source	Nalcor Action / Response / Supporting Documentation
EA process	Communication	Translation of plain language summary was in incorrect alphabet	E-mail dated June 4, 2010 E-mail dated June 7, 2010	This issue has been addressed
		Desire to have Project-related information translated in Naskapi	Letter dated November 26, 2009	Nalcor provided a Plain Language Summary of the Project and EIS in Naskapi and English
	Other	Further plans for consultation	Meeting Notes dated June 8, 2010	Nalcor will continue to provide updates
Asserted ancestral rights	Recognition of asserted rights and title	Recognition of Aboriginal Rights and Title in Labrador	Letter dated May 22, 2009. Letter dated March 31, 2010 Letter dated May 22, 2009	Nalcor has no mandate to resolve aboriginal rights and title issues

Innu Nation: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission

Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
Need for an EIS level review, allowing consideration of alternatives, evaluation of proposed mitigation measures and the development of monitoring programs	Chapter 1 Intro, 2.5, 9.3.8, 9.4.6, 11.3, 12.6, 13.4, 14.5, 16.9	
<p>The Project was subject to EA review under the Newfoundland and Labrador <i>Environmental Protection Act</i> (NLEPA) and the <i>Canadian Environmental Assessment Act</i> (CEAA). This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was submitted by Nalcor, as Proponent, in accordance with the requirements of the provincial and federal EA processes and the associated <i>Environmental Impact Statement Guidelines and Scoping Document</i> issued by the provincial and federal governments in May 2011 (Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and Government of Canada 2011).</p> <p>Chapter 2 (Section 2.5) presents a summary of the power generation supply options for both the Isolated Island and Interconnected Island alternatives. It represents a portfolio of electricity supply options that could be theoretically considered to meet future generation expansion requirements for the Island. These individual supply options represent a range of choices / alternatives from local indigenous resources, to importing energy fuels from world energy markets, to interconnecting with regional North American electricity markets.</p> <p>As an important and valuable planning tool, EA is intended to help inform and influence project design, and in doing so, to help address the potential environmental outcomes of proposed development projects. The EA process therefore allows for the identification, analysis, and evaluation of potential alternative project concepts and approaches, to help directly incorporate environmental considerations into project planning at an early stage. As required under the provincial and federal EA legislation and the associated EIS Guidelines and Scoping Document, the EIS also considers possible alternative means of carrying out the Project that are technically and economically feasible, and the environmental effects of the chosen alternative means.</p> <p>The EIS presents and considers mitigation options during the assessment for each KI, to determine the likely residual effects of the Project for each KI. The likely residual effects (positive or adverse) for each KI of a VEC are then carried forward and consolidated to determine the likely residual effects on each VEC. Each effects assessment chapter concludes with a discussion of any proposed environmental monitoring and / or follow-up programs related to one or more of the associated VECs during Project Construction and / or Operations and Maintenance (Sections 11.3, 12.6, 13.4, 14.5, and 16.9). Monitoring has been proposed in the EIS and monitoring requirements will be stipulated by the regulators in the eventual Project permits, including details such as scheduling, sampling design, frequency, and reporting, and Nalcor will comply with the requirements. If unforeseen adverse environmental effects are identified during any of the monitoring or follow-up programs, Nalcor will, as per their ongoing adaptive management process, adjust the existing mitigation measures or, if necessary, develop new mitigation or other measures to address those effects. This could result in Nalcor refining or modifying the design and implementation of management plans, mitigation measures, and Project operations, with the final approach selected depending on the issue identified.</p>		The project was subject to an EIS level environmental assessment and released from the federal and provincial environmental assessment processes.
Proposed transmission corridor crossings of the Kenamu River	13.2.1.1	
<p>The realignment of the transmission line from Muskrat Falls results in the transmission line crossing the Kenamu River in close proximity to the existing TLH Phase III crossing of the river. As a result, no work in the river will be required as the existing TLH crossing can be used to access both sides of the river.</p>		<p><u>See Appendix B</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan

Innu Nation: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission

Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
Kenamu River's potential eco-tourism development may be affected	16.7.7.2	
Construction, and operations and maintenance of major transmission lines have occurred within the province without any significant negative effect on tourism. Construction activities associated with the proposed Project are short-term, avoid key tourism attractions, are located away from most communities and major roads, and are within the normal pattern of summer construction activity within the province. Project Construction activity will use existing roadways and access routes where possible, thus, not adding unnecessary land disturbance.		EIS Addendum shows the location of the ROW and was presented during the environmental assessment process.
Specifically with respect to the Kenamu River, the river crossing is adjacent to the existing crossing of the same river by TLH phase III, and large expanses of the river are unaffected by the construction of the Project and will be available for eco-tourism development.		<u>See Appendix B</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan
Innu traditional use of the Kenamu River, and the transmission line's potential effect on Atlantic salmon	16.5.5.5, 16.5.6.4	
As indicated above, the realigned transmission line routing results in the crossing being adjacent to the TLH crossing. While work will be undertaken adjacent to either side of the river, the application of the standard techniques, including the establishment of buffers and silt control, will mitigate effects on the aquatic environment. No work is anticipated to be required in the river, as access to both sides is available from the TLH Phase III crossing.		<u>See Appendix B</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LITL Freshwater Fish Protection and Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan
Need to consider an alternative routing south of the Kenamu^(d)	2.11.2	
An alternative routing adjacent to the TLH Phase III will be considered during detailed design. This will minimize aquatic effects by making use of the existing crossing.		This was considered during the EA process. See EIS Addendum.
Electromagnetic radiation and its potential environmental effects	3.5.3.1, 3.5.3.2, 14.2.6.5, 14.2.7, 16.3.6.5, 16.3.6.6	
Research has not established a causal relationship between exposure to magnetic fields and human disease, nor a plausible biological mechanism by which exposure to electromagnetic fields (EMFs) could cause disease. Health Canada (2010) states, "when all of the studies are evaluated together, the evidence suggesting that EMFs may contribute to an increased risk of cancer is very weak". The right of way has been established to avoid development within the immediate area of the line, and field intensity at the edges of the right of way is consistent with accepted standards and practices. In addition, the Federal-Provincial-Territorial Radiation Protection Committee (Health Canada 2008) states 'that there is insufficient scientific evidence showing exposure to EMFs from power lines can cause adverse health effects such as cancer. Therefore, a warning to the public to avoid living near or spending time in proximity to power lines is not required.'		The transmission line has been constructed in accordance with applicable standards and guidelines.
The EMFs produced by the submarine cable will be in the order of 150 m as calculated by the Biot-Savart Formula (Worzyk 2009). The magnetic field strength attenuates rapidly from 260 µT (260,000 nT) at 1 m from the cable to 26 µT (26,000 nT) at 10 m as calculated using the Biot-Savart Formula using a maximum current of 1,286 amperes (A).		<u>See Appendix B</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marine Emissions Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan

Innu Nation: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission

Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
<p>As indicated in the EIS, there is no evidence to suggest that the EMFs emitted by the submarine HVdc cables will adversely affect marine fish in a significant way. It is predicted that the magnetic field induced by the cable electric field will reduce to background levels within a few metres of the cables. As discussed in the EIS, field studies have been conducted to investigate whether or not operating HVdc cables act as barriers to eel movement. There is no evidence of a significant effect on eel movement across HVdc cables emitting a magnetic field.</p> <p>For comparison, the Earth's natural magnetic field is also subject to short- and long-term variations. Solar electromagnetic radiation impinging on the Earth's surface can cause daily fluctuations in field intensity of up to 30 nT and shifts in inclination of up to 0.33°. These daily perturbations vary with latitude and season. Magnetic storms associated with sun spot activity also cause fluctuations of 200 nT or more. The Earth's natural geomagnetic field intensity in the Strait of Belle Isle is approximately 54,000 nT.</p> <p>For the electrode site, a threshold of effects on marine fauna at a magnetic flux density of 200 nT (2×10^{-7} T) was used as a reasonable (and conservative) value to define the ZOI of the electrodes. A surface ZOI for normal operations can be defined at some distance from the electrodes of equal to or less than 50 to 100 m.</p> <p>The upset condition where the system is operating in monopolar operation (i.e., maximum continuous current) results in a ZOI radius for the electrodes on the order of 500 m for L'Anse au Diable and Dowden's Point. Monopolar operation is expected to occur in the order of 10 to 20 hours per year.</p> <p>The overall likely environmental residual effect of Operations and Maintenance activities associated with the Project on the Marine Fish and Fish Habitat VEC is minimal. In cases where duration is far future and frequency is continuous, the magnitude and extent are limited.</p>		
Herbicide use and its potential effects on the quality and abundance of food plants such as berries	16.3.6.5	
<p>Vegetation management during Project Operations and Maintenance will include herbicide application. To manage the potential adverse effects of herbicide application, mitigation and management measures will be implemented such as providing notice to communities and Aboriginal groups of locations of the ROW where vegetation management has occurred. The notice would include the date of application via signage in the ROW, so that plant and berry harvesting would not occur in that location until the plants are again safe for consumption.</p> <p>Vegetation management via mechanical and herbicide application will be undertaken on the ROW to remove trees greater than 2 m in height. Treatment of compatible species also found on the right-of-way is avoided or minimized. Compatible species are low growing and do not grow to a sufficient height to reach energized lines or cause significant impediment or safety concerns to maintenance crews traveling in the right-of-way. Compatible species include berries, Labrador Tea, Kalmia species, Trailing Juniper, Dwarf Birch, and grass. This selective application of herbicide maintains the compatible species within the right-of-way giving them increased growing space with the removal of the target species. Once compatible species have established it makes it more difficult for the target species to re-establish and the length of time between treatments is increased.</p> <p>The herbicide to be used is Tordon 101 mixed with Sylgard 309 and it will be applied in accordance with appropriate regulations and procedures by approved personnel. Vegetation management will likely start in year eight of operations and will be repeated every seven years thereafter, or as required for safety. As such, only a portion of the ROW would be managed every seven years, and only appropriate plants (i.e., tall growing species) will be treated. The herbicide is considered to be non-residual and non-toxic to</p>		<p>This will be addressed during the Operations phase and will follow provincial legislation.</p>

Innu Nation: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission

Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
<p>wildlife or humans in the doses that would be applied to plants on the ROW.</p> <p>Another technique used during vegetation management includes the cut and stump. This treatment consists of cutting the target species and applying herbicide to the stump using a back pack sprayer or a sprayer mounted on the brushsaw. This kills the root system and prevents re-sprouting. This system is very expensive and labour intensive. It is typically used in sensitive areas. This vegetation control method will use Tordon 101, Garlon 4, and Glyphosate products.</p>		
<p>Potential that transmission corridor may encourage more non-Innu trapping in previously remote areas</p>	<p>16.5.6.3</p>	
<p>Whether and to what degree, and for what purpose, persons will use portions of the transmission ROW as a transportation corridor cannot be known with certainty, and will vary considerably by region. A detailed analysis of existing access within and adjacent to the proposed transmission corridor was completed as part of its Socioeconomic Environment Component Study for this EA (Nalcor et al. 2011). The analysis determined that while certain parts of the corridor have little or no existing access (for example, the eastern half of the corridor in Central and Southeastern Labrador, after it leaves the TLH), most parts of the corridor already have considerable existing accessibility due to forest access roads and other trails. Indeed, the presence of existing access was a key consideration in the selection of the transmission corridor, including decisions to route the corridor along the western portion of the TLH in Labrador and to use existing forest access road networks wherever possible, both to allow for better construction access and to avoid opening up new areas for human activities and use. Therefore, in many instances the Project will likely not create or enhance access to any particular wilderness area. In other areas, people may choose to use the ROW to access cabins or other sites rather than using existing routes, with little or no change in the nature or intensity of human presence or activities.</p>		<p>EIS Addendum presented the selected ROW for the project. The ROW follows the TLH3 for the first ~150 km.</p> <p>EIS Addendum also identifies the land use by other indigenous groups in Labrador prior to the creation of the ROW. Land use along the TLH3 is extensively used for trapping.</p> <p>LCP is currently in the process of determining what access is required during operations. This will include consultation with key stakeholders.</p>
<p>Historic Resources studies should contain sufficient Innu traditional knowledge, especially as they are not prepared by Innu</p>	<p>16.2.5.1</p>	
<p>As specified in the Guidelines, the EA for Historic and Heritage Resources considers sites of cultural / historical importance, including any known burial, cultural, spiritual and / or heritage sites. No known locations of cultural or spiritual importance to the Labrador Innu described in Armitage (2010) are located within the proposed Project area. Available information and the results of consultation with other Aboriginal groups in Labrador and Québec have also not identified any cultural or spiritual sites within the Project area (Nalcor Energy (Nalcor) et al. 2011). Any additional relevant information that is obtained through further consultation with Aboriginal groups will be considered and used to inform Project planning.</p>		<p>As per the Aboriginal Consultation Guidelines, Innu Nation were consulted on all relevant permits.</p> <p>And, as per the IBA, a joint Nalcor-Innu environmental management committee has been created that is responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • environmental policies • Environmental Management System • Consideration of Innu knowledge <p>This committee meets regularly.</p>

Innu Nation: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
Attitudes and perceptions about land use studies, and the need to ensure that the Innu feel that their input is valued, and how participating will benefit them	15.5.2, 16.3.3.1, 16.4.10, 16.5.3.1, 16.5.4.1, 16.5.5.1, 16.5.5.5, 16.5.6.4, 16.9.1, Table 16.9.1-1	
<p>For the Aboriginal contemporary traditional land use component, several information sources were identified, compiled and reviewed. These include published and unpublished literature, information and data provided to Nalcor by Aboriginal groups and the results of recent consultation activities and socioeconomic data collection initiatives completed for the EA by Aboriginal groups in cooperation with, and through funding and resources provided by Nalcor. Chapter 7 of this EIS presents additional details on Nalcor's Aboriginal consultation for the Project.</p> <p>In some instances, Nalcor was successful in concluding community engagement agreements with Aboriginal communities. These agreements provided mechanisms for sharing information and resources. Where an agreement was reached between Nalcor and an Aboriginal group, primary information was collected and incorporated into this EIS as available. Since December 2009, four agreements have been signed between Nalcor and the following Aboriginal groups: Innu Nation, NCC, Conseil des Innus de Pakua Shipi and Conseil des Innus de Unamen Shipu. The objectives of the community engagement agreements were / are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> familiarize the group with the Project and its potential environmental effects; identify any issues of concern with respect to potential environmental effects of the Project on the interests of the group; collect and document Aboriginal Ecological Knowledge (AEK) and information respecting contemporary land use and harvesting activities; and identify potential ways to address the issues identified. <p>The specific workplan and data collection methodology for each of these agreements were developed collaboratively by Nalcor and a project coordinator or researcher, who was hired by the Band or its Executive Council. The workplan and research methodology were subsequently approved by the Band or Executive Council and implemented by the project coordinator or researcher, in cooperation with a Nalcor representative.</p> <p>The agreement with Innu Nation was signed in July 2010 and completed in November 2010. Data collected under the completed agreement has been incorporated into this EIS. Any information and data obtained by Nalcor will be considered and incorporated, where relevant, including with respect to site specific mitigation and adaptive management measures during detailed design and routing.</p>		<p>As per the IBA, a joint Nalcor-Innu environmental management committee has been created that is responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> environmental policies Environmental Management System Consideration of Innu knowledge <p>This committee meets regularly.</p>
Potential effect of the Project on the Red Wine caribou herd	12.3.5.3, 12.3.6.3	
<p>In all areas, the effects, which may include habitat alteration and / or loss, possible mortality (direct or indirect), a reduction in forage availability or access and changes to migration or movement routes, are adverse. The 3 km wide assessment area includes the 2 km wide transmission corridor plus a 500 m buffer on either side. This approach of buffering the corridor is consistent with the proposed Environment Canada (2011b) Recovery Strategy for Woodland Caribou, Boreal Population, which defines 'undisturbed habitat'</p>		<p><u>See Appendix B</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2014 Annual Red Wine Mountain Caribou Report;

Innu Nation: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission

Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
<p>as that beyond 500 m from disturbances. Critical habitat for the MMH and RWMH ranges is defined as 65% undisturbed habitat within the respective ranges. The amount of undisturbed habitat is presently 98% of the MMH range, and 92% of the RWMH range (Environment Canada 2011b). In Central and Southeastern Labrador, the 3 km wide assessment area overlaps with less than 1% of both the MMH and RWMH ranges, and therefore will not affect critical habitat for Caribou in Labrador. In Newfoundland, where Caribou are considered "Not at Risk" (SARA 2011, internet site), 3% of the Primary Core area occurs within the assessment area. The actual amount of habitat affected will be less, as sensory disturbance effects are not predicted to occur beyond 500 m of Project Construction activities or roads.</p> <p>Construction effects will be adverse. In Central and Southeastern Labrador and Newfoundland the magnitude will be low as less than 5% of Caribou ranges (Labrador) or Primary Core area (Newfoundland) is affected. Effects will be Regional, as many Construction effects, such as habitat alteration and sensory disturbance, can extend beyond the LSA. The effects of the habitat alteration or loss caused by Project Construction, and the opportunities for increased access created by the Project will continue over the life of the Project. Although there are effects predicted to result from the Construction of the Project, Caribou populations are not likely to be affected on a regional scale.</p> <p>The likely residual environmental effects of Operations and Maintenance of the Project are similar to, but of lesser magnitude, than those predicted for the Construction phase. Although the individual Operations and Maintenance activities may be of short duration, the duration of effects, including habitat loss or fragmentation and increased access, will continue over the life of the Project. Sensory disturbance effects are not likely to occur beyond 250 m of infrastructure or clearings during Project Operations.</p> <p>The effects of the Project relative to baseline are not likely to affect the viability or recovery of woodland Caribou populations in Central and Southeastern Labrador and Newfoundland. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on Caribou, including the RWMH.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2015 Annual Caribou Report – Mealy Mountain Herd; • 2015 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd; • 2016 Annual Caribou Report - Mealy Mountain Herd; • 2016 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd; • 2017 Annual Caribou Report - Mealy Mountain Herd; • 2017 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program - 2014 Red Wine Mountains Caribou Herd, 2014 Aerial Survey and Collar Deployment; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – 2016 Red Wine Mountains Caribou Herd, 2016 Aerial Survey; • Labrador-Island Transmission Link Species at Risk Impacts Mitigation and Monitoring Plan • LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties

Innu Nation: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission

Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
		Environmental Protection Plan S.11.31(a)
Concerns about potential workplace discrimination	16.4.5.1	
<p>The potential for workplace discrimination is addressed in the Lower Churchill Benefits Strategy, which will also be adopted by the Project. The Benefits Strategy requires that Nalcor develop and implement and Gender Equity and Diversity plan during the construction of the Project. This plan is intended to address barriers to employment on the Project, including mitigating the potential for workplace discrimination.</p> <p>The potential for workplace discrimination and cultural sensitivity training is also addressed in the IBA with Innu Nation. The IBA requires that Nalcor, in consultation with Innu Nation, review and assess workplace policies with a view to reducing barriers to employment by Innu in the workplace, prohibition of discrimination and harassment of Innu in the workplace, and also includes commitments to offer cultural sensitivity training to all employees.</p>		<p>Lower Churchill Benefits Strategy adopted for the project.</p> <p>Impacts and Benefits Agreement in place. Innu Liaison Coordinator has been hired to support Innu employees on site. The Benefits Strategy between Nalcor Energy and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador establishes a hiring protocol for the Muskrat Falls Project. Commitments made in the Impacts and Benefits Agreement with Labrador's Innu Nation are a priority, followed by consideration of employment for qualified residents of Newfoundland and Labrador.</p> <p>For construction of the HVdc transmission line, the hiring protocol is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitments made in Impacts and Benefits Agreement with Labrador Innu • Qualified and experienced residents of Newfoundland and Labrador • Qualified and experienced residents of Canada <p>Monthly Benefits Reports can be found here.</p> <p>Sensitivity Training included in the Orientation for all</p>

Innu Nation: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
		project personnel.
Importance of consultation early in the EA process, and that meetings are held in the community, but not scheduled at the same time as other activities	7.1	
<p>Nalcor has planned, offered, and undertaken various consultation processes and activities with Aboriginal groups with the purpose of providing and receiving information on the Project and its potential environmental effects, and collecting AEK on the existing environment for incorporation into the EEIS. The key objectives and elements of Nalcor's Aboriginal consultation program include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing Aboriginal communities with information on the proposed Project, including its purpose and associated components and activities; • identifying and documenting any questions or concerns about the Project and its potential environmental and socioeconomic effects and benefits; • collecting and sharing information on contemporary land use activities by Aboriginal persons in or near the Project area, as well as relevant Aboriginal knowledge; and • discussing possible approaches and measures to avoid or reduce any likely adverse effects and enhance benefits of the Project on Aboriginal communities and their interests and activities, and on the environment in general. <p>Consultation with Aboriginal communities and organizations for the Project has been ongoing for several years, including prior to the registration of the Project under the provincial and federal EA processes. In January 2009, Nalcor contacted all relevant Labrador and Québec Aboriginal communities and organizations within several days of the Project's registration to provide the document and further details on the EA process and, in February 2009 provided a French translation to all French speaking Aboriginal communities in Québec. Further details on Nalcor's correspondence, discussions and other consultation initiatives and offers with individual groups are provided throughout EIS Chapter 7. See Section 7.2 for specifics related to Innu Nation.</p>		This was addressed during the environmental assessment. See the relevant Consultation Record that is also summarized in this Indigenous Consultation paper.
Concerns that sometimes those who receive training do not get jobs, including lack of jobs for Innu after Project Construction has ended	16.4.5.1	
<p>The IBA contains commitments for Innu Training and Employment. Specifically, during the pre-construction phase Nalcor will supply the Innu Nation with labour requirements for the construction phase, including minimum qualifications, and provide updates as required. During the construction phase, qualified Innu will be given preference over qualified non-Innu for filling job opportunities. The Innu employment objective is 5% of the project labour force, and a target of 10%. An Innu Employment and Training Coordinator will act as a liaison between Nalcor, contractors and the Innu to facilitate Innu training and employment. Nalcor and the Innu, in consultation with the contractor, will annually review the labour force to identify employment opportunities for Innu.</p> <p>On-the-job training opportunities will be provided by Nalcor or its contractors during the construction phase for the Project. Subject to successful completion of on-the-job-training and job availability, Innu trainees will be offered employment for such opportunities. Nalcor and its contractors will also provide work-term opportunities for Innu post-secondary students where possible.</p> <p>Prior to commencement of the operations phase, Nalcor will provide the Innu Nation with a list of permanent positions and required qualifications. The company will offer 20% of permanent positions to qualified Innu. Where possible, the company will provide on-the-job training opportunities to assist Innu to prepare for the permanent positions.</p>		<p>An Impacts and Benefits Agreement in place.</p> <p>The Benefits Strategy between Nalcor Energy and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador establishes a hiring protocol for the Muskrat Falls Project. Commitments made in the Impacts and Benefits Agreement with Labrador's Innu Nation are a priority, followed by consideration of employment for qualified residents of Newfoundland and Labrador.</p> <p>For construction of the HVdc transmission line, the hiring protocol is as follows:</p>

Innu Nation: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission

Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitments made in Impacts and Benefits Agreement with Labrador Innu • Qualified and experienced residents of Newfoundland and Labrador • Qualified and experienced residents of Canada <p>Monthly Benefits Reports can be found here.</p>
Requirement for full compliance with environmental regulations, and that the proponent and contractors be accountable for ensuring such compliance	3.4, 3.5, 3.6, and Table 3-1.1 in Appendix 3-1	
<p>All construction, and operation and maintenance activities will be conducted in accordance with permits and applicable legislative and regulatory requirements. A construction Environmental Protection Plan (EPP) and an Operations and Maintenance EPP will be prepared for use by all Project personnel, including employees of Nalcor and its contractors. The EPPs will incorporate applicable legislative and regulatory requirements and all Construction, Operations, and Maintenance related environmental commitments made as part of this EIS.</p>		<p>LCP uses an Environmental Management Plan and a Regulatory Compliance Plan to ensure full compliance with environmental regulations.</p> <p><u>See Appendix B</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan

Labrador Inuit: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
Electricity needs of Labrador Inuit communities	NIS	
Not in scope. Consideration of the issue raised is outside the scope of the Project.		No additional assessment or mitigation required.
The need for further details on the Project description (e.g., towers, ROW, electrodes, construction methods)	Chapter 3	
Extensive detail on the Project description can be found in Chapter 3, including Project components and Project activities.		No additional assessment or mitigation required.
Overall rationale for the Project and the need to consider effects and benefits together for this development	Chapter 2	
Nalcor's justification for the Project in energy terms is based on the requirement to meet the forecasted electricity requirements of residents and businesses in NL. NLH is responsible for developing a long-term electricity capacity and energy forecast for the NL electrical system, and has undertaken this activity for more than 40 years. The Island Interconnected (Project) alternative has a \$2.2 billion CPW preference over the Isolated Island alternative.		No additional assessment or mitigation required.
Perceived knowledge gap with respect to baseline information for Lake Melville and potential role of Inuit knowledge	7.1, 9.5.5	
Baseline information for this Project is appropriate for effects prediction. The current project configuration does not include any activity in Lake Melville.		The project did not include any activity in Lake Melville.

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
EA approach, including need for a comprehensive and thorough assessment	1.3, Chapter 9	
<p>The Project is subject to EA review under the <i>NLEPA</i> and the <i>CEAA</i>. This EIS was submitted by Nalcor, as Proponent, in accordance with the requirements of the provincial and federal EA processes and the associated Guidelines issued by the provincial and federal governments in May 2011.</p> <p>Chapter 9 describes the EA approach and methodology that has been used to conduct the environmental effects assessment reported in this EIS, including each of its key stages and components (Figure 9-1). The methods used are in keeping with current EA approaches and best practice, and have been developed and used to help ensure a thorough and rigorous analysis, while at the same time presenting the results of the EA in a clear, concise and well-organized manner.</p>		The project was subject to an EIS level environmental assessment and released from the federal and provincial environmental assessment processes.
Electricity requirements of Labrador coastal communities	NIS	
Not in scope. Consideration of the issue raised is outside the scope of the Project.		No additional documentation required.
Potential effects on local trappers as the corridor passes through traditional trapping grounds	16.5.5.5, 16.5.6.4	
<p>While Project components will occupy areas currently used by Aboriginal groups and organizations for land and resource use purposes these areas will be a small proportion of the total land available. Creation of new access will be minimal, and the new access that is created will be a benefit to some users. Project activities will likely disrupt some types of users and affect their quality of experience but users will be able to use alternative areas in the RSA. Project design, consultation, permitting, communications and other effects management measures will identify and address issues by avoiding sensitive areas as much as possible and complying with development regulations and guidelines. Given the large and alternative areas available to Aboriginal users and the effects management measures planned by Nalcor, it is anticipated that the Project will not result in a decrease in the current level of land and resource use by Aboriginal groups and organizations for traditional purposes in any area. Therefore, the effects of the Project on the Aboriginal Contemporary Traditional Land Use KI are not likely to be significant.</p>		<p>LCP is currently in the process of determining what access is required during operations. This will include consultation with key stakeholders.</p> <p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LITL Furbearers and Small Mammals Protection and Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan • 2014 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower Churchill Project; • 2015 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower Churchill Project; • 2016 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower Churchill Project; • 2017 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower Churchill Project;
Need for consultation and traditional knowledge collection, including resources to do so	7.1	
Nalcor has planned, offered and undertaken various consultation processes and activities with Aboriginal groups with the purpose of providing and receiving information on the Project and its potential environmental effects, and collecting AEK on the existing environment for incorporation into the EIS. The		Local traditional knowledge was included during the Environmental Assessment,

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
<p>key objectives and elements of Nalcor's Aboriginal consultation program include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing Aboriginal communities with information on the proposed Project, including its purpose and associated components and activities; • identifying and documenting any questions or concerns about the Project and its potential environmental and socioeconomic effects and benefits; • collecting and sharing information on contemporary land use activities by Aboriginal persons in or near the Project area, as well as relevant Aboriginal knowledge; and • discussing possible approaches and measures to avoid or reduce any likely adverse effects and enhance benefits of the Project on Aboriginal communities and their interests and activities, and on the environment in general. <p>Consultation with Aboriginal communities and organizations for the Project has been ongoing for several years, including prior to the registration of the Project under the provincial and federal EA processes. In January 2009, Nalcor contacted all relevant Labrador and Québec Aboriginal communities and organizations within several days of the Project's registration to provide the document and further details on the EA process and, in February 2009 provided a French translation to all French speaking Aboriginal communities in Québec. Further details on Nalcor's correspondence, discussions and other consultation initiatives and offers with individual groups are provided throughout Chapter 7. See Section 7.5 for specifics related to NCC.</p> <p>Nalcor recognizes and acknowledges that Aboriginal communities and organizations often require additional resources and support when engaging in consultation processes, particularly with regard to large development projects and their EAs. While there is no legal requirement for formal capacity arrangements, Nalcor has developed an approach to consultation which includes the provision of funding and / or other support to Aboriginal communities and organizations to facilitate Project-related consultation, where appropriate.</p>		including the NCC report, "Contemporary Land and Sea Uses, 2011".
Potential effects on the aquatic environment, specifically on "trophy sized" brook trout in Labrador	13.3.5.3, 13.3.6.3, 13.3.5.4, 13.3.6.4	
<p>The potential residual effects of Project Construction, and Operations and Maintenance activities on fish and fish habitat include localized (i.e., at the watercourse crossing) physical changes to fish habitat from sedimentation, increased erosion and accidental hydrocarbon release and water quality changes. Residual effects on fish species and assemblages will be limited both spatially and in duration, and include temporary scattering from the work area due to noise / vibration, impairment to upstream movement, change in fish assemblage due to a change in habitat and water quality, increased vulnerability to injury from crushing and capture by raptors. Increased fishing pressure by anglers and poachers is also a threat to sport fish populations (i.e., Atlantic salmon or brook trout). However, considering the planned mitigation measures and adherence to permit conditions for Project activities on or near the freshwater environment, effects will not be of sufficient magnitude, duration and geographic extent to cause a change in the Fish and Fish Habitat that will alter its status or integrity beyond an acceptable level. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on the Fish and Fish Habitat VEC.</p>		<p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LITL Freshwater Fish Protection and Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan • LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan
Potential effects on migratory birds	12.5.5, 12.5.6, 14.4.5.3, 14.4.6.3	
<p>For all the Avifauna KIs (i.e., Waterfowl, Upland Game Birds, Raptors, Passerines, and Species of Special Conservation Status), however, the Project is likely to result in the direct loss or alteration of generally 1% or less of available habitat in the RSA. Considering this and the planned mitigation measures to limit vegetation clearing, allow vegetation regeneration, and the low likelihood of Project-Avifauna interactions, the residual effect will not be of sufficient magnitude to compromise the sustainability of</p>		<p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project Avifauna Management

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
<p>populations within the RSA.</p> <p>The Project is not likely to adversely affect the sustainability of populations of any of the Avifauna KIs or representative species / guilds therein. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on Avifauna.</p>		<p>Plan Muskrat Falls Construction;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LCP Avifauna Protection and Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – 2014 Avifauna; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – 2015 Avifauna; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – Avifauna, 2016 Forest Songbird and Common Nighthawk (<i>Chordeiles minor</i>) Point-Count Surveys; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project – Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – Avifauna Final Report
Possible fragmentation of caribou habitat resulting from transmission line construction	12.3.5, 12.3.6	
<p>Construction involves clearing of vegetation for access roads, trails, construction camps, marshalling yards, and staging areas, followed by quarrying and borrowing to obtain parent material. Noise, vibration, lights, and general activity along the ROW will be present during clearing and installation. Caribou are sensitive to habitat loss, fragmentation and disturbance that will occur with the clearing of the ROW, road alignments and associated Project components. However, the effects of the Project relative to baseline are not likely to affect the viability or recovery of woodland caribou populations in Central and Southeastern Labrador and Newfoundland. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on Caribou.</p>		<p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2014 Annual Red Wine Mountain Caribou Report; • 2015 Annual Caribou Report – Mealy Mountain Herd; • 2015 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd; • 2016 Annual Caribou Report - Mealy Mountain Herd; • 2016 Annual Caribou

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
		<p>Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2017 Annual Caribou Report - Mealy Mountain Herd; • 2017 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program - 2014 Red Wine Mountains Caribou Herd, 2014 Aerial Survey and Collar Deployment; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – 2016 Red Wine Mountains Caribou Herd, 2016 Aerial Survey; • Labrador-Island Transmission Link Species at Risk Impacts Mitigation and Monitoring Plan • LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan S.11.31(a)
Potential effect on caribou as a result of predator use of the corridor, including wolves, coyotes and bears	12.3.6.3, 12.3.5.3, 12.3.9, 12.3.7	
Development of the ROW is not expected to substantially increase forage availability for moose, and therefore, moose density is not likely to increase due to the Project, suggesting that wolf density and predation pressure on Caribou in Central and Southeastern Labrador will also not increase. As moose numbers along the corridor are not likely to increase measurably, it is predicted that there will be little or no increase in the local predator populations (e.g., wolves in Central and Southeastern Labrador, and		<p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2014 Annual Red Wine Mountain Caribou Report; • 2015 Annual Caribou

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
<p>coyotes or black bears in Newfoundland) and subsequent predation on Caribou.</p> <p>Less than 5% of caribou herd ranges in Labrador or caribou Primary Core areas in Newfoundland will be exposed to the effects of Construction, and Operations and Maintenance activities. These are not predicted to affect the viability or recovery of woodland caribou populations in Central and Southeastern Labrador or in Newfoundland. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on the Caribou VEC.</p>		<p>Report – Mealy Mountain Herd;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2015 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd; • 2016 Annual Caribou Report - Mealy Mountain Herd; • 2016 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd; • 2017 Annual Caribou Report - Mealy Mountain Herd; • 2017 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program - 2014 Red Wine Mountains Caribou Herd, 2014 Aerial Survey and Collar Deployment; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – 2016 Red Wine Mountains Caribou Herd, 2016 Aerial Survey; • Labrador-Island Transmission Link Species at Risk Impacts Mitigation and Monitoring Plan • LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
		Protection Plan S.11.31(a)
Cable crossing of Strait of Belle Isle scallop beds and ability of NCC members to harvest scallops in the area	16.6.6.3	
Considering the extent of the affected scallop fishing area, it is reasonable to conclude that the loss of scallop habitat will not result in a significant change from baseline conditions in the RSA. For example, it is not expected that the Project will result in any noticeable drop in the annual, all-vessel catch, or any change in the average annual catch of a particular scallop enterprise.		<p>Nalcor reached compensation agreement with scallop harvesters on January 31, 2014.</p> <p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCP Strait of Belle Isle Marine Crossing Environmental Protection Plan
Ability of marshy or boggy land in-land to support structures for the power lines	3.4.3.2	
Nalcor will limit the alteration / loss of wetland habitat to the extent practical by routing of the ROW to avoid wetlands where feasible. However, when construction in wetland areas is necessary, appropriate structure and foundation designs will be used for the site conditions. These may include cribs made of untreated lumber and backfilled with borrow material installed to provide stability to foundations. Details for specific tower locations will be determined during final engineering.		<p>The EIS Addendum presented the route for the line, and demonstrates the avoidance of wetlands to the extent possible.</p> <p>Transmission line was constructed in accordance with applicable standards.</p> <p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan
Potential for the transmission line to follow Phase 2 and 3 of the TLH instead of building a new road to service / build the lines	3.2, 2.11.2	
In mid-November 2010, Nalcor advised the provincial and federal governments that it would also be assessing the potential option of locating the Project's Labrador converter station at or near the Muskrat Falls site on the lower Churchill River, as well as an associated transmission corridor that would extend from Muskrat Falls to the Trans-Labrador Highway Phase 3 (TLH3), and then follow generally along the south side of the highway for approximately 200 km before meeting and continuing along the previously identified corridor from that location to the Strait of Belle Isle. This Muskrat Falls to the Strait of Belle Isle transmission corridor has since become the preferred and proposed option for the Project. Following Phase 2 and 3 of the TLH would not be economically feasible.		<p>EIS Addendum presents the transmission line routing.</p> <p>No further documentation is required.</p>
Potential effects of heavy equipment and herbicide use during construction and maintenance, as the marshes supply the freshwater supply in some of the southern Labrador communities	13.2.5, 13.2.6, 13.2.7	

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
<p>With the mitigation proposed by Nalcor to protect the aquatic environment, adverse effects on the water supply for southern Labrador communities are unlikely.</p> <p>Compliance with regulations and adherence to Nalcor's standard practices for operating near and crossing water bodies will minimize effects of siltation and disturbance of water courses, and any areas of disturbance resulting from these activities will be small and localized.</p> <p>Regulations and adherence to standard practice will also minimize the potential effects of herbicide use for vegetation management. The use of approved non-persistent herbicides, adherence to appropriate techniques, and maintenance of required buffer zones will mitigate potential effects on water bodies and downstream water supplies.</p>		<p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan <p>This will be addressed during the Operations phase and will follow provincial legislation.</p>
Suggestion that the proposed converter station at Soldiers Pond be located in Labrador	2.11.2, 2.12.2, 3.2	
<p>The Labrador converter station is proposed to be located on the south side of the Churchill River at Muskrat Falls, adjacent to the switchyard for the Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project, from which the electricity to be transmitted by the Project will be supplied.</p> <p>A converter station is also required at or near the termination of the HVdc system on the Island to convert the dc electricity transmitted across the line back into ac form. The proposed transmission link extends to the Avalon Peninsula of the Island because this is the region where much of the province's population resides, and thus, the location of the province's highest electrical demand.</p> <p>The Newfoundland converter station is the convergence point of several existing high voltage transmission lines on the Avalon Peninsula, therefore representing an ideal location at which to bring the electricity transmitted by the Project onto the Island grid. For this reason, Soldiers Pond has been the preferred and proposed site for the dc-ac converter station throughout all of the previous development scenarios and attempts over the past decades. Again, there is no identified technical, economic or environmental rationale or benefit of having the converter facility at any other location.</p>		No further documentation required.
Potential Project-specific and cumulative effects on fish stocks, specifically the spawning grounds of the Alexis / St. Lewis River, which will be close to the transmission corridor^(c)	13.3.5, 13.3.6, 13.3.7, 13.3.9	
<p>The likely residual effects on Freshwater Fish and Fish Habitat will be limited by effective mitigation, and proper location of fording and / or stream crossings will minimize disturbance. Fish disturbance from noise and vibration, and increases in suspended sediment and nutrient levels from Project activities will be transient in nature. Changes to physical fish habitat will be localized to only a small section of each watercourse (i.e., at the stream crossing location). Any accidental releases of hydrocarbons that may occur will be responded to in a timely manner based on procedures outlined in the EPP and SHERP. Therefore, changes to Fish and Fish Habitat (i.e., changes in fish habitat or fish abundance / species assemblage) such that the freshwater environment is unable to recover are not likely to occur as a result of the Project. In addition, Nalcor is committed to adhere to the applicable legislation and regulatory requirements, Newfoundland and Labrador Operational Statements (NLOSs) and standard mitigation from both industry and government, and any permit conditions. Considering this, the effects to Fish and Fish Habitat are predicted to be not significant.</p> <p>In addition, the St. Lewis and Alexis Rivers do not overlap with the transmission corridor.</p>		<p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LITL Freshwater Fish Protection and Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan
The need for Labrador to benefit from large-scale resource developments	2.1, 16.4.5.1	

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
<p>Under the Benefits Strategy (Nalcor 2010, internet site), a construction hiring protocol will be established for Project Construction. This protocol will be consistent with the Canadian Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms, as well as any associated terms and conditions of governmental approvals for the Project. Nalcor will implement commitments made in any executed Impacts and Benefits Agreement (IBA) (GNL 2010, internet site), followed by first consideration for employment of qualified Newfoundland and Labrador residents, considering the gender equity and diversity provisions discussed below. Any collective agreements entered into by Nalcor or its primary contractors will contain provisions consistent with this protocol.</p> <p>The effects of Project Construction on Economy, Employment and Business are predicted to be primarily positive, and will be substantial. The provincial economy will benefit from the injection of approximately \$570 million in individual and business incomes and another \$84 million in government revenues. Individuals will also benefit from Project-related training and experience, and businesses from Project-related growth and development. Project-generated government revenues will benefit the province when reinvested in infrastructure and services. Similar benefits will also be experienced beyond the province, elsewhere in Canada and internationally, where Project labour, materials, goods and services cannot be supplied from within the province.</p> <p>Annual Project Operations and Maintenance expenditures within the province are estimated at \$17.6 million, which will translate to over \$10 million in income to businesses and individuals in the province. Individual and business income effects, government revenues, employment and business contract opportunities are similar in type, but smaller in magnitude, when compared to those associated with Project Construction, but they are continuous throughout the life of the Project.</p>		<p>The Benefits Strategy between Nalcor Energy and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador establishes a hiring protocol for the Muskrat Falls Project. Commitments made in the Impacts and Benefits Agreement with Labrador's Innu Nation are a priority, followed by consideration of employment for qualified residents of Newfoundland and Labrador.</p> <p>For construction of the HVdc transmission line, the hiring protocol is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitments made in Impacts and Benefits Agreement with Labrador Innu • Qualified and experienced residents of Newfoundland and Labrador • Qualified and experienced residents of Canada <p>Monthly Benefits Reports can be found here.</p>
Advanced notice required for meetings so people can attend	3.4.1.1, 7.1, 7.5.1	
Nalcor has planned, offered and undertaken various consultation processes and activities with Aboriginal groups with the purpose of providing and receiving information on the Project and its potential environmental effects, and collecting Aboriginal Ecological Knowledge on the existing environment for incorporation into the EIS. Nalcor is committed to providing appropriate notice for consultation initiatives with relevant stakeholders.		No additional information required.
Potential increased access to fish and mammals	12.3.5, 12.3.6, 12.3.7, 12.4.5, 12.4.6, 12.4.7, 13.3.5, 13.3.6, 13.3.7	
Nalcor will use existing access and limit the creation of new access to the extent practical. For caribou, habitat loss or fragmentation and increased access, will continue over the life of the Project. Sensory disturbance effects are not likely to occur beyond 250 m of infrastructure or clearings during Project Operations. The effects of the Project relative to baseline are not likely to affect the viability or recovery of woodland Caribou populations in Central and Southeastern Labrador and Newfoundland. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on Caribou.		LCP is currently in the process of determining what access is required during operations. This will include consultation with key stakeholders.

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
<p>For furbearers, no long-term disturbances are likely in important or proposed critical (NLDEC 2011c) habitat areas, such as Marten core areas in Newfoundland. No detectable change in regional populations or impairment of the sustainability of Furbearer populations in Newfoundland and Labrador is likely to occur as a result of the Project. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on Furbearers.</p> <p>For freshwater fish, angling pressure is likely to increase in areas previously not as accessible to anglers, and increased access could have a moderate effect on the populations of sport fish species. However, changes to Fish and Fish Habitat (i.e., changes in Fish Habitat or Fish Abundance and Species Assemblage such that the Freshwater environment is unable to recover) are not predicted to occur as a result of the Project. In addition, Nalcor is committed to adhere to the applicable legislation and regulatory requirements, Newfoundland and Labrador Operational Statements and standard mitigation from both industry and government where feasible, and any permit conditions. Considering this, the effects to Fish and Fish Habitat are predicted to be not significant.</p>		<p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2014 Annual Red Wine Mountain Caribou Report; • 2015 Annual Caribou Report – Mealy Mountain Herd; • 2015 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd; • 2016 Annual Caribou Report - Mealy Mountain Herd; • 2016 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd; • 2017 Annual Caribou Report - Mealy Mountain Herd; • 2017 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program - 2014 Red Wine Mountains Caribou Herd, 2014 Aerial Survey and Collar Deployment; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – 2016 Red Wine Mountains Caribou Herd, 2016 Aerial Survey; • Labrador-Island Transmission Link Species at Risk Impacts Mitigation and Monitoring Plan • 2014 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
		<p>Churchill Project;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2015 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower Churchill Project; • 2016 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower Churchill Project; • 2017 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower Churchill Project; • LITL Furbearers and Small Mammals Protection and Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan • LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan • LITL Freshwater Fish Protection and Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
Potential increase in poaching	12.3.5.3, 12.3.6.3	
While linear corridors associated with development can provide improved access for hunters and poachers, much of the corridor is adjacent to existing access routes, and access to many areas already exists. Nalcor acknowledges the ROW from the mid-point of TLH3 to Forteau is a new access, but notes that access control measures will be applied in certain areas and / or to ongoing activities after construction is complete in order as practical. It may be necessary to increase wildlife enforcement efforts on the end points of the transmission line route in order to deter illegal hunting activity.		LCP is currently in the process of determining what access is required during operations. This will include consultation with key stakeholders.
Potential increase in marten trapping along the corridor	12.4.5.3	
Roads and linear facilities provide increased access for hunters / trappers and predators, which may result in increased accidental snaring of Marten and subsequent mortality. Trapping of Marten has been prohibited on the Island since the 1930s, and modified trapping and snaring areas for other species have been implemented adjacent to areas where Marten are found in Newfoundland in order to minimize their accidental capture of Marten. However, there is an increased risk of accidental snaring with traps set for similar-sized Furbearers in newly accessible areas outside the modified trap zones. While this is primarily an issue during Operations and Maintenance, increased access will also be present during Construction. To mitigate this potential effect, access control measures will be implemented to manage public OHV use of Project roads and trails. As well, Project personnel will not be permitted to possess firearms on-site, and Nalcor will enforce a 'no-harvesting' policy. As a result, increased trapping and hunting due to increased access is not likely to have a measurable effect on Marten abundance.		<p>LCP is currently in the process of determining what access is required during operations. This will include consultation with key stakeholders.</p> <p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labrador-Island Transmission Link Species at Risk Impacts Mitigation and Monitoring Plan; • Field Report for Winter

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
		<p>2014- Newfoundland Marten Hair Snag Trapping and Off Highway Vehicle Track Densities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – 2015 Newfoundland Marten, Field Report for Winter 2015 – Newfoundland Marten Hair Snag Trapping and Off Highway Vehicle Track Densities; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – 2016 Newfoundland Marten – Newfoundland Marten Hair Snag Trapping and Off Highway Vehicle Surveys; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – Newfoundland Marten -Hair Snag Trapping and Off Highway Vehicle Surveys - Final Report • 2014 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower Churchill Project; • 2015 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower Churchill Project; • 2016 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower Churchill Project; • 2017 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower Churchill Project;

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LITL Furbearers and Small Mammals Protection and Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan <p>During construction, LCP enforced a No harvesting policy.</p> <p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCP No Harvesting Policy
Perceived EMF effects on health, including animal tissues, miscarriages amongst women, leukemia in children, breast cancer, and the disruption of defibrillators	16.3.6.5	
<p>Research has not established a causal relationship between exposure to magnetic fields and human disease, nor a plausible biological mechanism by which exposure to EMF could cause disease. Health Canada (2010) states, “when all of the studies are evaluated together, the evidence suggesting that EMFs may contribute to an increased risk of cancer is very weak”. The right of way has been established to avoid development within the immediate area of the line, and field intensity at the edges of the right of way is consistent with accepted standards and practices. In addition, the Federal-Provincial-Territorial Radiation Protection Committee (Health Canada 2008) states ‘that there is insufficient scientific evidence showing exposure to EMFs from power lines can cause adverse health effects such as cancer. Therefore, a warning to the public to avoid living near or spending time in proximity to power lines is not required.’</p> <p>The transmission line has rights of way in accordance with applicable standards and guidelines, and no development will be permitted within the right of way.</p>		<p>The transmission line has been constructed in accordance with applicable standards and guidelines.</p>
Call for equal benefits for all Aboriginal people and groups	7.1, 16.4.5	
<p>Nalcor’s approach to planning, undertaking and supporting consultation is both group- and Project-specific, given the nature and location of the proposed development and the type and level of interest by a particular Aboriginal community. It is Nalcor’s practice, when required or requested, to provide translation of oral presentation in the Aboriginal language spoken by the Aboriginal group. Nalcor recognizes and acknowledges that Aboriginal communities and organizations often require additional resources and support when engaging in consultation processes, particularly with regard to large development projects and their EAs. While there is no legal requirement for formal capacity arrangements, Nalcor has developed an approach to consultation which includes the provision of funding and / or other support to Aboriginal communities and organizations to facilitate Project-related consultation, where appropriate.</p>		<p>The Benefits Strategy between Nalcor Energy and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador establishes a hiring protocol for the Muskrat Falls Project. Commitments made in the Impacts and Benefits Agreement with Labrador’s Innu Nation are a priority, followed by consideration of employment for qualified residents of Newfoundland and Labrador.</p> <p>For construction of the HVdc transmission line, the</p>

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
		<p>hiring protocol is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitments made in Impacts and Benefits Agreement with Labrador Innu • Qualified and experienced residents of Newfoundland and Labrador • Qualified and experienced residents of Canada <p>Monthly Benefits Reports can be found here.</p>
Potential for the transmission lines to be put underground to minimize any visual effects	16.8.5.1	
<p>Nalcor has selected a transmission corridor, within which the ROW will be constructed, in consideration of visually sensitive areas (e.g., avoidance of Gros Morne National Park). Mitigation measures to limit the effects of the Project on the visual landscape include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoidance of visually sensitive areas; • following existing disturbance corridors where practical; • constructing in remote, uninhabited areas; and • retaining a vegetative buffer zone at watercourses and major highway crossings to the extent practical. <p>Placing the high voltage transmission lines underground is not an economically feasible option for a 1,100 km long Project.</p>		<p>The EIS Addendum presented the alignment for the project during the environmental assessment.</p> <p>See Appendix C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan
Potential effects of the Project on Labrador electricity rates	2.8.1	
Nalcor does not expect the Project to have an effect on Labrador customer electricity rates, as the costs associated with the Project will be recovered from Island electricity customers.		No additional documentation required. Outside of scope.
The need for the Project to not proceed until there has been a full environmental review and approval	1.3	
Nalcor can only proceed with the Project when it has all required approvals.		The project commenced following release from federal and provincial environmental assessment.
The nature and rationale for the use of sea electrodes vs. shore electrodes	2.12.5	
Nalcor considered the use of sea electrodes installed in Lake Melville in Labrador as well as in Holyrood Bay, Newfoundland, and this concept was reflected in the 2009 EA Registration and Project Description document submitted to initiate the EA process. Further technical review has identified potential issues with these locations, however, including concerns regarding the required salinity levels for the electrode to function properly. Moreover, concerns were also raised by stakeholders during Nalcor's EA consultation activities regarding the potential presence of a wood-pole line to Lake Melville and the presence of a sea electrode at this location, including with regard to environmental, visual and access issues. As a result, Nalcor has subsequently revised its Project planning, and no longer proposes to place		The rationale was presented in the Environmental Impacts Statement during the environmental assessment.

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
<p>sea electrodes in Lake Melville or Holyrood Bay.</p> <p>The current Project concept would see the use of "shore electrodes" at locations on the Labrador side of the Strait of Belle Isle and Conception Bay where the electrode elements will be placed within a wharf or breakwater-like structure installed adjacent to the shoreline. These locations were identified and selected through an extensive planning and analysis exercise that included consideration of a range of technical, economic and environmental factors and considerations, including: proximity to the proposed converter station site; existing site access and suitability, including any previous development at the site; local infrastructure presence and requirements; detailed electric field simulations using information on required electrode duty, safe voltage gradients, local soils and geology, and anticipated resistivities.</p>		
Potential effects of chemical use in vegetation control along the ROW	16.5.6.4	
<p>Vegetation management during Project Operations and Maintenance will include herbicide application, which could adversely affect areas currently available for berry picking or harvesting of medicinal plants. Vegetation management via mechanical and herbicide application will be undertaken on the ROW to remove trees greater than 2 m in height. Treatment of compatible species also found on the right-of-way is avoided or minimized. Compatible species are low growing and do not grow to a sufficient height to reach energized lines or cause significant impediment or safety concerns to maintenance crews traveling in the right-of-way. Compatible species include berries, Labrador Tea, Kalmia species, Trailing Juniper, Dwarf Birch, and grass. This selective application of herbicide maintains the compatible species within the right-of-way giving them increased growing space with the removal of the target species. Once compatible species have established it makes it more difficult for the target species to re-establish and the length of time between treatments is increased.</p> <p>The herbicide to be used is Tordon 101 mixed with Sylgard 309; it will be applied in accordance with appropriate regulations and procedures by approved personnel. Vegetation management will likely start in year eight of operations and will be repeated every seven years thereafter, or as required for safety. As such, only a portion of the ROW would be managed every seven years, and only appropriate plants (i.e., tall growing species) will be treated. The herbicide is considered to be non-residual and non-toxic to wildlife or humans in the doses that would be applied to plants on the ROW.</p> <p>Another technique used during vegetation management includes the cut and stump. This treatment consists of cutting the target species and applying herbicide to the stump using a back pack sprayer or a sprayer mounted on the brushsaw. This kills the root system and prevents re-sprouting. This system is very expensive and labour intensive. It is typically used in sensitive areas. This vegetation control method will use Tordon 101, Garlon 4, and Glyphosate products.</p> <p>To manage the potential adverse effects of herbicide application, mitigation and management measures will be implemented such as providing notice to communities and Aboriginal groups of locations of the ROW where vegetation management has occurred. The notice would include the date of application via signage in the ROW, so that plant and berry harvesting would not occur in that location until the plants are again safe for consumption.</p>		This will be addressed during the Operations phase as per provincial legislation.
Perception that Project should wait until it is known whether there is a market for Gull Island power	NIS	
This issue is outside the scope of the environmental assessment of the Project.		Outside of the project's scope. No further documentation.
Potential to import power from the North American grid	2.5.14	

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
<p>Beyond 2015, both New England and New York are facing potentially significant plant retirements, both because of the age of the generation fleet and because a significant proportion of the baseload generators in the region are carbon fuelled (coal and gas in particular). The New England system operator reports estimates for retirements or de-ratings in the range of 5,800 MW to 8,700 MW resulting from Environmental Protection Agency rules (ISO New England 2011b, internet site). Plant retirements and / or de-rating across the region have implications for the availability and price of supply and are risks which are introduced as a result of relying on imports as a long-term supply source for the province.</p> <p>While reliance on imports reduces control over security of supply, some of this may also be a result of how electricity markets are structured and function. For example in the New England and New York markets there are currently no long-term physical transmission rights (beyond 1 to 2 years), thereby complicating the process of transmitting energy from a power plant in the market to an external customer.</p> <p>As a result of these risks outlined on price volatility, security of long-term supply, and transmission impediments, the reliance on electricity imports as a long-term supply option for the Island was not considered further following Phase 1 screening.</p>		<p>The rationale was presented in the Environmental Impacts Statement during the environmental assessment.</p>
<p>Concern about how the business opportunities in the Innu IBA would affect NCC members' ability to bid on Project contracts</p>	16.4.5.1, 16.4.6.3	
<p>NCC members have the same opportunity to bid on Project contracts as any other Newfoundland and Labrador business. The Benefits Strategy (Nalcor 2010, internet site) is intended to enable full and fair access to business opportunities. NCC businesses are invited to register with Nalcor / SNC Lavalin and to participate in procurement activities.</p>		<p>The Benefits Strategy between Nalcor Energy and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador establishes a hiring protocol for the Muskrat Falls Project. Commitments made in the Impacts and Benefits Agreement with Labrador's Innu Nation are a priority, followed by consideration of employment for qualified residents of Newfoundland and Labrador.</p> <p>For construction of the HVdc transmission line, the hiring protocol is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitments made in Impacts and Benefits Agreement with Labrador Innu • Qualified and experienced residents of Newfoundland and Labrador

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualified and experienced residents of Canada <p>Monthly Benefits Reports can be found here.</p>
Access to wood cleared from the transmission line ROW	3.4.3.2, 16.5.5.1, 16.9.1	
Where practical and feasible, timber harvested, but not intended for commercial use, will be stacked to the side of the ROW where it will be available for domestic use.		<p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan
Ensuring rigorous and unbiased environmental studies for the Project and its EA	1.5	
The environmental studies and the EA for the Project were undertaken by a team of professional environmental consultants and personnel from Nalcor. The Project is subject to EA review under the <i>NLEPA</i> and the <i>CEAA</i> . This EIS was submitted by Nalcor, as Proponent, in accordance with the requirements of the provincial and federal EA processes and the associated <i>Guidelines</i> issued by the provincial and federal governments in May 2011.		<p>The project was subject to an EIS level environmental assessment and released from the federal and provincial environmental assessment processes.</p> <p>LCP uses an Environmental Management Plan and a Regulatory Compliance Plan to ensure full compliance with environmental regulations.</p> <p>Several environmental effects monitoring plans have also been implemented as committed during the EA. A full list can be found here.</p> <p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan
The need for electricity in Labrador to attract economic development. Access to recall power if needed for industry	2.3.1, 2.5.13.2	
Development of energy resources by Nalcor is being undertaken in accordance with the policy guidance provided by the <i>Energy Plan</i> as well as applicable legislation, including the <i>Electrical Power Control Act</i> .		No further information is required.

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
Nalcor has and will continue to cooperate with developers throughout the Province, including within Labrador, in order to ensure that a supply of energy is available to meet their needs.		
Potential effects on fisheries due increased siltation in water during the installation of the electrodes	14.2.5, 14.2.7	
<p>During construction, silt curtains will be deployed during electrode site dredging to minimize the extent of increased turbidity.</p> <p>The overall residual effect of construction activities on the Marine Fish and Fish Habitat VEC also reflect these low ratings. The effects of the Project Construction on the Marine Fish and Fish Habitat VEC are not likely to affect populations, distributions or activities (e.g., feeding, spawning, and migration) of species at a regional scale.</p> <p>The predicted effects of Project Construction, and Operations and Maintenance activities are not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on the Marine Fish and Fish Habitat VEC.</p>		<p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCP Strait of Belle Isle Marine Crossing Environmental Protection Plan
The need for “clean” energy in today’s world	1.1	
<p>The Project is an important part of ongoing efforts towards securing an adequate, reliable and clean electricity supply to address the province’s current and future energy needs. It will facilitate the transmission of electricity from the proposed Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project in Central Labrador to the Island, that will then be distributed through the existing Island grid throughout Newfoundland. This will allow the displacement of existing generation from the Holyrood Thermal Generating Station in eastern Newfoundland, to address the air quality issues currently associated with that facility’s emissions, as well as providing additional energy to address projected future requirements and facilitate further economic development.</p> <p>With the completion of the Project, and the shutdown of the Holyrood generating facility, approximately 98% of the electricity generation within the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador will be renewable and non-GHG emitting.</p>		No additional information is required.
The potential environmental effects of electro-magnetic fields	3.5.3.2, 14.2.6, 14.2.6, 14.3.6	
<p>Research has not established a causal relationship between exposure to magnetic fields and human disease, nor a plausible biological mechanism by which exposure to EMF could cause disease. Health Canada (2010) states, “when all of the studies are evaluated together, the evidence suggesting that EMFs may contribute to an increased risk of cancer is very weak”. The right of way has been established to avoid development within the immediate area of the line, and field intensity at the edges of the right of way is consistent with accepted standards and practices. In addition, the Federal-Provincial-Territorial Radiation Protection Committee (Health Canada 2008) states ‘that there is insufficient scientific evidence showing exposure to EMFs from power lines can cause adverse health effects such as cancer. Therefore, a warning to the public to avoid living near or spending time in proximity to power lines is not required.’</p> <p>The EMFs produced by the submarine cable will be in the order of 150 m as calculated by the Biot-Savart Formula (Worzyk 2009). The magnetic field strength attenuates rapidly from 260 µT (260,000 nT) at 1 m from the cable to 26 µT (26,000 nT) at 10 m as calculated using the Biot-Savart Formula using a maximum current of 1,286 amperes (A).</p> <p>As indicated in the EIS, there is no evidence to suggest that the EMFs emitted by the submarine HVdc cables will adversely affect marine fish in a significant way. It is predicted that the magnetic field induced</p>		<p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marine Emissions Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
<p>by the cable electric field will reduce to background levels within a few metres of the cables. As discussed in the EIS, field studies have been conducted to investigate whether or not operating HVdc cables act as barriers to eel movement. There is no any evidence for any significant effect on eel movement across HVdc cables emitting a magnetic field.</p> <p>For comparison, the Earth's natural magnetic field is also subject to short- and long-term variations. Solar electromagnetic radiation impinging on the Earth's surface can cause daily fluctuations in field intensity of up to 30 nT and shifts in inclination of up to 0.33°. These daily perturbations vary with latitude and season. Magnetic storms associated with sun spot activity also cause fluctuations of 200 nT or more. The Earth's natural geomagnetic field intensity in the Strait of Belle Isle is approximately 54,000 nT.</p> <p>For the electrode site, a threshold of effects on marine fauna at a magnetic flux density of 200 nT (2×10^{-7} T) was used as a reasonable (and conservative) value to define the ZOI of the electrodes. A surface ZOI for normal operations can be defined at some distance from the electrodes of equal to or less than 50 to 100 m.</p> <p>The upset condition where the system is operating in monopolar operation (i.e., maximum continuous current) results in a ZOI radius for the electrodes on the order of 500 m for L'Anse au Diable and Dowden's Point. Monopolar operation is expected to occur in the order of 10 to 20 hours per year.</p> <p>The overall likely environmental residual effect of Operations and Maintenance activities associated with the Project on the Marine Fish and Fish Habitat VEC is minimal. In cases where duration is far future and frequency is continuous, the magnitude and extent are limited.</p>		
The need to ensure that all construction sites are cleaned up afterwards	3.4.6.5	
Clean-up and reclamation will be conducted after the construction infrastructure has been decommissioned, and will include activities such as removing refuse, grading disturbed areas and contouring disturbed slopes to a stable profile. Reclamation will include site-specific measures to promote the natural revegetation of disturbed areas. Disturbed areas will be stabilized, as necessary, to prevent soil erosion.		<p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan
The need to have Aboriginal / community environmental monitors in place	7.1	
Environmental monitoring is a Proponent/contractor responsibility, with regulatory enforcement undertaken by appropriate federal and provincial authorities.		<p>LCP uses an Environmental Management Plan and a Regulatory Compliance Plan to ensure full compliance with environmental regulations.</p> <p>In addition, environmental monitors were hired that identified as belonging to an indigenous group. Monthly Benefits Reports can be found here that include employment statistics.</p>

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
Full explanation of the environmental studies is required	Chapter 6, Chapter 10, Chapter 15	
A complete explanation of all environmental studies can be found in EIS Chapters 6, 10 and 15.		In addition, several environmental effects monitoring plans have also been implemented as committed during the EA. A full list can be found in Appendix C .
Potential effects of an earthquake on the Strait of Belle Isle aspects of the Project	4.1.10	
Because Newfoundland and Labrador lies in a region of relatively low seismic risk, the Project is not likely to be affected by seismic activity. All Project buildings, including the converter stations and transition compounds, will be built to the standards of the National Building Code of Canada (NBCC) (National Research Council of Canada 2010). The NBCC uses earthquake probabilities and the nature of the ground motion most likely to occur at a site to determine structural design criteria.		No additional documentation required.
Potential effects of the Strait of Belle Isle cables and the electrode on marine fish	14.2.6.5, 14.2.5.4	
<p>Activities associated with the construction and installation of the submarine cables will result in at least two effects on the Fish KI: (i) the introduction of additional underwater sound to the marine environment causing behavioural changes in macro-invertebrates and fishes and (ii) sub-lethal and lethal physical effects on some macro-invertebrates and fishes due to rock placement during berm construction and dredging.</p> <p>Placement of rock during the construction of the Strait of Belle Isle berms will likely affect the health of some macro-invertebrates and perhaps some fish as well. However, the numbers of macro-invertebrates and fish that will experience health effects represent a small proportion of all macro-invertebrates and fishes in the LSA.</p> <p>Activities associated with the Operations and Maintenance of the submarine cables that are most likely to affect the Fish KI are the potential introduction of EMFs to the marine environment at the submarine cables. The primary potential effects of these activities on macro-invertebrates and fishes are changes in behaviour and changes in health.</p> <p>Research into geomagnetic orientation in fish has focused on two groups that undergo long migrations: (i) salmon (both <i>Oncorhynchus</i> spp. and <i>Salmo</i> spp.), and (ii) eels of the genus <i>Anguilla</i>. Salmon hatch from freshwater spawning grounds then migrate out to sea where they can undergo extensive oceanic or coastal feeding migrations for hundreds or even thousands of kilometres. After spending their adult lives foraging and growing at sea, salmon migrate back to their natal rivers to spawn. The fact that salmon undergo such long ocean migrations makes them likely candidates for a geomagnetic guidance system.</p> <p>Potential change in the health of macro-invertebrates and fishes during Operations and Maintenance of the submarine cables can be differentiated by mechanism. Direct injury and / or death could occur as a result of either submarine cable major repair. Both of these activities could also cause re-suspension of sediment (i.e., increased seawater turbidity) which in turn could have harmful effects on both macro-invertebrates and fishes. Exposures to EMFs generated by the submarine cables also have the potential</p>		<p>See Appendix C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LCP Strait of Belle Isle Marine Crossing Environmental Protection Plan • Marine Emissions Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
<p>to cause harmful effects to macro-invertebrates and fishes. However, all of these potential sources of health change in macro-invertebrates and fishes would have limited spatial and temporal effect, and thus affect only a small proportion of the macro-invertebrates and fishes in the LSA.</p> <p>The predicted effects of the Project (i.e., invertebrate and fish behavioural responses to operations-related EMFs emanating from the submarine cable) will relate to less than 10% of bottom substrate, seawater, and biota that occur in the RSA. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on the Marine Fish and Fish Habitat VEC.</p> <p>The specific size of the field will depend on local conditions but would be in the order of 150 m as calculated by the Biot-Savart Formula (Worzyk 2009). The magnetic field strength attenuates rapidly from 260 μT (260,000 nT) at 1 m from the cable to 26 μT (26,000 nT) at 10 m as calculated using the Biot-Savart Formula using a maximum current of 1,286 amperes (A).</p> <p>As indicated in the EIS, there is no evidence to suggest that the electromagnetic fields (EMFs) emitted by the submarine HVdc cables will adversely affect marine fish in a significant way. It is predicted that the magnetic field induced by the cable electric field will reduce to background levels within a few metres of the cables. Essentially the entire length of each cable will be at water depths of at least 60 m and at times greater than 100 m, meaning that the magnetic field occurring in most of the water column will be at natural levels. As stated in the EIS, there is evidence to support the view that Atlantic salmon typically spend most time in the upper water column during migration which would put these fish well outside any zone of magnetic field influence from the submarine cables. The American eel, on the other hand, is known to swim at greater depths during its oceanic migrations. As discussed in the EIS, field studies have been conducted to investigate whether or not operating HVdc cables act as barriers to eel movement. There is not any evidence for any significant effect on eel movement across HVdc cables emitting a magnetic field.</p> <p>For comparison, the Earth's natural magnetic field is also subject to short- and long-term variations. Solar electromagnetic radiation impinging on the Earth's surface can cause daily fluctuations in field intensity of up to 30 nT and shifts in inclination of up to 0.33°. These daily perturbations vary with latitude and season. Magnetic storms associated with sun spot activity also cause fluctuations of 200 nT or more. The Earth's natural geomagnetic field intensity in the Strait of Belle Isle is approximately 54,000 nT.</p> <p>The likely residual effects of Project Operations and Maintenance on the Fish KI are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse because of the emissions from the submarine cables (EMF) and shoreline electrodes (EMF and electrolysis); • Low magnitude because the number of affected macro- invertebrates and fishes is likely to represent a small proportion of those same animals in the general vicinity; • Limited to the LSA or just into the RSA; • Far future duration because submarine cable and electrode emissions will occur throughout the Operations and Maintenance phase; and • Continuous in frequency as inspection and maintenance will occur and EMFs will be generated throughout the Operation and Maintenance phase. 		
Potential Project effects on caribou	12.3.5	
<p>In all areas, the effects, which may include habitat alteration and / or loss, possible mortality (direct or indirect), a reduction in forage availability or access and changes to migration or movement routes, are adverse. The 3 km wide assessment area includes the 2 km wide transmission corridor plus a 500 m buffer on either side. This approach of buffering the corridor is consistent with the proposed</p>		<p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2014 Annual Red Wine Mountain Caribou

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
<p>Environment Canada (2011b) Recovery Strategy for Woodland Caribou, Boreal Population, which defines 'undisturbed habitat' as that beyond 500 m from disturbances. Critical habitat for the MMH and RWMH ranges is defined as 65% undisturbed habitat within the respective ranges. The amount of undisturbed habitat is presently 98% of the MMH range, and 92% of the RWMH range (Environment Canada 2011b). In Central and Southeastern Labrador, the 3 km wide assessment area overlaps with less than 1% of both the MMH and RWMH ranges, and therefore will not affect critical habitat for Caribou in Labrador. In Newfoundland, where Caribou are considered "Not at Risk" (SARA 2011, internet site), 3% of the Primary Core area occurs within the assessment area. The actual amount of habitat affected will be less, as sensory disturbance effects are not predicted to occur beyond 500 m of Project Construction activities or roads.</p> <p>Construction effects will be adverse. In Central and Southeastern Labrador and Newfoundland the magnitude will be low as less than 5% of Caribou ranges (Labrador) or Primary Core area (Newfoundland) is affected. Effects will be Regional, as many Construction effects, such as habitat alteration and sensory disturbance, can extend beyond the LSA. The effects of the habitat alteration or loss caused by Project Construction, and the opportunities for increased access created by the Project will continue over the life of the Project. Although there are effects predicted to result from the Construction of the Project, Caribou populations are not likely to be affected on a regional scale.</p> <p>The likely residual environmental effects of Operations and Maintenance of the Project are similar to, but of lesser magnitude, than those predicted for the Construction phase. Although the individual Operations and Maintenance activities may be of short duration, the duration of effects, including habitat loss or fragmentation and increased access, will continue over the life of the Project. Sensory disturbance effects are not likely to occur beyond 250 m of infrastructure or clearings during Project Operations.</p> <p>The effects of the Project relative to baseline are not likely to affect the viability or recovery of woodland Caribou populations in Central and Southeastern Labrador and Newfoundland. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on Caribou.</p>		<p>Report;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2015 Annual Caribou Report – Mealy Mountain Herd; • 2015 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd; • 2016 Annual Caribou Report - Mealy Mountain Herd; • 2016 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd; • 2017 Annual Caribou Report - Mealy Mountain Herd; • 2017 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program - 2014 Red Wine Mountains Caribou Herd, 2014 Aerial Survey and Collar Deployment; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – 2016 Red Wine Mountains Caribou Herd, 2016 Aerial Survey; • Labrador-Island Transmission Link Species at Risk Impacts Mitigation and Monitoring Plan • LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
		Specialties Environmental Protection Plan S.11.31(a)
Concerns about the effects of the transmission line on berries	16.5.5.5, 16.5.6.4	
<p>Vegetation management during Project Operations and Maintenance will include herbicide application, which could adversely affect areas currently available for berry picking or harvesting of medicinal plants. Vegetation management via mechanical and herbicide application will be undertaken on the ROW to remove trees greater than 2 m in height. Treatment of compatible species also found on the right-of-way is avoided or minimized. Compatible species are low growing and do not grow to a sufficient height to reach energized lines or cause significant impediment or safety concerns to maintenance crews traveling in the right-of-way. Compatible species include berries, Labrador Tea, Kalmia species, Trailing Juniper, Dwarf Birch, and grass. This selective application of herbicide maintains the compatible species within the right-of-way giving them increased growing space with the removal of the target species. Once compatible species have established it makes it more difficult for the target species to re-establish and the length of time between treatments is increased.</p> <p>The herbicide to be used is Tordon 101 mixed with Sylgard 309; it will be applied in accordance with appropriate regulations and procedures by approved personnel. Vegetation management will likely start in year eight of operations and will be repeated every seven years thereafter, or as required for safety. As such, only a portion of the ROW would be managed every seven years, and only appropriate plants (i.e., tall growing species) will be treated. The herbicide is considered to be non-residual and non-toxic to wildlife or humans in the doses that would be applied to plants on the ROW.</p> <p>Another technique used during vegetation management includes the cut and stump. This treatment consists of cutting the target species and applying herbicide to the stump using a back pack sprayer or a sprayer mounted on the brushsaw. This kills the root system and prevents re-sprouting. This system is very expensive and labour intensive. It is typically used in sensitive areas. This vegetation control method will use Tordon 101, Garlon 4, and Glyphosate products.</p> <p>To manage the potential adverse effects of herbicide application, mitigation and management measures will be implemented such as providing notice to communities and Aboriginal groups of locations of the ROW where vegetation management has occurred. The notice would include the date of application via signage in the ROW, so that plant and berry harvesting would not occur in that location until the plants are again safe for consumption.</p>		This will be addressed during the Operations phase, and will follow provincial legislation.
The need for long-term jobs in the region	16.4.5.4, 16.4.6.4	
<p>The Project will directly affect the lives of people living throughout Newfoundland and Labrador and elsewhere through the creation of new employment and earned income, opportunities for training skills development and work experience, and enhanced business opportunities related to the supply of goods and services to the Project. Indirect effects of the Project include increased revenue to governments and the subsequent benefits associated with how that revenue is spent on public goods and services. Additional induced effects of the Project will be experienced with successive rounds of spending of personal and business incomes, which in turn will generate additional jobs and government revenues through the overall economy.</p> <p>Total direct employment during Project Construction is expected to be approximately 3,070 person-years. Of this total, approximately 2,760 is expected to occur in Newfoundland and Labrador, including</p>		The Benefits Strategy between Nalcor Energy and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador establishes a hiring protocol for the Muskrat Falls Project. Commitments made in the Impacts and Benefits Agreement with Labrador's Innu Nation are a priority,

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
1,690 on the Island of Newfoundland and 1,080 in Labrador. Peak direct construction employment is expected in Year 3, with 540 person-years of work occurring on the Island and 340 person-years in Labrador. More detail on the specific types of occupations required for the Project can be found in Section 16.4.5.4.		<p>followed by consideration of employment for qualified residents of Newfoundland and Labrador.</p> <p>For construction of the HVdc transmission line, the hiring protocol is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitments made in Impacts and Benefits Agreement with Labrador Innu • Qualified and experienced residents of Newfoundland and Labrador • Qualified and experienced residents of Canada <p>Monthly Benefits Reports can be found here.</p>
Opening of the territory through transmission ROW and access roads	16.5.5.3	
<p>Various components of the Project will be located in areas used by members of Aboriginal communities and organizations for the purpose of hunting, trapping, gathering and fishing at various times of the year, and travelling on the land to places of cultural significance.</p> <p>The presence of the Project will generally not prevent or otherwise restrict the conduct of these activities in or near the LSA. For some Aboriginal users, the visible presence of large transmission towers, or a cleared ROW and / or other Project elements may detract from the experience of going into the country, and cause them to reduce their use of or stop using certain areas where the Project is located or visible. Again, whether and to what degree Aboriginal land users are aware of and concerned by the presence of the transmission line is a personal and subjective matter. This will vary considerably between individuals, as will the degree to which the Project will affect their use of certain areas and / or overall participation and enjoyment levels.</p> <p>The likely residual effects of Project Construction on the Aboriginal Contemporary Traditional Land Use KI are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse, as construction activities may cause disruptions to or restrictions on existing land and resource use by members of Aboriginal communities or organizations. However, the creation of access in certain areas may prove beneficial for some land uses where members of Aboriginal communities and organizations can pursue contemporary land use activities for traditional purposes. • Of low to moderate magnitude, as in many cases the land area occupied by the Project will be small compared to that used by or available to members of Aboriginal communities or organizations to carry out contemporary activities for traditional purposes, and because Project design, consultation and / or other effects management measures will serve to identify and address most issues. The effect is unlikely to result in a risk to overall participation rates, user enjoyment, or societal values. 		<p>LCP is currently in the process of determining what access is required during operations. This will include consultation with key stakeholders.</p>

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local in geographic extent, as most if not all interactions between the Project and Aboriginal land use will occur within the LSA, and particularly, at the site of construction activity as it occurs, with regional effects potentially occurring due to an expanded zone of influence. Of short to medium-term duration, as many potential disturbances will end quickly, whereas others (such as ROW clearing or infrastructure placement) will continue throughout the Construction phase of the Project (and then beyond, see Operations and Maintenance). Of low to continuous frequency, as some disruptions will occur only once or occasionally whereas others will extend throughout Construction and beyond. <p>The likely residual effects of Project Operations and Maintenance on the Aboriginal Contemporary Traditional Land Use KI are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adverse, as maintenance activities and / or the presence of Project infrastructure may disrupt Aboriginal contemporary traditional land and resource users. However, the creation of access in certain areas may prove beneficial for some. Of low to moderate magnitude, as in many cases the land area occupied by the Project will be small compared to that used by or available to members of Aboriginal communities or organizations and because Project design, consultation and / or other effects management measures will address identified issues. Local in geographic extent, as most if not all Project interactions will occur within the LSA, and particularly, at the Project sites and adjacent areas, with regional effects potentially occurring due to an expanded zone of influence (e.g., visual effects). Of short-term to far future duration, as maintenance-related disturbances will end quickly, whereas others (such as the presence of the ROW and transmission towers) will continue throughout the life of the Project. Of low to continuous frequency, as some disruptions will occur only once or occasionally, whereas others will extend throughout the life of the Project. <p>Project components will occupy areas currently used by Aboriginal groups and organizations for land and resource use purposes but these areas will be a small proportion of the total land available. Creation of new access will be minimal, and the new access that is created will be a benefit to some users. Project activities will likely disrupt some types of users and affect their quality of experience but users will be able to use alternative areas in the RSA. Project design, consultation, permitting, communications and other effects management measures will identify and address issues by avoiding sensitive areas as much as possible and complying with development regulations and guidelines. Given the large and alternative areas available to Aboriginal users and the effects management measures planned by Nalcor, it is likely that the Project will not result in a decrease in the current level of land and resource use by Aboriginal groups and organizations for traditional purposes in any area. Therefore, the effects of the Project on the Aboriginal Contemporary Traditional Land Use KI are not likely to be significant.</p>		
Proximity of proposed transmission corridor to float plane landing point at Forteau area, which could affect local chartering business	16.5.5.3	
<p>Nalcor is aware of an existing float plane base at Long Pond within the LSA near Forteau in the Labrador Straits region, which is owned and used by several local operators and which serves as a refuelling stop for other aircraft. Nalcor has had extensive discussions and a site visit with the operator of this facility, to fully understand the nature of the existing operations at this site, and to explore possible means to address any potential for safety issues or restrictions that may occur with the presence of transmission towers and conductors in this area. These discussions have covered topics such as applicable aviation standards and regulations, as well as potential tower characteristics and placement, and topography in this area. Nalcor anticipates that these cooperative discussions will continue as the detailed engineering and design of the Project activities in this area progress, with the goal to avoid or reduce any adverse effect of the Project on this operation.</p>		<p>Following consultation with the float plane operator, Nalcor assessed the possibility of adding aviation markers on the transmission line, adjacent to the float plane landing area/pond. The Operator was satisfied with this mitigation.</p>

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
As a result of these discussions, Nalcor is proposing to align the transmission towers and associated access outside the corridor in this specific location to mitigate the potential for effects on the float plane base.		
The need for reliable power	1.1, 2.1, 2.2	
<p>The Project is an important part of ongoing efforts towards securing an adequate, reliable and clean electricity supply to address the province's current and future energy needs. It will facilitate the transmission of electricity from the proposed Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project in Central Labrador to the Island that will then be distributed through the existing Island grid throughout Newfoundland.</p> <p>The need for reliable power to the coast of Labrador is not in scope. Consideration of the issue raised is outside the scope of the Project.</p>		Outside of the scope of the project. No further documentation is required.
Potential effects of transmission line passing through communities' drinking water supplies	16.3.6.5, 16.5.5.3	
<p>With the mitigation proposed by Nalcor to protect the aquatic environment, adverse effects on the water supply for communities crossed by the Project are unlikely.</p> <p>Compliance with legislative and regulatory requirements and adherence to Nalcor's standard practices for operating near and crossing water bodies will minimize effects of siltation and disturbance of water courses, and any areas of disturbance resulting from these activities will be small and localized.</p> <p>Legislative and regulatory requirements and adherence to standard practice will also minimize the potential effects of herbicide use for vegetation management. The use of approved non-persistent herbicides, adherence to appropriate techniques, and maintenance of required buffer zones will mitigate potential effects on water bodies and downstream water supplies.</p>		<p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LITL Freshwater Fish Protection and Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan S. 10.1; LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan <p>This will be addressed during the Operations phase as per provincial legislation.</p>
Economic benefits such as funding for roads and healthcare	7.1, 15.3.6.7, 16.4.5.1	
These are outside Nalcor's mandate, but within the mandate of other government departments and agencies.		No additional documentation required.
Process for placing rock over the Strait of Belle Isle cables and its possible effects on crab and fish such as turbot, halibut and cod, which dwell on the ocean floor	13.4.3.3, 14.2.5	
<p>The rock placement vessel will use a fall pipe to place the rock on the seafloor at depths greater than 60 m, and mostly greater than 90 m (i.e., below the effect of meteorological forcing). During installation, the fall pipe will be between 6 to 10 metres from a part of ongoing engineering and detailed design for the Strait of Belle Isle crossing, a current study over a 30 year period was conducted. The findings of that study were that at 'near bottom', the mean expected current during the summer and fall (i.e., during the construction season) is expected to be between 0.8 m/s and 1.1 m/s. The rock used for berm construction will be extracted from a quarry, Nalcor expects it to be clean and free of sediment. As stated in Section 14.2.5.3, based on the results of the baseline studies (Sikumiut 2011a, b, c; FJGI 2011; AMEC 2011a; FJGI 2010; AMEC 2010a, b), substrate finer than sand (e.g., mud, silt) in the LSA is negligible</p>		<p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCP Strait of Belle Isle Marine Crossing Environmental Protection Plan

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
(see Table 10.5.8-3) therefore the potential for sedimentation is limited.		
The likely effects of the Project on Marine Fish and Fish Habitat are predicted to be low magnitude and short term duration, and local to regional in geographic extent. The Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on the Marine Fish and Fish Habitat VEC.		
Potential effects of the Project on salmon, trout and char	13.3.5, 13.3.6, 13.3.7	
<p>Standard mitigation measures related to the freshwater environment reflect provincial and federal regulations and guidelines. Nalcor will use accepted standard practices and adhere to permit conditions where permits are required to work on or near water. Nalcor will establish appropriate buffers waterbodies. Areas of disturbance will be limited and occur only where necessary and permitted. Equipment will be in proper working order and where fording a permitted stream is required all precautions will be taken to conduct a clean, efficient crossing. Fording requires a permit which includes information on the stream's morphology at the proposed crossing location. Substrate, water velocity and depth, and bank slope are among some of the aspects reviewed by provincial authorities prior to granting the fording permit. This pre-examination of the crossing will be undertaken by Nalcor to select the preferred location at each crossing.</p> <p>The fording of equipment can reduce bank stability and re-suspend fine material from the stream substrate with its tracks and / or wheels. Further, vegetation removal and ground disturbance on or near waterbodies including culvert and bridge installations expose soil and organic debris, increasing the potential for particulate matter to enter watercourses. Sediment can re-settle in areas with low flows or lower water velocities, and introduced organic matter can lead to oxygen depletion and hypoxia, negatively affecting Fish Habitat. Sediments will re-settle downstream of the fording site, so the effect would be confined to the RSA, and would be medium to long-term in duration.</p> <p>The likely residual effects on Freshwater Fish and Fish Habitat will be limited by effective mitigation, and proper location of fording and / or stream crossings will minimize disturbance. Fish disturbance from noise and vibration, and increases in suspended sediment and nutrient levels from Project activities will be transient in nature. Changes to physical fish habitat will be localized to only a small section of each watercourse (i.e., at the stream crossing location). Any accidental releases of hydrocarbons that may occur will be responded to in a timely manner based on procedures outlined in the EPP and SHERP. Therefore, changes to Fish and Fish Habitat (i.e., changes in fish habitat or fish abundance / species assemblage) such that the freshwater environment is unable to recover are not likely to occur as a result of the Project. In addition, Nalcor is committed to adhere to the associated legislation, Newfoundland and Labrador Operational Statements (NLOSs) and standard mitigation from both industry and government, and any permit conditions. Considering this, the effects to Fish and Fish Habitat are predicted to be not significant.</p> <p>The predicted effects of Project Construction, and Operations and Maintenance activities will relate to less than 10% of bottom substrate, seawater and biota that occur in the RSA. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on the Marine Fish and Fish Habitat VEC.</p>		<p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LITL Freshwater Fish Protection and Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan
Concern with water levels within rivers decreasing	13.2	
No issues have been identified with respect to the interaction of the Project with water quantity, as standard mitigation associated with Project components (e.g., access road and bridge construction, towers, and converter station construction) will apply. Application of such mitigation measures will minimize the potential for rutting, damming or redirection of water during high flow events such as snow melt and heavy rainfall. All stream crossings, including culverts, will be constructed and sized so as not to		<p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
impede water flow and hydrologic regime of the watercourses, and in compliance with applicable regulatory requirements.		Protection Plan
Concern there will be an increase in the osprey population putting added pressure on fish resources	12.5.6.5	
Residual effects on Fish Abundance and Species Assemblage will be limited both spatially and in duration, and include the effect of predation capture by raptors. The likely residual effects will not be of sufficient magnitude, duration and geographic extent to cause a change in the Fish and Fish Habitat that will alter its status or integrity beyond an acceptable level. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on the Fish and Fish Habitat VEC.		As a part of regular operations, Nalcor conducts raptor surveys along all transmission lines. The results are reviewed by Nalcor's environment team
Concern the construction of the ROW will disturb soil along ponds, rivers and lakes affecting the fish	13.2.5, 13.3.5	
<p>Standard mitigation measures related to the freshwater environment reflect provincial and federal regulations and guidelines. Nalcor will use accepted standard practices and adhere to permit conditions where permits are required to work on or near water. Nalcor will establish appropriate buffers around waterbodies. Areas of disturbance will be limited and occur only where necessary and permitted. Equipment will be in proper working order and where fording a permitted stream is required all precautions will be taken to conduct a clean, efficient crossing. Fordings requires a permit which includes information on the stream's morphology at the proposed crossing location. Substrate, water velocity and depth, and bank slope are among some of the aspects reviewed by provincial authorities prior to granting the fording permit. This pre-examination of the crossing will be undertaken by Nalcor to select the preferred location at each crossing.</p> <p>The fording of equipment can reduce bank stability and re-suspend fine material from the stream substrate with its tracks and / or wheels. Further, vegetation removal and ground disturbance on or near waterbodies including culvert and bridge installations expose soil and organic debris, increasing the potential for particulate matter to enter watercourses. Sediment can re-settle in areas with low flows or lower water velocities, and introduced organic matter can lead to oxygen depletion and hypoxia, negatively affecting Fish Habitat. Sediments will re-settle downstream of the fording site, so the effect would be confined to the RSA, and would be medium to long-term in duration.</p> <p>The likely residual effects on Freshwater Resources (Water Quality) will be limited as of result of the effects management measures implemented. Any changes to the water quality (i.e., increase in total suspended solids (TSS), nutrients, herbicidal chemicals, toluene or ethylbenzene in exceedance of guidelines, or relative to baseline for those parameters that exceed guidelines under baseline conditions) that may occur as a result of the Project are not predicted to affect its baseline functions over the lifetime of the Project. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in a significant effect on Freshwater Resources.</p> <p>The likely residual effects on Freshwater Fish and Fish Habitat will be limited by effective mitigation, and proper location of fording and / or stream crossings will minimize disturbance. Fish disturbance from noise and vibration, and increases in suspended sediment and nutrient levels from Project activities will be transient in nature. Changes to physical fish habitat will be localized to only a small section of each watercourse (i.e., at the stream crossing location). Any accidental releases of hydrocarbons that may occur will be responded to in a timely manner based on procedures outlined in the EPP and SHERP. Therefore, changes to Fish and Fish Habitat (i.e., changes in fish habitat or fish abundance / species assemblage) such that the freshwater environment is unable to recover are not likely to occur as a result</p>		<p><u>See Appendix C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LITL Freshwater Fish Protection and Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan

NunatuKavut Community Council: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Responses/ Supporting Documentation
of the Project. In addition, Nalcor is committed to adhere to the applicable legislation and regulatory requirements, Newfoundland and Labrador Operational Statements (NLOSs) and standard mitigation from both industry and government, and any permit conditions. Considering this, the effects to Fish and Fish Habitat are predicted to be not significant.		

Quebec Innu and Naskapi Communities: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
The transmission line crosses hunting grounds and potential effects on ability to hunt and trap	16.5.5.5, 16.5.6.4	
<p>The presence of the Project will generally not prevent or otherwise restrict the conduct of these activities in or near the Local Study Area. Project components will occupy areas currently used by Aboriginal groups and organizations for land and resource use purposes but these areas will be a small proportion of the total land available. Creation of new access will be minimal, and the new access that is created will be a benefit to some users. Project activities will likely disrupt some types of users and affect their quality of experience but users will be able to use alternative areas in the regional study area. Project design, consultation, permitting, communications and other effects management measures will identify and address issues by avoiding sensitive areas as much as possible and complying with development regulations and guidelines. Given the large and alternative areas available to Aboriginal users and the effects management measures planned by Nalcor, it is anticipated that the Project will not result in a decrease in the current level of land and resource use by Aboriginal groups and organizations for traditional purposes in any area. Therefore, the effects of the Project on the Aboriginal Contemporary Traditional Land Use KI are not likely to be significant.</p>		<p>EIS Addendum presented the selected ROW for the project. The ROW follows the TLH3 for the first ~150 km.</p> <p>EIS Addendum also identified the land use by indigenous groups in Labrador prior to the creation of the ROW. Land use along the TLH3 is extensively used for trapping.</p> <p>LCP is currently in the process of determining what access is required during operations. This will include consultation with key stakeholders.</p>
Potential effects of the Project on caribou, particularly on the Red Wine Mountain and the Mealy Mountains Caribou Herds, as well as other wildlife	12.3.5.3, 12.3.6.3, 12.4.5, 12.4.6	
<p>In all areas, the effects, which may include habitat alteration and / or loss, possible mortality (direct or indirect), a reduction in forage availability or access and changes to migration or movement routes, are adverse. The 3 km wide assessment area includes the 2 km wide transmission corridor plus a 500 m buffer on either side. This approach of buffering the corridor is consistent with the proposed Environment Canada (2011b) Recovery Strategy for Woodland Caribou, Boreal Population, which defines 'undisturbed habitat' as that beyond 500 m from disturbances. Critical habitat for the MMH and RWMH ranges is defined as 65% undisturbed habitat within the respective ranges. The amount of undisturbed habitat is presently 98% of the MMH range, and 92% of the RWMH range (Environment Canada 2011b). In Central and Southeastern Labrador, the 3 km wide assessment area overlaps with less than 1% of both the MMH and RWMH ranges, and therefore will not affect critical habitat for Caribou in Labrador. In Newfoundland, where Caribou are considered "Not at Risk" (SARA 2011, internet site), 3% of the Primary Core area occurs within the assessment area. The actual amount of habitat affected will be less, as sensory disturbance effects are not predicted to occur beyond 500 m of Project Construction activities or roads.</p> <p>Construction effects will be adverse. In Central and Southeastern Labrador and Newfoundland the magnitude will be low as less than 5% of Caribou ranges (Labrador) or Primary Core area (Newfoundland) is affected. Effects will be Regional, as many Construction effects, such as habitat alteration and sensory disturbance, can extend beyond the LSA. The effects of the habitat alteration or loss caused by Project Construction, and the opportunities for increased access created by the Project will continue over the life of the Project. Although there are effects predicted to result from the Construction of the Project, Caribou populations are not likely to be affected on a regional scale.</p> <p>The likely residual environmental effects of Operations and Maintenance of the Project are similar to,</p>		<p><u>See Appendix D</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2014 Annual Red Wine Mountain Caribou Report; • 2015 Annual Caribou Report – Mealy Mountain Herd; • 2015 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd; • 2016 Annual Caribou Report - Mealy Mountain Herd; • 2016 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd; • 2017 Annual Caribou Report - Mealy Mountain Herd; • 2017 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd;

Quebec Innu and Naskapi Communities: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
<p>but of lesser magnitude, than those predicted for the Construction phase. Although the individual Operations and Maintenance activities may be of short duration, the duration of effects, including habitat loss or fragmentation and increased access, will continue over the life of the Project. Sensory disturbance effects are not likely to occur beyond 250 m of infrastructure or clearings during Project Operations.</p> <p>The effects of the Project relative to baseline are not likely to affect the viability or recovery of woodland Caribou populations in Central and Southeastern Labrador and Newfoundland. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on Caribou.</p> <p>The Project is predicted to affect only a small portion of available furbearer habitat within the LSA, and to have no measurable effect on the regional distributions or populations of furbearer species. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on the Furbearers VEC.</p> <p>The loss of less than 1% of the primary habitat available for avifauna in the Regional Study Area (RSA) is predicted to have a small measurable effect on habitat availability at the local scale and little, if any, effect at the regional scale. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on the Avifauna VEC.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program - 2014 Red Wine Mountains Caribou Herd, 2014 Aerial Survey and Collar Deployment; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – 2016 Red Wine Mountains Caribou Herd, 2016 Aerial Survey; • Labrador-Island Transmission Link Species at Risk Impacts Mitigation and Monitoring Plan • LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan S.11.31(a) • 2014 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower Churchill Project; • 2015 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower Churchill Project; • 2016 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower Churchill Project; • 2017 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower Churchill Project; • LITL Furbearers and Small Mammals Protection and Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan • Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project Avifauna Management Plan Muskrat Falls Construction; • LCP Avifauna Protection and Environmental Effects

Quebec Innu and Naskapi Communities: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
		<p>Monitoring Plan;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – 2014 Avifauna; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – 2015 Avifauna; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – Avifauna, 2016 Forest Songbird and Common Nighthawk (<i>Chordeiles minor</i>) Point-Count Surveys; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project – Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – Avifauna Final Report
Potential effects of the Project on traditional activities, particularly on access, hunting, trapping and fishing	16.5.5.5, 16.5.6.4	
<p>Various components of the Project will be located in areas used by members of Aboriginal communities and organizations for the purpose of hunting, trapping, gathering and fishing at various times of the year, and travelling on the land to places of cultural significance.</p> <p>The presence of the Project will generally not prevent or otherwise restrict the conduct of these activities in or near the LSA. For some Aboriginal users, the visible presence of large transmission towers, or a cleared ROW and / or other Project elements may detract from the experience of going into the country, and cause them to reduce their use of or stop using certain areas where the Project is located or visible. Again, whether and to what degree Aboriginal land users are aware of and concerned by the presence of the transmission line is a personal and subjective matter. This will vary considerably between individuals, as will the degree to which the Project will affect their use of certain areas and / or overall participation and enjoyment levels.</p> <p>The likely residual effects of Project Construction on the Aboriginal Contemporary Traditional Land Use KI are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse, as construction activities may cause disruptions to or restrictions on existing land and resource use by members of Aboriginal communities or organizations. However, the creation of access in certain areas may prove beneficial for some land uses where members of Aboriginal communities and organizations can pursue contemporary land use activities for traditional purposes. • Of low to moderate magnitude, as in many cases the land area occupied by the Project will be small compared to that used by or available to members of Aboriginal communities or 		<p>LCP is currently in the process of determining what access is required during operations. This will include consultation with key stakeholders.</p>

Quebec Innu and Naskapi Communities: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
<p>organizations to carry out contemporary activities for traditional purposes, and because Project design, consultation and / or other effects management measures will serve to identify and address most issues. The effect is unlikely to result in a risk to overall participation rates, user enjoyment, or societal values.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local in geographic extent, as most if not all interactions between the Project and Aboriginal land use will occur within the LSA, and particularly, at the site of construction activity as it occurs, with regional effects potentially occurring due to an expanded zone of influence. • Of short to medium-term duration, as many potential disturbances will end quickly, whereas others (such as ROW clearing or infrastructure placement) will continue throughout the Construction phase of the Project (and then beyond, see Operations and Maintenance). • Of low to continuous frequency, as some disruptions will occur only once or occasionally whereas others will extend throughout Construction and beyond. <p>The likely residual effects of Project Operations and Maintenance on the Aboriginal Contemporary Traditional Land Use KI are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse, as maintenance activities and / or the presence of Project infrastructure may disrupt Aboriginal contemporary traditional land and resource users. However, the creation of access in certain areas may prove beneficial for some. • Of low to moderate magnitude, as in many cases the land area occupied by the Project will be small compared to that used by or available to members of Aboriginal communities or organizations and because Project design, consultation and / or other effects management measures will address identified issues. • Local in geographic extent, as most if not all Project interactions will occur within the LSA, and particularly, at the Project sites and adjacent areas, with regional effects potentially occurring due to an expanded zone of influence (e.g., visual effects). • Of short-term to far future duration, as maintenance-related disturbances will end quickly, whereas others (such as the presence of the ROW and transmission towers) will continue throughout the life of the Project. • Of low to continuous frequency, as some disruptions will occur only once or occasionally, whereas others will extend throughout the life of the Project. <p>Project components will occupy areas currently used by Aboriginal groups and organizations for land and resource use purposes but these areas will be a small proportion of the total land available. Creation of new access will be minimal, and the new access that is created will be a benefit to some users. Project activities will likely disrupt some types of users and affect their quality of experience but users will be able to use alternative areas in the RSA. Project design, consultation, permitting, communications and other effects management measures will identify and address issues by avoiding sensitive areas as much as possible and complying with development regulations and guidelines. Given the large and alternative areas available to Aboriginal users and the effects management measures planned by Nalcor, it is anticipated that the Project will not result in a decrease in the current level of land and resource use by Aboriginal groups and organizations for traditional purposes in any area. Therefore, the effects of the Project on the Aboriginal Contemporary Traditional Land Use KI are not likely to be significant.</p>		
Potential effect of Project employment on ability to go into the woods to make a living through hunting, trapping and fishing	16.5	

Quebec Innu and Naskapi Communities: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
Project components will occupy areas currently used by Aboriginal groups and organizations for land and resource use purposes but these areas will be a small proportion of the total land available. Creation of new access will be minimal, and the new access that is created will be a benefit to some users. Project activities will likely disrupt some types of users and affect their quality of experience but users will be able to use alternative areas in the RSA. Project design, consultation, permitting, communications and other effects management measures will identify and address issues by avoiding sensitive areas as much as possible and complying with development regulations and guidelines. Given the large and alternative areas available to Aboriginal users and the effects management measures planned by Nalcor, it is likely that the Project will not result in a decrease in the current level of land and resource use by Aboriginal groups and organizations for traditional purposes in any area. Therefore, the effects of the Project on the Aboriginal Contemporary Traditional Land Use KI are not likely to be significant.		LCP is currently in the process of determining what access is required during operations. This will include consultation with key stakeholders.
Potential effects of the installation of subsea cables in the Strait of Belle Isle on salmon, which migrate through the Strait	14.2.6.5, 14.2.7	
<p>Activities associated with the construction and installation of the submarine cables will result in at least two effects on the Fish KI: (i) the introduction of additional underwater sound to the marine environment causing behavioural changes in macro-invertebrates and fishes and (ii) sub-lethal and lethal physical effects on some macro-invertebrates and fishes due to rock placement during berm construction and dredging.</p> <p>Placement of rock during the construction of the Strait of Belle Isle berms will likely affect the health of some macro-invertebrates and perhaps some fish as well. However, the numbers of macro-invertebrates and fish that will experience health effects represent a small proportion of all macro-invertebrates and fishes in the LSA.</p> <p>Activities associated with the Operations and Maintenance of the submarine cables that are most likely to affect the Fish KI are the potential introduction of EMFs to the marine environment at the submarine cables. The primary potential effects of these activities on macro-invertebrates and fishes are changes in behaviour and changes in health.</p> <p>Research into geomagnetic orientation in fish has focused on two groups that undergo long migrations: (i) salmon (both <i>Oncorhynchus</i> spp. and <i>Salmo</i> spp.), and (ii) eels of the genus <i>Anguilla</i>. Salmon hatch from freshwater spawning grounds then migrate out to sea where they can undergo extensive oceanic or coastal feeding migrations for hundreds or even thousands of kilometres. After spending their adult lives foraging and growing at sea, salmon migrate back to their natal rivers to spawn. The fact that salmon undergo such long ocean migrations makes them likely candidates for a geomagnetic guidance system.</p> <p>Potential change in the health of macro-invertebrates and fishes during Operations and Maintenance of the submarine cables can be differentiated by mechanism. Direct injury and / or death could occur as a result of either submarine cable major repair. Both of these activities could also cause re-suspension of sediment (i.e., increased seawater turbidity) which in turn could have harmful effects on both macro-invertebrates and fishes. Exposures to EMFs generated by the submarine cables also have the potential to cause harmful effects to macro-invertebrates and fishes. However, all of these potential sources of health change in macro-invertebrates and fishes would have limited spatial and temporal effect, and thus affect only a small proportion of the macro-invertebrates and fishes in the LSA.</p> <p>The predicted effects of the Project (i.e., invertebrate and fish behavioural responses to operations-related EMFs emanating from the submarine cable) will relate to less than 10% of bottom substrate, seawater, and biota that occur in the RSA. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant</p>		<p><u>See Appendix D</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCP Strait of Belle Isle Marine Crossing Environmental Protection Plan Marine Emissions Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan

Quebec Innu and Naskapi Communities: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
<p>adverse environmental effects on the Marine Fish and Fish Habitat VEC.</p> <p>The specific size of the field will depend on local conditions but would be in the order of 150 m as calculated by the Biot-Savart Formula (Worzyk 2009). The magnetic field strength attenuates rapidly from 260 μT (260,000 nT) at 1 m from the cable to 26 μT (26,000 nT) at 10 m as calculated using the Biot-Savart Formula using a maximum current of 1,286 amperes (A).</p> <p>As indicated in the EIS, there is no evidence to suggest that the EMFs emitted by the submarine HVdc cables will adversely affect marine fish in a significant way. It is predicted that the magnetic field induced by the cable electric field will reduce to background levels within a few metres of the cables. Essentially the entire length of each cable will be at water depths of at least 60 m and at times greater than 100 m, meaning that the magnetic field occurring in most of the water column will be at natural levels. As stated in the EIS, there is evidence to support the notion that Atlantic salmon typically spend most time in the upper water column during migration which would put these fish well outside any zone of magnetic field influence from the submarine cables. The American eel, on the other hand, is known to swim at greater depths during its oceanic migrations. As discussed in the EIS, field studies have been conducted to investigate whether or not operating HVdc cables act as barriers to eel movement. There is not any evidence for any significant effect on eel movement across HVdc cables emitting a magnetic field.</p> <p>For comparison, the Earth's natural magnetic field is also subject to short- and long-term variations. Solar electromagnetic radiation impinging on the Earth's surface can cause daily fluctuations in field intensity of up to 30 nT and shifts in inclination of up to 0.33°. These daily perturbations vary with latitude and season. Magnetic storms associated with sun spot activity also cause fluctuations of 200 nT or more. The Earth's natural geomagnetic field intensity in the Strait of Belle Isle is approximately 54,000 nT.</p> <p>The likely residual effects of Project Operations and Maintenance on the Fish KI are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse because of the emissions from the submarine cables (EMF) and shoreline electrodes (EMF and electrolysis); • Low magnitude because the number of affected macro- invertebrates and fishes is likely to represent a small proportion of those same animals in the general vicinity; • Limited to the LSA or just into the RSA; • Far future duration because submarine cable and electrode emissions will occur throughout the Operations and Maintenance phase; and • Continuous in frequency as inspection and maintenance will occur and EMFs will be generated throughout the Operation and Maintenance phase. 		
Concern about the use of pesticides and their potential effects on wildlife and berries and the associated potential human health effects	16.3.6.5	
<p>Vegetation management during Project Operations and Maintenance will include herbicide application, which could adversely affect areas currently available for berry picking or harvesting of medicinal plants. Vegetation management via mechanical and herbicide application will be undertaken on the ROW to remove trees greater than 2 m in height. Treatment of compatible species also found on the right-of-way is avoided or minimized. Compatible species are low growing and do not grow to a sufficient height to reach energized lines or cause significant impediment or safety concerns to maintenance crews traveling in the right-of-way. Compatible species include berries, Labrador Tea, Kalmia species, Trailing Juniper, Dwarf Birch, and grass. This selective application of herbicide maintains the compatible species within the right-of-way giving them increased growing space with the removal of the target species. Once compatible species have established it makes it more difficult for the target species to re-establish</p>		<p>This will be addressed during the Operations phase and will follow provincial legislation.</p>

Quebec Innu and Naskapi Communities: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
<p>and the length of time between treatments is increased.</p> <p>The herbicide to be used is Tordon 101 mixed with Sylgard 309; it will be applied in accordance with appropriate regulations and procedures by approved personnel. Vegetation management will likely start in year eight of operations and will be repeated every seven years thereafter, or as required for safety. As such, only a portion of the ROW would be managed every seven years, and only appropriate plants (i.e., tall growing species) will be treated. The herbicide is considered to be non-residual and non-toxic to wildlife or humans in the doses that would be applied to plants on the ROW.</p> <p>Another technique used during vegetation management includes the cut and stump. This treatment consists of cutting the target species and applying herbicide to the stump using a back pack sprayer or a sprayer mounted on the brushsaw. This kills the root system and prevents re-sprouting. This system is very expensive and labour intensive. It is typically used in sensitive areas. This vegetation control method will use Tordon 101, Garlon 4, and Glyphosate products.</p> <p>Vegetation management during Project Operations and Maintenance will include herbicide application. To manage the potential adverse effects of herbicide application, mitigation and management measures will be implemented such as providing notice to communities and Aboriginal groups of locations of the ROW where vegetation management has occurred. The notice would include the date of application via signage in the ROW, so that plant and berry harvesting would not occur in that location until the plants are again safe for consumption.</p>		
Whether the access trails used for construction of the transmission line will be preserved and accessible to the public	3.4.6.2	
<p>Nalcor will use existing access, and limit the creation of new access to the extent practical. Upon completion of Project construction, a limited number of access roads and trails will remain in place to provide an appropriate level of access for transmission line maintenance activities. All others will be decommissioned and rehabilitated using applicable and appropriate methods and standards. The extent of road and trail rehabilitation will vary and will range from disturbing the road surface using an excavator and restricting access to complete rehabilitation. Complete rehabilitation will include removing the road way, re-grading the area and backfilling ditches. Sediment and erosion control measures will be installed prior to decommissioning watercourse crossings. Decommissioning will include the removal of any watercourse crossing material and processed aggregate from the access road surface. Upon removal of the watercourse crossing materials, the watercourse banks will be returned to a stable condition. Access roads will be graded, as appropriate, to re-establish natural drainage patterns, and topsoil will be replaced.</p> <p>The proposed transmission line has the potential to be used by Aboriginal users as a travel route. As described in Chapter 3, Project Description, vegetation will be cleared along the ROW during construction, and ongoing vegetation management will keep vegetation below 2 m in height over the life of the Project. The ROW will therefore not be accessible to automobile traffic, although an access trail along the ROW to facilitate ongoing inspection and maintenance (similar to existing transmission lines throughout the province) will likely be used as an access route by Aboriginal users at various times of the year. Although Nalcor does not condone or promote the use of its transmission lines for this purpose, it is aware that this activity occurs elsewhere in the province and considers prevention of such activities difficult if not impossible. Through Nalcor's ongoing engagement with Aboriginal communities and organizations, some members have indicated that such access may have an overall positive effect on some Aboriginal land and resource users, as it will provide better or new access to currently remote areas, both for general passage (such as snowmobile travel) and to access areas for activities such as hunting and fishing. Whether and to what degree, and for what purpose, Aboriginal persons will use</p>		<p>LCP is currently in the process of determining what access is required during operations. This will include consultation with key stakeholders.</p>

Quebec Innu and Naskapi Communities: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
portions of the ROW as a transportation corridor cannot be known with certainty and will likely vary by group. Nalcor will consult with Aboriginal communities and organizations to explore possible approaches to transmission line routing.		
Desire for meaningful consultation	7.1	
<p>Nalcor has planned, offered and undertaken various consultation processes and activities with Aboriginal groups with the purpose of providing and receiving information on the Project and its potential environmental effects, and collecting AEK on the existing environment for incorporation into the EIS. The key objectives and elements of Nalcor's Aboriginal consultation program include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing Aboriginal communities with information on the proposed Project, including its purpose and associated components and activities; • identifying and documenting any questions or concerns about the Project and its potential environmental and socioeconomic effects and benefits; • collecting and sharing information on contemporary land use activities by Aboriginal persons in or near the Project area, as well as relevant Aboriginal knowledge; and • discussing possible approaches and measures to avoid or reduce any likely adverse effects and enhance benefits of the Project on Aboriginal communities and their interests and activities, and on the environment in general. <p>Consultation with Aboriginal communities and organizations for the Project has been ongoing for several years, including prior to the registration of the Project under the provincial and federal EA processes. In January 2009, Nalcor contacted all relevant Labrador and Québec Aboriginal communities and organizations within several days of the Project's registration to provide the document and further details on the EA process and, in February 2009 provided a French translation to all French speaking Aboriginal communities in Québec. Further details on Nalcor's correspondence, discussions and other consultation initiatives and offers with individual groups are provided throughout EIS Chapter 7. See Section 7.3 for specifics related to Quebec Innu and Naskapi communities.</p>		<p>Consultation during the environmental assessment was presented in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Impact Statement as well as summarized in this Indigenous Consultation paper.</p> <p>As per the Aboriginal Consultation Guidelines, all of the identified groups were consulted on all relevant permits and environmental effects monitoring plans for the project.</p>
Project-related information should be provided in Innu-aimun	Plain Language Summary	
The Plain Language Summary has been translated into Innu-aimun (Labrador and Québec dialects).		This was provided during the environmental assessment.
Concerned that various Innu groups are being treated differently	7.1	
<p>Nalcor has planned, offered and undertaken various consultation processes and activities with Aboriginal groups with the purpose of providing and receiving information on the Project and its potential environmental effects, and collecting AEK on the existing environment for incorporation into the EEIS.</p> <p>Nalcor's approach to planning, undertaking and supporting consultation is both group- and Project-specific, given the nature and location of the proposed development and the type and level of interest by a particular Aboriginal community.</p> <p>Given the interests and activities of different aboriginal groups in the Project area are different, it is reasonable to expect that the results of the consultation processes might be different.</p>		No additional information.
Comment that regardless of whether Nalcor is reducing or mitigating environmental effects, there will still be some effects on the environment	1.3, Chapter 17,	

Quebec Innu and Naskapi Communities: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
	Table 17.5-1	
<p>Through EA review, environmental issues are identified, likely environmental effects are assessed and evaluated, and measures to avoid or reduce adverse effects and optimize benefits are identified and proposed.</p> <p>The Project is being planned by Nalcor in a manner that considers environmentally (i.e., biophysical and socioeconomic) sensitive areas of the province and has avoided many such areas to the extent practical. Nalcor has incorporated best industry practices and mitigation options for routing, Construction, and Operations and Maintenance to limit residual adverse effects; used Traditional and Community Knowledge of the existing environment; and, will continue to engage in consultation with government, Aboriginal, and public stakeholders.</p> <p>See Table 17.5-1 for a summary of effects on atmospheric, terrestrial, freshwater, marine and socioeconomic VECs. In this EIS, Nalcor has demonstrated adherence to the basic principles of EA as outlined in Section 2 of the EIS Guidelines and Scoping Document (Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and the Government of Canada 2011). These principles are: using EA as a planning tool; Aboriginal and public participation is a central objective; collection and consideration of Aboriginal traditional and community knowledge; promotion of sustainable development; and applying a precautionary approach (including consideration of the Precautionary Principle) in the planning and assessment of the Project. The conclusion of this EIS is that the likely residual environmental effects (positive or negative) that result from the Construction, and Operations and Maintenance of the Project, are not likely to be significant. Considering this, and the commitments made in this EIS, Nalcor respectfully submits that the Project will be constructed, and operated and maintained in an environmentally responsible manner, respecting the principles of sustainable development. The Project will preserve ecosystem integrity, respect the right of future generations to the sustainable use of renewable and non-renewable resources, and enhance the lives of all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.</p>		<p>LCP uses an Environmental Management Plan and a Regulatory Compliance Plan to ensure full compliance with environmental regulations.</p> <p>Several environmental effects monitoring plans have also been implemented as committed during the EA. A full list can be found in Appendix D.</p> <p>See Appendix D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan
Potential for community economic benefits if people cannot work in Labrador	16.4.5.1, 16.4.10	
<p>Although the Benefits Strategy provides a hiring protocol priority (i.e., beneficiaries of an IBA, residents of Labrador, residents of Newfoundland, and residents of Canada), this protocol does not preclude qualified residents of Quebec, including members of Aboriginal groups, from working on the Project.</p>		<p>The Benefits Strategy between Nalcor Energy and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador establishes a hiring protocol for the Muskrat Falls Project. Commitments made in the Impacts and Benefits Agreement with Labrador's Innu Nation are a priority, followed by consideration of employment for qualified residents of Newfoundland and Labrador. For construction of the HVdc transmission line, the hiring protocol is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commitments made in Impacts and Benefits Agreement with Labrador

Quebec Innu and Naskapi Communities: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
		<p>Innu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualified and experienced residents of Newfoundland and Labrador Qualified and experienced residents of Canada <p>Monthly Benefits Reports can be found here.</p>
The eventual use of wood from the clearing of the right-of-way (ROW)	12.2.5.8	
Where practical and feasible, timber harvested, but not intended for commercial use, will be stacked to the side of the ROW where it will be available for domestic use.		<p>See Appendix D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan
Interest in employment and business opportunities	16.4.1, 16.4.5.4	
Quebec Innu have the same opportunity to bid on Project contracts as any other Newfoundland and Labrador business. The Benefits Strategy (Nalcor 2010, internet site) is intended to enable full and fair access to business opportunities. Quebec businesses are invited to register with Nalcor / SNC Lavalin and to participate in procurement activities.		Monthly Benefits Reports can be found here . These reports provide procurement details.
Desire to see the transmission line follow the Trans-Labrador Highway (TLH) all the way to the Strait of Belle Isle instead of cutting through the in-land territory	2.11.2	
In mid-November 2010, Nalcor advised the provincial and federal governments that it would also be assessing the potential option of locating the Project's Labrador converter station at or near the Muskrat Falls site on the lower Churchill River, as well as an associated transmission corridor that would extend from Muskrat Falls to the Trans-Labrador Highway Phase 3 (TLH3), and then follow generally along the south side of the highway to approximately its southernmost point before meeting and continuing along the previously identified corridor from that location to the Strait of Belle Isle. This Muskrat Falls to the Strait of Belle Isle transmission corridor has since become the preferred and proposed option for the Project. Following the TLH all the way to the Strait of Belle Isle would not be economically feasible.		No additional mitigation required.
Alternative transmission corridors and their consideration	2.11.2, 2.12.6,	
As a linear development, there is potentially an infinite number of alternative transmission corridor routes which may be considered, some of which may, to varying degrees, be considered technically and / or economically feasible, although, not necessarily preferable or environmentally better.		Alternatives were considered during the environmental assessment. No further documentation is required.
In Chapters 11-14 and 16 of the EIS, the initial and detailed environmental effects assessment is focussed first on the proposed (preferred) Project design concept (as described in detail in Chapter 3). From there, the various alternative transmission corridor segments listed in Table 2.12-6-1 are then assessed through a comparison to the predicted environmental effects of the proposed transmission corridor that is the subject of the preceding detailed environmental effects assessment. In doing so, this analysis considers and describes whether and how the potential environmental effects of each alternative segment would likely be different in nature and degree from those of the segment of the proposed transmission corridor that it would replace.		

Quebec Innu and Naskapi Communities: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
Consideration of other, potentially more environmentally friendly energy alternatives such as wind or solar	2.5	
<p>Section 2.5 presents a summary of the power generation supply options (including wind and solar) for both the Isolated Island and Interconnected Island alternatives. It represents a portfolio of electricity supply options that could be theoretically considered to meet future generation expansion requirements for the Island. These individual supply options represent a range of choices / alternatives from local indigenous resources, to importing energy fuels from world energy markets, to interconnecting with regional North American electricity markets.</p> <p>Based on an assessment of alternatives, the Project was identified as the most economic environmentally acceptable alternative to meet the Island's electricity needs.</p>		No additional mitigation required. This was assessed during the environmental assessment.
EA approach for the Project	1.3, Chapter 9	
<p>Chapter 9 describes the EA approach and methodology that has been used to conduct the environmental effects assessment reported in this EIS, including each of its key stages and components (Figure 9-1). The methods used are in keeping with current EA approaches and best practice and the Guidelines, and have been developed and used to help ensure a thorough and rigorous analysis, while at the same time presenting the results of the EA in a clear, concise and well-organized manner.</p>		No additional mitigation required.
Need to ensure that if the Project is approved and proceeds, all the commitments made are implemented and enforced	NIS	
<p>If the Project is approved Nalcor will comply with the commitments made in the EIS, and enforcement of those commitments is the responsibility of appropriate government agencies.</p>		Nalcor has an Environmental Commitments Management Plan. The completion of all commitments made during the environmental assessment are tracked and documented.
Potential dangers of subsea cables on marine and human life	14.2.6.5, 14.3.6, 16.3.6.4	
<p>The predicted effects of subsea cables and fish behavioural responses to operations-related electric fields and EMFs emanating from the submarine cable and shoreline electrodes, will relate to less than 10% of bottom substrate, seawater and biota that occur in the RSA. Therefore, subsea cables are not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on the Marine Fish and Fish Habitat VEC.</p> <p>The predicted effects of Project construction, and Operations and Maintenance activities (e.g., behavioural responses to various underwater sounds and operations-related EMFs from the submarine cable and shoreline electrodes) will relate to much less than 10% of the Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles that occur in the RSA. Therefore, subsea cables are not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on the Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles VEC.</p> <p>Preparation and construction of the submarine cable landing sites and construction and installation of submarine cables on At-sea Seabirds was assessed qualitatively and determined to have an adverse effect because of changes in behaviour, distribution and abundance on this KI due to attraction to artificial lighting on and potential collisions with Project vessels. However, the magnitude of the effect will likely be low because only a small proportion of the populations will likely be affected, the effect will be limited to the LSA, will occur over the short-term and adverse atmospheric conditions will likely occur</p>		<p><u>See Appendix D</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marine Emissions Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan

Quebec Innu and Naskapi Communities: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
<p>more than 10 times a year. With the proposed mitigation in place the effects on At-sea Seabird behaviour, distribution and abundance will likely be negligible.</p> <p>The submarine cable will have two sheath armour layers, as described in Section 3.3.3. When two conductive surfaces have an electric potential difference between them, any electric field will be confined within this space. In the submarine cables, the electric field exists between the conductor and the metallic sheath or armour wires, depending on design. There will be no electric field outside the submarine cable.</p> <p>Considering the use of horizontal directional drilling, the depth of the Strait of Belle Isle, and the use of rock berms over the cables, the potential for interactions between humans and the submarine cables are not likely to occur.</p>		
Potential effects on climate change	11.2.5.3, 11.2.6.3, 11.2.7	
<p>The changes to the Atmospheric Environment resulting from the Project are likely to be negligible and are unlikely to substantively influence ambient conditions within the RSA, partly based on the prediction that there will be no significant effects on climate (GHG emissions). Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse effects on the Atmospheric Environment.</p> <p>The Project is expected to contribute to the reduction in a substantial amount of GHG emissions. As stated in Nalcor's response to Information Request CEAA-06, the Interconnected Island alternative is forecasted to emit approximately 100 Mt less GHGs than the Isolated Island alternative over a 50 year study period. By reducing GHG emission in NL electricity sector, the Project mitigates the effects of climate change.</p>		No additional mitigation required.
Potential effects on medicinal plants	16.5.5.5, 16.5.6.4	
<p>The Project is not likely to result in an effect on any of the KIs within the Vegetation VEC, such that their continued contribution to ecosystem function within the LSA and the RSA cannot be sustainable. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on Vegetation (including medicinal plants).</p> <p>Project components will occupy areas currently used by Aboriginal groups and organizations for land and resource use purposes but these areas will be a small proportion of the total land available. Creation of new access will be minimal, and the new access that is created will be a benefit to some users. Project activities will likely disrupt some types of users and affect their quality of experience but users will be able to use alternative areas in the RSA. Project design, consultation, permitting, communications and other effects management measures will identify and address issues by avoiding sensitive areas as much as possible and complying with development regulations and guidelines. Given the large and alternative areas available to Aboriginal users and the effects management measures planned by Nalcor, it is anticipated that the Project will not result in a decrease in the current level of land and resource use by Aboriginal groups and organizations for traditional purposes in any area. Therefore, the effects of the Project on the Aboriginal Contemporary Traditional Land Use KI are not likely to be significant.</p>		<p><u>See Appendix D</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LITL Vegetation Protection and Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan <p>Regionally Uncommon Plant Surveys - Labrador</p>
Lack of financial resources to use the territory	NIS	
Not in scope. Consideration of the issue raised is outside the scope of the Project.		No additional mitigation

Quebec Innu and Naskapi Communities: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
		required.
Potential for environmental degradation affecting animals, plants, and water bodies	Chapters 11 to 14; 17.6.1, 17.6.2	
<p>In addition to complying with all applicable permits and legislative and regulatory requirements, Nalcor has also committed to using best management practices, where feasible.</p> <p>Effects management measures that Nalcor has incorporated into the Project for Construction, and Operations and Maintenance for Vegetation, include vegetation clearing procedures (e.g., selective clearing, harvest of merchantable timber, spill prevention), avoidance of vegetation communities that are identified as sensitive to disturbance, difficult to reclaim, or of stakeholder or management concern (to the extent practical), measures to prevent the introduction of non-native and invasive species, and avoidance of wetland and riparian habitat (to the extent practical).</p> <p>Effects management measures that Nalcor has incorporated into the Project for Construction, and Operations and Maintenance for Caribou, include measures to limit the loss or alteration of vegetation, measures to limit dust and noise associated with Project Construction, avoidance of the Primary Core area by at least 500 m (to the extent practical), appropriate waste disposal and spill prevention measures, and the development of an access control measures in consultation with regulators and stakeholders, to monitor and manage public off highway vehicle (OHV) use of Project roads and trails.</p> <p>Effects management measures that Nalcor has incorporated into the Project for Construction, and Operations and Maintenance for Furbearers, include measures to limit the loss or alteration of vegetation, measures to limit dust and noise associated with Project Construction, appropriate waste disposal and spill prevention measures, and the development of access control measures in consultation with regulators and stakeholders, to monitor and manage public OHV use of Project roads and trails.</p> <p>Effects management measures that Nalcor has incorporated into the Project for Construction, and Operations and Maintenance for Avifauna, include measures to limit the loss or alteration of vegetation, to avoid areas known to support high concentrations of waterfowl (to the extent possible), to provide separation between clearing activities and active raptor nests, to avoid Harlequin Duck breeding sites, and the development of an access control measures in consultation with regulators and stakeholders, to monitor and manage public OHV use of Project roads and trails.</p> <p>Nalcor will consult with appropriate regulatory authorities regarding final routing, as it relates to terrestrial components in the transmission corridor, including listed plants, Newfoundland marten and woodland caribou on the Island of Newfoundland, as relevant.</p> <p>Standard mitigation measures related to the freshwater environment reflect provincial and federal regulations and guidelines. Nalcor will use accepted standard practices and adhere to permit conditions where permits are required to work on or near water. Areas of disturbance will be limited and occur only where necessary and permitted. Equipment will be in proper working order and where fording a permitted stream is required all precautions will be taken to conduct a clean, efficient crossing. Fording requires a permit which includes information on the stream's morphology at the proposed crossing location. Substrate, water velocity and depth, and bank slope are among some of the aspects reviewed by provincial authorities prior to granting the fording permit. This pre-examination of the crossing will</p>		<p><u>See Appendix D</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCP HVdc Overland Transmission and HVdc Specialties Environmental Protection Plan LITL Vegetation Protection and Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan <p>Regionally Uncommon Plant Surveys - Labrador</p> <p><u>See Appendix D</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2014 Annual Red Wine Mountain Caribou Report; 2015 Annual Caribou Report – Mealy Mountain Herd; 2015 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd; 2016 Annual Caribou Report - Mealy Mountain Herd; 2016 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd; 2017 Annual Caribou Report - Mealy Mountain Herd; 2017 Annual Caribou Report – Red Wine Mountain Herd; Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program - 2014 Red Wine Mountains Caribou Herd, 2014 Aerial

Quebec Innu and Naskapi Communities: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
<p>be undertaken by Nalcor to select the preferred location at each crossing.</p> <p>Effects management measures that Nalcor has incorporated into the Project for Construction, and Operations and Maintenance, for Marine Fish and Fish Habitat include controlled rock placement during berm construction, selection of chemically-benign rock for berm construction, minimizing construction time to decrease the amount of exposure to vessel noise by invertebrates and fishes, the use of silt curtains during electrode site dredging, electrode design to minimize the electric and electromagnetic fields (e.g., through selection of electrode materials and maximization of electrode surface area), and minimizing the contact area between the shoreline pond and the berm to create a safe voltage gradient on the sea side of the berm. Effects management measures that Nalcor has incorporated into the Project for Construction, and Operation and Maintenance, for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles include the maintenance of constant course and speed by Project vessels (whenever possible), avoidance of any concentrations of marine mammals and sea turtles (whenever possible), completion of construction as quickly as safety allows, electrode design that minimizes EMF (e.g., through electrode design, electrode materials, electrode surface area, low resistivity surroundings), and minimizing the contact area between the shoreline pond and the berm to create a safe voltage gradient on the sea side of the berm. Effects management measures that Nalcor has incorporated into the Project for Construction, and Operations and Maintenance, for Seabirds include equipment maintenance and operations to limit noise and the potential for inadvertent release of contaminants, daily monitoring of seabird strandings, reduction of lighting (if deemed safe and feasible), and electrode design to minimize the electric and electromagnetic fields (e.g., through selection of electrode materials and maximization of electrode surface area).</p> <p>For Vegetation, habitat changes are likely to affect less than 5% of available habitat types or merchantable timber resources that occur within the LSA. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on the Vegetation VEC.</p> <p>Less than 5% of caribou herd ranges in Labrador or caribou Primary Core areas in Newfoundland will be exposed to the effects of Construction, and Operations and Maintenance activities. These are not predicted to affect the viability or recovery of woodland caribou populations in Central and Southeastern Labrador or in Newfoundland. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on the Caribou VEC.</p> <p>The Project is predicted to affect only a small portion of available furbearer habitat within the LSA, and to have no measurable effect on the regional distributions or populations of furbearer species. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on the Furbearers VEC.</p> <p>The loss of less than 1% of the primary habitat available for avifauna in the RSA is predicted to have a small measurable effect on habitat availability at the local scale and little, if any, effect at the regional scale. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on the Avifauna VEC.</p>		<p>Survey and Collar Deployment;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – 2016 Red Wine Mountains Caribou Herd, 2016 Aerial Survey; • Labrador-Island Transmission Link Species at Risk Impacts Mitigation and Monitoring Plan • LITL Furbearers and Small Mammals Protection and Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan • LCP Annual Black Bear Encounter Report – 2013; • 2014 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower Churchill Project; • 2015 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower Churchill Project; • 2016 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower Churchill Project; • 2017 Wildlife Sightings Report for the Lower Churchill Project; • Labrador-Island Transmission Link Species at Risk Impacts Mitigation and Monitoring Plan; • 2011-2012 Wildlife Reconnaissance Surveys; • 2013-2015 Avifauna Annual EEM Reports¹⁷;

¹⁷ This document contains the following reports: Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Development Project Annual Report 2013; Lower Churchill Project, Mitigation Program – 2014 Avifauna Management Plan – Annual Report on the Implementation of the 2014 Avifauna Management Plan; Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – 2014 Avifauna, Avifauna Field Surveys in the Lower Churchill River Valley; Annual Report on the Implementation of the Avifauna Management Plan – Torrent River Harlequin Duck Survey (2014); 2015 Annual

Quebec Innu and Naskapi Communities: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
<p>Any changes to the water quality (i.e., increase in total suspended solids (TSS), nutrients, herbicidal chemicals, toluene or ethylbenzene in exceedance of guidelines, or relative to baseline for those parameters that exceed guidelines under baseline conditions) that may occur as a result of the Project are not expected to affect its baseline functions over the lifetime of the Project. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in a significant effect on Freshwater Resources.</p> <p>Changes to Fish and Fish Habitat (i.e., changes in fish habitat or fish abundance / species assemblage) such that the freshwater environment is unable to recover are not likely to occur as a result of the Project. In addition, Nalcor is committed to adhere to the applicable legislation and regulatory requirements, Newfoundland and Labrador Operational Statements (NLOSs) and standard mitigation from both industry and government, and any permit conditions. Considering this, the effects to Fish and Fish Habitat are predicted to be not significant.</p> <p>The overall likely environmental residual effect of Construction, and Operations and Maintenance activities associated with the Project on the Marine Fish and Fish Habitat VEC is minimal. In cases where duration is far future and frequency is continuous, the magnitude and extent are limited. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on the Marine Fish and Fish Habitat VEC.</p> <p>The residual effects of Construction activities on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles will likely to be limited to behavioural responses to construction noise. Considering the known responses of these animals to vessel noise and the results of acoustic modelling, and the mitigation proposed by Nalcor, residual effects do not pose a serious risk to the Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles VEC, are predicted to be of short-term duration and to occur within the RSA. The likely residual effects of Operations and Maintenance activities on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles are predicted to be limited to behavioural responses to noise and perhaps EMFs. Considering the known responses of these animals to vessel noise, their distribution and abundance relative to the LSAs, the results of acoustic and EMF modelling, and the mitigation proposed by Nalcor, residual effects are predicted to fall within the normal range of variability and within the RSA.</p> <p>The overall likely residual environmental effect of combined Construction, and Operations and Maintenance activities associated with the Project on the Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles VEC is minimal.</p> <p>No detectable change to the abundance, distribution, behaviour, habitat use or nesting success of seabirds in the RSA is predicted to occur as a result of the Project. Therefore, the Project is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects on the Seabirds VEC.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LITL Avifauna Protection and Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan; • LCP Avifauna Management Plan; • Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project Avifauna Management Plan Muskrat Falls Construction; • LCP Avifauna Protection and Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – 2014 Avifauna; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – 2015 Avifauna; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project, Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – Avifauna, 2016 Forest Songbird and Common Nighthawk (<i>Chordeiles minor</i>) Point-Count Surveys; • Nalcor Energy Lower Churchill Project – Environmental Effects Monitoring Program – Avifauna Final Report • Marine Emissions Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan • LCP Strait of Belle Isle

Quebec Innu and Naskapi Communities: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
		Marine Crossing Environmental Protection Plan
Concern for community health issues and the need for sources of revenue to improve access to health services	15.3.6.7, 16.3.5.6, 16.3.5.7, 16.3.6.5, 16.3.6.6, 16.3.7.1, Table 16.3.7-1	
<p>While in some cases, the socioeconomic effects of the Project on health are direct (e.g., the benefits of employment income), in most cases effects on health will be indirect. The socioeconomic effects of the Project on health determinants are dependent on social responses, health practices and coping skills, and the availability of social support networks, particularly that of the family. The prediction of Project effects on many of the underlying determinants of health is complex and is a factor of personal choice and underlying social conditions.</p> <p>For those who obtain employment with the Project, there is the possibility of increased income, self-esteem and social status which, in turn, may positively affect other aspects of health and well-being such as improved personal health practices and coping skills. For some, increased income and any community-worker interactions may have adverse effects in terms of poor personal health practices (e.g., alcohol and substance abuse, gambling, prostitution) and coping skills.</p> <p>As the summary provided in Table 16.3.7-1 states, no likely significant residual effects on any of the KIs for the Communities VEC (including Health Conditions) are anticipated. While most effects are adverse, the magnitudes of those effects are low to moderate, meaning that the effect is within the capacity of the infrastructure component or the accepted threshold value of the parameter in question.</p> <p>In the context of Quebec Innu groups, no community effects are predicted, and while Nalcor understands the concern raised, this is not within the scope of the Project.</p>		No additional mitigation required.
Concern that significant traditional knowledge of the environment will not be considered in the environmental evaluation process	7.1, 9.5.3, Chapters 11 to 14, Chapter 16,	

Quebec Innu and Naskapi Communities: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
	16.10	
<p>Nalcor appreciates that populations living in proximity to the Project may have substantial and distinct knowledge, which can be considered in the assessment of the effects of the Project, and their mitigation. As such, Nalcor considered Aboriginal traditional and community knowledge of the existing environment as an integral part of the EIS, to the extent that it was available.</p> <p>Nalcor considered the Aboriginal traditional and community knowledge in assisting in its understanding, including the inter-relationships, among such matters as: ecosystem function; resource abundance, distribution and quality; social and economic well-being; and use of the land and resources. Nalcor also considered the traditional and community knowledge that was available, to inform the development of adequate baseline information, identification of key issues, identification of mitigation measures, prediction of residual effects, and assessment of their significance.</p>		As per the Aboriginal Consultation Guidelines, all of the identified groups were consulted on all relevant permits and environmental effects monitoring plans for the project.
Unsure of the need for more electricity and what markets would be supplied	2.2, 2.3	
Nalcor's justification for the Project in energy terms is based on the requirement to meet the forecasted electricity requirements of residents and businesses in NL. NLH is responsible for developing a long-term electricity capacity and energy forecast for the NL electrical system, and has undertaken this activity for more than 40 years. The Island Interconnected (Project) alternative has a \$2.2 billion CPW preference over the Isolated Island alternative.		Rationale for the project was assessed as part of the federal and provincial environmental assessment.
Would like to negotiate compensation or special programs	7.1	
<p>Nalcor's approach to planning, undertaking and supporting consultation is both group- and Project-specific, given the nature and location of the proposed development and the type and level of interest by a particular Aboriginal community. It is Nalcor's practice, when required or requested, to provide translation of oral presentation in the Aboriginal language spoken by the Aboriginal group. Nalcor recognizes and acknowledges that Aboriginal communities and organizations often require additional resources and support when engaging in consultation processes, particularly with regard to large development projects and their EAs. While there is no legal requirement for formal capacity arrangements, Nalcor has developed an approach to consultation which includes the provision of funding and / or other support to Aboriginal communities and organizations to facilitate Project-related consultation, where appropriate.</p> <p>No basis for negotiating compensation or special programs has been identified through the consultation undertaken to date, as no significant effect on traditional land use or activities has been identified through the consultation to date.</p>		No additional mitigation required.
Desire for an IBA, as the transmission lines go through their territory and land claims areas	7.3	
Nalcor's approach to planning, undertaking and supporting consultation is both group- and Project-specific, given the nature and location of the proposed development and the type and level of interest by a particular Aboriginal community. It is Nalcor's practice, when required or requested, to provide translation of oral presentation in the Aboriginal language spoken by the Aboriginal group. Nalcor recognizes and acknowledges that Aboriginal communities and organizations often require additional resources and support when engaging in consultation processes, particularly with regard to large development projects and their EAs. While there is no legal requirement for formal capacity arrangements, Nalcor has developed an approach to consultation which includes the provision of funding and / or other support to Aboriginal communities and organizations to facilitate Project-related consultation, where appropriate.		No additional mitigation required.

Quebec Innu and Naskapi Communities: Summary of Responses to Questions and Issues - Transmission		
Key Questions and Issues Raised	EIS Section	Response/ Supporting Documentation
No basis the negotiation of an IBA has been identified through the consultation undertaken to date, as no significant effect on traditional land use or activities has been identified through the consultation to date.		

List of Appendices:

Appendix A - Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Guidelines, Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project, Government of Canada and Government of Newfoundland and Labrador (July 2008).

Appendix B - Report of the Joint Review Panel, Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Generation Project (August 2011).

Appendix C - Impact Statement Guidelines and Scoping Document for Labrador Island Transmission Link, Government of Canada and Government of Newfoundland and Labrador (May 2011).

Appendix D - The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador's Aboriginal Consultation Policy on Land and Resource Development Decisions ("The Policy") (April 2013).

Appendix E - News Release. Nalcor Receives EA Release for Lower Churchill Generation Project, (March 2012).

Appendix F - News release. Nalcor Receives Federal Release from EA for LITL, (November 2013).

Appendix G - Council of the Innu of Ekuanitshit v. Canada (Attorney General), 2013 FC 418 (CanLII); Council of the Innu of Ekuanitshit v. Canada (Attorney General), 2014 FCA 189; Nunatsiavut v. Canada (Department of Fisheries and Oceans), 2015 FC 492; Nunatukavut Community Council Inc. v. Newfoundland & Labrador Hydro-Electric Corp., 2011 NLTD(G) 44; Nunatukavut Community Council Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General), 2015 FC 981; Grand Riverkeeper, Labrador Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General), 2012 FC 1520.

Appendix H - News release. Canada and Nuntukavut enter into Historic Talks. (June 2018).

Appendix I - Socioeconomic Environment: Aboriginal Communities and Land Use Component Study (Nalcor Energy, 2011)

Appendix J – Environmental Impact Statement, Labrador Island transmission Link, Existing Socioeconomic Environment, Volume 3, Chapter 15 (Nalcor Energy, 2012).

Appendix K - Environmental Impact Statement, Generation, Volume 1A, Chapter 8 (Nalcor Energy, 2009)

Appendix L - Supplemental Information to IR JRP 151, Consultation Assessment Report (CAR) (Nalcor Energy, September 2010).

Appendix M - Environmental Impact Statement, Labrador Island transmission Link, Existing Socioeconomic Environment, Volume 1, Chapter 7 (Nalcor Energy, 2012).

Appendix N - Record of Engagement

Appendix O - Supporting Documentation

List of Acronyms:

CAR

EA

EIS

JRP

LITL