APPENDIX E

Manitoba Metis Federation Traditional Use, Values and Knowledge of the

Bipole III Project Study Area



MANITOBA METIS TRADITIONAL USE, VALUES AND KNOWLEDGE OF THE BIPOLE III PROJECT STUDY AREA

SUBMITTED TO: Manitoba Hydro

PREPARED BY: Manitoba Metis Federation 3rd Floor, 150 Henry Avenue Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3B 0J7

August, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List o	f Appendices	iii
List o	f Tables	iii
List o	f Figures	iv
List o	f Maps	v
Ackno	owledgements	vi
Forwa	ard to Reader	vii
1.0	INTRODUCTION	. 1
2.0	METHODS	. 2
	2.1 Traditional Use, Values and Knowledge Screening Survey	. 2
	2.1.1 Screening Survey Sampling Frame	.2
	2.1.2 Screening Survey Instrument	.4
	2.2 Traditional use, values and knowledge study	. 5
	2.2.1 Map Biography and Interview Approach	. 5
	2.2.2 Interviewee Sample and Interview Process	. 6
	2.2.3 Interview Tools	. 8
	2.2.4 Data Capture Technology	10
	2.2.5 Data Synthesis and Analysis	11
3.0	SCREENING SURVEY FINDINGS	11
	3.1 Screening Survey Respondents	11
	3.2 Demographic characteristics of Screening Survey Population	12
	3.3 Profile of Respondents Who Utilize the Project Study Area	17
4.0	MANITOBA METIS TRADITIONAL USE, VALUES AND KNOWLEDGE	
	OF THE PROJECT STUDY AREA	19
	4.1 Limitations of the Findings	19
	4.2 Characteristics of the Interviewees	19
	4.2.1 Demographic Profile	19
	4.2.2. Residency and Origins of Interviewees	20
	4.3 Overview of Traditional Harvesting Practices	21
	4.3.1 Country Food Consumption Levels	24
	4.3.2 Capital Harvesting Equipment Ownership	25
	4.3.3 Duration of Time Engaged in Traditional Activities in Project Area	25
	4.3.4 Traditional Activity and Knowledge Learning	26
	4.3.5 Traditional Use Partners	27
	4.4 ANIMAI HARVESTING	28
	4 4 1 Large Animal Harvesting	28
	4.4.2 Small Animal Harvesting	32
	4.5 FISHING	35
	4.6 GATHERING	38
	4.7 TRAPPING	40
	4.8 Cultural Sites/Places	41
	4.9 Traditional Ecological Knowledge	<u>1</u> 1
5.0	CONCLUDING DEMARKS	11
5.0	CONCLUDING REMARKS.	44

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:	Maps A – H Series
APPENDIX B:	Screening Survey Package
APPENDIX C:	TLUKS Release Form
APPENDIX D:	TLUKS Interview Guide
APPENDIX E:	TLUKS Interview Data Recording Forms
APPENDIX F:	Digital Mapping Methodologies

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1:	Traditional Use, Values and Knowledge Data Collection Framework	7
TABLE 2:	Residence Location of Screening Survey Population Versus 2006 Census	.14
TABLE 3:	Age and Gender Profile of Screening Survey Respondents who Engage	
	in Traditional Activities Within the Project Study Area	.17
TABLE 4:	Residence of Screening Survey Respondents who Engage in	
	Traditional Activities Within the Project Study Area	.18
TABLE 5:	Interviewee Income Levels	.20
TABLE 6:	Residency and Origins of Interviewees	.20
TABLE 7:	Frequency of Country Food Consumption by Interviewees	.24
TABLE 8:	Traditional Use Related Equipment Ownership by Interviewees	.25
TABLE 9:	Duration of Time Spent in Project Study Area by Decade	.26
TABLE 10:	Number of Interviewees Who Harvest Large Animals	.28
TABLE 11:	Amount of Time (Days/Year) Spent Harvesting	
	Large Animals 1970's to Present	.29
TABLE 12:	Small Animals Most Sought After by Interviewees	.33
TABLE 13:	Amount of Time (Days/Year) Spent Harvesting Small Animals	
	1970's to Present	.33
TABLE 14:	Amount of Time (Days/Year) Spent Fishing 1970's to Present	.35
TABLE 15:	Fish Species Most Sought After by Interviewees	.35
TABLE 16:	Fish Species Harvested by Number and Percentage of Areas Identified	.36
TABLE 17:	Amount of Time (Days/Year) Spent Gathering 1970's to Present	.38
TABLE 18:	Gathering Product Categories by Frequency of Area Identified	.39

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1:	Manitoba Hydro's Bipole III Project Study Area
FIGURE 2:	Age Profile of Screening Survey Population Versus 2006 Census
FIGURE 3:	Screening Survey Population Residence Compared to 2006 Census15
FIGURE 4:	MMF Regions in Manitoba
FIGURE 5:	Comparison of Interviewee and Screening Survey Populations
	Residence Location (MMF Region)
FIGURE 6:	Traditional Use Areas by Interviewee Residence
FIGURE 7:	Source of Learning About Locations by Interviewees Active in Each Decade27
FIGURE 8:	Trends in Familial Relationship of Traditional Activity Partners
FIGURE 9:	Seasonality of Moose, Deer and Elk Harvesting by Decade 1960-201030
FIGURE 10:	Seasonality of Small Animal Harvesting by Decade 1960-201034
FIGURE 11:	Seasonality of Fishing by Decade 1940-2010
FIGURE 12:	Culturally Important Sites and Places
FIGURE 13:	Traditional Ecological Knowledge

LIST OF MAPS (Maps are located in Appendix A)

- MAP A: Spatial Extent of All Animal, Fish and Gathering Harvesting Areas 1940-2010
 Map A North
 Map A Central
 Map A South
- MAP B: Spatial Extent of Large Animal Harvesting Areas 1940-2010
 Map B North
 Map B Central
 Map B South
- MAP C: Spatial Extent of Moose Harvesting Areas 1940-2010 Map C – North Map C - Central Map C - South
- MAP D: Spatial Extent of Deer Harvesting Areas 1940-2010 Map D - Central Map D - South
- MAP E: Spatial Extent of Elk Harvesting Areas 1940-2010 Map E - Central Map E - South
- MAP F: Spatial Extent of Small Animal Harvesting Areas 1940-2010 Map F – North Map F - Central Map F - South
- MAP G: Spatial Extent of Fish Harvesting Areas 1940-2010 Map G – North Map G - Central Map G - South
- MAP H: Spatial Extent of Gathering Areas 1940-2010 Map H – North Map H - Central Map H - South

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Manitoba Metis Federation expresses gratitude to the many Manitoba Metis who contributed their time and information that supports this report. The response rate to our Screening Survey in the fall of 2010 was fantastic and the information provided by almost 800 Manitoba Metis has been extremely helpful in this study, and will greatly assist the MMF with other ongoing and future work.

We would especially like to acknowledge and thank the 49 individuals who participated in the detailed Traditional Use, Values and Knowledge Study interviews. The information you shared has contributed significantly to understanding the importance of the lands, waters and resources and Manitoba Metis traditional use and values in geographic area of the proposed BiPole III Transmission Line.

The MMF would also like to thank our Industry, Energy and Resources Committee and staff, particularly Will Goodon, Cameron Stewart, Justin Stapon and Angel Aguilar. Special thanks as well to our legal and consulting contractors: Jason Madden, Patt Larcombe of Symbion Consultants, and Dr. Peter Usher.

Finally, this study was made possible through funding from Manitoba Hydro, for which the MMF is grateful.

FORWARD TO THE READER

In 2010 the Manitoba Metis Federation retained P.M. (Patt) Larcombe of Symbion Consultants to assist with the design, methodologies and implementation of the Traditional Land Use, Values and Knowledge Study presented in this report. She was largely responsible for the design and analysis of the screening survey, detailed interview process, tools, and data analysis, and preparation of this report. She conducted approximately half of the detailed interviews, with the balance carried out by Manitoba Metis Federation staff. All geospatial data was handled by Cameron Stewart, GIS specialist, employed by the Manitoba Metis Federation.

Ms. Larcombe has been a private consultant for the past 25 years, working primarily for or on behalf of Aboriginal and First Nation communities. One of her primary areas of expertise and experience is retrospective and forward-looking assessment of social, economic, and cultural impacts of major resource development projects, including impacts on traditional use and values. She has designed and implemented socio-economic and traditional use and knowledge collection studies for a number of clients across Canada, most recently for the Taku River Tlingit First Nation in British Columbia in connection with environmental assessments of the Ruby Creek Molybdenum Mine and Tulsequah Chief Gold Mine. Additionally, she has conducted gap analyses and reviews of existing collection systems and study results, again most recently for the Innu Nation in connection with the Lower Churchill River hydroelectric projects, the Tsilhqot'in Nation in connection with the Prosperity Mine, and Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation in connection with a number of oil sands projects.

The information contained in this report is provided by the Manitoba Metis Federation to Manitoba Hydro solely for purposes of the environmental assessment of the BiPole III Transmission Line project. This report is based upon limited research conducted as part of the Manitoba Metis Federation Traditional Land Use, Values and Knowledge Study and therefore does not present a complete depiction of Manitoba Metis traditional use of, values and knowledge of the lands, waters and resources for traditional purposes in the BiPole III project study area. The information contained herein should not be construed as to define, limit, or otherwise constrain the constitutional, legislative or aboriginal rights or interests of Manitoba Metis.

This report is the property of the Manitoba Metis Federation. This report, extracts of this report, and/or original information from this report may not be used, reproduced or disseminated by any party other than Manitoba Hydro, without the written permission of the Manitoba Metis Federation.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In 2010, the Manitoba Metis Federation (MMF) and Manitoba Hydro entered into an agreement to facilitate engagement of, and participation by the MMF, in the environmental assessment of Manitoba Hydro's proposed BiPole III Transmission Line. One of the main objectives of this bi-lateral agreement was for the MMF to identify any Metis rights and interests that may be impacted by the proposed BiPole III Transmission Line project, including spiritual, cultural, socio-economic, harvesting and other practices.

One of the main components of the aforementioned bi-lateral agreement called for the conduct of a "traditional knowledge study" by the MMF. This report deals with this component and describes:

- the methodologies employed in the Manitoba Metis Traditional Use, Values and Knowledge Study;
- (2) Manitoba Metis current use of lands and resources within the Project Study Area for traditional purposes; and
- (3) Manitoba Metis traditional values and knowledge about the lands, waters and resources within the Project Study Area.

2.0 METHODS

2.1 TRADITIONAL USE, VALUES AND KNOWLEDGE SCREENING SURVEY

The first phase of the MMF's Traditional Use, Values and Knowledge Study involved a Screening Survey designed to enable the identification of Manitoba Metís who use the lands, waters and resources within the Project Study Area (see Figure 1) for traditional purposes. This survey also allowed the identification of individuals who were willing to participate in more detailed interviews to document Manitoba Metís traditional use, values and knowledge.

2.1.1 Screening Survey Sampling Frame

The population chosen as the Screening Survey sample frame was comprised of individuals who meet the definition of Metis as per the MMF Constitution (2008). This population includes individuals who are acknowledged as Manitoba Metís through their acceptance under the MMF's new membership registration and/or through their acceptance under the MMF's Metis Harvester Card registration.

Section III, Membership, of the MMF Constitution (ratified on September 14, 2008) defines "Metis" as "a person who self-identifies as Métis, is of historic Métis Nation Ancestry, is distinct from other Aboriginal Peoples and is accepted by the Métis Nation." Since ratification of the 2008 Constitution, MMF has instituted a new membership application process and maintains a new membership database.

Persons included in the MMF's new membership database are individuals who have applied for and been accepted as a Metis per the definition in the MMF Constitution. Individuals who appear on this membership database have met the following criteria:

- Are at least 18 years of age;
- Self-identify as a Metis person;
- Have demonstrated their historic Metis Nation Ancestry through the submission of a professionally created genealogy document;
- Are distinct from other Aboriginal Peoples (have declared they are not registered as a member of any Indian Band under the Indian Act, R.S.C. 1985, 1-6);
- Have had their application accepted by their Local and Regional MMF Executives; and
- Have had their primary residence within the MMF Regional limits for which they have been accepted for not less than six (6) months.

Beginning in 2004, after a multi-year comprehensive consultative process with Manitoba Metis and in response to the Supreme Court of Canada *Powley* decision (September 2003), the MMF started issuing Metis Harvester Identification Cards to Manitoba Metís through an "objectively verifiable process." In order to receive a Metis Harvester Card, a Metis Harvester must:



1. *Self-identify as Metis:* The application for MMF Metis Harvester Identification Card provides an objectively verifiable way of self-identifying as a Metis. The definition of Metis used in the harvester card application form is the same as that described above under the membership criteria.

2. Show an ancestral connection to the Historic Metis Community: In order to objectively verify an ancestral connection, current MMF members and new applicants of the MMF Harvester Identification Card must submit a copy of their own or a family member's, Metis genealogy along with their application form;

3. *Be accepted by the contemporary Metis Community:* Applicants must have their application and supporting documents reviewed and certified by their MMF Local Chair or Local Executive Designate. If approved, the application is forwarded to the Regional Office for processing. Finally, objectively verifiable means of showing acceptance by today's Manitoba Metis Community is to have the MMF, as the duly elected self-government representative of the Metis Nation within Manitoba, issue the MMF Metis Harvester Identification Card to the applicant.

Metis Harvesters must have their Metis Harvester Identification Card validated on a yearly basis. Persons in possession of the card may be as young as 12 years of age. For purposes of developing the Screening Survey population list, all individuals aged 15 years and older holding a valid harvester card were extracted from the MMF database.

There were 1,886 individuals on the new membership list and 1,862 individuals on the Harvester Card list as of June, 2010. There were 470 individuals listed in both the membership and Harvester Card lists. The combined lists yielded a Screening Survey population of 3,278 individuals aged 15 years and older. The final list was randomly sorted and then each person was allocated a unique personal identification number or PIN, starting with the number 1000.

2.1.2 Screening Survey Instrument

The Screening Survey was distributed via regular mail on October 1, 2010 to 3,278 individuals. Completed surveys, as well as packages returned as 'undeliverable' (incorrect addresses or marked 'moved' or 'no longer at this address') were received by the MMF over a period of approximately two months.

The Screening Survey package consisted of five parts: (1) a cover letter signed by the MMF Hydro Minister, (2) brief descriptions of a number of projects being proposed in the Province; (3) general information and instructions concerning the Screening Survey; (4) the Screening Survey; and (5) a postage stamped MMF return envelope. A copy of the package is included in Appendix B.

The survey portion of the package was comprised of six pages. Page one was a title page and contained a box with each individuals unique personal identification number (PIN). The next four pages each contained a map covering one quarter of the Province (i.e. northeast, northwest, southeast and southwest). The maps did not depict the location of any of the large-scale projects

being proposed in the province to minimize the possibility that respondents would be influenced or biased to identify areas within the project areas. Respondents were instructed to draw the areas on each relevant map where they routinely and regularly go to for purposes of traditional activities. Each of the four map pages also contained a table for respondents to indicate which traditional activities (hunting, fishing, trapping, and gathering) they engage in for each map sheet. The last page of the survey asked questions about the respondent's interest in participating in a detailed interview about their traditional activities. The MMF is also involved in work related to woodland caribou and sturgeon, and thus also utilized the survey to develop a list of individuals who may be interested in participating in workshops on these species.

2.2 TRADITIONAL LAND USE, VALUES AND KNOWLEDGE STUDY

The MMF's traditional land use, values and knowledge study was designed to assemble and document information concerning the spatial, temporal and other characteristics of Manitoba Metis use of lands, waters, and resources related to the exercise of rights associated with non-domestic food and other product acquisition, processing and consumption and associated cultural, social and economic benefits derived from such traditional use. The temporal framework of the study is directed at documenting traditional use by the living generation and therefore is designed to assemble information about the actual locations utilized and the activities undertaken by the interviewees in their lifetime. With the exception of trapping, traditional use in the context of this study does not include commercial activities (e.g. outfitting, guiding, or commercial fishing) or purely recreational use (e.g. catch and release fishing, camping, hiking or cottaging with no associated food or other form of personal production activity).

The study was also designed to solicit and document historic, social and/or cultural sites or places of importance to individuals, families and extended families, and/or the Manitoba Metis as a collective. Like traditional ecological knowledge, this knowledge may be learned from previous generations or discovered by the interviewee on her/his own. Finally, the study was designed to solicit and document traditional ecological knowledge held by Manitoba Metis.

2.2.1 Map Biography and Interview Approach

The MMF designed and employed an interview and map biography information collection approach largely based upon industry standard methods described in Tobias (2009).¹ The study design was also based upon discussions and conclusions derived during a workshop held by the MMF in June, 2010.² At this workshop, it was determined that the MMF would design a traditional use and knowledge study framework and tools that could be applied consistently to a number of current studies and continue to be applied into the future.

¹ Tobias, Terry. 2009. Living Proof-The Essential Data-Collection Guide for Indigenous Use and Occupancy Map Surveys. Ecotrust Canada and Union of B.C. Indian Chiefs.

² One day workshop held at MMF offices in Winnipeg involving legal and technical advisors from across Canada and MMF staff members.

MMF's traditional use and knowledge study is designed to document the "what, where, when, who and why" aspects of use of lands, waters and resources for traditional purposes, as well as the location and nature of historic and contemporary sites and features that hold cultural and/or spiritual value to Manitoba Metis, and traditional ecological knowledge. The types of information collected are summarized in Table 1.

2.2.2 Interviewee Sample and Interview Process

MMF's goal was to conduct 50 detailed interviews. This goal was not based upon an analysis of what would constitute a statistically valid sample size, but rather represented a realistic number of interviews that could be completed given the budget and timelines for the study.

Initially, a list of potential interview candidates was generated based upon the Screening Survey results. Of the 382 respondents who were determined to engage in traditional use in the Project Study Area, 60 indicated they would be willing to participate in a more detailed interview. These potential interviewees were contacted by telephone and arrangements made to conduct interviews during the week day during either a morning, afternoon or evening session.

A total of 49 interviewees were completed between November 12, 2010 and July 28, 2011. Interviews were conducted at MMF's main office in Winnipeg, and at regional or local offices in Selkirk, Brandon, Dauphin, Swan River, The Pas, and Thompson, Manitoba. Interviews were held with single interviewees in a quiet room. Each interview was conducted by a team of two individuals, one responsible for implementing the Interview Guide (see Section 2.2.3.1) and the other responsible for the mapping component.

At the outset of the interview, the interviewee was apprised of the purpose of the interview and what to expect during the interview, given a brief overview of the BiPole III project and environmental assessment review process by both Manitoba and Canada, and asked if they would allow the interview to be videotaped. Interviewees were informed that they would be provided a copy of the videotaped interview and a copy of their personal map(s) as a thank you from the MMF for their time in participating in the interview. The interviewer then explained that a release form was required to be signed in order for the interview to proceed. The interviewee was provided a copy of the release form to read and informed that they could ask questions about the form before signing it. Two copies of the release form were signed by both the interviewee and the interviewer, and one copy provided to the interviewee. A copy of the release form is included in Appendix C. Once the release form was signed the data collection component of the interviewee, the interviews generally took between two to three hours to complete. Once an interview was completed, the interviewee was asked to sign each of the maps in which their information had been documented.

As explained in greater detail in Section 2.2.3.2 the study utilized 1:250,000 scale topographic sheets as basemaps for recording the Interviewees spatial information. During each interview, the interview team had a laptop computer with 1:50,000 scale topographic maps available for viewing on a larger monitor screen in the event that the Interviewee required a larger scale to locate a particular feature, waterbody, etc.

	TABLE 1: Tradit	ional Use, Values a	nd Knowledge Data	Collection Framewor	k			
		Data Category				Туре	Mapped/ Non-Mapped Data	
Type of Information	Harvesting Activity	Overnight Places & Access Routes	Cultural and Historic Places/Sites	Traditional Knowledge	Qualitative	Quantitative	Spatial	Non-Spatial
What	 fish species small animal species large animal species plant and other gathered species trapped species 	 bush camps cabins campground portage boat landing ATV trail skidoo trail horse trail 	 burial/birth sites historic village sites historic event sites battle sites important landscape features sacred/spiritual places/sites other 	 fish spawning areas by species bird nesting area by species large mammal seasonal habitat, calving/birthing site, migration route by species salt lick other 	۰		۲	•
Where	 polygon, point or line showing geographic extent of area used to harvest species 	 point or line showing geographic location of feature 	 polygon, point or line showing geographic location of feature 	 polygon, point or line showing geographic location of feature 	•		٠	•
When	 decade(s) area used season(s) area used for harvesting # trips/year to area # days/year spent in area 	• decade(s) area used	 season(s) feature accessed frequency feature accessed 	• season(s) area important	0	•	•	0
Who	 activity partner(s) by familial connection 				•			۲
Why	 from whom learned about place reason goes to this location reason stopped going to this location 				•			۲

7

Non-Spatial

2.2.3 Interview Tools

2.2.3.1 Interview Guide

During the design phase of the study an Interview Guide or 'manual' was developed to ensure that the interviewers conducted the interviews in a consistent manner and to document how data was to be recorded on both the base maps and the data entry forms. A copy of this guide is included in Appendix D.

2.2.3.2 Base Maps

Sixteen base maps at a scale of 1:250,000 covering the entirety of the Project Study Area, as defined by Manitoba Hydro, were used during the interviews. These maps, as will be described in Section 2.2.3, were printed from Arcview using Capturx software. Fresh maps were used with each interviewee and upon completion of the interview, the interviewees PIN, name, date, and names of the interviewers were recorded on each map sheet utilized. Additionally, the interviewee signed each map sheet.

Information about traditional use, cultural and/or traditional knowledge location identified by the interviewee was documented as a polygon (e.g. harvesting area), line (e.g. trail) or point (e.g. bush camp) and each polygon, line or point was given a unique sequential number or tag. Thus every mapped feature was allocated a unique identification number comprised of the combination of the Interviewees PIN and the tag number.

2.2.3.3 Data Recording Forms

Four data recording forms were designed and employed to document information during the interview. Form A, filled in at the start of the interview, was designed to document basic socioeconomic information about the interviewee including age, gender, birth place and residence history, parental birth place and residence history, employment status, education status, marital status, and income. This form also documented information regarding ownership of equipment typically used in traditional activities and traditional food consumption levels.

Forms B, C and D were designed to link contextual information (the what, when, who and why data) to each discrete numbered (tagged) geographic feature (polygon, point or line) on the interviewee's map, as illustrated in the graphic below. A fresh form was used for each and every mapped feature and linked to the spatial reference through the common PIN and tag number.



Form B was designed to document each species or category of animal, fish, plants and other materials harvested for food and other non-commercial purposes (e.g. medicines, craft materials, fuel wood), occupation sites and access routes for each area identified on the base map by the interviewee. For each harvesting, occupation or access route tag, the form included fields for the following information:

- the timeframe (decade or decades) the interviewee had utilized the area;
- the time of year (season) the interviewee had utilized the area;
- the frequency (average number of trips per year) and duration of stay (average number of days per year) in the area;
- who the interviewee typically engaged in traditional activities with while in the particular area (immediate family, extended family, partners immediate and extended family and friends/other;
- from whom the interviewee learned about using the area (self, family, friend);
- if the interviewee had discontinued using an area, the reason(s) why; and
- notes field for additional information.

It is important to note that if an interviewee utilized the same tag for a different species at a different time of the year or during a separate trip, the area was given two different tag numbers. For example, if an Interview indicated that they utilize the same area for moose harvesting and upland game bird harvesting, but that they engage in these activities at different times of the year or on mutually exclusive trips, the area was given two tag numbers, one for moose and another for upland game birds. This procedure was done to ensure that the total number of trips and days spent engaged in traditional activities was properly accounted for, as well as to prevent overgeneralization within tags with respect to information such as seasonality, activity partners, etc.

9

Form C was designed to document information about cultural sites/places and traditional ecological knowledge. Finally, Form D was designed to document information about trapping activities. Copies of each of Forms A through D are included in Appendix E.

The interview guide, mapping protocol and data entry forms were tested during two preliminary interviews and adjustments made based upon issues recognized during the testing. Some of the refinements included adding additional species to the form list, and adding an additional data cell to record whether the tag was situated within the Project Study Area.³

2.2.4 Data Capture Technology

MMF employed 'real time data capture' software marketed by Adapx under the name Capturx. Real time data capture means that the spatial and contextual information provided by each interviewee was recorded using digital pen technology in conjunction with base maps and data entry forms printed using the Capturx software (which prints an almost invisible layer of microdots onto the paper which the digital pen reads).

In the case of the base maps, the digital pen loaded with Capturx for Arcview software recognizes the polygons, lines and points drawn on the base map during each interview in relation to the georeferenced spatial coordinates on the base map. The pen is then docked to a computer and the data downloaded directly into an Arcview geospatial database (see Appendix F for technical information). This system eliminates the need to have to digitize spatial information derived from each interview, saving time and eliminating the potential for digitizing error. As the digital pen also draws with regular ink, an original copy of the map biography is preserved and can be archived.

In the case of the contextual data related to each area drawn on the base map, the digital pen loaded with Capturx for Excel software records the data on the aforementioned four data entry forms. Upon completion of an interview, the pen is docked to a computer and the data is directly downloaded into the Excel program. Each interviewee's downloaded data was saved as a 'raw' file and then checked for accuracy against the hard copy form (i.e. ensuring all check boxes were recorded properly, ensuring number and text fields are correct, and spell checking). Once the quality control exercise was completed, each file was saved in new folder and labeled 'clean'. The information in the 'clean' file was then 'summarized' by the Capturx software and saved as a new 'summary' file. The summarized file strings all the data from each form into a single continuous row. Check box data is converted to 'true' or 'false' and numbers and text appear just as they did in the original 'clean' file. Finally, all summarized data from each interview for each of the four data forms were joined and then exported to Microsoft Access.

³ As the MMF is interested in documenting Manitoba Metis traditional use in general, any information provided by the Interviewees concerning traditional use, values or knowledge anywhere on the map sheets used for the BiPole III study was documented. The added data entry cell on Forms B, C and D permits the isolation and removal of data pertaining to tags outside of the Project Study Area prior to synthesis and analysis.

2.2.5 Data Synthesis and Analysis

A Microsoft Access database was created to import and house all of the Form A through D summarized Excel data. Custom tables and queries were developed for downloading data into Arcview GIS software.

Spatial data from all Interviewees was compiled (joined) to produce composite theme maps as listed below. The geographic expanse of the Project Study Area does not lend itself to depicting information on a single map sheet. Therefore in order to enhance readability, where applicable maps were generated for the northerly portion (e.g. Map A-North); central portion (e.g. Map A-Central); and southern portion (e.g. Map A-South).

- All animal, fish and gathering use areas (Map A series).
- All large animal harvesting areas Map B series)
- Moose harvesting areas (Map C series)
- Deer harvesting areas (Map D series)
- Elk harvesting areas (Map E series)
- All small animal harvesting areas (Map F series)
- Fish harvesting areas (Map G series)
- Gathering areas (Map H series)

Maps pertaining to cultural values and traditional ecological knowledge are included in the main body of the report. Methods for producing all major map products are described in Appendix F.

3.0 SCREENING SURVEY FINDINGS

3.1 Screening Survey Respondents

Of the 3,278 surveys that were distributed by mail, 797 were returned yielding a response rate of 24.3%. Of the 2,481 surveys not returned, 5.2% (172) were returned by the Post Master as undeliverable (moved/unknown, incomplete address, no such address) and the remainder (2,309/70.4%) were not returned at all. Of the 797 surveys returned, 62 (7.8%) were returned blank, leaving 735 surveys which contained information about if the respondent engaged in traditional activities, and if so, the geographic locations where they engage in traditional activities and the types of activities they pursue.

Of the 735 Screening Surveys returned with information, it was determined that 52% (382) of the respondents engage in one or more traditional use activities within the Project Study Area. That is, they drew areas on the quadrant maps included in the Screening Survey that were subsequently determined to be situated within the Project Study Area. Another 56 respondents (7.6% of 735) indicated they engage in hunting, fishing, trapping and/or gathering within the southwest, northwest and northeast quadrant maps, but since they did not actually mark any areas on these map quadrant sheets, it is not known whether they participate in traditional activities specifically within the Project Study Area.

3.2 Demographic Characteristics of Screening Survey Population

This section describes the broad demographic characteristics of the Screening Survey population and discusses how representative this population is relative to the broader Metis population in Manitoba. For the purposes of this discussion, 2006 Census data are used as a basis for characterizing the broader Metis population. Specifically, demographic data about the Manitoba population that self-identified in the 2006 Census as 'Metis-single response' are relied upon to characterize the adult (age 15 years and older) provincial Metis population. The phrase "single response" means individuals who self-identified as being of Aboriginal ethnic identity and who only chose the Metis category box from the list of potential Aboriginal categories.

According to the 2006 Census, the gender ratio of Metis, aged 15 years and older, was 48.7% male and 51.6% female. In the Screening Survey population, males are significantly over represented (66%) versus the 2006 Census (48.7%). This is largely attributed to the fact that the majority (81.3%) of MMF Harvester Card holders are male and approximately half the individuals in the Screening Survey population are derived from the Harvester Card database. It is noted that females are also under-represented in the MMF membership list (46.1%) versus the 2006 Census (51.6%).

The age composition of the Screening Survey population versus that reported in the 2006 Census is shown in Figure 2. It can be seen that the Screening Survey population is generally older than the 2006 Census profile, with a higher percentage of people in age brackets 45 years and older. There are at least two reasons for this. First, the Screening Survey population is based in part on the membership list which only includes individuals aged 18 years and older. Secondly, the age profile of the Screening Survey population that did not return the survey (mean age = 42/median age = 43) was younger than the population that did return the survey (mean age 48/median age = 50).⁴

⁴ Includes surveys returned as undeliverable by the post master.



Table 2 and Figure 3 below compare the residence location (MMF Region) of the Screening Survey population and the 2006 Census population. The top half of Table 2 shows the number and percentage of Metis who live in the 7 MMF Regions in Manitoba and the bottom half of the table shows the percentages by MMF Region with the Winnipeg Region excluded. The top half of Table 2 and Figure 3 reveals that Winnipeg MMF Region Metis are under-represented in the Screening Survey population. However, when the Winnipeg Metis population is excluded (see bottom half of Table 2), the relative proportioning of the Screening Survey population amongst the remaining six MMF Regions reasonably approximates the 2006 Census profile, with the exception that the Thompson MMF Region is under-represented. The boundaries of the MMF Regions are depicted in Figure 4.

	20 Census Pe Metis Respo	2006 Census Population Metis Single Response ⁵		ng Survey ulation
ALL MANITOB	A:			
MMF Region	#	%	#	%
Interlake	5040	9.7%	501	15.3%
Northwest	3655	7.0%	395	12.1%
Southeast	6110	11.7%	613	18.7%
Southwest	5650	10.8%	443	13.5%
The Pas	2390	4.6%	304	9.3%
Thompson	1775	3.4%	111	3.4%
Winnipeg	27480	52.7%	911	27.8%
TOTAL	52100	100.0%	3278	100.0%
WINNIPEG EXC	CLUDED:			
MMF Region	#	%	#	%
Interlake	5040	20.5%	501	21.2%
Northwest	3655	14.8%	395	16.7%
Southeast	6110	24.8%	613	25.9%
Southwest	5650	22.9%	443	18.7%
The Pas	2390	9.7%	304	12.8%
Thompson	1775	7.2%	111	4.7%
Winnipeg	27480	52.7%	911	27.8%
TOTAL	24620	100.0%	2367	100.0%

TABLE 2: Residence Location of Screening Survey Population Versus 2006 Census

⁵ The breakdown of this population data by MMF Region was done through a working arrangement between the MMF and Statistics Canada.





3.3 Profile of Respondents who Utilize the Project Study Area

Table 3 below provides a demographic overview of the 382 respondents found to engage in traditional activities within the Project Study Area (marked areas on the maps that were determined to be within the Project Study Area) relative to the overall Screening Survey population. It can be seen that the respondent sample that engages in traditional activity within the Project Study Area are predominantly male. The mean and median age of the 382 respondents are similar to the Screening Survey population, however they are under-represented in the youngest age bracket.

	All Screening Respond	g Survey ents	Respondents Who Use the Project Study Area		
GENDER	#	%	#	%	
Male	544	68.3	296	89.9	
Female	253	32.7	86	10.1	
TOTAL	797	100.0	382	100.0	
AGE	#	%	#	%	
<25 Years	93	11.7	27	7.1	
25-34 Years	92	11.5	45	11.8	
35-44 Years	90	11.3	46	12.0	
45-54 Years	210	26.4	101	26.4	
55-64 Years	176	22.0	90	23.6	
65+ Years	136	17.0	73	19.1	
TOTAL	797	100.0	382	100.0	
MEAN	49		50		
MEDIAN	50		52		
RANGE	16-90		17-86		

TABLE 3: Age and Gender Profile of Screening Survey Respondents Who Engage in Traditional Activities within the Project Study Area

Table 4 indicates the residence location of Respondents who indicated they engage in traditional activities within the Project Study Area. It can be seen that most of the respondents reside in the Northwest, Southwest, Winnipeg and Pas MMF Regions.

17

MMF REGION	#	%
Northwest	79	20.7%
Southwest	76	19.9%
Winnipeg	75	19.6%
The Pas	64	16.8%
Southeast	41	10.7%
Interlake	40	10.5%
Thompson	7	1.8%
TOTAL	382	100%

TABLE 4: Residence of Screening Survey Respondents whoEngage in Traditional Activities Within the Project Study Area

4.0 MANITOBA METIS TRADITIONAL USE, VALUES AND KNOWLEDGE OF THE PROJECT STUDY AREA

4.1 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY FINDINGS

The Project Study Area covers a vast expanse of the north, central, and southern areas of the province. A study area of this geographic magnitude is not commonly considered when undertaking traditional use, values and knowledge studies for a particular aboriginal group or population. Further, as described in Section 3.3 of this report, Manitoba Metis who indicated in the Screening Survey that they engage in traditional pursuits within the Project Study Area are disbursed throughout the province. As a consequence of these two factors, characterizing Manitoba Metis traditional use, values and knowledge based upon a sample size of 49 individuals must be viewed with great caution. To be specific, the information provided by the 49 Interviewees and described in the balance of this section of the report is considered a highly accurate depiction of their traditional activities and patterns. However, this information should only be considered illustrative of the likely broader Manitoba Metis population traditional use and practices within the Project Study Area.

4.2 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INTERVIEWEES

4.2.1 Demographic Profile

The average and median ages of the 49 Interviewees were both 53 (range 25 to 78 years of age). Five of the 49 Interviewees were female. Average and median household size were both 3.0 (range 1-8). Most (89.6%) Interviewees were married.

In terms of highest level of education, slightly more than a third of Interviewees had achieved grade 12 or less (36.7%); another 22.49% had a high school diploma or equivalency; 10.2% had some university or a graduate degree, 2.0% had a post graduate degree and 28.6% had a diploma or certificate. Over half (59.2%) of the Interviewees are employed full-time year round, 24.5% were retired, 10.2% were employed part time, or full time/part time on a seasonal basis, and the remaining 6.1% were temporarily laid off or had not worked in the past six month.

Table 5 indicates personal and family income levels (combination of earned income, investment income, pension earnings and transfer payments). Just over a third of the Interviewees have personal annual income of between \$40,000-\$59,999. Compared to overall Manitoba income levels, the Interviewees have higher incomes, particularly in the \$40,000+ brackets (i.e. 23.2% of Manitoban's had personal incomes of \$40,000 or greater versus 59.1% of Interviewees).⁶ The

⁶ As compared to 2006 Census data for Manitoba. See <u>http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2006/dp-pd/tbt/Rp-eng.cfm?TABID=1&LANG=E&APATH=3&DETAIL=0&DIM=0&FL=A&FREE=0&GC=0&GK=0&GRP=1&PID=94197&PRID=0&PTYPE=88971.97154&S=0&SHOWALL=0&SUB=0&Temporal=2006&THEME=81&VID=0&VNAMEE=&VNAMEF=</u>

same applies, although to a lesser extent, to family income levels (i.e. 78.2% of Manitoba families had family incomes of \$40,000 or greater versus 89.3% of Interviewee families).⁷

Income Bracket	Personal Income	Family Income
< \$20,000/year	16.3%	4.1%
\$20,000-\$39,999/year	24.5%	10.2%
\$40,000-\$59,999/year	36.7%	22.4%
\$60,000-\$74,999/year	12.2%	18.4%
\$75,000 +/year	10.2%	42.9%
No Answer	0.0%	2.0%

TABLE 5: Interviewee Income Levels

4.2.2 Residency and Origins of Interviewees

Table 6 below indicates the MMF regions that the Interviewees were residing in at the time of their interview, where they were born, and where their parents were born. Almost half of the people interviewed were residing either in the Winnipeg or Interlake MMF Regions at the time of their interview (see Figure 5). Interviewees from the Interlake Area are over-represented in the sample. Similar proportions were residing in the Northwest, Thompson, Pas and Southwest MMF Regions.

	Interviewee Residence at Time of Interview		Inte Plac	erviewee e of Birth	Inte Paren	erviewees ats Place of Birth
MMF REGION	#	%	#	%	#	%
Winnipeg	14	28.6%	9	18.4%	10	10.2%
Southeast	2	4.1%	7	14.3%	16	13.3%
Interlake	10	20.4%	6	12.2%	12	12.2%
Northwest	5	10.2%	8	16.3%	23	23.5%
Thompson	6	12.2%	3	6.1%	0	0.0%
The Pas	5	10.2%	8	16.3%	10	10.2%
Southwest	7	14.3%	5	10.2%	14	14.3%
Unknown/Out of Province	0	0.0%	3	6.1%	16	16.3%
TOTAL	49	100.0%	49	100.0%	98	100.0%

TABLE 6: Residency and Origins of Interviewees

⁷ Figure adjusted to exclude "no answer" data.



Two-thirds of the Interviewees had been living at their current place of residence for ten or more years and another fifth had lived at that location for between 5 to 10 years.

Almost all (93.7%) of the Interviewees were born in Manitoba. Those born in the province come from all MMF Regions. The fewest numbers of Interviewees were born in the Thompson MMF Region, while the remaining regional areas are all relatively equally represented (see Table 6).

The majority (83.3%) of the Interviewees parents were also born in Manitoba (see Table 6). Almost a quarter were born in the MMF Northwest Region, less than 10% were born in the Winnipeg Region, and none were reported to be born within the Thompson Region. Relatively similar numbers were born in the Southeast, Southwest, Interlake and The Pas regions.

4.3 OVERVIEW OF MANITOBA METIS TRADITIONAL USE

The 49 Manitoba Metis who participated in the detailed TLUK interviews to date identified a total of 419 food harvesting and 82 trapping polygon/point/line areas or "tags" within the Project Study Area.⁸ Map Series A shows all areas the Interviewees identified as having used for food harvesting and trapping, as well as sites or places of cultural and ecological importance.

Figure 6 shows the traditional use areas identified by Interviewees based upon the MMF Region they resided in at the time of their interview. As indicated in Table 6, the majority of the

⁸ Maps A – H depict some tags (polygons/points/lines) that lie outside of the Project Study Area, however these tags are excluded from all quantitative descriptions in this report.

Interviewees resided in the Winnipeg, Interlake and Southwest MMF Regions at the time of the interviews. Figure 6 indicates that Interviewees from these three regions engage in traditional activities throughout the Project Study Area. Interviewees residing in the Northwest MMF Region tend to engage in traditional activities primarily in the west central portion of the Project Study Area and Interviewees resident in the Thompson and The Pas MMF Regions tend have more localized use areas. Due to the small number of Interviewees who participated in the TLUKS to date, whether these geographic use patterns are indicative of Manitoba Metis harvesters in general cannot be determined.

A large proportion of the Interviewees reported harvesting large animals (88%) and fishing (88%). Almost a third reported harvesting small animals (63%) and less than half (41%) reported they engage in gathering activities. Twenty-nine percent of the Interviewees engage in both large and small animal harvesting, fishing and gathering activities and another quarter (24%) engage in large and small animal harvesting and fishing activities. Few of the Interviewees only engage in one category of harvesting; 8% reported they only engage in large animal harvesting; 6% reported they only engage in food fishing; and none reported only engaging in small animal or gathering activities.



FIGURE 6: Traditional Use Areas by Interviewee Residence (MMF Region)

The general seasonal pattern of traditional use for the decade 2000-2010 is illustrated below. Fall is the most important season for large and small animal harvesting, followed by winter and then summer. Summer and then winter are the seasons when fishing effort is highest. Berries and other edible plants are harvested predominantly from late summer through to fall freeze-up, while medicines are harvested throughout the year. Finally, fuel wood is harvested primarily from late fall through winter under frozen ground conditions.

Harvesting Activity	Spring	Summer	Fall	l.	Winter
Moose	e			2.44	
Dee	r		CERCE SALL		TOSAN E TOSE IV
Upland Birds	S			12	
Waterfow	1			12.9	
Fishing	g			1.	
Berries	S	The second			
Medicines	S				
Fuel Wood	d States and the states of the				
Most predominant season	2 nd most predominant season	3 rd most predomina	ant season		least used season

4.3.1 Country Food Consumption Levels

Interviewees were asked how often in the past year they had consumed a meal of bush or country food that they personally harvested or had been given to them by another family member or friend. The results in Table 7 below indicate that a majority of Interviewees (85.4%) consumed country food at least once per week and close to two-thirds (60.4%) consumed country food 2-3 times per week or more. These levels pertain to all country foods derived from all locations, not solely from the Project Study Area.

Frequency	% Reporting
None	0.0%
1-11 times/year	4.1%
Once per month	6.1%
2-3 times/month	4.1%
Once/week	24.5%
2-3 times/week	36.7%
4-5 times/week	12.2%
> 5 times/week	12.2%
TOTAL	100%

TABLE 7: Frequency of Country Food Consumption by Interviewees

4.3.2 Capital Harvesting Equipment Ownership

Interviewees were asked if they personally owned various equipment typically used in conjunction with traditional activities. Table 8 indicates the percentage of Interviewees who personally own each of the types of capital equipment. Almost all (92%) Interviewees reported owning a truck, about two-thirds own a motorized boat, slightly more than half own an all-terrain vehicle, and approximately half own skidoos and canoes. Two-thirds of the Interviewees own three or more types of equipment in the list.

Equipment Type	% Reporting Ownership		
All-Terrain Vehicle	58%		
Skidoo	54%		
Canoe	54%		
Motorized Boat	67%		
Truck	94%		
% of Interviewees Who Own	1 Piece of Equipment	17%	
% of Interviewees Who Own 2 Pieces of Equipment			
% of Interviewees Who Own 3 Pieces of Equipment			
% of Interviewees Who Own 4 Pieces of Equipment			
% of Interviewees Who Own	5 Pieces of Equipment	21%	

TABLE 8:	Traditional Use Related Equipment Ownership				
by Interviewees					

4.3.3 Duration of Time Engaged in Traditional Activities in Project Area

Table 9 indicates the total number of days the Interviewees estimated they spent in the Project Study Area on an annual basis by decade.⁹¹⁰ It is noted that not all Interviewees provided information of the number of days spent at each area or tag identified during their interview. In some cases, particularly when discussing traditional use in the earlier decades, the Interviewees indicated they couldn't recall the exact number of days or they made general references such as "I went all the time." When an Interviewee could not precisely identify the number of days, no information was recorded for that particular tag/area.

⁹ Due to the method employed when conducting the interviews, the total number of days generally does not double count time spent by an interviewe engaged in different activities (e.g. fishing, gathering, hunting) or harvesting different species (e.g. upland game and moose). For example, if an area (tag) was identified by the interviewee as a place where they engaged in both moose and upland birds harvesting, they were asked if they engaged in both activities during the same trip. If the answer was that they engaged in these two activities at different times of the year, the area was given two separate tag numbers and information about the number of trips and days/year for each activity was recorded separately. If they answered they did/do engage in both activities at the same time, the area was given a single tag number and the number of days was recorded once for that area.

¹⁰ Data for the 1940's suppressed due to small sample size.

The average number of days per year spent by the Interviewees (all hunting, fishing and gathering activities) has ranged from a low of a low of 40.6 days/year in the 1980's to a high of 54.5 in the 1970's. The mean number of days has ranged from a low of 24.0 in the 2000's to a high of 36.9 in the 1970's.

In the most recent decade, the 2000's, the Interviewees collectively spent approximately 2,015 days per year engaged in hunting, fishing and gathering activities within the Project Study Area. The average number of days per annum each Interviewee spent engaged in traditional activities was 49 days. Half of the Interviews spent more than 24 days (median 24) per year in the Project Study Area. Study Area.

	1950's	1960's	1970's	1980's	1990's	2000's
# Interviewees Who Provided Information on # Days	4	12	28	42	44	41
Total # days/year	207	597	1526	1705	1895	2015
Mean days/year/Interviewee	51.8	49.8	54.5	40.6	43.1	49.1
Median days/year/Interviewee	30.0	31.0	36.9	25.2	28.9	24.0
Range of days/year	7-140	3-313	3-141	2-223	1-269	4-260

 TABLE 9:

 Duration of Time Spent in Project Study Area by Decade¹¹

In general, the Interviewees make multiple trips to different locales to engage in specific harvesting activities. For example, trips for the purposes of harvesting large animals such as moose, elk and deer are typically done in the same season but on separate trips. Fishing is typically done independent of large and small animal harvesting, i.e. few Interviewees reported fishing during the same time as hunting. Gathering is typically done while engaged in fishing or done as a unique activity independent of other activities.

4.3.4 Traditional Activity and Knowledge Learning

Interviewees were asked from whom they learned to go to each area (tag) identified in their map biography for purposes of engaging in traditional use. Forty-six percent of the locations identified were learned about by the Interviewees from their own family members, 36% of locations were learned about through friends or others, and 18% of locations were discovered by the Interviewee's themselves.

Figure 7 illustrates from whom each area or tag the Interviewees learned on a decade-by-decade basis. For example, of all tags identified by Interviewees active in the 1970's, 54% of the areas

¹¹ Data only includes days spent for tags situated within the Project Study Area.

were learned about through family members. The data suggests that as the Interviewees age, information from friends regarding good places to go for traditional activities increases in importance.



4.3.5 Traditional Use Partners

Figure 8 illustrates who the Interviewees spend their time with while engaged in traditional activities, on a decade by decade basis. Information provided by the Interviewees regarding their activity partners were re-organized into five categories as follows:

'Immediate Family'	-	includes spouse/partner and own children.
'Own Generation'	-	includes brothers, sisters, and cousins.
'2 nd Generation'	-	includes parents, and aunts/uncles.
'3 rd Generation'	-	Includes grandparents and grandparents, great aunts, uncles, etc.
'Spouse/Partners Family'	-	includes in-laws, brother/sister in-laws, and other members of extended family.
'Friend/Other'	-	includes non-familial related friends, co- workers, etc.

Figure 8 indicates that the Interviewees generally began their traditional activity experiences in the company of their parents, aunts and uncles and siblings and cousins, and as they aged, married and had children, they spent more time with their immediate family and spouse/partner's family, as well as friends.

27



4.4 ANIMAL HARVESTING

4.4.1 Large Animal Harvesting

Most Interviewees (87.7% or 43/49) reported harvesting one or more large animal species within the Project Study Area at some point in their lifetime. The number of Interviewees who harvested various species of large animals are listed in Table 10. Moose is the most sought after species of large animals by Interviewees, followed by deer and then elk.

	Interviewees Who Reported Hunting Species				
Large Animal Species	#	% of all 49 Interviewees	% of 43 Interviewees who engaged in harvesting large animals		
Moose	33	67%	77%		
Deer	26	53%	60%		
Elk	22	45%	51%		
Black Bear	4	8%	9%		
Woodland Caribou	3	6%	7%		
Barren Land Caribou	2	4%	5%		

TABLE 10: Number of Interviewees who Harvest Large Animals
During the past four decades, the average (mean) number of days spent harvesting all large animals has ranged from approximately 19 to 21 days/year/harvester, and the median number of days during the same four decade period has remained constant at 14.0 (see Table 11 below). The number of trips/year/harvester during the same timeframe has been a mean of 9-11 trips and a median of 3-6 trips/year.

	1970's	1980's	1990's	2000's
# Interviewees engaged in activity	17	32	32	33
Mean Days	20.6	18.8	19.6	19.4
Median Days	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0
Range in Days	3-75	3-82	1-82	4-82

TABLE 11: Amount of Time (Days/Year) Spent Harvesting Large Animals 1970's to Present

Map Series B shows all locations identified as being used for large animal hunting during the period from 1940-2010. In total, the 49 Interviewees identified 158 areas (tags) where one or more large animals were sought for food harvesting purposes. The numbers of single large animal use areas (meaning only one large animal species was identified as being pursued in a particular area/tag) and multiple large animal use areas (meaning more than one large animal species was identified as being pursued in the same area/tag during the same trip) are show below.

What the maps (see Map Series B) and data below indicate is that Interviewees target specific geographic areas to hunt for moose, elk and deer and make separate trips in a year to harvest each species. For example, although Interviewees may utilize the same general area (e.g. Duck Mountains) for large animal harvesting purposes, most will make one or more trips annually to seek out moose and another trip or more to seek out deer or elk. The data in the list below indicates that few of the Interviewees seek out more than one species during any given trip. For example, only 5% of the total large animal tags (areas) are used for simultaneously harvesting elk and moose, elk and deer, or elk and deer. This behaviour is in large part attributable to the Interviewees abiding by the Manitoba Metis Federation "Laws of the Harvest" as well as provincial regulations concerning sport hunting seasons. There is, however, also a tendency on the part of the Interviewees to favour single species harvesting practices for social reasons. For example, some of the Interviewees indicated they go to place 'x' with group 'y' every year for moose hunting and then will make another trip with the same or different group or activity partner to the same locale for deer. Social interaction with family or friends appears to also be an important factor governing harvesting activities.

Species	% of Tags Identified
Deer Only	23%
Moose Only	43%
Elk Only	15%
Elk and Moose	5%
Elk and Deer	5%
Deer and Moose	5%
Elk, Deer and Moose	3%

Harvesting of moose, deer and elk during the past four decades has occurred primarily in the fall season and secondarily in the winter season as illustrated in Figure 9 below. The seasonality of moose, deer and elk harvesting patterns are largely identical.



Map Series B indicates the locations where the Interviewees have engaged in the harvesting of all species of large animal. The only species harvested in the northern most part of the Project Study Area are moose and caribou (Map B-North). The central part of the Project Study Area (Map B-Central) is where the majority of the Interviewees indicated they harvest moose, deer and elk. Largely, with the exception of areas near the towns of Rivers and Poplar Point, the Interviewees have not utilized the southern portion of the Project Study Area for large animal harvesting purposes.

MOOSE

Just over two-thirds of the 49 Interviewees (33 or 67%) reported they have hunted moose within the Project Study Area at some time in their life. These 33 Interviewees identified a total of 85 areas (tags) within the Project Study Area.

During the past four decades, the average (mean) number of days the Interviewees have spent engaged in moose harvesting activity has ranged from 20.8 to 22.5 days/year/harvester, and the median number of days during the same four decade period has ranged from 14.5 to 19.0. The average number of trips/year/harvester during the same timeframe has ranged from 10 to 12 trips and the median number of trips has ranged between 4.5 to 7 trips/year.

Map Series C indicates the areas the Interviewees identified they utilize for moose harvesting. In the northern portion of the Project Study Area, moose harvesting areas are generally located along waterways or roadways (see Map C-North) where access is available.

Moose harvesting areas in the central portion of the Project Study Area (see Map C-Central) are more dispersed, owing to greater road and off-road trail access. Moose harvesting occurs throughout an area roughly bounded by the towns of Swan River and Minitonas at the southern end, easterly to Duck Bay, north to Pelican Rapids and Red Deer Lake, and to the west the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border. Higher intensity use areas within this general block include the Swan Lake area and Porcupine Provincial Forest Area. Moose are also harvested south of the town of Swan River to just south of Roblin, and around the town of Grandview south to the northern boundary of Riding Mountain National Park.

Map C-South indicates that none of the Interviewees engage in moose harvesting activities south of Riding Mountain National Park.

DEER:

Just over half of the 49 Interviewees (26 or 53%) reported they have hunted deer within the Project Study Area at some time in their life. These 26 Interviewees identified a total of 56 areas (tags) within the Project Study Area.

During the past four decades, the average (mean) number of days the Interviewees have spent engaged in deer harvesting activity has ranged from 8 to 25 days/year/harvester, and the median number of days during the same four decade period has ranged from 7 to 12 days. The average number of trips/year/harvester during the same timeframe has ranged from 5 to 16 trips and the median number of trips has ranged between 7.5 to 12 trips/year.

Map Series D indicates the areas the Interviewees identified they utilize for deer harvesting. In the central portion of the Project Study Area (Map D-Central), deer harvesting occurs throughout an area roughly from the town of Roblin at the southern end, to the west shoreline of Lake Winnipegosis, west to the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border, and north to Red Deer Lake. Deer harvesting also occurs along Highway #10 from Dawson Bay to The Pas and in the Pasquia area

south of The Pas. Finally, an east-west block from roughly the town of Grandview east past Dauphin to the eastern boundary of the Project Study Area in the vicinity of the towns of Eddystone and Kinosota was also identified for deer harvesting. Within the central portion of the Project Study Area, the most intensively used (highest number of Interviewees) is in the vicinity of the towns of National Mills, Barrows, Baden and Sclater.

In the southern portion of the Project Study area, deer harvesting locations identified by the Interviewees included areas in the vicinity of the towns of Russell, Erickson, Alonsa, Amaranth, Poplar Point, and Marquette.

ELK:

Just less than half of the 49 Interviewees (22 or 45%) reported they have hunted elk within the Project Study Area at some time in their life. These 22 Interviewees identified a total of 43 areas (tags) within the Project Study Area.

During the past four decades, the average (mean) number of days the Interviewees have spent engaged in deer harvesting activity has ranged from 19 to 35 days/year/harvester, and the median number of days during the same four decade period has ranged from 15 to 32 days. The average number of trips/year/harvester during the same timeframe has ranged from 8 to 16 trips and the median number of trips has ranged between 4 to 10 trips/year.

Map Series E indicates the areas the Interviewees identified they utilize for elk harvesting. Elk hunting occurs in the western most side of the province in an area south of Dawson Bay to the town of Erickson. Map E-Central illustrates elk harvesting areas are situated around Red Deer Lake, in the Porcupine and Duck Mountain Provincial Forests, Duck Mountains area, and the north, south and east sides of the boundaries of Riding Mountain National Park. The most intensively used area is located just north of the town of Boggy Creek.

CARIBOU AND BLACK BEAR:

Only a small number of the 49 Interviewees indicated that they have sought Barren land or woodland caribou, or black bear, and therefore no further analysis is provided on harvesting associated with these species.

4.4.2 Small Animal Harvesting

Almost two-thirds (31 or 63.3%) of the 49 Interviewees reported harvesting one or more small animals at some point in their lifetime. Upland birds (grouse, partridge, ptarmigan, and chicken) are the most sought after, followed by ducks and geese, and then rabbits (see Table 12 below).

TABLE 12: Small Animals Most Sought After by Interviewees (# and % of 31 Interviewees who have harvested small animals)

Small Animal	#	%
Upland Birds	25	80.6%
Ducks	17	54.8%
Geese	16	51.6%
Rabbits	12	38.7%
Shot Coyote/Wolf ¹²	2	6.5%
Shot Beaver ¹³	1	3.2%
Other Waterfowl	0	0.0%

During the past four decades, the average (mean) number of days spent harvesting small animals has ranged from approximately 16 to 18 days/harvester, and the median number of days during the same four decade period has ranged between 11 and 15 (see Table 13 below).

TABLE 13: Amount of Time (Days/Year) Spent Harvesting Small Animals 1970's to Present

	1970's	1980's	1990's	2000's
# Interviewees engaged in activity	13	20	22	20
Mean Days	16.5	15.7	16.4	17.7
Median Days	11.0	13.5	12.5	15.0
Range in Days	0.3-57	1-85	1-100	0.5-95

Small animal harvesting during the past four decades has occurred primarily in the fall season and secondarily in the winter season as illustrated in Figure 10 below. The seasonality of upland birds, waterfowl and rabbit harvesting patterns are largely identical.

¹² Coyote and/or wolf shot for bounty purposes or for their fur for non-commercial pelt sales reasons (e.g. homemade handicrafts and clothing).

¹³ Beaver shot for food purposes.



In total, the Interviewees identified 62 tags (areas) they utilize for harvesting one or more of the small animal categories. Forty-three percent of these tags were used by Interviewees exclusively for small animal harvesting purposes, while the balance are largely associated with concurrent large animal harvesting activities (e.g. elk or moose hunting in the morning and upland bird hunting in the early evening). Upland birds were harvested in 73% of these 62 areas; geese in 53%; ducks in 50%; and rabbits in 29%.



The three predominant areas identified for small animal harvesting activities by the Interviewees within the Project Study Area are within NTS Map sheets 62N (28.8% of all tags); 63C (18.3%) and 62J (12.5%), highlighted in yellow on the diagram to the left.

Map F series show all locations identified as being used for harvesting small animals for food purposes. The areas identified for small animal harvesting are largely the same as previously discussed for large animal harvesting.

4.5 FISHING

A majority (88%) of the 49 Interviewees reported harvesting fish in the Project Study Area at some point in their lifetime. Interviewees only reported on locations and provided information about fishing activities where fish was harvested for food consumption purposes, i.e. the data does not include fishing activity where the Interviewee may have caught and released fish.

During the past four decades, the average (mean) number of days spent fishing each year has ranged from approximately 30 to 40 days/fisher, while the median number of days during the same four decade period has been relatively constant at between 20 to 22 days (see Table 14).

TABLE 14:	Amount of	Time (Days/	(Year) Spent	Fishing-1970's to Present	

(D (V) C (C'1' 1070) (D

	1970's	1980's	1990's	2000's
# Interviewees engaged in fishing	24	31	32	32
Mean Days	40.3	25.7	30.1	34.0
Median Days	22.0	22.0	20.5	21.5
Range in Days	3 - 141	2 - 76	2-156	.5-156

Among the 43 Interviewees who indicted they engage in food fishing in the Project Study Area, pickerel is the most sought after fish species for food consumption, followed by jackfish, trout and suckers (see Table 15).

TABLE 15:

Fish Species Most Sought After by Interviewees (# and % of 43 Fishers who harvest each species)

Fish Species	#	%
Pickerel	40	93.0%
Jackfish	35	81.4%
Trout	21	48.8%
Suckers	15	34.9%
Perch	13	30.2%
Other ¹⁴	9	20.9%
Whitefish	5	11.6%
Bass	3	7.0%
Sturgeon	2	4.7%

¹⁴ Other species mentioned were mariah, sheepshead, and catfish.

Table 16 indicates the number of locations (tags) identified as being utilized for harvesting various fish species (all decades combined) ranked in order from most frequently cited to least. Not only are pickerel sought after by the largest percentage of fishers, but they are sought after in the most locations as well. On average, Interviewees who harvest pickerel, fish at 4.2 different locations (165 pickerel tags/40 fishers). In comparison, Interviewees who harvest jackfish, fish at an average of 2.8 locations (99 jackfish tags/35 fishers) and Interviewees who harvest trout, fish at an average of x1.9 locations (40 trout tags/21 fishers).

Species	#	%
Pickerel	165	45.3%
Jackfish	99	27.2%
Trout	40	11.0%
Suckers	19	5.2%
Perch	18	4.9%
Other	12	3.3%
Whitefish	6	1.6%
Bass	3	0.8%
Sturgeon	2	0.5%
TOTAL	364	100.0%

TABLE 16: Fish Species Harvested for Food (# and % of total areas or tags)

Food fishing occurs in all seasons of the year, although summer is the predominant season as illustrated in Figure 11. Winter fishing appears to be more common in the most recent two decades. Fishing is largely done from shore or a boat with rod and reel during the open water seasons, although a few Interviewees indicated using nets. Winter ice fishing areas are generally accessed by truck and skidoo.





The three predominant areas identified for fishing activities by the Interviewees within the Project Study Area are within NTS Map sheets 63K (23.4% of all fishing tags); 62N (15.4%) and 63C (11.5%) highlighted in yellow on the diagram to the left.

Map G series show all locations identified as being used for food fishing. In total, the 49 Interviewees identified 208 tags (areas) they frequent/use/rely upon for food fishing.

In the northern portion of the Project Study Area, Interviewees identified the following general fishing locations (see Map G-North);

- Athapapuskow Lake and river and lakes in the vicinity of the town of Flin Flon,
- Kississing Lake, also north of Flin Flon
- Cranberry Lakes area to Elbow Lake,
- Iskwasum Lake,
- Reed Lake,
- Lakes in the vicinity of the town of Snow Lake, including File, Woosey, Herblet and Wekusko Lakes,
- The Grass River system, including Pakwa and Setting Lakes in the vicinity of the town of Wabowden and Paint Lakes area just south of Thompson,
- · Wintering and Partridge Crop Lakes,
- Burntwood, Highrock and Wuskwatim Lakes,
- · Burntwood River and lakes around the town of Thompson,
- Stevens Lake near the town of Gillam,
- In the far northeastern area, Myre Lake, Limestone River, Weir River, Angling River, and Cooper Creek.

Among the above noted fishing locations, the most intensively used areas by the Interviewees include: Athapapuskow Lake, Wekusko Lake, Setting Lake, and the Paint Lakes.

In the central portion of the Project Study Area, Interviewees identified the following general fishing locations listed generally from north to south (see Map G-Central);

- Cormorant and Clearwater Lakes, north of the town of The Pas,
- Saskatchewan and Summerberry River system,
- Red Deer Lake north of the town of Barrows,
- Dawson Bay,

- Swan Lake,
- North Steeprock Lake in the Porcupine Provincial Forest,
- Swan River system south of the town of Swan River,
- · Mouths of creeks entering Lake Winnipegosis near the town of Camperville,
- Lakes and creeks within Duck Mountain Provincial Park and Duck Mountain Provincial Forest area, with Wellman and Childs Lakes most intensively used,
- Creeks and small lakes in the vicinity of the towns of Boggy Creek and San Clara,
- Shellmouth River and Lake of the Prairies,
- Creeks to the west of the town of Dauphin,
- South and west shoreline areas of Dauphin Lake,
- Creeks and small lakes in the vicinity of the towns of Eddystone, Cayer and Kinosota.

Not surprisingly, very few fishing areas were identified in the southern portion of the Project Study Area, an area of the province that generally lacks productive fish habitats and populations (see Map G-South).

4.6 GATHERING

Twenty of the 49 Interviewees reported gathering at some point between the 1940's and present. Since the 1980's, close to one-third of the 49 Interviews have engaged in gathering activities. In total, the Interviewees identified 39 areas or tags.

The amount of time (# trips and # days/year) spent engaged in gathering activities during the period from the 1970's to present is illustrated in Table 17. The findings indicate that during the past four decades, the Interviewees spend between one to one and half weeks a year engaged in gathering activities.

	1970's	1980's	1990's	2000's
# Interviewees engaged in gathering	10	16	15	16
Mean Days	13.5	11.0	11.0	8.3
Median Days	5.5	5.5	7.0	5.3
Range in Days	2 - 80	2 - 40	2-35	2-22

TABLE 17: Amount of Time (Days/Year) Spent Gathering-1970's to Present

Three-quarters of those than engage/engaged in gathering (15/20) indicated they harvest berries, 60% (12/20) harvest wood products, just over a third (7/20) harvest roots, nuts and/or mushrooms, and one-fifth (4/20) harvest medicines. Plant gathering occurs predominantly in the summer and fall seasons, although fuel wood is harvested throughout the year and certain root plants may be harvested in the spring.

The species of berries harvested, in order of frequency identified are:

- Blueberries
- Raspberries, Saskatoons and Chokecherries
- Strawberries, Cranberries, Goose Berries and Pin Cherries
- Moss berries
- Elder berries, black berries and nanny berries

The types of roots, nuts and other edible and/or medicinal plants identified include:

- Hazel nuts and bear nuts
- Mushrooms
- Fiddle heads
- Horse radish
- Wild tea
- Seneca root
- Sweet grass and sage
- Weekis or Weeka root
- Balsam bark
- Red willow
- Black poplar bud

Other gathered materials identified were:

- Fuel wood
- Trees for personal and commercial uses
- Animal horn

Table 18 indicates the number of tags (polygons) identified as being used to harvest different plant based materials. This table, for example, indicates that 28 areas or 43.8% of all tags were identified as berry gathering locations (some areas may have been identified by multiple Interviewees and individual interviewees may identify multiple gathering categories within the same tag).

PRODUCT	#	%
Berries	28	43.8%
Wood/Trees	15	23.4%
Medicine	8	12.5%
Roots/Nuts	5	7.8%
Mushrooms	4	6.3%
Sweet Grass/Sage	2	3.1%
Wildrice	1	1.6%
Other	1	1.6%

TABLE 18: Gathering Product Categories by Frequency of Areas Identified

TOTAL	64	100%



The three predominant areas identified for gathering activities by the Interviewees within the Project Study Area are within NTS Map sheets 62N (28.1% of all gathering tags); 63C (18.8%) and 62H (10.9%), highlighted in yellow on the diagram to the left. Locations where the Interviewees indicated they engage in gathering activities are shown on Maps H: North, Central and South.

In the northern portion of the Project Study Area, gathering occurs along Provincial road #391 between Thompson and Nelson House,

in the vicinity of Nelson and Burntwood Lakes, in the vicinity of the town of Snow Lake and south to the rail line below Wekusko Lake, and along the north side of Highway #6 from Wabowden to Thompson. Gathering also occurs along the road north from Bakers Narrows to Kisseynew Lake area (See Map H-North).

In the central portion of the Project Study Area, gathering areas were identified at the northeast side of Clearwater Lake, in the Carrot River/Pasquia area south of The Pas, the south side of Highway #77 in the vicinity of the towns of Barrows and Baden. An area south of Pelican Rapids to Swan River and Minitonas and Camperville was also identified. A number of Interviewees identified areas within the western part of the province from Lake of the Prairies north to the town of Benito, on the Saskatchewan border, and including the Duck Mountains area. The Dauphin area, north of Riding Mountain National Park and east to the town of Ste. Rose du Lac was also identified (See Map H-Central).

Gathering areas in the southern portion of the Project Study Area included an area on the northwest side of Lake Manitoba in the vicinity of the town of Alonsa, near the town of Erickson, near the towns of Poplar Point, St. Eustache, Rosser, and Ste. Geneviève (See Map H-South).

4.7 TRAPPING

Nine Interviewees reported trapping within the Project Study Area at some point during their lifetime. Species trapped included: beaver, coyote, fisher, fox, lynx, marten, mink, muskrat, otter, rabbit, raccoon, squirrel, weasel, wolf and wolverine.

The 9 Interviewees identified a total of 82 areas (tags) where they have pursued trapping activities at some point in their life. The largest percentage of tags (13%) were utilized for muskrat trapping, followed by weasel (11%), beaver, coyote and fox (each 10%). Less than 10% of the areas were used for other furbearer species.

Due to the limited number of Interviewees who reported trapping, further information is suppressed.

4.8 CULTURAL SITES/PLACES

Interviewees identified a number of culturally important sites or places, including: ceremonial, burial, other sacred/spiritual places (e.g. Thunderbird nest and Manipogo siting area) and an intergenerational family camp.¹⁵ Most of these sites/places are outside of the Project Study Area. The general location of these sites/places, as well as the locations of historic fur trade posts, Metis cart trails, and York boat routes are shown on Figure 12.

4.9 TRADITIONAL ECOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE

A number of interviewees shared ecological knowledge about the Project Study Area. Figure 13 shows the locations and types of important animal or fish habitats identified in the study to date. It was reported that elk and moose are known to migrate/move through an area in the southwest corner of the Duck Mountains. The Duck Mountains are identified as an area where elk calve, as well as important summer and wintering habitat. An area southeast of Dauphin, within the Riding Mountains is also identified as important elk winter habitat. It has been reported that barren land caribou are often seen during the summer in an area east of Stephens Lake on the north side of the Nelson River.

¹⁵ It is the writers understanding that the interviewer who conducted the latter half of the interviews did not specifically ask the Interviewees for information about cultural or ecological knowledge, and thus these data sets likely have gaps.



FIGURE 12: Culturally Important Sites and Places



5.0 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The information provided by the sample of 49 Manitoba Metis suggests extensive traditional use in the Project Study Area, particularly in the Porcupine and Duck Mountain areas of the province. As noted in Section 4.1 of this report, factors which limit the application of the findings of the 49 detailed interviews to quantitatively characterize the broader traditional use and knowledge patterns of the Manitoba Metis population at large include: the geographic expanse of the Project Study Area; the fact that the Manitoba Metis use of this part of the province is not linked to residence location; and the small sample size. Notwithstanding this limitation, the study has found (i.e. Screening Survey results) that at least 382 Manitoba Metis engage in traditional activities within the Project Study Area. Whether their traditional use patterns (e.g. geographic locations, harvesting practices, amount of time spent on the land) are identical to the 49 Interviewees cannot be stated with certainty. However, the demographic characteristics (age, residence) of the larger sample of 382 Manitoba Metis is similar to the 49 Interviewees and this suggests that the findings of this study may be broadly illustrative of Manitoba Metis use of lands and resources in the Project Study Area for traditional purposes. **APPENDIX A: MAP SERIES A- H**

APPENDIX B: SCREENING SURVEY PACKAGE

 $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$



MANITOBA METIS FEDERATION INC.

300 - 150 Henry Avenue, Winnipeg, Manifoba R3B 0J7 Phone: (204) 586-8474 Fox: (204) 947-1816 Website: www.mmf.mb.co

October 1, 2010

Dear Métis Citizens:

RE: MANITOBA MÉTIS COMMUNITY TRADITIONAL LAND USE AND KNOWLEDGE STUDY ("TLUKS") INITIATIVE

Since the birth of the Métis Nation, we have relied on the lands, waters and natural resources of what is now known as the Province of Manitoba as well as the rest of the Métis Nation Homeland to sustain ourselves, our families, our communities, our nation and our distinct Métis culture.

For the Manitoba Métis Community, our historic and ongoing use of, connections to and mobility throughout our traditional territory defines who we are as a people. Over the generations, our people have consistently stood up and fought to protect our lands and our use of our lands. We continue to do this today through our ongoing court battles and our Métis Laws of the Hunt and MMF Harvesters Card System. As such, the MMF is initiating a Traditional Land Use and Knowledge Study ("TLUKS") initiative to better document and understand how our people have used and continue to use our lands. This knowledge is critical in order to understand the impacts of specific developments on Métis rights, interests and way of life. In particular, we are beginning this work to better understand the impacts of the following projects:

- Manitoba Hydro Bipole III Transmission Line
- Manitoba Hydro Keeyask Hydroelectric Project
- Berens River All-Season Road

. . .

East Side Wide Area Transportation Network

In order to fully understand the potential impact of government authorized development on Metis rights, interests and way of life, we need to better understand how our people have and continue to use our traditional territory. With this information, your Métis government will be able to better protect your rights and interests in negotiations with governments and industry with respect to development in Manitoba. We will be using this information in our efforts to ensure Métis rights are not being negatively affected by policies and developments throughout our territory. We want to ensure impacts on Métis rights are – first and foremost – avoided. We also want to ensure if certain impacts cannot be avoided then they will be as minimal as possible and compensated for. We also want to ensure that Métis citizens and communities share in the economic development occurring on our traditional territory.

I believe this is an exciting and important initiative for the MMF because we will be ensuring Métis-rights, interests and way of life are no longer ignored by any government or proponent undertaking activity in our territory. We will also be documenting, and mapping our history, current use and knowledge in an effort to expand our work of Metis use throughout all of Manitoba.

I hope you will help the MMF in undertaking this important work in the advancement of Métis rights. I am asking that you review the attached package of information, fill out the appropriate maps, and, complete the survey. A registered envelope has been attached so that you can simply seal the survey package and put it in the mail for a return to our office. Please be assured that all information provided will be completely secure and confidential. Once these surveys are received and reviewed, the MMF will be contacting specific individuals to see if they are interested in participating in a one-on-one interview as a part of our TLUKS initiative.

I want to thank you in advance for your support and commitment to Métis rights by completing the attached survey. With your help your Métis government will ensure Métis rights, interests and way of life will be respected and protected for generations to come.

Meeqwetch,

Anita Campbell Hydro Minister

Major Projects and Initiatives

Project 1: Bi-Pole III

Manitoba Hydro is proposing to build a new transmission line from Gillam, Manitoba. This new line will run down the west side of the Province. They are looking at a number of different routes within a large study area at this time. To learn more about this project, you can go to Manitoba Hydro's website –<u>http://www.hydro.mb.ca/projects/bipoleIII/index.shtml</u>

Project 2: Keeyask Hydroelectric Project

Manitoba Hydro, in partnership with a First Nations group, is proposing to build a new 695 Megawatt hydroelectric generating station called Keeyask. Keeyask is located on the Nelson River between Split Lake and Stephens Lake, in north-eastern Manitoba. To learn more about this project, you can go to Manitoba Hydro's website –

http://www.hydro.mb.ca/projects/keeyask/index.shtml.

Project 3: Berens River All-Season Road

The Manitoba Floodway and East Side Road Authority is proposing to build an all-season road from Highway 304 at Manigotagan to Berens River. This will involve up-grading the existing Rice River Road from Manigotagan to Bloodvein and building an all-season road from Bloodvein to Berens River. To learn more about this project, you can go to MFESRA's website – <u>http://www.eastsideroadauthority.mb.ca/</u>

Project 4: East Side Wide Area Transportation Network

The Manitoba Floodway and East Side Road Authority is studying a potential all-season road network to link remote access (air/barge/winter road) communities situated on the east side of Lake Winnipeg to the existing all-season road connection near Norway House, Manitoba. This work is at the planning stage but if it is decided the project will proceed, it will have to undergo an environmental impact assessment. To learn more about this project, you can go to MFESRA's website – <u>http://www.eastsideroadauthority.mb.ca/</u>

Project 5: Woodland Caribou Recovery Strategy

Manitoba's Woodland Caribou were listed as a "threatened species" in 2003 under the *Species at Risk Act.* Because they have been listed as being "threatened", government must develop a plan (known as a Recovery Strategy) to help the population grow to a sustainable size. In preparing this plan, Government must consult with Aboriginal organizations and communities, including Manitoba Métis. Part of the planning process involves gathering information from Manitoba Métis about past and current harvesting activities, as well as traditional ecological knowledge about the Woodland Caribou. To learn more about this project, you can go to the Species at Risk website- http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca/document/default_e.cfm?documentID=1762

Project 6: Sturgeon

Manitoba's Lake Sturgeon have been identified as an "endangered species" and Government is evaluating whether to "list" sturgeon under the *Species at Risk Act*. Fisheries and Oceans Canada is in the process of creating five Sturgeon Recovery Teams to determine ways to improve Manitoba's sturgeon populations. Fisheries and Oceans Canada has extended an invitation through the MMF for Manitoba Metis to become involved and are seeking representation and active participation on Recovery Teams.

MMF Major Project Screening Survey

It is very important that this survey be filled out by the person whom the MMF letter was addressed to. We want to hear back from women and men and people of various ages. If your household has received more than one of these surveys, it is because more than one person in your household is recognized as an MMF member and we want to hear back from as many MMF members as possible. To ensure confidentiality, we have given you a Personal Identification Number (PIN) so that your name does not appear on this survey, unless you indicate on the last page you would like to participate in a more detailed interview and/or participate in a workshop. This is the number in the box in the centre of the first page of survey.

This survey consists of 6 pages which are stapled together – please do not remove the staple! The first page is a title page and has the box with your unique PIN. On the next four pages are four maps, each covering about one quarter of the Province. Please look at each map and draw circles indicating places that you routinely and regularly go to for purposes of traditional activities (meaning hunting, fishing, and/or gathering for purposes of obtaining food, medicines, or craft materials, camping and staying on the land while harvesting, or making a living from outfitting, guiding, trapping, etc.). Please try to be as precise as you can, i.e. drawing huge circles over the entire map will not assist MMF in its work. On each map page you are also asked to indicate which activities you typically do on a regular basis. The last page asks questions about your interest in participating in either detailed interviews and/or workshops.

REGARDLESS OF WHETHER OR NOT YOU PARTICIPATE IN TRADITIONAL ACTIVITIES, OR IF YOU CHOOSE NOT TO ANWER ANY OF THE QUESTIONS, PLEASE RETURN THIS SURVEY IN THE PRE-ADDRESSED AND STAMPED RETURN ENVELOPE WITHIN 7 DAYS. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND PARTICIPATION!

FYI!!!!!

By completing the survey and sending it back to the MMF in the registered envelope provided, you will be entered to win a 2-night stay at the Canad Inns Club Regent Casino in Winnipeg Manitoba. Come stay and Play for 2 nights in Manitoba's Capital!

If you have any questions, concerns or require help in doing this survey, please call Justin Stapon, MMF Bi-Pole III Coordinator at (204-586-8474, ext.395) between 9:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday or email him at jstapon@mmf.mb.ca.



MANITOBA MÉTIS FEDERATION

MAJOR PROJECT SCREENING SURVEY

(AUGUST, 2010)



REGARDLESS OF WHETHER OR NOT

YOU PARTICIPATE IN TRADITIONAL ACTIVITIES,

OR IF YOU CHOOSE NOT TO ANWER ANY OF THE QUESTIONS,

PLEASE RETURN THIS SURVEY IN THE PRE-ADDRESSED AND STAMPED RETURN ENVELOPE WITHIN 7 DAYS.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND PARTICIPATION!







 \bigcirc

🛞 North West Manitoba



🛞 South East Manitoba





South West Manitoba



QUESTION #1: Traditional Knowledge

If you do practice traditional activities within Manitoba on a regular basis, would you be interested in participating in a detailed interview which would involve our Consultant sitting down with you for several hours to document your use of the land, waters and resources? Please check off "yes" or "no" to the right. If you answered "yes" to Question #1 above, please print your name, a day time telephon number and an email address below so we can contact you to discuss this further.	□ Yes □ No ne
Name:	
Telephone No / Email Address:	
QUESTION #2: Woodland Caribou Do you harvest Woodland Caribou in Manitoba or feel you have knowledge about this species and its habitat? Please check off "yes" or "no" to the right.	□ Yes □ No
If you answered "yes" to Question #2 above, would you be interested in participating in workshop to discuss ways and means of protecting and enhancing Woodland Caribou populations and habitat? If yes, please print your name, a day time telephone number are email address below so we contact you to discuss this further.	a nd an
Name:	
Telephone Number: / Email Address:	
QUESTION #3: Sturgeon Do you harvest Sturgeon in Manitoba or feel you have knowledge about this species and its habitat? Please check off "yes" or "no" to the right.	□ Yes □ No
If you answered "yes" to Question #3 above, would you be interested in participating in workshop to discuss ways and means of protecting and enhancing Sturgeon populations habitat? If yes, please print your name, a day time telephone number and an email address we can contact you to discuss this further.	a and ess below
Name:	

Telephone Number: _____ / Email Address: ______

APPENDIX C: TLUKS RELEASE FORM



Traditional Land Use and Knowledge Study

Interviewee Release

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the Manitoba Métis Federation's ("MMF") Traditional Land Use and Knowledge Study (the "TLUK Study").

This document provides you with information on the TLUK Study and how the MMF will be using the information is collects from your interview, so you can provide your informed consent with respect to your participation in the TLUK Study.

Background and Overview of the TLUK Study

There are a number of projects being proposed within the Province where the Manitoba Métis Community has constitutional rights and interests. For example, Manitoba Hydro has the following projects: BiPole 3 Transmission Line, Point du Bois modernization, Conawapa and Keeyask hydro stations; and the East Side Road authority has its Berens River Road project. The MMF, as the self-government representative of the Manitoba Métis Community, is working with Metis citizens in order to identify spiritual, cultural, socio-economic, harvesting and other traditional interests, values and rights of the Manitoba Métis Community in areas that may be impacted by one or more of these projects.

In order to collect this information, the MMF is undertaking a TLUK Study. As part of this work, MMF is doing in-depth, mapping-based interviews with a representative sample of Métis citizens who use the lands and resources within and near each of the potential projects. The maps and other information from these interviews will be put together in order to see the overall use of the areas by the Manitoba Métis Community. Then the MMF, with assistance from experts, can assess the overall environmental and socio-economic impacts of a particular project on Métis rights, interests and way of life. Based on the Study, the MMF will be able to work with the proponents of major projects in order to avoid, minimize and/or accommodate the impacts on the Manitoba Métis Community.

The MMF has retained Patt Larcombe of Symbion Consultants to assist in conducting the TLUK Study. She, or ______ and _____ of the MMF, will be conducting the interview with you today.

Release and Authorizations

By signing this Release, you are authorizing the MMF to use your genealogy and the information collected from your interview, including your personal map biography, for purposes of documenting and reporting on the overall use by the Manitoba Métis Community. Neither your name nor your personal map biography will appear in any TLUK Study report. Instead, MMF reports will include maps and other descriptive information based upon the combined results from of all interviews done about a particular project area. This report will ultimately be made public and will be presented to the project proponent and to government regulators by the MMF.

By signing this Release, you are also authorizing the MMF to use your genealogy, map biography and interview information for future projects or initiatives the MMF may pursue or engage in for the advancement of Métis rights, interests and way of life.

The MMF will own all of the documents and materials it creates based on your interview and genealogy. It will be responsible to use, protect and maintain these materials, consistent with the authorizations you provide below.

The MMF has agreed to prepare an interview summary of each interview it completes and to share this interview summary with the project proponent. MMF is seeking direction from you on the amount of information you authorize the MMF to include in your personal interview summary. The MMF will only provide the information you authorize according to which box below contains your initials.



Provide my name and all relevant information (i.e., residence, place of birth, parent(s) place of birth, family background) in my interview summary.



Only provide my name in my interview summary (i.e., <u>do not</u> include my residence, place of birth, parent(s) place of birth, or family background).



Withhold my name but include all other relevant information (i.e. residence, place of birth, parent(s) place of birth, family background) from my interview summary.



Withhold all identifying information from my interview summary (i.e. name, residence, place of birth, parent(s) place of birth, family background).

I, ______, have read the Interviewee Release in full and agree that the MMF and Symbion Consultants may use my genealogy and the interview information collected from me for the purposes set out above and based on the authorizations agreed to.

Signed on the _____ day of _____, 20____:

Participant/Interviewee

Interviewer/Witness

Signature

Signature

APPENDIX D: TLUKS INTERVIEW GUIDE

INTERVIEW QUESTION GUIDE – FORM 'A' [PAGE 1 OF 3]

I am going to start this interview by asking you some questions about yourself and your family.

USING FORM 'A' start asking the following questions and filling out Form 'A' with the digital pen. Interviewer does the following prior to asking the first question:

- Write the interviewee's PIN at the top left side of Form 'A';
- Put a '1' in the box for Bipole III Project at the top right side of Form 'A';
- Note the interviewee's gender by checking the box for either female or male at Question 1.

Question #2: Can you tell me what year you were born? [Write the year in the box using 4 digit format, e.g. "1958"]

Question #3: What is your current place of residence? [Prompt-where are you living (e.g. where you regularly sleep and have your meals) right now; write the name of the closest village, town, or city within Manitoba]

Question #4: How long have you been living at the place you just mentioned? Less than 1 year? Between 1 to 4 years? Between 5-10 Years? More than 10 Years?

[Put an 'check' in the box that corresponds to their answer]

I am now going to ask you some questions about where you have lived in the past. The reason I am asking you the following questions is to help us understand Manitoba Metis connections to different geographic areas both within and outside of Manitoba.

Question #5: Can you tell me where you were born?

[Prompt-I am not asking what hospital you were born in but rather where your parent or parents would have taken you home from the hospital. Write the name of the closest village, town or city and the name of the province (e.g. MB for Manitoba or SK for Saskatchewan)].

The next three questions will help us understand a bit more about the economic aspects of Manitoba Metis traditional activities and lifestyle.

Question #13: Can you tell me which of the following types of equipment, if any, you personally own? All Terrain Vehicle (ATV); Skidoo; Canoe; Motorized Boat; Truck?

[Put an "check" in each of the appropriate response boxes on the form].

Question #14: Can you tell me how often over the past 12 months you have had a meal containing traditional foods? By traditional foods I mean non-domesticated animals such as deer, fish caught by net or rod/reel, or wild plants not grown in a garden. You can include meals where you ate traditional foods that you personally harvested or that were given to you by a family member or friend. [Prompt – show the Interviewee the possible answer boxes for this question and ask them which answer which box best reflects the frequency of traditional meals

they have had in the past 12 months. If interviewee has difficulty selecting a box, discuss their consumption patterns and help them to decide on the most accurate response.] Only put a "check" in one response box.

Question #15: During the times when you were living away from Manitoba did you regularly come back to Manitoba to engage in traditional food harvesting activities? [If Interviewee has not indicated earlier in the interview that they have ever lived outside of Manitoba, skip asking this question and put an 'check' in the 'not appl.' box].

Question #16: During the times when you were living away from Manitoba did you regularly engage in traditional food harvesting activities in the Province that you were living or other places outside of Manitoba? [If Interviewee has not indicated earlier in the interview that they have ever lived outside of Manitoba, skip asking this question and put a 'check' in the 'not appl.' box].
INTERVIEW QUESTION GUIDE – FORM 'A' [PAGE 3 OF 3]

I am now going to ask you some questions about your marital status, education achievements, occupation and income. The reason we are asking these types of questions is to help us understand if the people we are interviewing in this Study are representative of the general Manitoba Metis population. As with all the information you provide in this interview, your information will be held in the strictest confidence.

Question #17: How many people currently live full-time at your place of residence (the place you are living at right now)? Record the number in the box on the form.

Question #18: Can you tell me what your current marital status is?

- I am single and have never been legally married
- I am single, but am divorced or legally separated
- I am married or in a common-law relationship
- I am widowed

Put a 'check' in the appropriate response box on the form.

Question #19: Can you tell me what your <u>highest level</u> of schooling is? [Prompt – show the Interviewee the acetate sheet with the possible answer boxes for this question and ask them which box (e.g. a, b, c, etc.) applies to them. Put a 'check' in the appropriate response box on the form.

Question #20: Can you tell me what your current employment status is? [Prompt – show the Interviewee the acetate sheet with the possible answer boxes for this question and ask them which box (a, b, c, etc.) applies to them. Put a 'check' in the appropriate response box on the form.

Question #21: Can you tell me which of the following answers best describes your current personal annual income? Personal annual income includes your wages or salary from a job or business, employment insurance, Canada Pension and/or Old Age Pension, a pension from your former employer, disability payments, social assistance, etc.?

[Prompt – show the Interviewee the acetate sheet with the possible answer boxes for this question and ask them which box applies to them. Put a 'check' in the appropriate response box on the form.

Question #22: Can you tell me which of the following answers best describes your total annual household income? By household, we mean the combined total income of yourself, your spouse or partner, and other adults (e.g. grandmother) living with you full-time. Again annual income includes wages or salary from a job or business, employment insurance, Canada Pension and/or Old Age Pension, a pension from your former employer, disability payments, social assistance, etc.? [Prompt – show the Interviewee the acetate sheet with the possible answer boxes for this question and ask them which box applies to them. Put a 'check' in the appropriate response box on the form.

INTERVIEW GUIDE – FORM 'B'

We are now going to start documenting your personal traditional use, values and knowledge information within the Study Area on the maps and forms. The Study Area is the area on each map that is included within the thick line boundaries [show interviewee where the boundary is on the first map]. We would like you to show us places within the Study Area on each of the maps where you:

- Hunt animals for food;
- Fish for food;
- Gather plants for food and medicine;
- Stay overnight while on the land (e.g. cabin, campsite);
- Access this hunting, fishing, gathering, camping place (e.g. boat landings, trails);
- Know of historic or cultural sites or places (e.g. gathering place, burial site, sacred/spiritual site or place); and/or
- Know of important animal, fish or plant habitat (e.g. fish spawning place, moose calving place, rare plant growing area).

Each time you identify a place on the maps we will be asking you to show us exactly where to draw the boundaries, line or point and then asking you a series of questions about that particular place we've just drawn on the map.

Let's start with hunting, fishing and gathering;

Can you show me places within the Study Area on this map that you have gone to hunt animals, fish or gather plants for food purposes? These are places that you may go to now or may have gone to in the past. I'm especially interesting in hearing about places you have gone often. By often, I mean places that you frequently have gone to (e.g. every year, every second year) at some point in your lifetime.

[Mapper draws the first area on the map indicated by the Interviewee with the digital pen and records the first unique map feature number or TAG (e.g. 001) with an arrow pointing to the place (most likely a polygon)]. Mapper says out loud, I have just drawn a hunting/fishing/gathering area near such and such river/lake/town and labelled it #1.

Interviewer using Form B, writes the PIN+Unique Map Feature # on the form, checks the appropriate box for whether it is a polygon, line or point feature, and records the Map Sheet #. Interviewer marks on Form B whether the polygon, line or point feature is located within a particular defined Study Area according to the number codes on the form.

Which animals have you hunted/fish have you fished/plants have you gathered [use appropriate wording] in this area we've just drawn on the map? Interviewer puts 'check or checks's beside the named species under the "What" section of Form B.

What decades have you gone to this place to hunt/fish/gather the species you just told us about?

Interviewer puts 'check or checks's beside each of the named decades under the "WHEN" section of Form B.

Now let's talk further about what time of the year and with who you have gone to this place in your lifetime. Let's start with the earliest decade you mentioned and work our way up to the most recent times.

During the 19_____'s, can you tell me which season or seasons of the year you usually went to this place? [record by putting 'check or checks's in the appropriate boxes under the appropriate seasons columns on Form B].

During the 19_____'s, can you tell me how often you would go to this place? For example, did you go there once a year, twice a year, once every two years? [record by putting the number (e.g. 1, 2, 4) in the FREQUENCY box on Form B in the row for the appropriate decade]. If person indicates once every two years, record this as 0.5; once every 3 years, record this as 0.33; every 4 years record this as 0.25, every 5 years record as 0.20. If person goes to this place less than once every 5 years, record as 0.

During the 19_____'s, can you tell me how many days you would typically spend at this place? For example, did you typically [hunt, fish and/or harvest plants] there for 1 day, 2 days, 5 days each year?

[record by putting the number of days per year (e.g. 1, 3, 12). If person went to this place several times a year, discuss with them how many days for each trip and add up the total and put that number in the box.]

During this same decade, who did you most often go with to this place? [provide Interviewee with acetate sheet showing possible answers; put a 'check ' in all appropriate boxes under "WHO" columns]

Move onto to next indicated decade and repeat the WHEN and WHO questions until done with all decades for this place.

Lastly, can you tell me why you go or have gone to this place? [Probe Questions:]

- How did you learn or discover this is a good place to go?
- Why do you keep going back to this place? <u>or</u> Why did you stop going to this place?
- If place is far from where they currently live/used to live, ask Why do you travel so far to get to this place rather than going to places that are closer?

Record their answer(s) in the WHY box on Form B.

REPEAT ABOVE LINE OF QUESTIONING WITH SEPARATE UNIQUE MAP FEATURE # AND FORM B SHEETS UNTIL ALL HUNTING, FISHING AND GATHERING AREAS WITHIN THE STUDY AREA ON THE PARTICULAR MAP SHEET HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED.

OCCUPATION PLACES

Now let's move on to places you have stayed out on the land overnight and how you get around to these places.

When you were hunting, fishing or gathering plants at the places we've marked on this map, did you ever stay out on the land overnight? If yes, ask following questions. If no, move on to questions regarding access routes.

Occupation Places- Cabins:

Did you ever stay in a cabin or cabins? [If no, move onto question about campsites].

Can you show me where that cabin is/was or where one of those cabins is/was? [Mapper places a dot/point at the location indicated by the Interviewee and says out loud, I am putting a point with the unique map feature # _____ on the map showing the location of a cabin].

Which decades did you use that cabin? [Interviewer puts 'check's's in appropriate decade boxes on Form B]

Other questions, as applicable: Whose cabin was/is it? Why did you start/stop using that cabin? Is that cabin still there? If no, what happened to it? [Interviewer records answer in the "OTHER INTERVIEWER NOTES" box].

Did you stay in a cabin in another location within the Study Area on this map sheet? [If so, repeat above. If no, move onto campsites below]

Occupation Places- Campsites:

When you were hunting, fishing or gathering plants at the places we've marked on this map, did you ever stay out on the land in a tent, trailer, or vehicle? [If no, move onto next line of questioning regarding access routes]

Can you show me where you have camped in a tent, trailer or vehicle? [Mapper places a dot/point at each location indicated by the Interviewee and says out loud, I am putting a point with the unique map feature # _____ on the map showing the

location of an overnight camping place]. Interviewer records following information on a separate Form B sheet for each and every camp site indicated.

Was/Is this camp site in a private or government campground or did you just set up camp out in the bush?

If yes, put a 'check' for "camp ground" on Form B If no, put a 'check' for "bush camp" on Form B.

What decades did you use this camp site? [Interviewer puts 'check's in appropriate decade boxes on Form B]

ACCESS ROUTES

For each item below, create a new unique map feature number and record information on a Form B sheet.

Water Related:

Can you show me places within the Study Area on this map where you have portaged when canoeing or boating to get to the places you've identified you use/used for harvesting activities. What decades did you use this portage?

Can you show me places within the Study Area on this map that you have used as a boat landing area (e.g. for a boil-up, lunch/picnic area) while traveling to and harvesting at the places you've identified on this map? What decades did you use this landing area?

Land Related:

Can you show me trails you use/have used in the past where you access the hunting, fishing, gathering, overnight places we've marked on the map. [We are looking for 'off-road' trails that are not already shown on the map].

What decades have/did you use this trail and which form of transportation did you use (i.e. foot, ATV, skidoo, horse, 4-Wheel truck)? ['Check' Access Route box and decade box(es) on Form B].

INTERVIEW GUIDE – FORM 'C'

CULTURAL SITES/PLACES

Now let's move on to sites or places that are culturally important to you.

Former Village Sites

Do you know of any former village sites in the Study Area on this map? By former village site I mean places where larger numbers of Metis people would congregate and live out on the land for a part of the year.

[If yes, put a 'check' in the box beside "former village site' and record any detailed information they may have about this place, probe questions: when was this, when did it stop, do you know who these people were and where they were from?]

Have you ever been to this place yourself? If so, what time of year (which month or months) have you gone to this place? How often have you been to this place? [never; once a year; every 2-3 years; every 4-5 years; less than once every 5 years] [put a 'check' in appropriate box in Form 'C']

Historic Event Sites

Do you know of any historic event places in the Study Area on this map? By historic event places I mean places such as buffalo hunt camps, seasonal fish camps, etc. where larger numbers of Metis people would gather on a regular basis.

Have you ever been to this place yourself? If so, what time of year (which month or months) have you gone to this place? How often have you been to this place? [never; once a year; every 2-3 years; every 4-5 years; less than once every 5 years] [put a 'check' in appropriate box in Form 'C']

Battle Sites

Do you know of any sites where Metis people were historically involved in fights or battles against First Nations or government or armies?

Have you ever been to this place yourself? If so, what time of year (which month or months) have you gone to this place? How often have you been to this place? [never; once a year; every 2-3 years; every 4-5 years; less than once every 5 years] [put a 'check' in appropriate box in Form 'C']

Burial Sites

Do you know of any sites where Metis people were historically buried? What I mean by this is historical and non-Church affiliated cemetery places or perhaps places where Metis persons were buried out in the bush?

Have you ever been to this place yourself? If so, what time of year (which month or months) have you gone to this place? How often have you been to this place? [never; once a year; every 2-3 years; every 4-5 years; less than once every 5 years] [put a 'check' in appropriate box in Form 'C'] Are you related to any people who are buried in this place?

Sacred/Spiritual Place/Site

Do you know of any sites or places out on the land within the Study Area on this map which you are known to Manitoba Metis as being sacred or spiritual? Can you explain why this area is considered sacred or spiritual?

Have you ever been to this place yourself? If so, what time of year (which month or months) have you gone to this place? How often have you been to this place? [never; once a year; every 2-3 years; every 4-5 years; less than once every 5 years] [put a 'check' in appropriate box in Form 'C']

Important Landscape Features

Do you know of any sites or places out on the land within the Study Area on this map which have special value because of their natural features. By this I mean places that are especially valued because of their beauty, their elevation, unique plant or rocks, etc. Can you explain why this landscape feature is considered culturally important to you.

Have you ever been to this place yourself? If so, what time of year (which month or months) have you gone to this place? How often have you been to this place? [never; once a year; every 2-3 years; every 4-5 years; less than once every 5 years] [put a 'check' in appropriate box in Form 'C']

TRADITIONAL ECOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE (FORM 'C').

Now let's move on to documenting any traditional ecological knowledge you may have. We'd like you to show us the locations of important animal, fish and/or plant habitat that you have personal knowledge about.

Are you aware of any important fish spawning habitat areas within the Study Area on this map? If so, where is the place located? Which fish species use this spawning area?

Are you aware of any important seasonal habitat for moose, deer, caribou (Barren Land or Woodland), bear or other large animal species? If so, where is the place located? Which species use this area and in what season? Why is this place such important habitat?

Are you aware of any important migration routes used by moose, deer, caribou, or bear? Can you show me on the map where these migration routes are and which species uses them and at what time of the year?

Are you aware of any important calving/birthing places used by moose, deer, caribou, bear or other large animal species? Can you show me on the map where these places are and which species uses them for calving/birthing. What time of the year is this place used? Why do you think this place is good for calving/birthing?

Are you aware of any important waterfowl or upland bird nesting areas within the Study Area on this map? Can you show me on the map where these places are and which species of waterfowl/upland bird uses them. What time of the year is this place used for nesting? Why do you think this place is good for nesting?

Are you aware of the locations of any salt licks that animals use? If so, can you show me where the salt lick is located and what animals you have seen using it.

Is there any other kind of important habitat for animals/fish/plants that we haven't discussed? Can you share what you know and show on the map where this is.

Each TEK polygon/line/point receives a unique map feature number and a separate Form C sheet is filled out for every mapped feature.

IF THE INTERVIEWEE IS/HAS NOT BEEN A REGISTERED TRAPPER OR REGISTERED TRAPPERS HELPER, GO BACK NOW TO THE INITIAL PIN FORM AND RECORD THE FOLLOWING:

1. THE TIME THE INTERVIEW ENDED

2. THE SEQUENCE TOTAL OF UNIQUE MAP FEATURE NUMBERS

MAKE SURE YOU GIVE THE INTERVIEWEE ONE OF THE SIGNED COPIES OF THEIR WAIVER/RELEASE FORM!

IF INTERVIEWEE HAS BEEN/IS A REGISTERED TRAPPER OR REGISTERED TRAPPER'S HELD FOR AN AREA THAT FALLS WITHIN THE STUDY AREA, MOVE TO FORM 'D' BELOW.

INTERVIEW GUIDE – FORM 'D' Trapping Only

Can you tell me generally where did/do you trap? [Based upon response to this question select required map sheet(s) for this part of the interview and check to see if Trapline is within (partially or wholly) the Study Area].

Are you still a Registered Trapper or Trappers Helper? If no, when was the last year that you were? What is the last year that you actively trapped? Why did you stop trapping?

What is the name of the Trapline Block and Trapline Number that you used to trap within/are trapping on now? [record answer in "OTHER INTERVIEWER NOTES"]

Is this the Trapline you have always trapped on? If no, probe what other Trapline they have used in the past and the reason and timing of the change.

Can you show me on the map the places within the Trapline that you trap/trapped different furbearers. Which species did you trap in this area? What decades did you trap these species in this area? What seasons did you trap in this area? In this time period were you the Registered Trapper or a Helper? What was the last year that you trapped in this area?

REPEAT ABOVE FOR EACH AND EVERY TRAPPING PLACE IDENTIFIED, USE SEPARATE FORM D SHEET FOR EACH AREA IDENTIFIED.

GO BACK NOW TO THE INITIAL PIN FORM AND RECORD THE FOLLOWING:

THE TIME THE INTERVIEW ENDED
 THE SEQUENCE TOTAL OF UNIQUE MAP FEATURE NUMBERS

HAVE THE INTERVIEWEE SIGN EACH OF THE MAPS THEY HAVE PROVIDED INFORMATION ABOUT.

MAKE SURE YOU GIVE THE INTERVIEWEE ONE OF THE SIGNED COPIES OF THEIR WAIVER/RELEASE FORM!

APPENDIX E: TLUKS INTERVIEW DATA RECORDING FORMS

MMF TLUKS: RECORDING FORM 'A' [Nov 23, 2010 version]

Page 1 of 3

	1	125
- 1		2

		Project(s)	1 = Bi-Pole III	
PIN#		Interview	2 = Berens River Road	
		Relates to	3 = Point du Bois	
	4 digit number (e.g. 1005)	(max 2):	4 = Keeyask/Conawapa	

1. Ge	1. Gender: 2. Age		3. Current Place of Residence	4.Time lived a one box]	[check "V"		
					D		
Female	Male	Year Born	Closest Village, Town, City	< 1 Yr	1-4 Yrs	5-10 Yrs	> 10 Yrs

5. Where were you		
born?	(closest village, town, city)	Province

6. Place(s) lived at (for at least 1 year) up until 18 years of age?

		11	Rea	ason You Were	ere Living at this Place		
Closest Village, Town, City	Province	Family Hm	School/Training	Work	0	ther-specify	
			D		D		
			D				
				D			
		D					

		en Gregele	Rea	ason You Wer	e Living at this Pl	ace
Closest Village, Town, City	Province	Family Hm	School/Training	Work	Other	Specify Other Reason

8.Place considered/called "home"?		
	Closest Village, Town, City	Province

MANITOBA METIS FEDERATION TLUKS: RECORDING FORM 'A'

			21			10	
9. Mother Was Born At:	ST STOLLS	10. Father Was Born At:					
Closest Village, City	and the second	Prov		Closest Vil	lage, City	Provinc	
11. Places Mother Mostly Lived:			Re	eason She Was	living at this Pl	ace	
Closest Village Town City	Province	Family Hm	School/Training	Work	Other	Specify Other Reason	
		D		D			
		D	D	D			
		D	D				
		0		D	D		
			D	D	D		

Places Father Mostly Lived:		Reason He Was Living at this Place					
Closest Village, Town, City	Province	Family Hm	School/Training	Work	Other	Specify Other Reason	
		D			D		
					D		
		D			۵		
		D	D		D		
			D				

13. Types of equipment personally owned? [check "v" as many boxes as appropriate].									
	All Terrain Vehicle		Skidoo		Canoe		Motorized Boat		Truck

4. Frequency of country food consumption in the past 12 months. [check"v" one box that best describes how often].							
	a. None		e. Once a week				
	b. Between 1 and 11 times		f. 2 to 3 times a week				
	c. About once a month	0	g. 4 to 5 times a week				
	d. About 2 to 3 times a month		h. More than 5 times a week				

15. During the times when you were living your feer Maniteba did you soularly speed back to Maniteba to		YES
15. During the times when you were living away from Manitoba old you regularly come back to Manitoba to		NO
engage in traditional loop harvesting.	D	NOT APPL.
		YES
b. During the times when you were living away from Manitoba did you regularly engage in traditional food		NO
havesung in the Frovince that you were nying or other places outside of MBr		NOT APPL.

MANITOBA METIS FEDERATION TLUKS: RECORDING FORM 'A'

17. How many people currently live full-time at your place of residence?

1825 C.

[e.g. 3 or 12]

8. Cur	rent marital status? [check "v" one box]	
	a. Single - Never Legally Married	c. Married/Common Law
	b. Single – Divorced/Legally Separated	d. Widowed
	e. Don't Know/Refused to Answer	

9. Hij	shest level of education? [check "v" one box]		
	a. Grade 9 or less		b. Grade 10 -12
	c. High School Diploma		d. High School Equivalency
	e. Some University		f. Graduate Degree (Bachelors)
	g. Post Graduate Degree (Masters or Doctorate)		h. Diploma or Certificate
	i. Don't Know/Refused to Answer	0	

20. Cu	rrent employment status? [Check "V" one box]	
	a. Employed Full-Time, Year Round	b. Employed Part-Time, Year Round
	c. Employed Full Time, Seasonally	d. Employed Part-Time, Seasonally
	e. Not Employed, on Disability Leave	f. Not Employed – Temporarily Laid Off
	g. Not Employed in Past 6 Months	h. Retired
	i. Don't Know/Refused to Answer	

1. Cu	rrent personal annual income? [Check "v" one box]		
	a. Less than \$20,000/year	0	d. Between \$60,000 - \$74,999/year
	b. Between \$20,000 - \$39,999/year		e. \$75,000 or more/year
	c. Between \$40,000 - \$59,999/year		f. Don't Know/Refused to Answer

22. Cu	rrent total annual household income? [Check "V" one	box]	
	a. Less than \$20,000/year		d. Between \$60,000 - \$74,999/year
	b. Between \$20,000 - \$39,999/year		e. \$75,000 or more/year
	c. Between \$40,000 - \$59,999/year		f. Don't Know/Refused to Answer

NOW MOVE ON TO THE MAP BIOGRAPHY PART OF THE INTERVIEW. AT THIS POINT ASK THE INTERVIEWEE IF THEY HAVE EVER BEEN A REGISTERED TRAPPER LICENSED TO TRAP IN THE STUDY AREA OR A HELPER TO A TRAPPER LICENSED TO TRAP IN THE STUDY AREA. IF ANSWER IS NO, YOU DO NOT NEED TO USE FORM 'D' DURING THE INTERVIEW.

							Polygon			1	NTS											
							Line			n	AN	,						1+ 8P	ole 3 51	udy Area		
	PIN (4 digit	umb	er)	TAG (3	digit 001, 010	, 101)	Point			SH	EET	#						2* Den 3* Kee 4* 500	ens fou ryssk St h B.Pole	utly Are & Keey	Area a ask Stu	ay.
-									1									Areas 0 - IF N	OT N	WY ST	UDY AN	EA.
١	NHAT		1.			WHEN	a Marine								٧	VHO	0					
	Elk		1.1.1.1	1.12	SEAS	ON						0	wn	Grar	nd or	Aur	nt or	Cous	in or vi	Snor	ical	and a
	Moose			-	JLA		-			er		Far	nity	GG	rand	Un	cle	Cou	isin	Partr	er's	
	Deer			Winter	Spring	Summer	Fall	۲ ar)	E	IT	ren	her	ster	de	ide	de	ide	de	ide	ily	_	Jer
	Caribou-BL	13						ENC s/ye	/yea	e/Pa	hild	/fat	r/si	s si	r's s	s si	r's s	s si	r's s	Farr	lin	/otl
	Caribou – WL			Nov, Dec,	Mar, Apr &	Jun, Jul &	Sen & Ort	QUE	RATI ays,	nse	n C	ther	the	her	the	her	the	her	the	hed.	Fa	(pue
	Black Bear		YEARS	Jan & Feb	May	Aug	Joep a out	FRE (# ti	Ind #	Spo	NO NO	mot	bro	Fat	Mo	Fat	Mo	Fat	Mo	Lun	Ext	Frie
	Rabbit		<1940			_					_	-		-	-		-	_				
	Geese	_	<1940								-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Duck		1940-49						100													
	Other Waterfowl					15.000		1000	211 214					5								- 2
	Shot Coyote/Wolf		1950-59																			
	Shot Beaver					-			-		100		120	1000	1							0
FISHI	NG:		1960-69						1.00													
	Whitefish									1		10/15									20	
	Jackfish		1970-79																			
	Pickerel	-	1000.00	-	-	_	-	11.1.1	Mag V	-	_	-	-	-	-	_	-		_	-	-	-
	Suckers	-	1980-89	u	Ц	U		R. Ma		-	Ц	-	-	-	-	-	ч	-	-	-	ч	-
	Trout		1990-99													п						
	Sturgeon			-	-					-	-	-	-	-		-	_	-		-	_	-
	Perch		2000-10						and a													
	Bass	1000		South States	1000	ALC: NO.		CONTRACTOR OF	Contraction of the		-				-		100			1		1050
	Other	34																				
GATH	HERING:	WH	Y: How d	id vou lear	n to go to thi	s place or co	me to kno	w about th	is place? V	Vhv (do v		to to	this	plac	e in	stea	d of	foth	er	545	
	Berries	loca	ations? If	relevant, w	hy did you s	top going to	this place?								2							
	Roots/Nuts		Learned A	bout Place o	n Own	Good Pl	ace to Harv	est/Overnig	ht		Har	vest	Succ	ess D	eclin	ed						
	Mushrooms		Learned A	bout Place f	rom Family	Always	Gone to this	Place		Too Many Using this Location												
	Wild Rice		Learned A	bout Place fr	om Friend(s)	D Other R	eason				Gov	ernr	nent	or Pr	rivate	Par	ty Re	aso	ns			
	Sweet Grain/Sage	OT			DTES:																	
	Wood/Trees		(Chever)			- 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14	Dates (199	5			1			1	5.2		3 - D-	15	11.5	133		- 05
	Medicine																					
0000	IPATION																					
	Cabin																					
	Camp																					
	Ground Bush Camp																					
ACCES	S ROLITES																					
T	Portage																					
	Boat Landing																					
0	Foot Trail																					
	ATV-4 Wheel Trail																					
	Skidoo Trail																					
	Horse Trail																					

MMF-TLUKS - RESPONSE RECORDING FORM 'B' [June 6, 2011 version]

	PiN (4 digit number	d		TAG (3 dig	t 001,616,101)	100			Point 🗆		SHEET #					1- Served with the set Served with the set Server a Law	ada Khati Arian Mila	2.0
UL	TURAL SITES/PLAC	ES			Links	1. 11		a second second	1.000.000		No.	1.2 m	192 - Q.	1. 2	1.5			-
		172						Stars Title	1000	W	IEN AND HOW	OFTEND	O YOU G	D TO/USE TI	HIS SITE/PLA	CE?		And and
	WHAT		MORE	DETAIL	ED DESCRIPT	NON		Winter (Nov,Dec,lan, Feb)	Spring (Mar,Apr,M	lay)	Summer (Jun, Jul, Aug)	Fall	(Sep,	Never	Once a Year	Every 2-3 Years	Every 4-5 Years	Less then every 5 Yea
	Former Village Site												157	17. 1 The				
7	Historic Event Site																	
1	Battle Site							Pole IL -	Sec. 1	1.4		all the second	121			a partie	20.28	
2	Ceremonial Site/Place																	
2	Burial Site												213					
2	Sacred/Spiritual							Station 1						1.4.5.2				
2	Imp Landscape Feature												See 1	1.00				
2	Other												1	1. 1. 2.				
2	Other							English and						1.385				
	WHAT Fish Spawning Area		Whitefish	0	Jackfish	0	Tro	at		Si Picker	PECIES al/Walleye	0	Sturgeon		0	Other:		100
0	Deer	LARG	E ANIMAL HAB	ITATS														
2	Caribou (Barren Land)		Winter		Spring	0	Sun	uner		Fall		0	Migration	Route	0	Calving/Bir	thing Site	
2	Caribou (Woodland)		1. 1. 1. 1. 1.		101 1000		57.5	Section	Sec. Sal	nu			11221	19 L		allent.	W.L.	
2	Elk	1000																
7	Bear																	
1	Nesting Area		Duck		Geese		Swa	n		Other	Waterfowl	0	Upland Bi	rd	0	Other:		
2	Salt Lick	100																
1	Other: (describe)																	
1 2 2 6 10 202	OTHER NOTES:																	

MMF-TLUKS RESPONSE RECORDING FORM 'D' - TRAPPING (Nov 23, 2010 version)

PIN (4 digit number) TAG (3 digit 001,010,101)

Polygon	
Line	NTS MAP
Point	SHEET#

3 - Billole Study Area
2 - Gerena Kover Souty Area
1- Kenyash Shudy Jena
4 - Both SiPole & Kerryash Arrest
4 - II OCTUDE ANY STUDY AND

V	VHAT
TRAPP	ING:
	Badger
	Bear
	Beaver
D	Coyote
	Fisher
	Fox
	Lynx
	Marten
	Mink
	Muskrat
	Otter
	Rabbit
	Raccoon
	Weasel
	Wolf
	Wolverine

24.34		WHE	N	104				
			Sea	sons	Trapper Status			
Y	EARS	Spring	Summer	Fall	Winter	Registered Trapper	Registered Trapper's Helber	
	<1940		D					
	1940-49		o		•			
	1950-59		۵		D			
	1960-69	D		•				
	1970-79		٥		D	D	D	
	1980-89			D	0			
	1990-99							
	2000-10	0	0		0	0	D	



OTHER INTERVIEWER NOTES

APPENDIX F: Digital Mapping Methodologies

Digital Mapping Data Capture during the Interview Process:

Each area, linear feature or point feature identified by an interviewee was first coded with the Capturx digital pen (loaded with Capturx for ArcView 9.3.1 software) as a polygon, line or point, then drawn onto the base map (1:250,000 scale scanned georeferenced NTS raster map), and given a unique "tag" number in sequential order. The combination of the interviewees Personal Identification Number (4 digit code) and the unique "tag" number created a unique identification code for each and every feature recorded for all of the interviews. Each unique identification code is linked to the attribute data recorded on the separate data entry forms (Forms B through D). Post interview information contained on the digital pen was downloaded into ArcView after each interview and the pen cleared for the next interview. Two pens were purchased in case of interview overlap.

Map Creation for Berens River Road Project:

Each interview base map (based on the 250K NTS tile make-up of Manitoba - 4 in total) has a corresponding interactive Capturx legend that can be changed on-the-fly between line, point and polygon. All accessible legend features are linked directly to the geodatabase of choice. The Capturx markup layer is included in the legend with the default settings to be housed in separate folders for QC purposes. All interview base maps were downloaded from Canmatrix Georeferenced, Digital Topographic Maps of Canada - 52M, 53D, 62P and 63A. All downloaded .TIF images were imported and manipulated in ArcView 9.3.1 and then printed 3' x 4' using a compatible carbon based ink map plotter.

Geodatabase and Feature Class Creation:

One project folder was created to house all geodatabases and Capturx markup files. All line, point and polygon features are created and linked as feature classes housed in the "original_gdb" geodatabase. The original_gdb was created with 3 primary columns in the attribute table: PIN, PIN_TAG and TAG. To isolate data in order to create specific visuals, all Access tables will be joined based on the PIN_TAG relationship. A carbon copy geodatabase was created to be used as the "scratch_gdb" QC geodatabase for review of all captured spatial data. Lastly, a "final_gdb" was created to house all final feature class versions.

All feature classes housed in the scratch geodatabase are linked directly to all paper base maps to gather information, including the Capturx markup layer. Once quality checked in the scratch geodatabase, all feature classes are copied to the final geodatabase to be housed for final analysis and isolation. Once moved from the scratch_gdb, the 3 feature classes are replaced from the original_gdb (named the same) and placed back into the scratch_gdb. Therefore, 'tricking' the scratch_gdb to believe that nothing has moved and resetting the values simultaneously, thereby eliminating the need to create a fresh feature class after each individual interview. All Capturx markup files (separated by PIN labeled folders) are housed separately from the 3 geodatabases in order to determine base map usage per interviewee, and to lessen confusion.

Final Analysis

For final analysis, all separate feature classes were grouped by PIN numbers in the final geodatabase. All polygons (PLY), lines (LN) and point (PT) features were then merged to form separate Berens_Ply_Merged, Berens_LN_Merged and Berens_PT_Merged feature classes. The primary Access database with the preferred queried tables is then joined to the final_gdb where the 3 merged feature classes are housed. Depending on the request, visuals are produced by simply joining the queried Access table (e.g. Moose_Harvesting) with the feature class based on the PIN_TAG relationship.

Polygon intensity is accomplished by incorporating the python script application "super_region_poly_v93" found at ArcScripts at <u>http://arcscripts.esri.com</u> into the arctool box in Arc View 9.3.1. The script runs a selective program that counts the polygon overlap of each created layer, and creates an overall layer of intensity. The resulting intensity displays are created largely through the symbology tab of each layer by grouping levels of intensity.









 NAD 1993 UTM Zone 14N Projecton: Transverse Mercator False Easting: 500000.0 False Northing: 0.0 Contral Meridian: -99.0 Scale Factor: 0.99950 Lattude Origin: 0.0 Linear Unit: Metre Data Sources MB Hydro: "Bipole 3 Alternate Routes Map" Maritoba Land Initiative: mil gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Metis Federation
 N

Manitoba Metis Federation Bipole 3 Transmission Project Traditional Land Use, Values and Knowledge Study

Map H Central - Gathering (Berries, Roots or Nuts, Mushrooms, Wild Rice, Sweet Grass, Wood Harvesting, Medicine, Other Gathering) Areas 1940 - 2011 All Seasons

The following harvesting and traditional knowledge display is based on preliminary data from 49 interviewees, and should not be interpreted or representative of the entire Manitoba Metis population. For discussion purposes only. May not be reproduced without consent





l'M Zone ransvers 1: 50000 g: 0.0 ian: -99 0.9996 rigin: 0. Metre	14N se Mercator 00.0 1.0 5 0	Geographic Coordinate System: GCS North American 1983 Datum: D North American 1983 Prime Meridian: Greenwich Angular Unit: Degree	N
15	30	60 Kilometers	

For discussion purposes only. May not be reproduced without consent



NAD 1983 UTM Zone 14N Projection: Transverse Mer False Easting: 500000.0 False Northing: 0.0 Central Meridian: -99.0 Scale Factor: 0.99960 Latitude Of Origin: 0.0 Linear Unit: Metre

40

80 Kilometr

1:892.000

20

The following harvesting and traditional knowledge display is based on preliminary data from 49 interviewees, and shouldnot be interpreted or representative of the entire Manitoba Metis population For discussion purposes only. May not be reproduced without consent

Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Metis Federation Cartographer: Cam Stewart





 1993 UTM Zone 14N
 Geographic Coordinate System:

 ection: Transverse Mercator
 GCS North American 1983

 ie Easting: 500000.0
 Datum: D North American 1983

 ie Northing: 0.0
 Datum: D North American 1983

 tral Meridian: -99.0
 Prime Meridian: Greenwich

 le Factor: 0.99960
 Angular Unit: Degree

 ude Of Origin: 0.0
 Angular Unit: Degree

 o
 20
 40

1:892,000

Manitoba Metis Federation Bipole 3 Transmission Project Traditional Land Use, Values and Knowledge Study Map G South - Food Fishing (Whitefish, Jackfish, Pickeral, Suckers, Trout, Sturgeon, Perch, Bass, Otherfish) Areas 1940 - 2011 All Seasons

The following harvesting and traditional knowledge display is based on preliminary data from 49 interviewees, and shouldnot be interpreted or representative of the entire Manitoba Metis population. For discussion purposes only. May not be reproduced without consent

Data Sources: MB Hydro: "Bipole 3 Alternate Routes Map" Manitoba Land Initiative: mli.gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Metis Federation Cartographer: Cam Stewart p





NAD 1983 UTII Zone 14N Projection: Transverse Mercator Palse Easting: 500000 Palse Northing: 0.0 Central Meridan: -990 Scale Factor: 0.99960 Lattude Of Origin: 0.0 Unear Unit: Metre Data Sources MB Hydo: "Bjole 3 Atternate Routes Map" Manitoba Land Initiative: mi gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba I Metis Federation 9 125 23 30 0000

Manitoba Metis Federation Bipole 3 Transmission Project Traditional Land Use, Values and Knowledge Study

Map G Central - Food Fishing (Whitefish, Jackfish, Pickeral, Suckers, Trout, Sturgeon, Perch, Bass, Otherfish) Areas 1950 - 2010 All Seasons Spatial Extent and Use Intensity

The following harvesting and traditional knowledge display is based on preliminary data from 49 interviewees, and should not be interpreted or representative of the entire Manitoba Metis population. For discussion purposes only. May not be reproduced without consent





Manitoba Metis Federation Bipole 3 Transmission Project Traditional Land Use, Values and Knowledge Study

Map G Central - Food Fishing (Whitefish, Jackfish, Pickeral, Suckers, Trout, Sturgeon, Perch, Bass, Otherfish) Areas 1940 - 2011 All Seasons

The following harvesting and traditional knowledge display is based on preliminary data from 49 interviewees, and should not be interpreted or representative of the entire Manitoba Metis population. For discussion purposes only. May not be reproduced without consent





60 Kilometers ┥ 1:892,000

For discussion purposes only. May not be reproduced without consen



┥ 1:892,000

For discussion purposes only. May not be reproduced without consent



40

20

80 Kild

1 1.892 000

The following harvesting and traditional knowledge display is based on preliminary data from 49 interviewees, and shouldnot be interpreted or representative of the entire Manitoba Metis population For discussion purposes only. May not be reproduced without consen

Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Metis Federation Cartographer: Cam Stewart





NAD 1983 UTM Zone 14N Projection: Transverse Mercator False Easting: 500000.0 False Northing: 0.0 Central Meridian: -99.0 Scale Factor: 0.99960 Latitude Of Origin: 0.0 Linear Unit: Metre



NAD 1983 UTM Zone 14N Projection: Transverse Mercator False Easting: 00 Central Maridan: Greenwich August Unit: Degree CS North American 1983 Diture D North American 1983 D North Ame





NAD 1993 UTIH Zone 14N Projection: Transverse Mercator False Resting: 50000.0 False Northing: 0.0 Central Meridian: -99.0 Scale Factor: 0.99960 Latkude Of Origin: 0.0 Linear Unit: Metre Data Sources MB Hydor: Biplols 3 Aternate Routes Map^o Manitoba Land Initiative: mil gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Metis Federation 1:690,000

Manitoba Metis Federation Bipole 3 Transmission Project Traditional Land Use, Values and Knowledge Study

Map F Central - Small Animal (Rabbit, Coyote, Wolf, Beaver, Waterfowl, Upland Birds) Harvesting Areas 1940 - 2011 All Seasons

The following harvesting and traditional knowledge display is based on preliminary data from 49 interviewees, and should not be interpreted or representative of the entire Manitoba Metis population. For discussion purposes only. May not be reproduced without consent










Manitoba Metis Federation Bipole 3 Transmission Project Traditional Land Use, Values and Knowledge Study

```
Map E Central - Large Animal (Elk) Harvesting Areas 1940 - 2011
```

All Seasons Spatial Extent and Use Intensity





NAD 1983 UTILI Zone 14N Projector: Transverse Mercator False Easting: 50000.0 False Easting: 50000.0 Central Meridiar: -900 Scale Factor. 0.9980 Lattude Of Origin: 0.0 Linear Unit: Degree Maritoba Land Initiative: mil gov.mb.ca Maritoba Metis Federation Bipole 3 Transmission Project Traditional Land Use, Values and Knowledge Study Map E Central - Large Animal (Elk) Harvesting Areas 1940 - 2011 All Seasons The following harvesting and traditional knowledge display is based on preliminary data from 49 interviewees, and should not be interpreted or representative of the entire Manitoba Metis population. May not be reproduced without consent



Projection: Transverse Mercator False Easting: 500000.0 False Northing: 0.0 Central Meridian: -99.0 Scale Factor: 0.99960 Latitude Of Origin: 0.0 Linear Unit: Metre 40 80 Kilometres J 1:892,000

The following harvesting and traditional knowledge display is based on preliminary data from 49 interviewees, and shouldnot be interpreted or representative of the entire Manitoba Metis population. For discussion purposes only.

May not be reproduced without consent

Data Sources: MB Hydro: "Bipole 3 Alternate Routes Map" Manitoba Land Initiative: mli.gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Metis Federation Cartographer: Cam Stewart







NAD 1983 UTM Zone 14N Projection: Transverse Mercator False Easting: 50000.0 Central Meridian: -900 Scale Factor: 099900 Latitude Of Origin: 0.0 Unear Unit: Metre Data Sources: MB Hydro: Blobe 3 Attende Routes Map MB Hydro: Blobe 3 Attende Routes Map Manitoba Land Initiative: mit gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Land Initiative: mit gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Land Initiative: mit gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Land Initiative: mit gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Land Initiative: mit gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Land Initiative: mit gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Land Initiative: mit gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Land Initiative: mit gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Land Initiative: mit gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Land Initiative: mit gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Land Initiative: mit gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Land Initiative: mit gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Land Initiative: mit gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Metis Federation The following harvesting and traditional knowledge display is based on preliminary data from 49 interviewees, and should not be interpreted or representative of the entire Manitoba Metis population. May not be reproduced without consent





 NAD 1983 UTM Zone 14N
 GCS North American 1983

 Projection: Transverse Mercator
 False North American 1983

 False Northall Mercator
 False North American 1983

 Central Meridian: 99.0
 Scale Factor: 0.99960

 Lattude Of Origin: 0.0
 Linear Unit: Metre

 Datares
 Manitoba Land Initiative: mit.gov.mb.ca

 Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011
 Manitoba Metis Federation

 1:5690,000
 1:5690,000

Manitoba Metis Federation Bipole 3 Transmission Project Traditional Land Use, Values and Knowledge Study

Map D Central - Large Animal (Deer) Harvesting Areas 1940 - 2011 All Seasons









 NAD 1983 UTM Zone 14N
 Geographic Coordinate System:

 Projection: Transverse Mercator
 GCS North American 1983

 False Easting: 500000.0
 Datum: D North American 1983

 False Northing: 0.0
 Prime Meridian: Greenwich

 Central Meridian: -99.0
 Angular Unit: Degree

 Scale Factor: 0.99960
 Latitude O Origin: 0.0

 Latitude O Origin: 0.0
 Letinear Unit: Metre

40

1-892.000

Manitoba Metis Federation Bipole 3 Transmission Project Traditional Land Use, Values and Knowledge Study

Map C South - Large Animal (Moose) Harvesting Areas 1940 - 2011 All Seasons

The following harvesting and traditional knowledge display is based on preliminary data from 49 interviewees, and shouldnot be interpreted or representative of the entire Manitoba Metis population. For discussion purposes only. May not be reproduced without consent Data Sources: MB Hydro: "Bipole 3 Alternate Routes Map" Manitoba Land Initiative: mli.gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Metis Federation Cartographer: Cam Stewart





NAD 1993 UTM Zone 14N Projection: Transverse Mercator False Rotting: 0.0 Central Meridian: 50000.0 Caster Factor: 0.99900 Lattude Of Origin: 0.0 Linear Unit: Metre Data Sources Manitoba Land Initiative: mi.gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Metis Federation 9 12.5 23 30 0000

Manitoba Metis Federation Bipole 3 Transmission Project Traditional Land Use, Values and Knowledge Study

Map C Central - Large Animal (Moose) Harvesting Areas 1940 - 2011 All Seasons Spatial Extent and Use Intensity





Manitoba Metis Federation Bipole 3 Transmission Project Traditional Land Use, Values and Knowledge Study

Map C Central - Large Animal (Moose) Harvesting Areas 1940 - 2011 All Seasons









40 80 Kilometre: 20 1:892,000





NAD 1983 UTM Zone 14N Projection: Transverse Mercator False Easting: 500000.0 False Northing: 0.0 Central Meridian: -99.0 Scale Factor: 0.99960 Latitude Of Origin: 0.0 Linear Unit: Metre Geographic Coordinate System: GCS North American 1983 Datum: D North American 1983 Prime Meridian: Greenwich Angular Unit: Degree 80 Kilometres 20

N

1:892,000

Manitoba Metis Federation Bipole 3 Transmission Project Traditional Land Use, Values and Knowledge Study

Map B South - Large Animal (Elk, Moose, Deer, Bear, Caribou) Harvesting Areas 1940 - 2011 All Seasons

The following harvesting and traditional knowledge display is based on preliminary data from 49 interviewees, and shouldnot be interpreted or representative of the entire Manitoba Metis population For discussion purposes only. May not be reproduced without consent

Data Sources: MB Hydro: "Bipole 3 Alternate Routes Map" Mankoba Land Initiative: mll.gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Mankoba Metis Federation Cartographer: Cam Stewart





NAD 1993 UTM Zone 14N Projection: Transverse Mercator False Rotting: 0.0 Central Meridian: -99.0 Scale Factor 0.99960 Lattude Of Origin: 0.0 Unear Unit: Metre Data Sources: MB Hydro: Bipole 3A ternate Routes Map" Maritoba Anelis Federation Maritoba Metis Federation 1:690,000 123 21 21 21 21 20 20 center

Manitoba Metis Federation Bipole 3 Transmission Project Traditional Land Use, Values and Knowledge Study

Map B Central - Large Animal (Moose, Elk, Deer, Bear, Caribou) Harvesting Areas 1940 - 2011 All Seasons Spatial Extent and Use Intensity





 NAD 1983 UTIH Zone 14N
 GCS North American 1983

 Projection: Transverse Mercator
 Datum: D North American 1983

 False Northing: 0.0
 Central Meridian: Greenwich

 Scale Factor 0.99950
 Angular Unit: Degree

 Lattude Of Origin: 0.0
 Linear Unit: Metre

 Data Sources
 MB Hydro: TBipole 3 Alternate Routes Map"

 Manitoba Land Initiative: mit gov.mb.ca
 N

 Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011
 1:690,000

 9
 12.6
 34

Manitoba Metis Federation Bipole 3 Transmission Project Traditional Land Use, Values and Knowledge Study

Map B Central - Large Animal (Moose, Deer, Elk, Bear, Caribou) Harvesting Areas 1940 - 2011 All Seasons









NAD 1983 UTM Zone 14N Projection: Transverse Mercator False Easting: 500000.0 False Northing: 0.0 Central Meridian: -99.0 Scale Factor: 0.99960 Latitude Of Origin: 0.0 Linear Unit: Metre 40 80 Kilometres 20 J 1:892,000

The following harvesting and traditional knowledge display is based on preliminary data from 49 interviewees, and shouldnot be interpreted or representative of the entire Manitoba Metis population For discussion purposes only. May not be reproduced without consent

Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Metis Federation Cartographer: Cam Stewart





NAD 1993 UTM Zone 14N Projection: Transverse Mercator False Easting: 50000.0 False North American 1983 prime Maridian: Greenwich Angular Unit: Degree Data Sources: MB Hydra: Telpole 3 Attensite Routes Map" Manitoba Land Initiative: mit gov.mb.ca Date of Completion: Aug 30, 2011 Manitoba Metis Federation 1:690,000

Manitoba Metis Federation Bipole 3 Transmission Project Traditional Land Use, Values and Knowledge Study

Map A Central - Merged all BP3 TLUKS Interview Data (Large Animal Harvesting, Small Animal Harvesting, Gathering, Fishing and Traditional Knowledge) 1940 - 2011 All Seasons



