MANITOBA CLEAN ENVIRONMENT COMMISSION

BIPOLE III TRANSMISSION PROJECT

PUBLIC HEARING

VOLUME 3

* *

Transcript of Proceedings

Held at Fort Garry Hotel

Winnipeg, Manitoba

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2012

* *

APPEARANCES

CLEAN ENVIRONMENT COMMISSION
Terry Sargeant - Chairman
Pat MacKay - Member
Brian Kaplan - Member
Ken Gibbons - Member
Wayne Motheral - Member
Michael Green - Counsel to the Board
Cathy Johnson - Commission Secretary

MANITOBA CONSERVATION AND WATER STEWARDSHIP
Tracey Braun
Elise Dagdick

MANITOBA HYDRO
Douglas Bedford - Counsel
Janet Mayor - Counsel
Shannon Johnson

BIPOLE III COALITION
Brian Meronek - Counsel
Karen Friesen
Garland Laliberte

CONSUMERS ASSOCIATION OF CANADA
Byron Williams - Counsel
Gloria Desorcey
Aimee Craft - Counsel

MANITOBA METIS FEDERATION
Jason Madden - Counsel

MANITOBA WILDLANDS and SAPOTAWEYAK CREE NATION
Gaile Whelan Enns

GREEN PARTY OF MANITOBA
James Beddome

PEGUIS FIRST NATION
Robert Dawson - Counsel

TATASKWEYAK CREE NATION
Ian Cluny
Shaun Keating

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

PINE CREEK FIRST NATION
Charlie Boucher
Warren Mills
John Stockwell

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS

Wednesday, October 3, 2012

Upon commencing at 9:00 a.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, welcome to Day 3. Moving right along. No opening comments from here this morning.

I understand Hydro has something to put on the record? No, I was misled. So, then, we will turn it over to you this morning. We have the final half day of presentations. Mr. Madden?

MR. MADDEN: Madden, for the Manitoba Métis Foundation. I have a few logistical issues. With respect to corrections to transcripts, what is the CEC's procedure in dealing with those? I have reviewed some sections, and there is some edits, do we just provide those to the commission secretary?

THE CHAIRMAN: You could, I am not sure we have ever dealt with corrections before, we do verbatim transcripts.

THE WITNESS: I must have said some words, that I never knew were part of the English language, that day. On, Monday. Can we -- can I provide --

THE CHAIRMAN: Provide them to the commission secretary, and we will consider them, yes.

MR. MADDEN: Second thing, I have a case

management call that I can't reschedule for 3:30, I am wondering with respect to scheduling of the cross-examination, if there is flexibility to, I don't want to start, and then have to end halfway through. So I am wondering, if I could begin first thing tomorrow morning.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may recall yesterday afternoon, in response to Ms Craft, I said that friendly arrangements among the participants as to scheduling, we have no problem with that at all. The only reason for the schedule is just to have some order to it. But if you people, if the participants, I shouldn't say you people, if the participants wish to make some reasonable changes to that, we have no problem.

MR. MADDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, this morning, we are going to, I think it is actually, about three, or four presentations, but it is broken into two chunks, from Manitoba Hydro. The first titled the north, and the second one, entitled construction. Association I will turn it over to Mr. Bedford, do you have any opening comments, or do we turn it over to Mr. --

MR. BEDFORD: No, thank you. We should

affirm each of the witnesses, and I guess we created some unnecessary confusion by describing one, this presentation as the North, Mr. MacInnes is actually going to address Gillam, and Ms Zebrowksi, is going to describe the overview of our Aboriginal consultation process, and in addition, the Community Development Initiative known as CDI. Thank you. And the misinformation to you this morning was we do have an answer to an undertaking that we gave yesterday. And we will provide that answer, we thought best, when all of our witnesses return. And Mr. Mazur, will put in the undertaking, because he is the one that undertook.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Miss Johnson, would you affirm these witnesses? Could you state your names for the record, please?

Finlay MacInnes, affirmed.

Deirdre Zebrowski, affirmed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, Mr. MacInnes, are you going first? You may lead off.

MR. MACINNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, Ladies and Gentlemen. I would just like to tell you a little bit about myself. My name

is Finlay MacInnes, I am the division manager for Generation North. I am based out of Gillam, Manitoba. I have worked for Manitoba Hydro for in excess of 40 years, 30 of them in the north, and approximately 20 based out of the Gillam area.

I have held the division manager position since 2003. I feel that this gives me a good understanding of some of the issues, and challenges as well as opportunities for the north.

Just to give you a bit of an idea of the area, and what I am involved in, Kelsey, is my southern most station on the Nelson River, then Wuskwatim which is just coming on line. We have two units there now. And we have two small units at Glory River which empty into the Churchill River. And, then we have Notigi, Missi Falls control structures, and although I am based out of the Gillam, and the vast majority of my work is associated with this area. And we supply approximately 75 percent of the generation for the Province of Manitoba.

This is a sign that you will see when you come into the airport, and enter into, towards the Town of Gillam. I think these signs are very important, because what it does, is it shows that we

have a total population of approximately 1300 people in Gillam, by the last census, Fox Lake has urban reserve within the Town of Gillam. And they have approximately 350 members that reside there as well. And an additional 200 members approximately out at Fox Lake, which used to be known as Bird.

Some of the things that have helped us over the years, is, we have had a few different committees that tried to ensure that we had opportunity for northerners, and in it particular case Fox Lake within Gillam. In '96, '97, we started, what we called a JEBO committee, which is a Joint Employment and Business Opportunity, and in 2007, we moved it to Harmonized Gillam Development, or HGD. And I will refer to that a couple of times throughout the presentation. And the reason we moved the JEBO is still in existence, but we felt it was too restrictive on the overall application.

Gillam has been in existence for a number of years for Hydro. Started the development of the Nelson River. This is when it was still a CN town for the most part. And when I call it CN town, Fox Lake was still in the vicinity, and part of it. But the development of the town itself started with the CN. You can see the station, the CN station in

here. And that was built in 1935. CN used to be the end of the rail until they extended the rail up into Churchill, but at one time they actually turned the trains around at Gillam and headed south again.

This is when Hydro started moving into the area, and this is is in the mid '60's, to late '60's. And anybody that is familiar with Gillam, this is Gillam Drive, and this would be Nelson Crescent, and this is where the runway is located, still there today. But, if you notice there are no buildings, or anything at the airport at this point.

This is a picture that is probably a little dearer to my heart this is what Gillam looked like in 1973 when I moved up there. Some of the things I would like to draw your attention to, is some of the facilities that were put into place at that time. And one of them, this here is the Gillam Hospital, and, unfortunately, it burned down in the late '80s, and there was a new facility built at that time. It is a ten room, ten-bed hospital that we are using presently today. This is the school, and there are some temporary classrooms, and that, with the school, some of these temporary classrooms are still in use today.

The Town of Gillam is changing, and I will

show that as we get into it. But just for an example, the student enrollment in Gillam school has increased about a hundred by about a hundred students over the last two years, part of that is because of our hiring practices, and, we are hiring more mature family men rather than people just out of school, that are up there for a quick dollar, if you will, and some experience. And then leave. What we are trying to do, is build a sustainable community.

This here is the existing shopping center, and if you can see, here, these, this was originally built as a trailer complex, and, it is reached the end of its useful life, and we will be talking a little bit more about that, and what is going on there as well.

This is what Gillam more or less as it looks, today. And what I wanted to do is just identify this particular subdivision right here, which is locally known as Crayola due to the color of all of the houses. It was built to accommodate the staff for Limestone. And this basically, I just wanted to identify, so you can see what we are looking at as we move forward.

This is where we are today, we are looking at a new subdivision that is to be built. The

interesting portion of this is, if you notice all of the water and that on it, we have started removing the peat moss to allow the permafrost to start melting. We have had a number of units up in Gillam, that have shifted, and, we have had to relocate, et cetera.

But some of the interesting portions of this is this has not been done in isolation. This has been done through our HGD, and under our HGD which is Harmonized Gillam Development, we have put land use planning committees together, which consist of Fox Lake First Nation, it consists of Town of Gillam, Manitoba Hydro, and the Province of Manitoba. And this particular lot will require, or, will provide about 70 lots for housing. Through our focus groups, and through the HGD, and through consultants, which is Hilderman Thomas Frank Cram, which was jointly selected by the HGD committee, We have determined that the needs of the community, if we are to double over the next ten to 15 years, which is, tentatively what people have indicated to us, we are probably going to need minimum three of these, maybe four, as well as a redevelopment of the existing trailer park.

This is the only one site that has been

identified. There have been a number of tentative identified, but we haven't done any of the desk work to find out if they are suitable or not. It is interesting in the fact that the north, although, it is large land mass, is not extremely suitable for construction processes. And that is why we are thawing out the permafrost here, and draining off the water. And, we are excavating.

An example of it, is we have hit permafrost as shallow, this is in the last month, as shallow as 16 to 18 inches, where we hit permafrost. And we will backfill the whole site up, and put in water, sewer, roads, et cetera,.

This is another view of the same site, and you can see the proximity to the airstrip. But once again, Fox Lake has indicated that they may need any where up to 180, 200 lots, as employment opportunities, and people return home. So that is part of the consideration that we have to take into it. Manitoba Hydro will probably need approximately, another 180 lots for itself, the Town of Gillam has also expressed a need, to have lots that they can sell, to the public where, it is their desire, and our desire, that we slowly move this away from being a company town to being a community that

is there for the long haul. We know that we build generating stations for a hundred years plus, the community has to represent that.

This is just a snapshot of the old Northern grocery store, and the new Co-op that is in existence today. And the only reason that I put this in, is to show that as a community grows, the goods and services, and everything else has to grow with it. So, it actually is it provide additional benefit for all citizens in the community.

This is a restaurant in Gillam, it is Mile 326, which, Mile 326 was chosen as the name because that is the miles on the railway. And Gillam originally was a CN community. Mile 326 is a joint venture between Fox Lake First Nation, and Sodexo, they have been in operation here over two years, and quite successful.

It is it has provided a number of opportunities for people to work. The vast majority of staff come from Fox Lake. And it has been a good addition for capacity building. A number of these people have moved into other areas of opportunity with some of the camps, and, gone onto be trained in areas of management and Red Seal cooks.

Other areas that we have opportunity for

joint ventures. Some of the houses that were built in the '70's were double-wide trailers that were taken in. And, what we have done here is the double-wides run basements, we have retained the basements, they are in good shape, and joint ventures such as this one, McDiarmid Lumber, and Fox Lake, have actually built new houses on the existing basements. And so, now, we have replaced with conventional houses. You notice in some places we have actually extended beyond the basement a little bit, to provide additional space.

This is only one of them, they also have a joint venture with replacing these homes with Stefan Homes in Winnipeg, which has been in Gillam for a number of years, and in fact built an apartment building, and it is out for rent that they own. So we slowly starting to attract some private development.

This is the joint statement, from the Harmonized Gillam Development. It was signed in 2007 by the existing Chief of Fox Lake at the time, Chief George Neepin, and our previous CEO, Bob Brennan. And I am going to read it, because I think it is important. The Harmonized Gillam Development, is the harmonization of the respective interests and

ambitions of the stakeholders in the area. Moreover, harmonized Gillam development must focus on building a community where all residents live, work, play, and prosper together. Where there is a mutual use and enjoyment of community facilities and services, and where residents respect, and support the interests and ambitions of their neighbors.

This joint statement has been utilized as our guiding framework, and we have, through the HGD and JEBO, and land use planning, and town use planning committees, insured that all stakeholders are participant in the development, and redevelopment of Gillam.

Other areas where I think that we have been doing some benefit to the north, is opportunities for technical jobs which are skilled, high paying, and necessary both for Manitoba Hydro, but good for the development of the capacity building in the communities.

This particular unit here, and the reason I put it in here, this was at Limestone Generating Station. It is a thrust bearing, but what it does is it provides the opportunity to talk a little bit about preplacement training program that we have put in place, and has been in place now for about 12

years. And it provides ten spots in the north, and ten spots in the south, but I will only talk about the north right now.

And we go into the various communities, and we recruit people. I think we had something like total of about 112, this past, for the ten positions. And we know that the educational standards in all of the communities is not totally adequate. So, what we have done is we have a ten-month preplacement, where we will give them exposure into the various trades in the generating stations and in the converter stations, and we will work with them if they are a little bit shy on maths or physics, and we will upgrade their skills, so they can be successful in the apprenticeship programs. And over the years, we have maintained about an 85 percent success rate. So it is something that I am very proud of, I was involved with this right from day one.

Another area, what we have been doing here, and this is a training meeting that is going on at the training center at the Radisson Converter Station. But I just wanted to use this as a bit of an example, and in some of the stations in particular, Limestone, in its proximity to Fox Lake, or the Bird site, have gone into the school, and

invited the children, and the teachers, to participate in our first aid and our CPR training.

And so, when our staff receive this training, we are also providing it to the school, and, to the teachers. So they benefit, in a number of ways. One of them, is in the safety side of it. They also benefit in the fact that they get to know some of the workers, and it removes any stigma, or fear, and it gets them to see what is going on inside the generating station. And hopefully entice them into completing their education, and becoming employees.

This is an open house that was held at Limestone Generating Station. And, it was held on a Saturday and all of the staff at Limestone actually volunteered their time, and they were very happy to do it. They had a great time. We had a really good turn out both from Fox Lake, and the town of Gillam. And, one of the things that actually amazed me over the number of years that I have been up there, is how many people in Gillam, and in Bird, or Fox Lake have not been in our facilities. And, we would welcome, at any time, with open arms, but the truth of it is, sometimes you have to go out there, and entice them in, because, they are a bit shy, and,

not -- I guess they probably don't think they are welcome, even though they are.

This is the our previous CLO, which is the Community Liaison Officer, and she has got a booth at the open house at Limestone. The CLO position is integral to our relationship between Fox Lake, and, Manitoba Hydro. She makes regular visits to all of our facilities. I would say she is probably at each one of them once every couple of weeks, and she assists with our employees, or we have a number, I believe we have about 36 employees from Fox Lake, and sometimes they feel more comfortable it would seem talking to her rather than line management. And she will take it to our attention to do. So it is actually a very valuable position.

She is also integral, in helping provide the cross-cultural training. It is mandatory, that all of our staff in Gen North, and Power Supply North undergo cross-cultural training. And we have been doing it for a number of years now and it is an ongoing thing. People turn over. The average life span in Gillam, if you will, is about six and a half years, so we always have new people coming in. And cross cultural training, is a very important part of their orientation.

This is another example, once again, at Limestone, and Limestone seems to be a bit front and center, but it is because it is across the road from Bird site, or the Fox Lake site now. And what we have done is we have taken the elders in, we have given them a tour of the plant, talk to them, give them coffee, and doughnuts, and, we provided a bingo evening for them. And very well received, and, once again, it helps bring them into our facilities, and give them an understanding of what we are all about.

This is just some of the facilities, we talked a little bit about under the HGD. That the facilities are for the community, for all of the community. This is the swimming pool, or aquatic centre, there is an inside shot of it. The Rec Centre, and this is the curling, there is also ice hockey, bowling, theatre, and other facilities, within the Rec Centre. And as part of the growth, we recognize that the Rec Centre will also be expanding. And, through the HGD, and focus groups, and consultation with the community we will determine what facilities, and what amenities are added.

This is just an example, once again, only this is outdoor. There is a number of baseball teams, we have a couple of ball diamonds set out

there, right where you first come into town. The town of Gillam is very active, and, this is our July 1st, although, we don't have it on July 1st, we usually have it in the fall. There is just too much daylight, for good fire works, on July 1st, so, it is usually, around the end of September.

Another one is, we have a very active RCMP community within Gillam. There is a Sergeant, and five Constables, and they have a different ratio, and they add, as the town grows, and they have same as any other community on their own staffing levels. But here they are putting on safety training on bicycles, and a bicycle rodeo for the community. I believe they also had prizes of a couple of bicycles for the kids.

And we have a driving range that was put together, and built by the town of Gillam a few years back, and I personally have enjoyed it a number of times as well. This, when we talked a little bit about the shopping centre, and it is gone, it was an old one. This is actually Stage 1 of three part town centre, and it will be operated by the Town of Gillam.

What we are trying to achieve is a true town centre, not a shopping centre. There is going

to be apartments above it. The apartments are not designed for Hydro personnel, they are designed for anybody. And one of the things that we do recognize along with the town, is that will help offset some of the operating costs of the town centre as well, from the rents.

Part of the town centre, is also Wellness Centre, and originally, when we were talking about it we were calling it a professional centre, but, basically, it is going to house dentists, and physiotherapists, chiropractors, optometrists, it will have a fitness centre, et cetera. It will also have some apartments above it, and one of the reasons being, is the dental group, for example, that comes, up is the Assiniboine Dental Group, they have been coming up to Gillam since 1966, and they come a number of times a year, and so what we wanted to do, is we will have accommodation for them to stay right at the facilities, and, the same with the optometrists, and other ones, that provide the services. So dearly needed in northern communities.

And, once again, these services are for the community, they are not for Hydro. We do utilize them, but they are utilized by everybody.

This just gives a bit of a key recap of where we have

been, how Hydro has come in, and it has changed the townsite, there is no two ways about it. This is the way Gillam looks today. This, is a snapshot of where we are headed tomorrow, and I think the important one is this one right here. As we move forward, we move forward together.

We have, like everybody else, a good working relationship with Fox Lake, periodically, we stumble, and, like most people, that know each other quite well, periodically, we argue. But the reality of it is, we both share the common interest of the town, and the development of the community. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. MacInnes.

MR. BEDFORD: Mr. MacInnes, you told us at the outset of the presentation, that you anticipate that the population of Gillam will double in the next ten to 15 years. Can you remind us all, what the population of Gillam is today?

MR. MACINNES: The population today, is about 1300 people, and the facilities, and everything that we have today are geared towards the present population. The numbers, when I say it is going to double, has been provided to us, Fox Lake has indicated that they could have any wheres from 150 to

200 families returning, if, once there is employment and housing. Manitoba Hydro, we are speculating a little bit, on, you know the new projects, becoming into place. But if we look at the staffing levels, we have in the existing, plus some additional staff that is going to be required for Gillam service. As a town, for example, expands, so does the need for some the services. So, yes, we see it doubling. Ten, 15 years, maybe premature, but probably between now, and 20 years.

MR. BEDFORD: Mr. MacInnes, we, of course, some of us know that in the general vicinity of Gillam, aside from Fox Lake Cree Nation, there are, in the immediate vicinity three other Cree Nations that make this their home. So, feel at liberty to make use of the large map, that is adjacent to the commissioners when responding to my next couple of questions. Or if it is more convenient, although, the map isn't ideal, if you could find your way back, on the screen, to the map that you showed us at the outset of your presentation and I would like you to remind us all where the members of Tataskweyak Cree Nation live, and also York Factory First Nation, examine War Lake First Nation.

MR. MACINNES: Yes. When we look at

Kelsey here, Kelsey, and I was the plant manager at Kelsey for about nine years. At that time, I spent a great deal of time with the Tataskweyak, in the site of Split Lake, and York Landing, and War Lake, which is by Ilford, right along the railway. We have had many contracts and everything with all of these communities. In fact, the catering contract at Kelsey right now for the staff house is a joint venture between Sodexo, and York Landing.

We are just going through a major repair the overall portion of the generators at Kelsey. We put in a camp there, and, that camp was in fact built by Tataskweyak. When I was in Kelsey, we redid all of the pre-board dikes, and that was done by Tataskweyak, as a joint venture with Arnason contractors. We do try to provide opportunity, opportunity for all the local communities that we are near, and we do try to build capacity with them. Other than the contract, I am, right now, I don't know, if we have any employees from York. And, one of the reasons it is harder to get York Landing into the technical trades because their schooling doesn't go up to Grade 12. That is an issue.

From Tataskweyak, or Split Lake, we have a lot of employees, a number of them at Kelsey, but

they have entered into the preplacement training program, and have been quite successful. I don't know the numbers of them offhand, we certainly could get it, but there are, every year, there are members coming in from Tataskweyak. And we have a good working relationship.

One of the things that I should also make mention here, is I am focused on the operations of the plants. Construction builds them, then they turn them over to me. So, for example, with Wuskwatim, I am just actually getting involved with it now. And we have taken over two of the units, the third one hasn't been turned over to us yet. But that is not to say that we don't work very closely with construction, we obviously do. But, we are here, not for ten years, we are here for the hundreds of years.

MR. BEDFORD: Mr. MacInnes, can can you tell us, with respect to Generation North, the division that you head, how many Manitobans who identify themselves as Métis, are employed in your division in operations?

MR. MACINNES: I can't tell you how many are based in Gillam. I can tell you that there are a hundred that have been declared Métis in the north.

I haven't got the breakdown, though, of how many are based in Gillam itself.

MR. BEDFORD: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. MacInnes, just to follow on the last question, out of how many Hydro employees in the north?

MR. MACINNES it is a bit of a changing number, but I would say there is probably, and I don't have the exact number, but I would speculate that there is probably around four hundred in the Gillam area. Thompson is another one.

THE CHAIRMAN: The number, the 100 Métis, that you referred to, what would the total -- I mean, 100 out of how many?

MR. MACINNES I would put that at approximately 550.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you said in Gillam there are about 400 Hydro employees?

MR. MACINNES: Correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of the 1300 people in Gillam, how many of them are Hydro, including family?

MR. MACINNES: I don't have an exact number. I would have to conclude, that we are moving more towards family based rather than single. We no longer have a staff house in Gillam. It is

conventional housing. I know that the census on the town website has said that there is approximately 350 Fox Lake members. I do know there are some that work for CN, the services, there is, like Gillam area, the Co-op, Natural Resources, et cetera. I would have to do the maths to back it up. Or I can find it out for you.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is about four hundred employees, plus a lot of wives, or partners, and some children, so, Six to 700 perhaps?

MR. MACINNES: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any other questions of clarification. Thank you. We will move on then.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can we ask a couple of quick questions?

THE CHAIRMAN: Not at this time. If you were here yesterday afternoon, you would know the questioning doesn't start until this afternoon, and in fact, this panel probably won't be on until tomorrow. Ms Zebrowksi?

MS ZEBROWSKI: Good morning, my name is Deidre Zebrowksi, and I am the Manager of the Policy and Strategic Initiatives Department within the Aboriginal Relations Division in Manitoba Hydro.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you take the mic a little closer, please?

MS ZEBROWSKI: Certainly. My department is responsible for developing, and coordinating policy direction, and leading and supporting negotiations with communities on issues related to Aboriginal participation, benefits, and adverse effects associated with existing, and future projects. I have been with Manitoba Hydro for two and a half years. And prior to transitioning to my current role I also held the position of senior policy analyst within the department.

By way of additional background, my education background includes a Bachelor of Science degree in ecology, with a joint major in Botany and Zoology. I also have a Master of Science degree in Forest Entomology. And prior to working at Manitoba Hydro, I have been with the Province of Manitoba in the forestry branch for approximately 14 years. And during my time with the provincial government I worked on a variety of projects and files, which included work in the areas of policy development, ecosystem based management, natural resource and land use management issues, Aboriginal participation in the forestry sector, as well as Crown consultation.

The intent of my presentation today is to provide a general overview of the processes, and mechanisms which have been used to seek Aboriginal engagement or the Bipole III project. And some aspects of what I talk about today, will be covered in more detail during other presentations in this hearing process. In addition to the processes used for Aboriginal engagement. I am also going to provide a brief overview of the Bipole III Community Development Initiative.

So, Aboriginal engagement on the Bipole III project has occurred through a variety of mechanisms, I am going to provide a brief overview of these here, and I will provide a little bit more detail on each throughout the presentation. My colleague, Mr. Joyal, yesterday also provided a presentation regarding the public engagement process, or what Manitoba Hydro has termed the Environmental Assessment Consultation Process, or EACP.

During this process, in recognition of the unique rights and interests of Aboriginal communities, as well as the challenges with engaging many northern communities, for example, logistical challenges with travel, the Manitoba Hydro split the EACP process into two groupings, we had

Non-Aboriginal, then we had Aboriginal and Northern. And the Aboriginal and northern grouping, included Manitoba Métis Federation, First Nations, Northern Affairs communities as well as Aboriginal and regional organizations.

The EACP process for both groups, were carried out separately, but they occurred over the same timeframe, and used the same four rounds that were described in the presentation yesterday. The goals of the EACP Process as well as standards which were also described yesterday, were the same for both groups.

Additional information about those goals and processes can be found in the EACP technical report, but also briefly over viewed in Chapter 5 of the EIS. A second mechanism of engagement included providing opportunities for communities to share Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge or ATK, with Manitoba Hydro. For the purposes of the EIS, Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge or ATK was the over arching term used to describe the knowledge that they shared with Manitoba Hydro. But Manitoba Hydro does acknowledge that some communities use different terms to describe this kind of knowledge. For example, other terms that might be used would include

Traditional Knowledge, Traditional Ecological Knowledge, or Aboriginal Ecological Knowledge.

ATK was shared with Hydro in two ways, through Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge workshops, and through self-directed ATK studies. The intent of providing opportunities for ATK to be shared with Manitoba Hydro, was to assist Manitoba Hydro to identify and evaluate alternate routes, to Identify potential impacts, and also to assist in informing the development of the Environmental Protection Plan.

A third mechanism included discussions and meetings with communities that occurred outside of those first two processes that I have already described. And these other discussions might have originated for a variety of reasons, including contractual obligations, long standing, unique relationships, and to provide information to share information about the Environmental Protection Plan, or to work with the community to address specific concern that might have been raised. And I am going to provide some examples of these later on in my presentation.

I am not going to talk too much about the Crown consultation process as this is something that is being undertaken by the Province of Manitoba.

And there have been no aspects of this process which have been delegated to Manitoba Hydro. However having said that Manitoba Hydro has attended some community Crown consultation meetings when we have been requested to do so by the parties involved. And the purpose of us being there is usually to answer questions or provide information about the project.

So, just to provide, go back, and provide a little bit more information about the EACP process, the four rounds of the process took place from early 2008, through to the spring of 2011, and throughout these four rounds, a total of 26 First Nations, the Manitoba Métis Federation, 23 Northern Affairs communities, and five Aboriginal or regional organizations participated.

One of the things that we discovered during the first round of the process was the feedback provided to us suggested that community open houses would be a more effective way to share information with communities, and so in subsequent rounds, particularly in the second and third rounds, the focus of Manitoba Hydro was doing community open houses rather than focusing on meetings with leadership or representatives of communities.

Where we did have community open houses

those were arranged through the community leadership. The numbers in the table that I have on this slide represent the actual numbers of meetings, or actual number of open houses which took place in each round. These numbers, on this particular table are not actually reflective of the actual numbers who participated, because in some places where had you communities that are located in close proximity to each other, oftentimes, or sometimes those communities would choose to have a joint meeting, or choose to have a joint open house. I am going to run through a breakdown of those numbers from that perspective.

Round 1, Manitoba Hydro held meetings with community leadership or representatives and there was a total of 39 meetings, which included 21 First Nations, 21 Northern Affairs communities, and three organizations. In Round 2, there were five meetings which included the Manitoba Métis Federation, two First Nations, and two Aboriginal organizations. And we also held 29 open houses which had participation from 16 First Nations and 20 Northern Affairs communities.

Round 3, there were 28 open houses with participation from 15 First Nations, and 22 Northern

Affairs communities. And during this period of Round 3, Manitoba Hydro also provided funding to the Southern Chiefs' Organization for them to hold a two day gathering on Bipole III, and to do this on behalf of Treaty 2, and Treaty 4 First Nations.

During Round 4, there were 19 meetings, with participation from 10 First Nations, and 7 Northern Affairs communities, the MMF, and one organization. And, then there was a total of 21 open houses with participation from 9 First Nations and 18 Northern Affairs communities.

During this process, information was occasionally shared through means other than the specific EACP meetings, or open houses, the SCO gathering is one I have mentioned that is one example of that. Another example would be sometimes information was shared through existing processes, or mechanisms. So, for example, Bipole III project information was shared with Cross Lake First Nation through the Article 9 process of the Northern Flood Agreement.

As I referenced earlier, Manitoba Hydro wished to provide an opportunity for interested communities to share Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge that may be relevant to the Bipole III project, and

one of the ways this was done, was through ATK workshops. For this process, letters were sent to 49 communities in May of 2009. And, this letter offered the opportunity to hold an ATK workshop in the community. The communities receiving invitations included 23 First Nations, and 23 Northern Affairs communities.

Following this invitation letter, there was a number that indicated interest, and, in the end we had participation by five First Nation communities, and 14 Northern Affairs communities the workshops largely took place concurrently with Rounds 3, and 4 of the EACP process, or more specifically they were held late in 2009 and throughout 2010.

The workshops were funded by Manitoba Hydro, but were planned and implemented by Northern Lights Heritage Services on behalf of Manitoba Hydro. A presentation providing greater detail on these workshops is going to be forthcoming later in this process, so I don't want to provide extensive detail here, but I did want to show a map that shows where the different communities were located that took place in these workshops.

Just starting from the north, there, Pikwitonei, Thicket Portage, Herb Lake Landing,

Cormorant, Dawson Bay, Chemawawin Cree Nation, and a group of communities here which are shown in this larger square blown up a bit, Red Deer Lake, Westgate, National Mills, Barrows, Baden, and Powell. As well as Pelican Rapids, Duck Bay, Pine Creek First Nation, Camperville, Waywayseecappo First Nation, Dakota Tipi First Nation, and Dakota Plains First Nation.

MR. MADDEN: I may have missed this. Can you give the timeframe for when those workshops were held? You gave it for other periods, so I would like the exact timeframe.

MS ZEBROWSKI: They took place late in 2009 and throughout 2010.

MR. MADDEN: Can you be more specific about throughout 2010?

MS ZEBROWSKI: I could undertake to get you that information.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe this is detailed in the technical reports, Mr. Madden.

MR. MADDEN: I believe not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Listen we are not getting into debates right now, they are making a presentation.

MS ZEBROWSKI: If it is not in the

technical reports, I can provide it.

Okay. When Manitoba Hydro sent the invitations for ATK workshops, some communities responded with an interest in sharing ATK with Manitoba Hydro, but indicated they would prefer to undertake their own traditional knowledge study rather than participating in a workshop. In other cases the desire to undertake a self-directed ATK study was conveyed through other Bipole III related discussions that communities were having with Manitoba Hydro. So, when a community indicated a desire to undertake a self-directed study, Manitoba Hydro would request a work plan, and proposal to be provided to Manitoba -- be provided for Manitoba Hydro's consideration. Work plans, and budgets were considered, and negotiated with individual communities on a case-by-case basis.

Manitoba Hydro did receive requests to undertake land use and occupancy studies from some communities, who Manitoba Hydro considered to be outside of the Bipole III study area, and in this those cases Manitoba Hydro generally declined to provide funding for those studies. In total, we provided funding for 8 self-directed studies that were related to the Bipole III project.

And I am just again going to show a map, just to identify the communities that participated in this way. So there was Fox Lake Cree Nation, Tataskweyak Cree Nation, Opaskwayak Cree Nation, Sapotaweyak Cree Nation, Wuskwi Sipihk First Nation, Swan Lake First Nation, and Long Plain First Nation.

The Manitoba Métis Federation also participated in a self-directed study. And their study focused on their members who utilized the six Manitoba Métis Federation regions showed on this map, which crossed the Bipole III project area. The particular regions were the Thompson Region, The Pas, Northwest, Southwest, Winnipeg, and Southeast.

While sharing the information related to the Bipole III project study area was the sort of intended broad focus of these studies, the detailed study objectives, methodology format of each study was determined by the community that was undertaking the study. Most of the self-directed studies incorporated interviews with community members as part of their methodologies. And reports shared with Manitoba Hydro generally included information regarding historical and contemporary land use, sites of importance to the community, and concerns the community may have related to the project.

Each of the self-directed studies that were received prior to the submission of the EIS, were attached to the EIS in their entirety. And a summary of each report attached to the EIS was also included in Chapter 5 as well in the ATK Technical Report No. 2. The summaries provided for each report, were provided to the associated community for their review and comment prior to being included in the EIS. The best source of information, regarding the community perspectives on the Bipole III project will be the community reports themselves, or presentations and information that will be brought forward by the communities at this hearing, however I would like to take a few minutes to provide a brief overview of each of the reports that we received.

Fox Lake Cree Nation, provided a report, an interim report to Manitoba Hydro in May of 2011, and a final report in December of 2011. The reports, the primary objectives or one of the primary objectives of the Fox Lake Cree Nation study was to communicate the perspective of Elders and resource users about the impacts of the project. To achieve this, Fox Lake Cree Nation undertook three different research methods including map biography, route interviews, group interviews, and ground truthing.

The reports provided to Manitoba Hydro described Fox Lake Cree Nations areas of use and their community's connection to these lands. The report notes that their lands are now used by a number of Manitoba Hydro generating stations and the developments have impacted Fox Lake Cree Nation in a number of ways, including environmental impacts as well as impacts on community well-being. The importance of Fox Lake Cree Nation defining examine. Emphasized. And the report describes a variety of important land use activities, and resources, including berry picking, fishing, hunting, traditional medicine harvesting, trapping, and important community sites.

The Fox Lake report also discusses the two Heritage sites that have been identified at the location of the proposed Keewatinoow Converter Station.

The report from Long Plain First Nation was received in April 2011, and the objective of the Long Plain First Nation study was to document their communities traditional, and current land use with the project study area and their concerns related to the project. They conducted interviews, with 125 community members. And, Long Plain First Nation has

identified that one of its major concerns is the declining water quality in the area. The report also focuses on changes observed in the way in which the community uses the land related to agricultural activities as well as changes associated with hunting, trapping, harvesting, and fishing activities that have been observed overtime.

Long Plain First Nation, identifies concerns related to the project, including electromagnetic fields, impacts on the health of wildlife, and community members, treaty land entitlement process, and the ability of Long Plain First Nation members to be able to continue hunting, trapping, fishing, and harvesting.

The Manitoba Métis Federation provided their report to Manitoba Hydro in September of 2011. The purpose of the MMF's traditional land use and knowledge study was to identify any Métis rights and interests that had a potential to be affected by the Bipole III project. The report outlines the methods of going to the place of study, the current Metis use of the project study area, and the documented knowledge about the study area.

The MMF developed a community engagement process through this work and it results with the MMF

using three different methodologies or mechanisms to gather information for their study. A screening survey provided information regarding the extent to which respondents engaged in traditional activities in the project study area. And the survey responses were used to identify potential participants for key person interviews.

The information collected as part of the study provided a description of Métis land use in the project study area. This included information regarding seasonal activities, types of species harvested, consumption of country foods, harvesting practices, the process of learning about the land, the amount of time spent on the land, and the way in which people accessed their areas of use.

The report identifies that there are extensive Métis traditional use of the project study area, particularly in the Porcupine, and Duck Mountain areas of the province.

Opaskwayak Cree Nation submitted their report to Manitoba Hydro in July of 2011, and the report describes the community's areas of use, and also provides description of Opaskwayak Cree Nation's rights and responsibilities relating to a Natural Resources agreement, between OCN and the Province of

Manitoba.

Opaskwayak, identifies that approximately 83 kilometers of the proposed transmission line would traverse lands used by the community including five registered traplines of Opaskwayak Cree Nation members. The report emphasizes the importance of trapping to OCN culture. The community has concerns with the decreasing number of members engaging in trapping activities, in particular youth. And the report also identifies the efforts of the community is doing, undertaking to address this concern.

The extent of current industrial land use was noted as a source of concern, particularly, with respect to environmental impacts, access management, and impact on cultural, and socioeconomic stability. The report provides information about sites of cultural importance to OCN, which the felt might be impacted by the Bipole III project.

Swan Lake First Nation provided a report to Manitoba Hydro in July of 2011, and the purpose of their report was to identify the community's traditional use in the project study area, as well as identify potential impacts of the project on the First Nation. Swan Lake First Nation's historical and treaty research department conducted historical

research, and site visits to areas of concern. In addition there were interviews taken with community Elders and local land owners.

The report identified a number of important community sites located in the vicinity of the project. And the sites identified have historical relevance to Swan Lake First Nation, and in some cases to other Treaty 1 First Nations. Swan Lake First Nation, would like to ensure that the sacred and ceremonial sites remain undisturbed, and protection of burial grounds is also identified as a concern.

Subsequent to the work on the traditional knowledge study, and upon request by Swan Lake First Nation, Manitoba Hydro provided some additional support for Swan Lake First Nation to complete additional work in the areas of botanical surveys, and archeological work.

The results of these studies were incorporated into the July 2011 report as appendices, and the results of these additional studies includes botanical species list for the area surveyed as well as noting the location of rare species, or species that were of particular importance to Swan Lake First Nation. The archeological work focused on the seven

kilometers of the proposed preferred route where it crosses the Assiniboine River. And worked to confirm known archeological sites as well to identify any previously unknown sites.

Tataskweyak Cree Nation provided two reports to Manitoba Hydro. The first was provided in June of 2010, and the second was provided in March of 2011. The first report included a constraints map, and a descriptive report, and provided results of TCN's consultations with members, regarding the three original proposed Bipole III alternate routes through the Split Lake management area.

The report concluded that Tataskweyak Cree Nation was willing to enter into further discussions with Manitoba Hydro, and conduct further examinations with a focus on Route B within the Split Lake resource management area. The three, three potential route adjustments were identified, which would locate the Bipole III line as close as possible to the Provincial Road 280. Following submission of this initial report in June of 2010, Route B, the route which is most closely situated to Provincial Road 280, was announced as the preliminary preferred route within the Split Lake resource management area. And in December 2010, Tataskweyak Cree Nation,

Manitoba Hydro was able to incorporate two of the three proposed route amounts, which had been proposed by Tataskweyak Cree Nation.

The second report that the community undertook summarized the consultations with TCN members, and provided member perspectives regarding the selection of the Bipole III route, and the potential project impacts on the Split Lake resource management area. Tataskweyak Cree Nation used their established Overview of Water and Land or OWL process, to gather information from their membership. This process involved two rounds of interviews, and included a mapping component. The second report identifies a number of Manitoba Hydro major projects that already exist within in land used by Tataskweyak Cree Nation and frequent concerns related to cumulative effects on traditional lifestyle including social, economic, spiritual, and cultural customs and practices.

Wuskwi Sipihk First Nation, did not provide Manitoba Hydro with a report, but they did provide Manitoba Hydro with a series of maps in July of 2011. The maps were prepared based on a number of elder and resource user interviews, and the information on the maps documents the community's knowledge regarding

hunting, trapping, fishing, harvesting, Heritage resource sites, and sites of importance to the community.

Now, I don't have a separate slide for Sapotaweyak Cree Nation, as I referenced early, Sapotaweyak Cree Nation, did undertake a self-directed study. Prior to the submission of the environmental impact statement, Sapotaweyak had indicated a strong interest in undertaking a self-directed study. However they were unable to provide us with a proposal in the timeframes required in order to, to be included in the EIS.

But given the strong interest the community had indicated prior to the submission of the EIS, Manitoba Hydro did agree to provide support to Sapotaweyak Cree Nation, to undertake a self-directed study, following the submission of the EIS. This was done with the understanding that the information provided in the report would be used to confirm, and if required update the Environmental Protection Plan. Some materials were provided to Manitoba Hydro in August of 2012. However the final report, is still pending and Sapotaweyak Cree Nation has requested that we not file the materials that they have provided to us to date, so, I won't be

providing anymore detail on the information that they have provided.

So I referenced in my introduction that Manitoba Hydro has engaged in discussions outside of the EACP process, and the ATK processes, and the ongoing discussions we are having with Fox Lake Cree Nation are an example of this. Components of the Bipole III project are located within both the Fox Lake resource management area, their RMA, and Fox Lake traditional territory as defined in the 2004 impact settlement agreement.

Manitoba Hydro, the Province of Manitoba, and Fox Lake Cree Nation, are all signatories to the ISA. The proposed Keewatinoow converter station is located approximately 35 kilometers, from Fox Lake community of Bird and approximately 91 kilometers from the town of Gillam, the historic and present day home of Fox Lake Cree Nation. Pursuant to section 8.5 of the 2004 ISA, Manitoba Hydro is undertaking a consultation process with Fox Lake Cree Nation, concerning the Keewatinoow converter station.

Since November 2009, the parties have met bi-weekly, or monthly, approximately 45 times in total pursuant to this process. As per the ISA agreement obligations, Manitoba Hydro, has provided

funding for Fox Lake'S participation in this process, and, we have done this through a series of process funding agreements.

As part of the discussions, Fox Lake Cree Nation has shared its perspectives that the First Nation views the Bipole III project in the context of previous, and future projects. They don't view it in isolation. And as a result of previous developments in the Gillam region, including the development of the Town of Gillam as Manitoba Hydro's base for its lower Nelson River operations, Fox Lake Cree Nation considers the existing environment, and human condition, to be one that is already heavily impacted by previous developments.

Fox Lake, and Manitoba Hydro, have discussed a range of concerns arising from development of the project related to human and social issues, safety and community services, and land, and water, and resource based issues. Two background papers summarizing the parties perspectives on these issues were developed, and both have been filed as part of this process.

In addition to discussions and summary papers, I have just described, discussions during this process have also to date have included

information sharing around selection of the preliminary preferred electrode site, and evaluation and selection of the preliminary preferred Keewatinoow converter station site, pre-construction field work, permit applications, and associated employment, and business opportunities, discussions and follow-up regarding archeological findings of the Keewatinoow converter station preferred site, Potential adverse effects and general discussions regarding the regulatory approval process, and construction employment opportunities.

Manitoba Hydro, and Fox Lake Cree Nation are continuing to meet in an effort to reach an agreement, in accordance with the ISA.

Another example of ongoing conversations, and discussions, include the discussions that Manitoba Hydro is having with Tataskweyak Cree Nation. Tataskweyak Cree Nation has a long history with Manitoba Hydro and today the community and the Corporation have a unique relationship, and interact across a number of projects, and processes.

Tataskweyak Cree Nation is signatory to the 1977 Northern Flood Agreement, and since the 1970s, the relationship between Manitoba Hydro and Tataskweyak has continued to evolve. In 1992,

Tataskweyak Cree Nation, Manitoba Hydro, the Province of Manitoba, and Canada signed the 1992 Northern Flood Agreement implementation agreement. This agreement included a range of provisions and led to the creation of the Split Lake resource management area, and also defined the Split Lake resource area. The 1977 agreement, 1992 agreement, and several subsequent agreements have added to the relationship between Manitoba Hydro, and Tataskweyak Cree Nation.

As noted in the environmental impact statement, there are a number of existing Manitoba Hydro operations located within the Split Lake resource management area. And over 225 kilometers of the proposed Bipole III transmission line, as well as a portion of the related facilities are located within the Split Lake resource management area, and broader Split Lake area as defined in '92 agreement.

In context of our longstanding, unique relationship, and number of existing Manitoba Hydro operations located within the Split Lake resource management area, Manitoba Hydro has been meeting with Tataskweyak Cree Nation regarding their concerns related to the Bipole III. These meetings commenced in the Fall of 2009, and Manitoba Hydro and

Tataskweyak Cree Nation are continuing to engage in discussions with respect to addressing training, employment, business opportunities, and project impacts.

Another ongoing discussion, that is outside of the previously described processes, is Manitoba Hydro's engagement with resource users. Manitoba Hydro has a Trappers Notification/Compensation Policy. Which provides for compensation for impacts on commercial trapping by high voltage transmission lines. Information about this policy was shared with communities as well as individual resource users who participated in the EACP process. But, since the submission of the EIS, Manitoba Hydro has also been providing information about the policy, and working to set up meetings with individual resource users, who may be impacted by the proposed Bipole III transmission line.

In addition, Manitoba Hydro has also been sharing information on this policy with trappers associations and local fur councils. There will be additional information provided about this policy, and the current discussions taking place with trappers in a later presentation to this hearing. I am not going to provide further detail on that now.

So throughout all of the Aboriginal engagement processes that Manitoba Hydro has been engaged in, including the EACP and the ATK workshops and self-directed studies as well as these other on going discussions that we have been having, the information that has been shared with Manitoba Hydro, could be broadly split into three main categories, the first of which, would be Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge, another would be project benefits, and the last would be other issues, and concerns.

With respect to ATK, Manitoba Hydro heard about sites of importance to communities in the project study area. This included historical sites, contemporary use sites, sites of cultural importance, and locations of Heritage resources.

Locations, and types of traditional contemporary land use were shared with Manitoba Hydro, as well as importance of activities hunting, trapping, fishing, harvesting of plants. And in particular the importance of these activities to culture and community's health were identified.

With respect to project benefits, communities indicated that they wanted to see benefits for their communities related to Bipole III. This included training, and job opportunities,

particularly for youth within communities. As well as wanting to ensure that their communities are aware of what the business opportunities may be, and how their community can participate in the project opportunities that are available.

Many communities also indicated an interest in financial benefits related to the project. This was included expressed interest in partnerships, or ownership in the project. As well as other financial benefits.

Manitoba Hydro also heard about a range of other issues, and concerns that communities had with respect to the Bipole III project. While there were concerns that were specific to individual communities, there were a number of concerns that were common to many communities, and I have included some of these on this slide, some examples of some of these.

So one of the things you heard about was access. In particular, this was often related to concerns that the right of way would create increased access to areas of community use, or areas that were previously unaccessible. We heard concerns about electromagnetic fields, in particular, what the potential impacts of this might be on human health,

or the health of wildlife or plant species. We heard about protection of Heritage and cultural resources. Specifically concerns, with the sites being identified, and properly protected during construction, and operation of the project.

We heard concerns about vegetation management. This was usually linked to chemical use, and what the impact of that chemical use might be on human health, on the health of plant communities, or on wildlife. And as well, what the impact of chemical use might be on local waterways. We also heard about the potential negative impacts on hunting, trapping, fishing, and harvesting.

Although the EIS has been submitted, Manitoba Hydro is continuing to engage with Aboriginal communities with respect to the Bipole III project in a number of ways. A draft Environmental Protection Plan was submitted with the EIS. And Manitoba Hydro is currently working to confirm, and refine this plan. This plan consists of three components, including planned mitigation measures, monitoring plans, and management plans for access, vegetation, and waste.

The Environmental Protection Plan also includes identification of, and mitigation, and

monitoring measures, for sensitive sites, and sensitive sites can be locations, features, areas, activities, or facilities that are identified as being sensitive to disturbance. And further these sites, can include ecologically, socially, economically, or culturally sensitive sites.

Manitoba Hydro is currently in the process of setting up, and holding meetings with communities that have identified concerns related to the Bipole III project, and the purpose of these meetings is to review the Environmental Protection Plan with communities, so we can discuss, and identify how the specific concerns each community has identified will be addressed through the Environmental Protection Plan. It also provides an opportunity to, for the communities to provide input into the various mitigation, and monitoring plans.

And, lastly, these meetings, will provide the opportunity for communities to identify sensitive sites to Manitoba Hydro, that may not have been previously identified in any of the previous processes. There is going to be more information about the Environmental Protection Plan provided in, again, following presentations at these hearings, and, I believe that will be happening later in

October.

Manitoba Hydro is also currently in the process of meeting with interested communities to provide information about potential employment, and business opportunities. Further information on the construction of the project, and the related potential opportunities will be provided in a presentation later today.

In terms of other concerns, and ongoing discussions, Manitoba Hydro is continuing to meet with a number of communities related to the Bipole III project, as I have already referenced we have ongoing discussions with Fox Lake Cree Nation, and Tataskweyak Cree Nation which would be examples of this. However there is a number of other examples as well.

Over the past few months the Manitoba Métis Federation has identified to Manitoba Hydro a number of concerns related to the Bipole III project. Manitoba Hydro, and MMF are currently working together to explore how we can work together to address these concerns. Manitoba Hydro has also had discussions with Swan Lake First Nation, regarding their concerns with respect to cultural, and Heritage sites. And we have also been meeting with Swampy

Cree Tribal Council to address their interest related to the project. And we have also had a number of other recent meetings, the primary purpose of which is to answer questions, and share information about the Bipole III project, and those have included meetings with representatives of Pine Creek First Nation, representatives of Treaty 2, and representatives of the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs.

So Manitoba Hydro will continue to meet with communities that wish to meet with us, or are seeking further information about the project, or have questions about the project. And this would also include continuing to attend community Crown consultation meetings when we are requested to do so.

Now just going to provide a brief overview of the Community Development Initiative. Or the CDI as we have started to call it. The CDI is a program that was developed specifically for the Bipole III project. In the past Manitoba Hydro has heard from communities that major transmission lines do not provide concrete benefits to communities. The CDI program was developed in response to that feedback. Specifically the intent of the program is to provide benefits to people living in the vicinity of the Bipole III project. And the mechanism being used to

do this. Is to provide an annual disbursement to communities that are in close proximity to the project facilities.

The CDI annual disbursements are intended to be used to support community development projects, that would benefit a broad segment of the community. Based on the final preferred route as identified in the environmental impact statement, there are currently approximately 60 communities anticipated to be eligible for the CDI, and these would include broadly speaking, First Nations, Northern Affairs Community Councils, Rural Municipalities, and incorporated towns and villages.

The program will be in place for ten years, at which point the program will be reviewed, and there is a potential for renewal. The total cost of the program will be approximately four, to five million dollars annually over the ten-year period. The commencement of the program is subject to receiving regulatory approvals for the Bipole III project, and once the program has commenced in order to receive disbursements through the CDI program, eligible communities will be required to enter into a participation agreement. And Manitoba Hydro intends to provide further information to interested

communities upon receipt of regulatory approvals for the project.

And that concludes my presentation today.

MR. BEDFORD: Ms Zebrowksi, I am wondering if you can, and if you cannot, Mr. Penner, will help us out later. But, if you can, you made reference to Swampy Cree Tribal Council. Can you tell us which particular First Nations have formed, and, make up Swampy Cree Tribal Council?

MS ZEBROWSKI: Hopefully, I won't miss anybody, but they include Chemawawin Cree Nation, Marcel Colomb First Nation, Opaskwayak Cree Nation, Sapotaweyak Cree Nation, Wuskwi Sipihk First Nation, Mosakahiken Cree Nation, and I believe, and I believe Grand Rapids First Nation.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Mathias Colomb.

MR. BEDFORD: Thank you.

MS ZEBROWSKI: Mathias Colomb, my apologies.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ms Zebrowksi, just a clarification, at the outset, you referred to the environmental assessment consultation process that Mr. Joyal described yesterday. Were, were some of the meetings that he described and some of the

meetings that you have listed here, were they the same?

MS ZEBROWSKI: Some of them would have been the same. Because I believe his presentation was more a broad overview of everything that took place.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I guess the issue of sort of a calendar of these meetings, and, who was involved in the meetings, it has been sometime since I looked at the technical report. I do remember a lot of detail about the meetings. But, perhaps, we might sort of between us, check and see. It has been suggested that it, that a calendar of these meetings is not listed in the technical reports. Perhaps, we can all have a look at it, and if not, you might put together a fairly quick list of, of all of the meetings under the Aboriginal engagement, and which communities were involved in the meetings.

MS ZEBROWSKI: We could do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think we need a lot of detail, about what happened at those meetings, just a list, and, date of the meetings, in which communities, and or groups, were involved. If it doesn't exist already, in the --

MS ZEBROWSKI: We can do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any questions, clarifications?

MR. KAPLAN: Ms Zebrowksi, I have one question perhaps for clarification, but right at the end, you are talking, right at the end of your presentation, you are talking about the CDI potential for renewal. Can I just ask you what your understanding is, what that will be based on, and, who decides that?

MS ZEBROWSKI: My understanding is that it would be based on a review which would have some criteria, to evaluate what the success of the program, and positivity of the program had been over the ten years. And probably feedback, from those that had been involved in the program, specifically in terms of looking at what sort of positive things communities were able to do with those disbursements, and it would be Manitoba Hydro policy decision, as to whether or not it would be renewed. That is my understanding.

MR. KAPLAN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anything else, Mr. Bedford?

MR. BEDFORD: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Ms Johnson, do you have some documents?

MS JOHNSON: Yes, we will enter Mr. MacInnes's presentation as MH-47, and Ms Zebrowksi's as 48.

(EXHIBIT MH-47: GILLAM PRESENTATION)

(EXHIBIT MH-48: ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT AND CDI PRESENTATION)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, we will take this opportunity now to have a morning break, so, come back in 20 minutes, what is that, just before quarter to, so 17 or 18 minutes to 11, please.

(HEARING RECESSED)

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, could we come back to order, please, the second half of this morning's presentation, two presentations on construction of the converter station, and construction of the line. I don't know which order this is going to go, but.

MR. ELDER: I will start Mr. Chair, Construction of the converter station.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any introductory comments from Manitoba Hydro?

MS MAYOR: No, there aren't. We need to get the witnesses affirmed, and we will get going.

ROBERT ELDER, affirmed.

GLENN PENNER, affirmed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Proceed.

MR. ELDER: Good morning. Good morning, Panel, Participants, and Guests. My name is Rob Elder, and my colleague is Glenn Penner, and I would like to discuss some of the construction aspects of the project this morning.

I will be discussing the converter station portion of the project, and Glenn will be discussing the transmission line components.

First a little bit about myself. I am a 1993 graduate of the U of M. I have a Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering, and I am a professional engineer with Manitoba Hydro. My current role is as the Project Manager for the converter station portion of the Bipole III project, and I have been in that capacity about two years. I have about 18 years of experience with Manitoba Hydro focusing primarily on construction, and maintenance of both thermal, hydraulic, and now HVdc transmission

projects. My role in providing the CIS was to identify the construction practices, contracting methods, work force estimates --

THE CHAIRMAN: Pull the mike in, Mr. Elder.

MR. ELDER: Is that better, Mr. Sargeant?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. ELDER: Work force estimates, worker accommodation strategies for the north relating to the construction of the two converter stations.

Today I would like to talk about the converter station construction. What primary work packages are included in that portion of the project, the timing and sequencing of the construction, and go into a little bit of depth about the Keewatinoow work force strategy.

So the construction of the converter station includes, as some of my colleagues, have said previously the Keewatinoow converter station which is located 79 kilometers northeast of Gillam, converts the AC power to DC. Construction of the Riel converter station which is south, southern converter station just outside of Winnipeg, and converts the power from DC back to AC.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I interrupt. You said

79 kilometers, but we also heard a figure of 91 kilometers.

MR. ELDER: We will confirm that. I heard that this morning, it is around that distance, but we will confirm exactly what the distance is, sir.

Just a little short comparison of the Keewatinoow versus Riel. Keewatinoow, in the north has developed access, but the site itself is undeveloped. So there is remote construction location requiring full scale worker accommodations, and, it will be built under the Burntwood Nelson Agreement, or BNA as it is called. The BNA is no strike, no lockout bargaining agreement covering all major projects in Northern Manitoba.

The BNA sets out hiring preferences, including priorities for First Nations, including Métis, and residents of the local area as first hiring preference. The agreement also contains provisions related to recruitment, referral, placement, training, and retention for Northern Aboriginal people.

The Riel converter station is partially developed, it is an existing site. There is no camp requirements, because of location. And there is no specific project labour agreement in place for that

location.

The main components of the converter station work include the Keewatinoow civil site improvements and infrastructure, the Keewatinoow construction camp, the The HVdc converter equipment which will cloak both ends of the line. The Keewatinoow 230 AC switchyard, electrodes at both ends, the Riel sychronous condensers, if needed, and the Keewatinoow camp operations.

The Keewatinoow civil site improvements, and infrastructure work package will be the package that develops the site. Right now, if you look in this picture you can see the existing access road. The site will be roughly in this area. And this package would be to put in the roads into the area. Take out the permafrost, and build the site up to a grade where we could start construction on the site. This work package precedes all of the other work packages in the area, and the activities are anticipated to start once, if and when we do get the licencing.

This slide here gives you the next phase is the Keewatinoow construction camp and facilities, there is installation of main, 600 person camp. It will be a multi storeyed facility located in, as Mr.

McGarry pointed out yesterday, up in this area here, and it will accommodate, provide accommodations for the converter station staff as well as transmission folks that will be working in the area. There is also construction of a lagoon, and first phase of that 600 man camp, that was started this September under a separate licence.

The next work package, is the HVdc converter equipment itself. It will be let as a single contract covering work at both locations. It will be the largest contract of the project and it will be include the design, supply, and commissioning will all be awarded to a single vendor, and the installation may also be included to that vendor. The equipment is highly specialized, and there are about three to four vendors in the world that have the technology to do the work.

Another important note here is the, there are significant lead time on these contracts. We will need about a year of, from the time the tender hits the street, until the time we would be in a position to award the contract. So it, it is fairly intensive process.

The next package is the northern or Keewatinoow 230 kV AC switchyard. This is only in

the northern facility as this switchyard is already developed at the Riel site. It requires integrated civil, electrical, and design construction. So, we are looking at doing this package as a single contract for the engineering procurement, and the installation phase of the work.

And, as Mr. McGarry indicated yesterday, there will be the electrode sites at both the north, and the south. My group will be responsible for developing those sites themselves, and Mr. Penner's group will run the lines to those sites. They are located near the converter stations, and as, as described by Mr. Mazur, they provide temporary current during a loss of a pole, or reference during normal operation.

And, the synchronous condensers, this picture here gives you a feel for it. This is a railcar for oil, and this is the rotating machine here, it gives a bit of a sense of the size of these. We are looking, if we go with the traditional LCC technology, then we would need approximately four of these machines. And once we have determined the technology, we would let a contract for this, if we need these machines. And it would also go as a design, supply, and installation contract to a single

vendor. Again there is about, roughly, about four vendors, in the world that can provide these types of machines.

Just to give you a brief timeline on the converter station construction, as indicated here, the EIS was filed in late 2011, assuming a licence in early 13, commencement of the civil work would begin immediately. The procurement of the DC package would start around that is about March of '13. We have got roughly two years of civil work to do in the northern location. During that time, we would get the procurement of the DC package done, the design, and the supply of the equipment to start that DC installation around 2015 at both facilities. Commissioning would then be in late '17, with a starting, beginning of '17, complete late '17.

Some of the current construction activities we have got under way right now, to, as, as lead is procurement of the camp contracts, the supply of the camp. We have purchased the, the 350-person camp. The lead time is about a year and a half for that, so, it is being manufactured now. The engineering, and contract development for the major work packages, is under way, because we need a couple of years lead time for that work. And, we are also staffing up so

that should we get a licence next year, we are ready to to go.

On the engineering, and procurement side the conceptual engineering is now complete, and by that, the first phase of the, of the project is to develop the design criteria that feeds into the EIS. You know, the wants, and the musts, what sort of breakers we would need, what sort of transformers, we would need, and so that, conceptual phase is where we develop all of that. We have got our engineering, our Owner's engineer assigned for the remainder of the project. And we are working on our procurement documents for the converters, and the AC switchyards which would go out March of next year.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Elder, Owner's engineer, that is probably an inside term.

MR. ELDER: Sorry, okay. We have hired an engineer local, Teshmont Engineering to support the engineering efforts. They are a local engineering firm with HVdc experience. They supplement our team. Some of the things they bring to the team, we have about 40 years of HVdc experience within Hydro, we want to make sure we get an industry perspective in that. They also provide some of the horsepower on our project management treatment on developing

these procurement documents.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I think on the same point. Mr. Motheral?

MR. MOTHERAL: Just going back, where you said the condensers, they will be awarded to a single vendor, and you said there was only four.

MR. ELDER: Yes.

MR. MOTHERAL: Where are those four?

MR. ELDER: They all have Canadian offices, they would be the Allston (ph), ABB (ph), but manufacturing would primarily be done oversees.

MR. MOTHERAL: Seemed to be unusual, thank you.

MR. ELDER: You are welcome.

So just a summary, when we would anticipate some of the major construction activities starting for the Keewatinoow site, for the northern site. The civil site improvements would start the winter of '13. Construction, and camp facilities, would start winter of '13. Camp operations, would start at the same time. The AC switchyard construction would start around winter of '14. The HVdc equipment installation would start around spring of '15. And the electrodes would go, would start around the fall of 2015 as well.

What we have is the work force estimate for the Keewatinoow Craft stations. Along the bottom, it is hard to see, is time, this is Y being 2017 working backwards, this is the anticipated work force. Number of people on this side over time for the work force. Couple of key points to make here, the peak work force in the north, is about 334, and total person years, for the northern converter station is about 917 persons.

MS MAYOR: Mr. Elder, can you go back to that slide, and explain what the three colors are on the graph.

MR. ELDER: Certainly, blue section is construction support and services, that would be typically camp operations none -- so, yes, the blue lines would be camp support, employee retention and support, tend to be our, the types of work that we do as direct negotiated contracts with some of the First Nations. The red bars there are nondesignated trades, so laborers, non -- and, then the green would be designated trades, like electricians, the millwrights, carpenters is how, is how that is broken out.

MS MAYOR: Could you also explain, there are two peaks, what those two timeframes are, for

those of us who can't read that far.

MR. ELDER: As I indicated, there is about two years of civil work at the beginning of the project, and that is what you see in this first peak here, and then this second peak here, would be the installation of the HVdc equipment itself. When we get to the Riel work force estimate, you won't see this first peak, because, that civil work is already done at that facility. And, then, as we ramp down, on commissioning.

Now, moving to the Riel site as I mentioned, the site preparation is minimal because it is an existing facility. We have, there would be some minor civil, civil site prep activities, construction trailers, and the like for, for the team that is going to do the converter work, would start in the summer of '13, and, some minor supporting infrastructure.

The DC converter construction would start in the spring of '15, the electrode at that facility, would be done parallel with the north, fall of '15 again, and the synchronous condensers would start in the fall of '15.

Here is the similar work force estimate for the Riel site now, as I mentioned, you don't see that

first peak there, because that civil work, that infrastructure work is already done at Riel. Your peak work force, is, about 359 Craft workers, you will notice you don't see a large blue contribution of construction support, because, we don't have a camp there. And the person years, is around 627 person years.

I thought we would spend sometime this morning looking at the work force strategy at Keewatinoow. There are several aspects that make it necessary to have a strategy in place. One being it is a remote northern location, there are site access concerns, and obviously, because of that the camp accommodations. As I mentioned, this is an overview of the area, the existing Limestone Generating Station, is down here. Gillam is about, about 80 kilometers, down here. The town of Bird, is about 27 kilometers from site. And this is an existing access road that was built about 20 years ago. Going to the proposed Conawapa site that is here.

One of the significant differences from this site, to say, a Wuskwatim site, Wuskwatim, one of the first sites is develop a 45 kilometer road into site, which creates a whole bunch of considerations for developing access, and providing

access to people for hunting, and that. In this case the road has been there all along. So the intent of the access management plan is really to ensure public safety. But not to restrict access from local, from the local community.

The construction site here, is what is highlighted in white. And the other unique feature is there is a set of rapids here, and, some local, some public docks here, that are used for hunting and fishing. So the current scheme is we need to put a security gate around here, because we have a number of the brown spots, you see on here, are borrow areas, so we may have rock trucks, running up and down this area, so the intent is to secure the area from a safety perspective, but still maintain access to the boat launch.

So we will have a system in place, and, we are currently meeting with Fox Lake to discuss some of these concepts on how we would have an escorted service through there, if a community member, from anywhere, from Gillam, from Fox, from TCN needs to get to that boat launch we need to maintain access for them. Should there be any blasting activities or anything like that, going on on site we need to make sure the public is safe.

The, the other pieces that we expect a large number of the workers to be from out of the area. So they would be flown into Gillam. And, then bused from Gillam to the work site. The next major work package is Keewatinoow camp operations. This relates to activities for operating the catering, the maintenance, the security, the overall site. Some of the key concerns is to have, with, with modern camps is to have a nice camp, so that one, employees, for attraction and retention reasons, but also, to not have the workers have any reason to leave site. So the, these are some renderings, I will be showing some renderings of what we anticipate the camp to look like. But the other major contract is operating this, this 600 person facility, and we are currently in negotiations with Fox Lake on, on an operational contract for that.

This is an oversight of what the camp will look like, we have a number of Craft worker dorms, here. I will show some more details of that in the next slides. We have some supervisor dorms here, we have a recreational complex here, a site office administration office here. And an emergency response, and medical support in this area here. This is another rendering of what the facility will

look like. Important to note, as Mr. McGarry noted yesterday, the original plan, when EIS was submitted, was to have a single story facility, which we would have only been able to house the 350 men in there. With additional planning and levelling of work force, and this three, this three storey concept, we are all to do the whole 600 man camp in there. And we have avoided having to develop the other site which was is about 25 hectares.

This is a rendering of what the rooms will look like for craft workers, each room will have an individual bathroom with shower, it will have a desk with free Internet, each room will have a 32-inch TV, access to cable, mini fridge, single bed, they will have their own HVAC system. And this is, from what was built in Wuskwatim, this is, even in that short time to now, this is the industry standard for camps.

So, just to finish up, some of the activities that are currently planned over the next year, is depending on approval of the environmental licence, will commence the civil site improvements, and infrastructure of Keewatinoow, we will complete the expansion and installation of the camp, and then, release the converter station, the DC, and the AC switchyard RFPs later this year.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Elder.

MS MAYOR: Mr. Chairman I have one further question for Mr. Elder. In terms of the two graphs, are those the most, those estimates, the most up to date figures that we have right now?

MR. ELDER: Yes, they are, they have changed somewhat, from the original EIS. As I mentioned, we are constantly planning, and trying to level out those. So, we have been able to level out some of the peaks, which reduces our camp size, and we will continue to develop those. They are just estimates, though, once we have contracts in place, the contractors, will give us their final sequence on how they plan to build it, but for planning purposes of the camp and that, and obviously to illustrate approximate camp size we need to do that now.

MS MAYOR: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. Gibbons, question of clarification?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes, Mr. Elder, on the slide relating, I think it is slide number -- if I can get the number here for you. I have lost track of it now. Slide number I guess it would be 11. It mentions that the Riel converter station will have synchronous condensers, but in the earlier slide

regarding Keewatinoow, it says, that will be determined later, after a decision has been made by, on some technology question. Can you just briefly outline why there is a difference between the two stations in that regard? That would be Part 1, and then Part 2 is, is there any ecological difference, in whether a converter station uses a condenser arrangement, or not?

MR. ELDER: Sure, yeah. So synchronous -- you will have to bear with me, I am a mechanical engineer, so I will do my best to explain. The synchronous condensers as Mr. Mazur explained are only required in the south. Because you have so much generation in the north. You have lot of rotating mass there. In the south you need those synchronous condensers, that rotating mass in the south to, in essence draw the power down the line. That is why on our system the synchronous condensers are only at Dorsey and none in the north. That is why they are only in the south.

Now, to answer your next question, why are they required for one technology, and not the other? With the, with the original, with the LCC technology, the traditional technology, you need that spinning, you need that spinning mass. With the newer voltage

source technology, the way the conversion happens, you don't need that. So, there is not the need for those, for those machines. So. Did that answer your question?

MR. GIBBONS: The Part B was does it make, from an ecological perspective, does it make a difference, for example, would the site require a bigger foot footprint, are there concerns, for example, some of the equipment requires insulating oils, and so forth. Would that be a concern, that would be different when you are using these condense source?

MR. ELDER: Yes. The current footprint includes provisions, for the synchronous condensers, so, there would be no increase on the overall footprint of the facilities. The synchronous condensers, are listed in the EIS. There will be some insulating oils with them. There will be some lubricating oils, with the machines, some insulating oils with the transformers.

MR. GIBBONS: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Penner?

MR. PENNER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, Participants, members of the public, my name is Glenn Penner, and I work for Manitoba Hydro, as manager of

the Transmission Line, and Civil Construction Department. And I have been in this role for about 6 years. I have been an employee of Manitoba Hydro for 21 years, and before joining the construction department, I was a senior structural designer responsible for the design of transmission towers, for about 12 years. I hold a bachelor of science in civil engineering, from the University of Manitoba. And I am a registered professional engineer in Manitoba.

Today I would like to share with you, how, Manitoba Hydro will construct the Bipole III transmission line. I would like to cover three areas in this presentation, northern construction, southern construction, and some of our contracting strategies. As my colleague Gerald Neufeld explained yesterday, the line has been split into eight segments for construction purposes. There will be four northern sections, approximately two hundred kilometers each. Two central sections, and two southern sections of about 150 kilometers each.

I would like to start with talking a little bit about the northern construction. So, the northern construction sections start, in the Gillam Keewatinoow area, and travel passed Thompson, The

Pas, and all the way town to Minetonas. In the north, the process will be to develop access, clear the transmission line right of way, and, then build the tower, and foundations.

For clearing in the contracts for each section, approximately 50 to 70 persons will be required at peak construction. And, Manitoba Hydro expects that each section will take approximately two winter seasons to clear and another two winter seasons to construct.

Access, in the northern sections is only practical in frozen ground conditions. A typical winter construction season, can last three to four months, but it is always dependent on the weather. So, our first step is access trails. And access trails are started by packing snow, with snowmobiles, and light tracked equipment, to allow frost into the ground, and as the ground freezes larger and larger equipment can be used to pack the trail. This is a photo of a typical access trail. It is snow packed down on frozen ground, and it is built wide enough to get trucks and equipment to the transmission line.

Manitoba Hydro's strategy is to use existing trails, cut lines, roads, and transmission line right of ways and other existing linear features

rather than creating new access. Our initial assessment indicates that there are more than 50 useful existing access points along the four northern sections of the line.

On average, we typically need access points every 30 to 40 kilometers along the transmission line. So, not all of these 50 access points will be utilized, and, there may be some locations where new trails are needed because of difficult along the transmission line, they will be the exception rather than the rule.

Along the transmission line trail will be within the right of way for the majority of the project, however there will be requirement for access around steep terrain, environmentally sensitive sites, and streams and rivers that can not be crossed. For these, what we call bypass trails, there will be a process in place, with Manitoba Conservation to deal with approvals for all of these trails.

Most of these trails, will be several hundred meters in length. And, few will be longer than an a thousand meters in length. It is very difficult to predict where all of these trails will be located until centerline clearing has begun.

Access to the right of way will be limited to construction personnel, signage will be placed at the entrance to all of the access trails identifying it as a construction site and directing nonconstruction personnel to the construction office before entering the trail.

Flooding, ice crossings. Typically the longest part of creating access, is getting enough ice on the rivers, and streams, by flooding ice crossings, the thickness of ice can be built up faster than waiting for weather, water crossings, will be conducted and decommissioned under the DFO operating statement. This is just a picture here, of a, an example of transporting heavy equipment across the ice using a skid to spread out the load.

I would like to talk a little bit about some construction equipment, this is a shear blade on a D8 Caterpillar, it is used to cut brush, it is commonly referred to as a KG blade. The blade is just above the ground and with frozen ground it shears the brush, without disturbing the root mass. Leaving the root mass in place is important, it reduces soil disturbance and promotes low growth grasses and bushes.

This is another D8 Caterpillar and it is

used to pile brush and debris in preparation for salvage or burning. This is another piece of equipment used in the clearing operation. This is known as a feller buncher. It is typically used in the forestry industry, and the feller buncher allows for cutting of brush in sensitive areas, and hilly terrain. The equipment can reach in, and stack brush without tramping over the entire right of way. It can cut multiple trees at once, and lay them down together for processing or burning.

This is the signage that we use for environmentally sensitive areas. We have a sign that says this is an example of the Wuskwatim signs, and, on Bipole III we are planning on changing this sign to a red octagon to remind the operators these are environmentally sensitive zones, and it is an area we don't want the equipment driving into. The fluorescent ESS signs indicate that environmentally sensitive zones are coming down the roadway.

This is an example of an ESS site along the Wuskwatim project, it is Frog Creek, the stream was identified on the EPP as a sensitive site and could not be crossed. The clearing in this area was completed by hand clearing. And, this is a typical crew, a typical hand crewing crew, in an

environmentally sensitive area.

This is a picture of stacked timber ready to be hauled for processing, and, if you, it may not be evident to people at the back, but these are, as timber, all stacked ready to be picked up by trucks to be hauled for processing.

Merchantable timber will be salvaged to the licence holder, if the cost is too high to transport, the licence holder may relinquish their rights to the wood. Firewood may also be available for local community members.

So behind the clearing operation, brush piles are burned, and at the end of the season, the line is checked to ensure that brush piles are extinguished before the fire season.

This is an aerial shot of cleared right of way showing buffer zones at a stream crossing. And, you can see there is a tower right in here, just in front of the buffer zone, and the buffer zone is identified here, with the standing tree. This is the stream in here, and, again on the other side. So the, what is cleared is just enough to get the conductor through, and to get equipment across the stream area.

Leaving the standard standing timber.

At the end of the season, access across the

river will be decommissioned appropriately, and if needed, re-vegetation will occur on the banks, to stop potential erosion, and sedimentation. Here is another picture, and, this is also from the Wuskwatim project. You can see the transmission tower here, you can see the roadway down to the river, and the ice crossing. And, the trees standing with the buffer. This was taken in the spring just after most of the snow melt, but before the river ice had melted.

Next I would like to talk about the construction in the north, and talk a little bit about foundations, the next step after clearing right of way, is installation of foundations and anchors. There will be several types of foundations and anchors, just depends on the ground conditions. This is a typical northern foundation, it is known as subgrade, or concrete wood pad. It has a steel pier that extends above the ground for, to receive the tower base. The hole is excavated, foundation installed, and leveled, and then backfilled back to ground level. With this type of foundation, approximately two to four sites per day, per crew can be completed, and, of course, it depends on the weather conditions.

Another example, of a typical foundation, this is known as a drilled pier (ph) foundation. It is a steel pipe model, with flights on it, and it is turned into the ground, to support the tower, and the guy anchors. This operation, is, much quicker, and one crew can do eight to ten sites per day. But this type of foundation requires good soil conditions to a specific depth.

After the foundations are complete tower assembly begins. This is a picture of a tower assembly crew on the Wuskwatim project. Towers, may be assembled on this tower site, or they may be assembled on a central location, and then moved to site by truck. Assembly of lattice towers is very labour intensive, and can provide job opportunities on the project.

Some communities across Northern Manitoba, have developed expertise in tower assembly. As an example, Fairford First Nation has a crew that is well respected across Canada, for tower assembly. And, since the Wuskwatim, Cormorant has also developed a crew of tower assemblers that has worked from Toronto to Vancouver.

Once the towers are assembled, and ready to be erected, cranes move on the site. And once the

crane has lifted a tower on to the base of the foundation, the ground crew will attach the guy wires, and move onto the next location. You can see, that the below the insulators, there is shivs and ropes, coming down the tower in preparation for the stringing operation.

THE CHAIRMAN: How long does it take to do one tower?

MR. PENNER: Typically, a tower may take 45 minutes to an hour to have everything set up and moved onto the next site.

THE CHAIRMAN: That quick?

MR. PENNER: That quick. That is why they need to have an number of towers assembled, and the foundations kind of running ahead. The longest process, is actually installing the foundations, and getting the guy anchors ready to go.

So, these are a typical mobile camp, and it is difficult to determine the best location for camps prior to the start of the clearing operation. Preference for site in the camp, is along the transmission right of way, or in other disturbed areas near the right of way. So the location of the camp, is selected to balance the distance for daily worker travel, with camp moves. This can vary,

depending upon the terrain, ease of camp moves, and the right of way condition.

Contractor camp locations will go through an approval process with Manitoba Hydro, and Manitoba Conservation. Mobile camps, will be used in remote areas as the work approaches more populated areas along the route, hotels and other facilities will be used to support the work force. Anyone living in the camp will be required to follow camp rules, and as such will not be allowed to hunt on the project, while working on this project.

This is a typical picture of a waste water treatment facility on mobile camp.

I would like to move to the southern construction. In the south the construction will begin in the second summer season after receipt of licence. The construction is quite different compared to the north. There will be minimal need for clearing, and the access to the right of way is much easier. The work in the southern sections will take place during the summer, and fall seasons, when construction is not possible in the north. In portions of C1, and C2, access and terrain is such that winter construction maybe required.

There will be three distinct stages of

construction, foundation installation, tower assembly, and erection, and finally, conductor stringing. These stages will take several weeks to pass, but the construction at any specific location will appear to be intermittent at best, and, will move fairly quickly.

So in the first stage of construction, the foundations will be started, foundations are much easier in the south. And particularly a cast in place pile will be used for foundations. Initially a drill rig, and associated equipment will arrive on site. The hole for foundation, will drill the hole for the foundation, and install the reinforcing steel in the hole. This will be followed by concrete trucks, pouring concrete into the holes, and the foundation crew will advance approximately one, to two kilometers per day.

It should be noted that before construction begins, the transmission line supervisor, will contact land owners in the south, and give them a rough idea of schedule and what to expect. They will also deal with specific concerns relating to that specific land owner, such as fencing, and, preferences for access to the fields.

THE CHAIRMAN: How many towers, would

there be per kilometer?

MR. PENNER: Typically, around two, I believe the ruling span is around 500 meters, so it is a typical, in that range. And, it can, in the south it will be more consistent in the north depending on hilly terrain, it can vary.

This is just another picture of foundation pile ready for concrete. So, a typical foundation crew, will consist of about 12 staff. A drill rig a crane, a loader, and several crew trucks, and then several larger trucks, for materials and supplies, and concrete delivery. Because this process moves along the line, are prolonged noise and dust should not be be a concern during any part of the operation.

The next phase is tower assembly, and it differs from the north, because the towers have a wider base, and typically can't be assembled in any specific location, except right at the tower site. So, after the concrete has set, the tower steel will begin to arrive. The towers will be partly assembled on the ground near the tower location, and, you can see sections being assembled in here. And, once the base of the tower, the upper pieces will be installed by larger cranes.

So, here is another example of a tower

where the base is complete, and this crane is putting on this tower top that would have been assembled on the ground. So once a large portion of towers have been assembled, several weeks later, the stringing operation, will begin. This will consist of setting up a pulling wheel, and tensioning wheel several kilometers apart. And pulling the conductor over each pulley. You can see the, the tensioning wheels.

Once the conductor has been strung between the towers, it must be spliced to the next wheel of conductor, this splicing is completed with something known as implosive sleeve which bonds one conductor to the other with implosion. This is one part of the construction that has noise to it. When the sleeves are imploded, it is similar to sound of a shotgun blast, the public, and residents in the area will be notified before this happens. And safety protocol will dictate there will be horn blasts to notify adjacent workers. We have been using these implosive sleeves for construction for over ten years.

I would like to switch, and carry on with contracting strategies now. As I said earlier the transmission line project is split into 8 sections,

which allow more companies opportunity at the work, and, also reduces schedule risk. In addition, north, and central sections, the clearing contracts will be separate from the construction to allow opportunities for First Nations and local Manitoba companies to participate in the work. We are currently in negotiations, with several First Nations, which include SCTC, TCN, and Fox Lake, on First Nation joint ventures to clear northern sections of the line. We are also exploring opportunities with Pine Creek, Treaty 2 First Nations, and we have also attempted to schedule meetings with the MMF. Examine, with Métis Economic Development Organization, to discuss these kind of opportunities as well.

In tendered contracts the transmission line agreement, and contract documents require that contractors have to hire all labour through a series of hiring preferences, where Aboriginal, northern, and residents local to the line will have opportunity to apply for positions. At the start of each contract, the project will hold recruitment sessions hosted by the contractor, together with Manitoba Hydro and the unions involved. In addition, the contractors bidding on the work will be in touch with

local community contacts to find out what local businesses are available to the subcontract -- to subcontract parts of the work.

There will be opportunities for on the job training for tower assemblers, chain saw cutters, and other labour positions. Manitoba Hydro is also developing a pre project heavy equipment operator training program. The program would require new workers, sorry, would train new workers, and give them approximately six weeks, of training before getting on the job experience.

Typical business opportunities, for subcontractors, include fuel supply, accommodations, food services and catering, trucking, and equipment rental. The work on the project, will be governed by the Provincial Workplace Health and Safety Act, as such the contractors will be required to have an on site safety officer. They will also provide safety training, regular safety meetings, daily tailboard discussions, on work place hazards, proper personnel protective equipment, and safe work procedures.

The contractor, as part of the terms of the contract, will be required to have a detailed safety management program to ensure that worker, and public safety is given the highest priority. Manitoba

Hydro, will also have a dedicated safety officer to monitor the safety performance of the contractors.

In order to protect, and preserve the environment, Manitoba Hydro, will require the contractors on this project to follow the Environment Licence Act, the Construction Environmental Plans, the Access Management Plans, it will also be a requirement of the contracts, that the contractors themselves have environment -- sorry, environmental management programs, including, an on site environmental officer.

Manitoba Hydro will also have environmental officers, and environmental inspectors, to monitor the performance of the contractor with respect to the environment. We will also hire local community monitors, in each section in the north to review and inspect the work during the construction.

This concludes my presentation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Penner. Ms Mayor, do you some further --

MS. MAYOR: Just one point of clarification, arising out of Mr. Penner's presentation, but to Mr. Elder. Mr. Penner had indicated that there were camp rules in place, which would include hunting restrictions on the individuals living in the camp. Could you comment, with respect

to --

THE CHAIRMAN: Could you speak up a little.

MS MAYOR: Could you comment with respect to any rules there are in the Keewatinoow camp relating to hunting or other restrictions.

MR. ELDER: Yes, I can. There will be similar rules for the Keewatinoow camp. Two things, no firearms on the site, or hunting on the construction site. And the fact that the workers, will be flown in, and, bused to site, they won't have access to their personal vehicles. So, we anticipate that will greatly reduce any hunting pressures in the area.

MS MAYOR: Thank you, that is everything.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kaplan.

MR. KAPLAN: Perhaps for both of you, my question is, I don't hunt. But I also understand the cliche rules are made to be broken. If I could just ask, what is your knowledge, as far as repercussions, as far as crew members, who breach these rules, what if they go ahead and do hunt, what happens to them?

MR. ELDER: The camp rules, will be strictly enforced. I can speak, on Wuskwatim, there are

levels of discipline, and staff will be asked to leave the site if, if there is infractions of the rules.

MR. KAPLAN: So this is all handled internally by Manitoba Hydro then?

MR. ELDER: Yes, well, the way, the way it was set up at Wuskwatim, and it will be similar, there will be a camp committee, including the union representatives, camp administrator, and in Wuskwatim, we had NCN representation on that committee to administer those rules. We are looking at doing a similar thing here.

MR. KAPLAN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gibbons.

MR. GIBBONS: Two questions, one relates to winter construction. The access trails are only constructed during the winter. But I am not clear about the conversion stations, converter stations, are those only constructed in the winter for the same reason, or can construction go on later than that?

MR. ELDER: Yes, at the converter stations, we would come into the area, once we get the licence, and construction would proceed through the five years. So, one of the first steps, would be to, to cut trails, in, into the site, so we can start to dry

it out and work on it. So, we would be restricted in the spring, but we would be working there the whole time.

MR. GIBBONS: And the second question has to do with the, the construction -- sorry, not the construction, but the assembly of the towers, this is for Mr. Penner. In the south, particularly, where the assembly of these larger towers, takes, place on site. Can all of that be done within the right of way? In other words, there is -- they don't need any additional space to do the actual assembly.

MR. PENNER: It can all be done very close to the base of the tower. They don't need any additional area.

MR. GIBBONS: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, any other from the panelists? Thank you gentlemen.

That brings the morning presentations to a conclusion. But, before we all run off we will begin after lunch with the questioning of Manitoba Hydro officials. As I noted yesterday afternoon, I will repeat for those who weren't here yesterday, we will be conducting the questioning slash cross-examination in the same order as the presentations. So, we will begin this afternoon,

with, the panel that presented the reliability presentation on Monday afternoon. It is my understanding, that Mr. Tymofichuk is not available, but Mr. Mazur and Mr. Neufeld will be here.

Following that, we will, if we conclude that this afternoon, and there is sufficient time, we will then move on to the next presentation, which was Mr. Joyal, on the consultation, and that will probably be enough to fill the afternoon, if not too much.

Any questions on that at this point?

MS MAYOR: Mr. Sargeant, just to clarify, that we will have the other presenters also present at the front because there is overlap in some of the presentations. So, although, it will be the main presenters will be put at the front, there will be a supporting cast, so people aren't surprised why the other individuals are there.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is fine, just as long as participants, realize they are not questioning the other participants directly.

MS MAYOR: The second point is there are a few housekeeping matters, at the beginning of the afternoon we would like to take care of. For example, the answer to an undertaking, given yesterday.

So with your permission we would like to do that before the questioning starts.

THE CHAIRMAN: No problem. We will then take a break for lunch, please be ready to start at 1:00 p.m.

MS JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, before we leave. Mr. Elders' presentation, will be MH - 049, and Mr. Penner's will be 50. Thank you. I keep for getting about that very necessary piece of business. We are adjourned for the morning.

(EXHIBIT MH - 049: Converter Station Construction presentation)

(EXHIBIT MH - 050: Line Construction Presentation)

(HEARING RECESSED 11:48 a.m.)

(Proceedings reconvened at 1:00 p.m.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Can we resume the hearing, please? Ms. Mayor, you indicated before lunch you had some matters to address?

MS. MAYOR: Yes, thank you. Just some brief matters for clarification from this morning's presentation and from yesterday afternoon's presentations, and some information relating to those.

Mr. Mazur is going to provide some information just on the record to clarify a few of those matters. The first one is with respect to an information request that he received an answer to and we wanted to just correct it. It was information request 428. I'll turn it over to Mr. Mazur just to make the clarification on the record.

MR. MAZUR: Good afternoon. Yes, I'd like to note a correction in IR 428. I'd like to change a figure in line 28 to $1.2 billion, 1.2, which previously read 1.76 billion.

MS. MAYOR: And that in particular was in relation to the preliminary cost to relocate Bipole II Dorsey converter to Riel. So that's just a change in the estimated cost.

The second matter is in relation to Mr. Tymofichuk's presentation yesterday afternoon. Mr. Tymofichuk had indicated that Manitoba Hydro had asked for 2,250 megawatts of emergency power from the U.S. So I'm just going to ask Mr. Mazur just to clarify that point. That was in line one and two of page 136 of the transcript.

MR. MAZUR: Yes, thank you. Mr. Tymofichuk stated that we asked for 2,200 megawatts of emergency power from the U.S. I just wanted to clarify that the 2,200 megawatts is the total emergency generation call made when generation in Manitoba is lost and not imported to Manitoba. Thank you.

MS. MAYOR: Thirdly, there was a question from I believe Commissioner MacKay, and I could be wrong, with respect to the currents in the ground electrode and how they went back through the line and what direction to take. So we are going to ask Mr. Mazur also just to clarify that point, to make sure that there is a full understanding.

MR. MAZUR: Thank you. Yes, I wasn't totally satisfied that you understood my explanation of how current gets back to the source

at Keewatinoow if we have a conductor outage. So I went back to some circuit theory to try and get the answer a little clearer. And the answer really is something similar to what I said, but hopefully this will be a little more understandable.

A complete circuit that's formed, a closed loop is a requirement to make the electric current flow. Without a closed loop, current will not flow anywhere. So this is a fundamental law of circuits. So when a pole conductor is lost, the ground provides the least resistant ground path between the Riel and Keewatinoow electrodes to complete the circuit over which the DC current flows. Simply put, if it doesn't get back to the source, there will be no current coming out of the source. I hope that added a little clarification to my answer.

MS. MAYOR: And I apologize, I think, Mr. Chairman, that was actually your question. So I apologize, I think it came from you.

Then one last matter before we commence the questioning was with respect to the answer to the first undertaking that Manitoba Hydro provided with respect to tower size. And I

believe it was a question from Commissioner Gibbons, that we were to provide that, and Mr. Mazur has that information. So that particular undertaking can be answered now. I'll turn it over to him.

MR. MAZUR: Yes. The guyed tower footprint was the one question. And the footprints from the guys will vary from 2,172 metres squared to 4,122 metres squared, depending on the varying heights of the towers. The prominent tower type will have a guyed footprint of 2,873 metres squared, so roughly 53, 54 by 54 metres.

Also to clarify the self-supporting towers. The self-supporting towers have varying tower bases ranging from 48 metres squared to 86 metres squared. The prominent tower type, which was typically the number on my slide, will have a 62 metre squared footprint of approximately 7.9 metres by 7.9 metres. Thank you.

MS. MAYOR: Thank you. Those are all the housekeeping matters.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I'll just briefly repeat what I have said a few times now. The questioning, examination this afternoon, the

first session will be just on those presentations made by Mr. Tymofichuk on reliability, Mr. Neufeld on system design, and Mr. Mazur on system planning.

Mr. Tymofichuk had a long previous commitment, I believe out of the country. He is not available to be here today. Someone I presume among all these folks off to my right will be able to respond on behalf of Mr. Tymofichuk. And Mr. Mazur and Mr. Neufeld are here to answer questions in their area. The other Hydro officials at the front are there to support Messrs. Neufeld and Mazur, not to answer questions in respect of their areas until later in these proceedings. For most of them, that will be tomorrow or Friday.

Now, we heard both yesterday and this morning that there had been some arrangements among the participants to change the order of presentation. We have no problem with that as long as we are aware of what that is. I will call out the order that we have, and if there are deviations to that, just please come forward. Tataskweyak Cree Nation? Pine Creek First Nation, do you have questions, Mr. Mills?

MR. MILLS: No, we have Mr. Tymofichuk's report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So MMF, Mr. Madden?

MR. MADDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My questions are for Mr. Neufeld. I am Jason Madden from the Manitoba Metis Federation.

More specifically, if you can go to your Powerpoint presentation on page 5 -- actually, sorry, page 4. And it's the slide entitled "Environmental Assessment Process, Final Preferred Route, Length of Line, Crown Lands, Private Lands." It's on page 4. It's actually slide, I guess it's slide 7. But for us we have two slides on each page.

MR. NEUFELD: Okay, I've got it.

MR. MADDEN: So I'm just seeking clarification. In relation to Crown lands, it says 931 kilometres of the final preferred route is going to be located on Crown lands. Are those going to be Crown lands that are already -- I guess my question is, some of them are on right-of-ways that already exist, some of them are going to be on new right-of-ways that are created, that essentially remove existing Crown lands out

of present use. Is there a further breakdown on how much of that is based upon existing and how much of that will actually be new cuts or new requirements of taking up Crown land for the line?

MR. McGARRY: Good afternoon Commissioners, Mr. Madden. The numbers have not been broken down, as you indicated. It was just a gross number for Crown land.

MR. MADDEN: Can those be provided?

MR. McGARRY: If you could clarify your definition of the breakdown?

MR. MADDEN: So my definition of the breakdown is, there's existing right-of-ways that you're using in some areas that wouldn't require new Crown lands to essentially be removed from potential use, for let's say harvesting purposes. What I'm really getting at is, how much is the new footprint going to take out from existing Crown lands where Aboriginal people can presently harvest, to now be a part of a right-of-way? I can't, from our reads of the technical reports, as well as the presentation, it's saying, well, there's 67 percent Crown lands. 931 kilometres of it is on Crown lands. How much of that is already existing Crown lands that is subject to a line or

subject to, you know, that essentially is already taken up? And then of that, what is the total distance of that? So I would gather that that 931 kilometres would be multiplied by 66 metres to figure out how much in square kilometres is actually being removed from Crown land?

MR. McGARRY: Right.

MR. MADDEN: And that's what we're looking for, an understanding of that.

MR. McGARRY: I think I understand that. We'll endeavour to get those figures for you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Madden, just perhaps what you're looking for is undisturbed Crown land. Would that be a way of putting it?

MR. MADDEN: I think if that's how it's appropriately characterized, yes. I think it is what is existing and what will be new taken, essentially taken up for the purposes of Bipole III.

And then related to that, if we can get the amount of the, I guess the amount of kilometres of that would be undisturbed Crown lands. I'll use the language that the Chair suggested. And then related to that, how much,

when you factor in the size of the right-of-way, how much would that be in square kilometres as well being removed?

So my other question on this is, when you're saying 931 kilometres of Crown lands, does that include access roads or new access roads?

MR. McGARRY: That would just be for the route itself at this point.

MR. MADDEN: Do you have a calculation or an estimate of how much more in undisturbed Crown lands you would be taking up for access roads?

MR. McGARRY: Not at this time. We have developed an inventory of existing access points. That inventory is quite large. In fact, we currently believe that we may not have to create new access, but likely will. There is plenty of access to the areas we want to construct right now. So the calculation won't be done until we are actually at a contracting stage to determine exact point of access.

MR. MADDEN: So when you're saying it's fairly confident that you can use existing access, do you have any idea where you see there potentially being needs for more access roads than

in other areas? That's not outlined in the EIS. My understanding is that there's far more in the south that you can tap into, but that in the north there's going to be probably more of a need to strategically position them where you can garner access. Has there been any understanding or calculation about what that may look like?

MR. McGARRY: I don't believe we have direct calculation. But even in the north, there is a fair number of access points that have been inventoried. They are there and they exist for a number of reasons, whether it's mineral exploration, forestry development, other access points. But the approach taken was to try and use what existing access there is along the proposed route to minimize our need to create new access.

MR. MADDEN: I'm going to have further questions about how you would go about figuring out where those access roads would be, but I think I'm getting into the environmental management plan. I'm just going to focus now on what's essentially in Mr. Neufeld's presentation.

So another question, Mr. Neufeld, and then if someone else needs to respond. In relation to expense or cost associated with the

line, 67 percent are on Crown lands, 33 percent are on private lands. Is it more expensive for Bipole III when you are dealing with private lands and having compensation models with that, or is there a differential?

MR. McGARRY: Differential, the cost for -- just to get your question clear again -- the cost for developing on private land versus Crown land?

MR. MADDEN: Yes, what's more expensive?

MR. McGARRY: I would say, well for private land, obviously we have to negotiate an easement and any compensation for damages on private land, so that represents a cost. There are some costs associated with it but I'm afraid I'm not familiar with them for Crown land. There is a general permit application to acquire that land. The cost implications, I'm not familiar with.

MR. MADDEN: Will a future panel be more familiar? Will there be a --

MR. McGARRY: There will be. We have --

THE CHAIRMAN: Could you pull the mic

closer to you? We're having trouble hearing.

MR. McGARRY: There will be a member on a future panel to review those kind of costs.

MR. MADDEN: Who would that be?

MR. McGARRY: Curtis McLeod.

MR. NEUFELD: Could I just ask a clarifying question? Are you referring to just the land itself or the overall construction costs?

MR. MADDEN: I guess both. I'm trying to understand, or appreciate, is it more cost efficient to build on Crown lands or is it more -- is there a desire -- I wouldn't say a desire -- is there a cost efficiency created by putting more of Bipole III on Crown lands versus private? That's really the broad question. I think I'll dig more into the details of it, but is there a cost advantage that's created by virtue of more of Bipole III being located on Crown lands versus private lands?

MR. McGARRY: We --

MR. MADDEN: Sorry, from Manitoba Hydro's perspective, not necessarily from others' perspective, but for Manitoba Hydro?

MR. McGARRY: Well, cost of development will be with the construction people.

I believe we have people here who can speak to construction cost. The cost of acquiring land is where we started on this and what I was trying to explain and how that will be dealt with to satisfy your information. I would have to turn to our construction people to give you an answer on cost of private versus Crown, if there is any.

MR. PENNER: Are you specifically asking construction costs?

MR. MADDEN: I'm asking acquiring of the land as well as construction costs?

MR. PENNER: So construction costs, if you were to be building on private land versus adjacent Crown land, there would be no difference in cost. But there is obviously a difference in cost. In my presentation, we spoke about northern construction versus southern construction. Whereas typically in the north, we have more access type issues. There's more clearing that needs to be done, but there is no adjacent landowners. And in the south, the same thing. There's not typically Crown land adjacent to the farmland communities that we need to be going through.

So there is no additional cost to

being on one land versus the other.

MR. MADDEN: But there would be an acquiring?

MR. PENNER: There's differences in the cost of acquiring the land.

MR. MADDEN: Do you have an idea of what that difference by and large is versus acquiring it from the Crown or acquiring it from a private landowner?

MR. PENNER: Can I take that back and get that to you?

MR. MADDEN: Sure.

MR. PENNER: Okay.

MR. MADDEN: Of the landowners where it says 454 kilometres are on private lands, 436 private landowners, do you have a breakdown of those landowners with respect to how many may be First Nations or Metis?

MR. NEUFELD: I believe we have that. We likely have that information but we don't have it here. Again, we have a presenter later in the week, or later in the month that would be speaking to some of the details on that.

MR. MADDEN: Then they would be able -- that will be provided? I guess my

question is, it's not in the technical reports, it's not in the EIS, so we're asking the question if either it can be as an undertaking or just the expectation that we're going to have an answer on that at a further panel, I'm fine with that.

MR. NEUFELD: We'll take it as an undertaking.

MR. MADDEN: I want to go now to page 5. It's your slide about sustainable development. I guess it's two more slides forward.

We have 13 points here. Can you explain those 13 points of where those come from? Are those Manitoba Hydro created objectives of how it defines sustainable development?

MR. McGARRY: I think I can speak to that. The criteria for evaluation of sustainable development comes from provincial guidelines. Those are the ones we used for the EIS.

MR. MADDEN: So those are from the Sustainable Development Act, Manitoba's legislation?

MR. McGARRY: I believe that's correct. Although I don't have that particular slide in front of me so I'm doing a bit of an assumption there.

MR. MADDEN: Okay. I guess this is a question for Mr. Neufeld. In addition to those principles or goals, would the principle of attempting to secure public support for Manitoba Hydro's projects and undertakings be a goal set by Manitoba Hydro?

MR. NEUFELD: Well, if you recall back to my presentation, we talked about item number 10, which is public participation. And so the intent for Bipole III has been to provide opportunities for input from the public and interested parties in the evaluation of the development and the program as it relates to the final preferred route for Bipole III.

MR. MADDEN: But you'd agree with me that there's a difference between participation and support. So I may participate, I may attend meetings, I may have my voice heard, but Manitoba Hydro may ultimately make a decision that's inconsistent with that. I would therefore not support the project. Participation doesn't equate to support. You do agree with me that there's a distinction between that?

MR. NEUFELD: It may not, I agree.

MR. MADDEN: Sorry, it may not?

MR. NEUFELD: That's correct.

MR. MADDEN: And is a goal of Bipole III to have public support for the project?

MR. NEUFELD: The goal was to ensure that feedback would be received and that it would result in a project that would have minimal impact on the people and the environment.

MR. MADDEN: And do you define that definition as support?

MR. NEUFELD: I would say it would not be to gauge public acceptance per se.

MR. MADDEN: That's not a factor of Manitoba Hydro to attempt to ensure there is public acceptance or general public support for the project? It's just to provide an opportunity for input?

MR. NEUFELD: No, I wouldn't agree with that. The intent of the open houses was to provide an opportunity for us to communicate to the public and create an awareness of the project, create an awareness of why Manitoba Hydro needed to proceed on with this project, and to provide opportunities for feedback so that we could make the appropriate changes in our routing to respect the various factors that included location and

perhaps impact to individuals, and create a level of interest through public engagement that would allow a final preferred route that would certainly minimize the impact on a number of factors.

MR. MADDEN: So a goal of Manitoba Hydro's would be to have public support for the project through -- and the vehicle or the way that Manitoba Hydro intended to achieve that is through its processes that it's undertaken?

MR. NEUFELD: Right.

MR. MADDEN: And are you familiar with the concept of a social licence for projects?

MR. NEUFELD: I am.

MR. MADDEN: Can you explain how you or Manitoba Hydro would understand obtaining a social licence for projects?

MR. NEUFELD: In terms of my understanding of a social licence, I would submit that the process that we followed with regard to our four rounds of consultation, along with the extensive amount of research that was done, and adjusting the routes accordingly, listening to the needs of various interests in individuals and the public, that we would have gone a significant way down the path of getting a social licence.

MR. MADDEN: So do you think -- is it Manitoba Hydro's perspective that there is public support for the project as it currently stands?

MR. NEUFELD: I would say there's a significant amount of public support, yes.

MR. MADDEN: And Manitoba Hydro believes that you have a social licence for the project as well?

MR. NEUFELD: I believe we do.

MR. MADDEN: Going on to the next page on sustainable development. And in your testimony Monday, you talked about the environmental assessment process of how you cast the net wide and then you become more focused. Can you elaborate on that a little bit more? I'm trying to understand, from casting the net wide, is that looking at the large yellow study area on the map and then continuing to refine?

MR. NEUFELD: So just to be sure we're on the same page, it's not sustainable development. I believe the report is under Environmental Assessment Process.

MR. MADDEN: Yes, sorry.

MR. NEUFELD: Okay. With regard to starting wide and then starting to narrow down,

the broad band that you see on the map on slide 7, which is entitled Environmental Assessment Process --

MR. MADDEN: Okay.

MR. NEUFELD: -- directly after Project Description, the broad band which covers approximately 20 percent of the area of Manitoba is that swath, if you will, that we started with. That was the building block for the review of, and search for a corridor that might be appropriately located within that band, that yellow band.

So to go back to my presentation, the process of doing research on the area, the process of going through public consultation and gaining feedback from various stakeholders and interested parties allowed us to start narrowing the search area.

And of course, we saw Mr. McGarry's and Mr. Dyck's presentation yesterday. And that probably more adequately describes the whole process of narrowing down and trying to understand where our route could be allowed and where we would prefer not to go.

MR. MADDEN: And as you just indicated, we call it the backwards banana, but

the yellow area, it's about 20 percent of the land mass of Manitoba, it's quite a large area. And so the net needed to be cast wide and then continually refined as additional or more information became available?

MR. NEUFELD: That's correct.

MR. MADDEN: Would you agree with me that that's a helpful way of deciding of how to route the line, is having that information and continuing to cast the net wide and then continue to refine it as more and more information becomes available?

MR. NEUFELD: I would agree with you, yes.

MR. MADDEN: Would you agree with me that that probably applies to Aboriginal peoples as well, who may have a large traditional territory, that they may need to cast the net wide and then refine as well?

MR. NEUFELD: I believe, in response to your question, that when I'm speaking about the environmental process here, it included all aspects including the Aboriginal First Nation interests.

MR. MADDEN: Would you agree with me

that you can't stop halfway through in the refinement, that you need to continue to drill down further and further as you get more and more information? You can't stop halfway. Or the whole, I guess, benefit of using that type of model doesn't really work.

MR. NEUFELD: Well, that would be true. And I would liken it to an analogy, I would say following a carpenter's rule, if you're familiar with that. You need to measure twice, you might need to measure three times before you saw. No waste, most efficient and you get it right.

MR. MADDEN: And the key component of that is that as more information becomes available, you need to add that -- you need to remeasure?

MR. NEUFELD: I would say that there is a judgment call that needs to be made at some point in time. Back to the carpenter's rule, if you're building a house and framing it, there's no point in going to a 32nd of an inch because it probably doesn't matter.

MR. MADDEN: But if something more significant came up, you would say, well, maybe we

have to go back to the drawing board or maybe we should go back and remeasure?

MR. NEUFELD: We believe that the research we have completed so far is comprehensive. We have consulted extensively, I believe, as you have heard over the last few days. We feel we have a fairly good lay of the land.

MR. MADDEN: And I'm not talking specific about Bipole III. But following through on the principle of the model that you have explained for an environmental assessment is that as you continue to narrow down, or if new information becomes available and it's significant, that you would want to reassess based upon the environmental assessment model that you have outlined -- if it was significant. And I'm not saying that there is anything that's significant, I'm just saying the fundamental principle of how you -- based upon this theory or based upon the environmental assessment process that Manitoba Hydro used, is that as you distill down further, if new information became available you would have to reassess?

MR. NEUFELD: Well, I would say, looking in the rearview mirror, that we have done

that.

MR. MADDEN: But if additional information came up -- I guess I'll use this example. If all of a sudden you are proceeding down with a specific project and new technology became available, and that new technology removed significant cost as well as potential environmental side-effects, Manitoba Hydro would look at that new technology, correct?

MR. NEUFELD: My understanding in the role of the engineer, as an engineer that I have taken in this company, is that technology changes usually don't develop from a finding to something that can be practically applied within the time frame of our typical project, even though be it a large project like this.

MR. MADDEN: I'm using a hypothetical. I think that people would probably have said the same thing about the Internet many years ago, and that's been transformational. If something did come up, that proponents shouldn't have blinders on, two issues, shouldn't be so focused on the rabbit's hole that they miss -- that when additional information is fed in, and it's important that it needs to be factored into that

assessment?

MR. NEUFELD: I would agree with you to within reason. If we recall back to Mr. Tymofichuk's presentation on Monday, he talked about the need for reliability and the need for putting a facility like this in. So there comes a point in time, I believe, in terms of meeting the expectations of the Manitoba Hydro Act and the need for Manitoba Hydro to ensure there is a reliable supply of electricity for everyone living in this province, that you need to just move ahead.

MR. MADDEN: I think that's all. Thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Madden. Bipole Coalition, Mr. Meronek?

MR. MERONEK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Neufeld, I just want to follow up on an answer you gave to Mr. Madden moments ago about the feeling or position of Manitoba Hydro that it had public support for this project.

You had confirmed to Mr. Madden moments ago that you felt that Manitoba Hydro had public support for Bipole III?

MR. NEUFELD: I'm sorry, could you ask

the question again?

MR. MERONEK: I believe you answered Mr. Madden's question in the affirmative, does Manitoba Hydro feel that it has public support for this project?

MR. NEUFELD: I believe we have public support, yes.

MR. MERONEK: And how did you gauge that, sir? Has there been some kind of an analysis done or survey done that's on the record?

MR. McGARRY: I think public support is obviously a desired approach for the corporation. And it was garnered, although not quantitively measured perhaps, but one of the overriding responses we got from public consultation was very few people questioned the need for the project. And I think that in some ways speaks to a project going forward. Most of the debate centred around where, as everyone knows.

So in that sense, there did seem to be some public support in that regard, that reliability and redundancy is desirable.

MR. MERONEK: So if I can understand your answer, Mr. McGarry, there isn't a specific

survey that was done? Anything that would suggest public support is found in the material that's been filed in the EIS?

MR. McGARRY: Chapter 5 of the EIS outlines the public consultation process and outlines a lot of the issues we heard. That process normally reports on what we heard. And as I'm sure you are aware, what comes out of these processes, as mostly the people who have issues or questions for the proponent will show up and do so, and rightfully so. You're not always going to get a long stream of people there to congratulate you on developing the project. So to me, it's just the nature of the process, it's what you're going to hear. Did we go out and quantitatively measure it? Not as such, not through that program.

MR. MERONEK: I just want to move to something more technical, and it has to deal with reliability in the sense of the issue of ice storms. Mr. Tymofichuk painted some pretty grim pictures the other day about the ramifications and effects of ice storms, specifically in Quebec. And I think there was one in Manitoba many years ago. And I think we are all keenly aware of what

happened in Quebec.

Is it possible that an ice storm could be so all-pervasive that it could knock out all Bipoles at the same time?

MR. MAZUR: It's always possible for one to imagine a scenario where that could happen. However, one of the key points of a lot of the analysis that we have done is that providing separate redundant facilities does significantly improve the chance or reduce the risk of that type of event. For example, the Bipole III line on the west reduces the risk by a factor of 10 or more for ice and wind storms impacting all three Bipoles compared to, you know, the system as it is with just the Bipole I and II.

MR. MERONEK: I appreciate that, Mr. Mazur. If we're dealing with an all-pervasive ice storm, and let's talk about Winnipeg, that could very well knock out all the distribution lines. Would that be fair?

MR. MAZUR: It certainly could knock out a significant number of distribution lines. There's been events in the past that have knocked out distribution lines in specific areas of the province, mainly kind of the southern central part

of the province.

MR. MERONEK: And the impact, although maybe not as long, would be just as catastrophic, would it not, if the end-user is not getting electricity or power?

MR. MAZUR: I'm sorry, I didn't hear the first part of the question?

MR. MERONEK: I said, although maybe not as long lasting, the effect would be just as catastrophic if the end-user does not receive power?

MR. MAZUR: It certainly would be a hardship for the end-users that do not receive power. However, there's a significant difference between having an impact in the entire province versus a localized impact. And what I mean by that is that there is always options for the localized impacted citizens to move out temporarily to find a place of comfort. It's much more difficult to try and deal with that with a significant number of the population of the province.

MR. MERONEK: Well, we were talking about worst case scenarios, or Mr. Tymofichuk was painting some grim pictures. But if it happened

in Winnipeg, that would be half the province, correct, in terms of population, or more?

MR. MAZUR: It would certainly be that, yeah.

MR. MERONEK: Are there any ice prevention devices that you are aware of to ameliorate that possibility? And I'm thinking about Quebec, where I would have expected there would have been some rectifying measures taken to prevent that. Does Manitoba Hydro have any devices that it can incorporate just to give us comfort that ice storms can be modified?

MR. MAZUR: On the distribution networks in the lower voltage system, Manitoba Hydro does conduct ice melting when it's appropriate and have been doing that for quite some time.

On the high voltage networks, at this point we have no way to mitigate the ice storm itself, other than -- precisely the purpose of Bipole III is to provide the separate redundant facilities to reduce the risks, as I pointed out earlier.

MR. MERONEK: It's my understanding that in Quebec, there's a device used and it's

called the Areva T&D, which is used to melt ice and prevent ice from forming on conductors. Are you aware of that device?

MR. MAZUR: I'm aware that the device is being developed. It's a special device that's intended to be connected to some of their high voltage networks for the purpose of ice melting. I'm not aware at this point that it's actually functional or not.

MR. MERONEK: So I take it from that answer that Manitoba Hydro hasn't investigated whether there are practical and workable devices to help ameliorate the catastrophic effects of ice storms?

MR. MAZUR: Manitoba Hydro is aware of the devices. However, the nature of our system, application of devices, once you have the problem, is a bandaid. Our approach at this point is to address the issue by trying to provide redundancy into the system so we have a reduced risk of losing the whole system.

MR. MERONEK: As I understand these devices, they raise the temperature of the conductors above the ambient temperature and thereby melt or prevent ice from building up.

Have I got that correct?

MR. MAZUR: I believe that would be correct. One of the requirements is that you have to have sufficient energy to be able to supply to the device so that you can do that.

MR. MERONEK: Has Manitoba Hydro investigated whether Bipole III or Bipoles I and II would have sufficient energy to be able to accommodate that particular initiative?

MR. MAZUR: We haven't investigated any means to ice melt on Bipole I and II. I mean, there's a few issues. A lot of our experience with ice on Bipoles I and II, and much of our system, is not only in the conductor but all the non-conducting parts.

So as I said earlier, you know, the action we're taking at this point is to provide redundancy. And there is some possibility that we could -- that we may provide some mechanism to deal with ice on Bipole III, but we haven't finalized any decision on that.

MR. MERONEK: Just a short snapper. There was a picture, a fairly graphic picture of a, I think it was called a galloping sway on the conductors? Do you have that vernacular or

terminology down correctly?

MR. MAZUR: Um-hum.

MR. MERONEK: I think the evidence was that it was about a 30-foot sway to the perpendicular? Do I have that correct?

MR. MAZUR: I would have to go back to the transcript to remember the exact number, sir.

MR. MERONEK: Well subject to check, is that still a height which is safe for farm machinery, if there was equipment underneath the conductor with experiencing a 30-foot sway, would that cause any problems?

MR. MAZUR: Based on what assumption?

MR. MERONEK: Well, the height of the equipment from the ground.

MR. MAZUR: I assume that if the conductor broke and an energized conductor fell on something, which is a fairly low probability event, there would be some damage.

MR. MERONEK: Mr. Chairman, I want to get your guidance on this next area, and perhaps a ruling. I know that chapter 2 is off the table from a cross-examination perspective in terms of needs for and alternatives to, and costs and reliability and matters of those nature. There is

an aspect of chapter 2 that deals with underground cable. What are your thoughts on being able to cross-examine on that aspect?

THE CHAIRMAN: I would allow questions on underground cable.

MR. MERONEK: Okay. Who is in the best position to field these questions?

MR. MAZUR: The underground cable?

MR. MERONEK: Yes. That would be Mr. Mazur.

And there was a cryptic narrative on underground cables in chapter 2 of the EIS, starting at page 17 and carried over on to page 18. Was that your penmanship, Mr. Mazur?

MR. MAZUR: Yes, myself or my staff.

MR. MERONEK: Now, in answer to I believe a question or an information request from the Commission, and I'll identify it as CEC/MH-3-064, there was a question probing whether underground cables in certain agricultural areas for short distances would be appropriate. And Manitoba Hydro was invited to respond and it did. Can you take credit for that response, Mr. Mazur?

MR. MAZUR: Yes.

MR. MERONEK: Sorry?

MR. MAZUR: Yes.

MR. MERONEK: Okay. And in that response, Manitoba Hydro identified certain issues with respect to underground cable that made it not as favourable as overhead lines. One being cost, correct?

MR. MAZUR: Yes. We identified, based on our cost analysis, that underground cable is anywhere in the range from three to six times, let me check the wording here, more costly than overhead cable.

MR. MERONEK: And one of the other issues was reliability?

MR. MAZUR: That's correct. The report we commissioned to investigate cable indicates that the high voltage cables have a -- they are very immature technology at this point in time, in the range of 500 kV. So the failure rates appear to be significantly higher than overhead line. Yeah. Having said that, recognize that there's minimal data available to date on operating 500 kV cables.

MR. MERONEK: And the report to which you refer is a technical report commissioned in April of 2011, and it's a reference in chapter 2,

and it's called potential use of submarine or underground cables for long distance electricity transmission in Manitoba?

MR. MAZUR: That's correct.

MR. MERONEK: And that report is the report Manitoba Hydro relies on for the position it's taking with respect to the use of underground cable versus overhead lines?

MR. MAZUR: That was one of the reports that we commissioned to provide us information on underground cable and submarine cable in that respect.

MR. MERONEK: That's the only report that I'm aware of in this filing. Are there any others?

MR. MAZUR: No, other than the technical literature.

MR. MERONEK: Okay. Now as I understand that report, it was based on examining six routes?

MR. MAZUR: Yes.

MR. MERONEK: And those six routes, for the record, are found at page 28 through 32 of the technical report?

MR. MAZUR: I believe that's correct,

yes.

MR. MERONEK: And can you confirm for me, sir, that the route that was being examined, or the routes examined in those reports are not routes which are the same as the final preferred route that we have before us today?

MR. MAZUR: The routes that were examined in this report were routes selected to look at a hypothetical routing of generation from the north to the south. And there was no attempt necessarily to mirror a route such as the preferred route.

MR. MERONEK: This report was commissioned in 2011. Can you tell us why there wasn't a comparison to the preferred route that is presented for approval before this Commission today.

MR. MAZUR: If you'll note the title of the report, it was "Post Bipole III Concepts Review." It never was intended to evaluate cable routing for Bipole III. Our concept for Bipole III is an overhead line.

MR. MERONEK: Would you agree with me, sir, then this report is of limited value when it comes to assessing the issue of costs and

reliability for underground cable for areas that are of concern to my clients, and that is agricultural Manitoba?

MR. MAZUR: I don't think I would agree with that assessment. The report provides a significant amount of information on, you know, the technology of underground cable, cost of underground cable. In fact, you know, it does look at sections of cable. You know, it isn't limited to 12 or 1,300 kilometres of underground cable. Most of these routes are hybrid routes which is a combination of overhead, underground and/or submarine.

MR. MERONEK: There are six routes that are being examined. One is an overhead route from Hudsons Bay down to Winnipeg between the lakes, correct?

MR. MAZUR: Which route are you referring to?

MR. MERONEK: The overhead route that is found on page --

MR. MAZUR: Route number one?

MR. MERONEK: -- twenty-seven. Yes, route number one. It goes from Hudsons Bay down partly through between Lake Winnipeg and Lake

Manitoba system, correct?

MR. MAZUR: Yes.

MR. MERONEK: You have three routes that are strictly partially submarine cable routes, correct, or a combination of overhead routes and submarine cable?

MR. MAZUR: I believe that's correct.

MR. MERONEK: And then you have two routes, essentially overhead routes, but underground cable around Grand Rapids to the extent of, in one route 175 kilometres, in one route 263 kilometres, correct?

MR. MAZUR: That is correct.

MR. MERONEK: And nothing relating to Southern Manitoba?

MR. MAZUR: That is correct.

MR. MERONEK: And one of the impediments, as I understand it from this report, with respect to the underground portion of the routes related to the geographic difficulties around Grand Rapids, in which a tunnel would have to be built. Did I read that accurately?

MR. MAZUR: I think the route around Grand Rapids would have to certainly be an underground route to avoid the congestion.

MR. MERONEK: A tunnel?

MR. MAZUR: I'm not sure, I don't see the word tunnel. Oh, yes I do, yes. A tunnel is assumed to be about 0.6 kilometres. So one portion of that 175 kilometres is a tunnel.

MR. MERONEK: Now, Manitoba Hydro was invited to provide studies, plans, calculations, analyses to demonstrate that underground cable in agricultural Manitoba was not feasible. Do you recall that? And I'm referring to Manitoba Hydro information request 6-335B.

MR. MAZUR: Yes.

MR. MERONEK: And Manitoba Hydro declined, or did not provide any such plans, studies, calculations pursuant to that request?

MR. MAZUR: Manitoba Hydro does not have plans, specific plans -- or excuse me, Manitoba Hydro does not have plans specific to that request.

MR. MERONEK: But --

MR. MAZUR: We have looked at cable costs, looked at cable costs in the literature and developed our own estimates.

MR. MERONEK: But declined to provide that to the Commission, is that correct?

MR. MAZUR: Our response was that we did not have such plans, sir.

MR. MERONEK: But in your information request, you have repeated that your preliminary calculations are it's three to six times more expensive?

MR. MAZUR: That's correct. Some of the information comes from, if I may, from the underground cable report that you had earlier referenced. It also comes from analysis or review of costs of other projects, one in Alberta for example, in comparison to our overhead cost. Based on that analysis, we believe that the costs of underground cable is significantly more expensive than on the ground.

MR. MERONEK: But you haven't shared that with the Commission.

MR. MAZUR: I think we have in the response to the IR.

MR. MERONEK: We would not find any calculations done by Manitoba Hydro on the record that would suggest three to six times more expensive for underground cable than for overhead lines in Southern Manitoba; is that correct?

MR. MAZUR: I would disagree. The one

calculation is provided in the report.

MR. MERONEK: All right. We'll look at the report. Now, in the report, the technical report, there is a reference in the summary section at page 109 -- sorry, page 91 -- sorry, there's a table at page 91 that talks about costs for all of the routes, including the two routes that have some portion or segment with underground cable. Do you see that, sir, on page 91?

MR. MAZUR: Yes, I do.

MR. MERONEK: And the two routes in terms of the cost that are calculated in this report are anywhere from one and a half times to two times. Would you agree with that, sir?

MR. MAZUR: Could you point out the numbers you are talking, referring to, sir?

MR. MERONEK: Routes two and three.

MR. MAZUR: If you're looking at the base dollar estimates, I believe that's right. But if you look at the kilometre dollar estimates, I would have to go and do that calculation.

MR. MERONEK: All right. Let's move to page 104 then, and that's under the heading "Findings and Conclusions." And the findings of this report on page 104, number 15, and I'll read

it.

"The least costly hybrid DC or AC route would be approximately 1.5 and 2.8 times more expensive respectively than the base case overhead route, assuming long train shipping is feasible."

Do you see that?

MR. MAZUR: So, I just point out that the conclusion that you have read is based on a hybrid AC/DC scheme, and it does not include all the infrastructure that would be required to actually implement the plan.

MR. MERONEK: But I thought you said, sir, that Manitoba Hydro was relying on this report with respect to costs. And I don't see anywhere in this report that it says three to six times more expensive. Can you confirm that?

MR. MAZUR: I would like to clarify. I did not say that we quoted directly out of the report to get the three to six times. What I said is, we used the report as an information input to derive cost.

MR. MERONEK: And if you could go back to page 94 -- have you got that, sir, page 94?

MR. MAZUR: I'm on page 94.

MR. MERONEK: And I'll just read the last sentence on that page, under the heading "Interpretation of Estimate Results."

"When comparisons are made with actual hybrid solutions such as when overhead line length is much longer, overall cost premiums for solutions with cables are reduced."

Do you see that, sir?

MR. MAZUR: Yes, I see that.

MR. MERONEK: Do you agree with that statement?

MR. MAZUR: I think you have to take it in the context of the statement above, in the context that cost premiums for cables expressed would be considerably higher as shown in table 20, sir.

MR. MERONEK: But --

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Meronek, can I interrupt? I'm just wondering where you're hoping to go with this. I said we would entertain questions in respect to underground cable because we on the panel, frankly, have some curiosity about that. But if you're planning to go into

exhaustive alternatives to pursuit, then I'll have to declare it out of order.

MR. MERONEK: That's where I am headed, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Into an exhaustive alternatives to?

MR. MERONEK: Define exhaustive, as opposed to exhausting?

THE CHAIRMAN: We're not here to debate, as you well know, the NFAT issues. Some of the elements within it, particularly as I have noted, we have our own curiosity about underground cable. But only to get some answers, but not to get into an alternatives to analysis.

MR. MERONEK: Well, to be quite upfront about it, it would be our position, if we are allowed to pursue it, that this is a viable option for Manitoba Hydro to pursue and it hasn't done so.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure that I can allow you to go there.

MR. MERONEK: I'm sorry?

THE CHAIRMAN: I said I'm not sure that I can allow you to go there. We have directions from our Minister that an NFAT is not

on the table. Questions to some degree within the purview of chapter 2, or within the purview of the reliability presentation made on Monday, I would allow, but not if you are going down a major alternatives to road.

MR. MERONEK: I knew I was going where angels fear to tread. I had some good questions though.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sure you did. I Have no doubt at all.

MR. MERONEK: All right. Well, those are my questions then.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Meronek. Consumers Association, Ms. Craft, anything?

MS. CRAFT: We had advised that Mr. Williams, we have made arrangements for Mr. Williams to do all of his cross-examination when he returns.

THE CHAIRMAN: But will he be going back into areas that we're covering today?

MS. CRAFT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: We may have to discuss that during the break. That wasn't our understanding, but we won't pursue that right now, but we'll talk about that during the break.

I don't see Chief Genaille here. Mr. Dawson from Peguis?

MR. BEDDOME: I have an email from Gaile. She is wanting just to confirm that there will be some chances to ask some questions tomorrow morning?

THE CHAIRMAN: We'll proceed in the order that I mentioned earlier, Mr. Beddome. We set out this lineup yesterday afternoon. In fact, Ms. Whalen Enns was here at that time. She knows that we are not making special accommodations for various parties.

MR. BEDDOME: Is it possible if I am on my own as a party willing to move forward -- (inaudible)

THE CHAIRMAN: Please, we're not going to debate from the back of the room to the front. Mr. Dawson has the floor now and I'll turn it over to him.

MR. DAWSON: If it helps, I don't mind stepping aside. I don't know what the nature of the discussion was that was settling in.

THE CHAIRMAN: You go ahead, sir.

MR. DAWSON: My questions primarily relate to Mr. Tymofichuk's presentation, and I'm

going to guess that Mr. Neufeld is most likely the person who will answer. To the extent, Mr. Neufeld, that you find you are unable to answer, I note that my learned friend, Mr. Bedford, has indicated Mr. Tymofichuk is planning to come back, if requested, at the end of the month, and I'm willing to wait. So if you feel uncomfortable in answering these questions, you feel free to tell me you'd like to wait.

So, Mr. Neufeld, I understand that of course Mr. Tymofichuk gave a presentation which has been entered as Exhibit 41 from Manitoba Hydro entitled "Reliability" yesterday. Am I correct?

MR. NEUFELD: I don't have a copy of his presentation with the same title that you do.

MR. DAWSON: What's the title that you have?

THE CHAIRMAN: We do. Mr. Dawson is correct.

MR. NEUFELD: Okay, I'll accept that. Yes.

MR. DAWSON: Now I'm really interested. What's the title of the presentation that you are looking at?

MR. NEUFELD: I have an earlier draft

that got normalized, if you will, across the whole cadre of presenters.

MR. DAWSON: So what's the title of your presentation?

MR. NEUFELD: Mr. Tymofichuk, professional engineer, vice-president of transmission.

MR. DAWSON: I think "Reliability" is easier.

Having sat through that presentation yesterday, I, in the very broadest sense, got the feeling that Mr. Tymofichuk's purpose was essentially to show that there is, at least in his opinion, a need for Bipole III. Am I correct?

MR. NEUFELD: It would be more than Mr. Tymofichuk's opinion, sir. And yes, there is a need for Bipole III.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Tymofichuk yesterday gave evidence indicating that it was his view that there was a need for Bipole III. Is that an accurate summary of what he said yesterday in the very broadest sense?

MR. NEUFELD: I would broaden it further. He was here representing the corporation, it was more than his opinion.

MR. DAWSON: So what was it?

MR. NEUFELD: The corporation's view.

MR. DAWSON: I note just by way of example that he made reference to a fire that almost took out the Buffalo Lake area. Is that right?

MR. NEUFELD: That's correct.

MR. DAWSON: And that fire almost had an effect -- well, it did have an effect on Bipoles I and II, if I remember correctly, am I right?

MR. NEUFELD: Can you refer me to the slide, the slide number?

MR. DAWSON: No, I can't.

MR. NEUFELD: Okay. I believe it did, yes.

MR. DAWSON: I can give you the transcript but I don't have the slide exhibits because I don't have electronic copies.

MS. MAYOR: It's page 23.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

MR. NEUFELD: Yes, there was an effect on Bipoles I and II, and three-quarters of the power on the DC system was lost.

MR. DAWSON: That's my understanding

as well. Mr. Tymofichuk went on to note or to say that the U.S. market-place noted this problem, this effect. Am I right?

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dawson, I don't understand. We accepted Mr. Tymofichuk's evidence on Monday as his position. You seem to be asking questions to confirm that that was his position. Why are you going there?

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Tymofichuk is not here.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, but Mr. --

MR. DAWSON: I have to belabour the point because I have a witness who is essentially, almost by extension, having to testify as to what someone else said.

THE CHAIRMAN: But why would you need to question Mr. Tymofichuk about whether or not he meant what he said on Monday? Can't we take that as evidence?

MR. DAWSON: If I accept, and I'm quite happy to do as the Chair wishes, that we should simply accept what Mr. Tymofichuk has said with respect to reliability, I do think that raises a problem. My learned friend, Mr. Meronek, was earlier told that he can't pursue certain

issues relating to alternate routes, for example, and that that was pursuant to the decision of this panel. And indeed the panel had indicated that when we had met at the pre-hearing conference, indicating, if I remember the words of the chair were that it was off the table.

If Mr. Tymofichuk's evidence relates to reliability and therefore the need for the Bipole III, does that not then give rise to the problem that we have evidence from Manitoba Hydro that the panel is accepting, but that is then in turn precluding the participants from asking questions about on the ground that it's off the table?

THE CHAIRMAN: There's a difference between asking the questions about the evidence, and simply every one of your questions so far has just been whether or not Mr. Tymofichuk said what he said.

MR. DAWSON: So what you are essentially doing is critiquing my style of cross-examination rather than foreclosing the direction I am going?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, for now anyway. I may foreclose later, but at this point I think

you're using up time that is valuable. If you get to the point and start asking questions that don't really ask for an obvious answer --

MR. DAWSON: Perhaps I have misunderstood the haste with which this panel is trying to proceed.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure we're talking about haste, but rather than wasting time.

MR. DAWSON: Well, I certainly apologize if the panel thought that I was wasting time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you for your apology.

MR. DAWSON: Rather than waste time, I will ask Mr. Neufeld just a quick question about your own presentation. And this relates to Exhibit 42 on system design, which you gave. At page 4 of your slides, there was a reference to the length of the line as well as the length of Crown lands and private lands that were needed. I'll give you a moment to turn to that.

MR. NEUFELD: You're referring to the slide under the title of Environmental Assessment Process.

MR. DAWSON: It's on page 4 and it has

the -- the first line is, length of line 1,384.

MR. NEUFELD: Correct.

MR. DAWSON: This is not at all trying to be a smart ass, I'm just asking the question. The length of the line is 1,384, but when I add the Crown and the private lands, I get 1,385. Can we explain the discrepancy?

MR. NEUFELD: Can you just remind me the document that you saw 1,385 kilometres?

MR. DAWSON: This is Exhibit 42, it's a slide presentation that accompanied your testimony. It was entitled System Design. At page 4 of the handout that accompanied that, there is a slide that begins, length of line 1,384.

MR. NEUFELD: Correct.

MR. DAWSON: And then it refers to the Crown as 931.

MR. NEUFELD: Oh, you're questioning my arithmetic?

MR. DAWSON: I'm just trying to find out why the numbers don't come out. I'm sure it's rounding, but I just want to make sure.

MR. NEUFELD: There is a small rounding error.

MR. DAWSON: Okay. I'm not quite sure

whether it should be Mr. Mazur or Mr. Neufeld, but one of you can answer this question. In response to one of the information requests, and I'll give you the number, although I don't think you need to turn to it, it's CEC Manitoba Hydro 7, package 7, 486. Manitoba Hydro makes reference to the fact that it hasn't studied the probability of contamination of the surrounding environment. And that's relating, of course, to spills and combustion of insulating oils. Is that an oversight or is that the usual practice in this?

MR. MAZUR: If you can give us a second to find it?

MR. DAWSON: Absolutely. Please take as much time as the Chair will allow you to take.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is very patient with time as long as it's not being wasted.

That paper must be pretty hot. It seems to be getting passed quickly all the way down the table.

MS. MAYOR: Could we just ask that the question be repeated? They were trying to determine who had answered that particular undertaking.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dawson, will you please repeat the question?

MS. MAYOR: Thank you.

MR. DAWSON: I have asked, with respect, to Hydro's choice not to study probabilities relating to contamination of the environment with respect to oil spills and fire. And I have asked whether that was done by oversight or whether it was part of a deliberate practice?

MR. ELDER: I think to answer your question, the IR asks if Manitoba Hydro didn't have suitable containment and what the probability of those types of spills would be. And the response we gave is, we wouldn't consider not having that containment, so there was no reason to study it. The question was, if we didn't have oil containment, what would be the impacts to the environment? And we wouldn't consider building a facility without that containment in place.

MR. DAWSON: I'm very sorry, but there was coughing. The last sentence please again?

MR. ELDER: The IR asked what would be the impacts of an oil spill if Manitoba Hydro didn't have containment around oil filled

apparatus? And the response we gave is, we don't know because we wouldn't build the facilities without that sort of containment in place. So there's no need to study it.

MR. DAWSON: Okay. Again, just not to belabour the point, it's not oversight, it was just part of your normal practice not to explore that issue because it simply doesn't arise?

MR. ELDER: What I said is the normal practice would be to put secondary containment around that sort of devices to make sure that that wasn't a concern. So there's no need to study the probabilities if it wasn't there.

MR. DAWSON: I think those are my questions for the two, and one missing witness yesterday. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Dawson. Ms. Whalen Enns is not here. Mr. Beddome?

MR. BEDDOME: Thank you very much. Just for the record, James Beddome, Green Party of Manitoba obviously. I guess first I'll have to apologize. As an unfunded participant, we are not necessarily able to be here every day.

MS. JOHNSON: Mr. Beddome, if you want it to be recorded, you're going to have to slow

down.

MR. BEDDOME: Okay. Sorry, my apologies. These are rather quick remarks just to save time, but just saying that we weren't able to be here in person yesterday, but I have been taking some time to sort of look through the transcript as well as your Powerpoint.

The first question I just wanted to ask was, and I don't know who wants to respond to this, but I think it would be fair to say that there are two substantially different reliability risks, that of a converter station failure and that of a transmission corridor failure. Would that be correct?

MR. MAZUR: I didn't quite hear the last part of your --

MR. BEDDOME: Sure. So there are separate risks when it comes to reliability, the first being that of a converter station failure and the second being that of a transmission corridor failure?

MR. MAZUR: That is correct.

MR. BEDDOME: Okay. So I'm going to deal with them each sequentially. In terms of a converter station failure, that would seemingly be

the larger risk; is that correct?

MR. MAZUR: It's a different risk in the sense that the consequence of the failure is more significant, because the estimated duration of the failure will be significantly longer.

MR. BEDDOME: Um-hum. And the significantly longer period, as referenced in your report, is up to three years for a converter station failure and up to eight weeks or two months for a transmission failure, correct?

MR. MAZUR: That is correct.

MR. BEDDOME: Now, in terms of the three years, can you -- I mean, I'm assuming three years is sort of a worst case scenario, and there might be a whole variety of different scenarios that may sort of go on a variety of scale. So what would be a best case, I guess a best case isn't the right word, but in terms of having some sort of converter station failure, something that would be shorter, how short do you think in terms of a repair could take in a better example of failure than say a failure that would be equivalent to three years?

MR. MAZUR: Well, I think that really depends a lot on the failure. I think

Mr. Tymofichuk's presentation showed a piece of station bus that had fallen down, and that was relatively short. I'd have to check the transcript to determine exact time. On the other hand, we have had experiences of a converter transformer failing that was in excess of a year. I mean --

MR. BEDDOME: Okay. And can you elaborate further why it was in excess of a year, in terms of what was the failure and what was the year long delay?

MR. ELDER: Maybe I could just add to what Mr. Mazur said there. As you can see from the timelines that I presented this morning, to build a new converter station is about 36 to 42 months. If you assume that the facility was destroyed, that's the sort of time frames you'd be looking. You've got about a one to two, 18 months design, and then the rest is construction and commissioning. So I hope that helps answer your question, Mr. Beddome.

MR. BEDDOME: Um-hum, thank you. Now, in terms of the 18 month design, what is the -- and once again I know this will probably be different given the equipment in question. I

guess the first one to start is how many manufacturers of sort of this high end converter station equipment is there, globally?

MR. ELDER: As I said this morning, there's about three to four in the world.

MR. BEDDOME: Okay.

MR. ELDER: And the market right now is extremely busy.

MR. BEDDOME: It is extremely busy. So there is three to four in the world. Is there a particular one that Manitoba Hydro deals with?

MR. ELDER: I'm sorry?

MR. BEDDOME: Is there a particular company that is sort of preferred that Manitoba Hydro deals with at present, in terms of --

MR. ELDER: We don't have a preference between the three, but we do business with all three of them.

MR. BEDDOME: Okay. And any service contracts with those providers in terms of the converter station equipment that Manitoba Hydro has?

MR. ELDER: Yes, with all of them. I couldn't give you a list off the top of my head, but we've got service contracts of various types

through all of them, the three major HVDC apparatus people in the world, on Bipole II -- Ron?

MR. MAZUR: Correct.

MR. ELDER: -- is manufactured by one of the manufacturers of the three. The valves on Bipole I are from one of the second manufacturers. So, yes, we do business with all three of them.

MR. BEDDOME: And in terms of those service contracts, is it possible to provide a brief overview of them going forward in the future. I know you may not have that on hand today?

THE CHAIRMAN: What's the purpose of that, Mr. Beddome?

MR. BEDDOME: Well, it was going to be in my follow-up question. But the purpose would be, do the service contracts deal with failures in any way in terms of placing any of the onus or responsibility on the supplier?

MR. ELDER: We don't have any sort of contracts in place like that. No, we don't have anything in place like that.

MR. BEDDOME: Okay. And the lag time for ordering, you mentioned it's a tight market.

What's the rough -- I mean once again I know it's highly differential on equipment, but what would you estimate as a range of an order lag time in terms of getting something in, if there was a need to get something on an emergency basis?

MR. ELDER: As I said, the vendors are telling us 36 to 42 months to have a plant in place now. If you had a plant that was destroyed, you'd have to clear all that equipment out of place also.

MR. BEDDOME: And could that 36 to 42 month time frame be shortened for additional charges?

MR. ELDER: I assume so. I don't know by how much, though.

MR. BEDDOME: So Manitoba Hydro hasn't investigated that in any way?

MR. ELDER: I guess, just to put some time frames on it, transformer deliveries that Ron was talking about are in the order of 18 to 24 months to build. So that gives you a feel for how long it takes to get some of the equipment.

MR. BEDDOME: Thank you. I think that more or less handles those questions there.

A secondary question that I had, and I

don't believe it was answered in the information request, was sort of asked by the Bipole III Coalition. And it was, has Manitoba Hydro investigated the feasibility or possibility of using pre-existing contractual arrangements with large electrical users in terms of, I know there are some provisions in some of your programs that deal with this in terms of clawing back power in the event of an outage or failure? I mean, if one could elaborate further, you could buy business interruption insurance or come into some sort of contractual arrangement with the large users.

MR. MAZUR: Can you repeat the question?

MR. BEDDOME: Essentially, I'm wanting to know -- and let me backtrack and just establish some basics. There are perhaps 10 to 20 large electrical users in the province that use a good majority of the power. Would that not be fair to say?

MR. MAZUR: I haven't counted them specifically, but there is a certain number at least over 10 that are, yeah.

MR. BEDDOME: Okay. And of those 10, roughly what would you estimate their percentage

of power consumption is in Manitoba?

MR. MAZUR: I think I would have to go back and look at each one of them, but we've got, you know, some substantial loads in the mining sector, in the chemical sector.

MR. BEDDOME: Okay. Is it possible at a future date to sort of provide any kind of outline to that information?

THE CHAIRMAN: Ms. Mayor?

MS. MAYOR: Again, we're asking about the relevance to this particular hearing that we're at in providing that information?

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you speak to the relevance of that, Mr. Beddome?

MR. BEDDOME: Sure. The relevance in what I'm trying to establish is, if there's a need for reliability on the basis of a 1500-megawatt deficit, as Manitoba Hydro calculates. I'm just essentially taking a look at some of those numbers in terms of, you know, other ways that you may be able to address that deficit, or getting a better understanding of where that 1500-megawatt deficit goes to. In some of the information responses, I will actually move forward into them, that they answer some of these questions, but perhaps not as

fully as we might like.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you could make that argument in a final argument without a huge amount of detail that you requested. I just don't see the relevance of that. I tend to agree with Ms. Mayor.

MR. BEDDOME: Well, I suppose the relevance is that in the event of an outage, let's say if we have a 1500-megawatt deficit, but contractual arrangements contract that by X number of megawatts, then it might help with reliability.

THE CHAIRMAN: I said you could make that argument when we get to final argument, and we'll consider that as --

MR. BEDDOME: But why can't I question the proponent for further clarification?

THE CHAIRMAN: You can question him for further clarification, but I think the degree of information you're asking for is not necessary. In general terms, yes, but for the specific full details you are requesting, I don't see the relevance.

MR. BEDDOME: Well, I was simply trying to establish some of the background. Can I return to the original question? Is that

something that Manitoba Hydro has investigated?

MR. MAZUR: I think in response to your question, if it's toward the 1500-megawatt deficit that we're estimating for 2017, this is the deficit of supply, which is internal generation plus import that's left after Bipole I and II, or all our northern generation is lost. So it's all Southern Manitoba load. And that deficit already has forecast demand side management removed. Our mandate is to serve that load. And we have some contractual curtailable contracts. I think that's in the order of about 300 megawatts. And even those contracts don't allow us to not serve that load, day in, day out, week by week, over a period of years. So our plan is that we must have firm transmission and generation to serve that. In fact, it's our mandate.

MR. BEDDOME: Thank you. So just to clarify, that 300 megawatts of curtailment is already factored into the numbers that you show in terms of the deficit?

MR. MAZUR: We are assuming we have to serve the 300. It can be curtailed from time to time. But the assumption, I might add, on the

deficit assumes every name plate generation of all our remaining Hydro resources, which would be about 1950 megawatts. We certainly don't have name plate generation available all the time, if the water is low or if there's any units out for maintenance. It also assumes that we have all the thermal available, and we have 500 megawatts of thermal. It also assumes that we can get the import that we have stated in chapter 2 into the province at any time. Import is another issue, because I think at times over the winter of January 2011, the 700 megawatts, which is firm transmission from the United States, was only half available, we could only get 400 megawatts because of outages of equipment.

So I would make the case, and we have stated in several IRs that the 1500 megawatts can be a conservative estimate. It could be much worse. There are days, peak days when it could certainly be better.

MR. BEDDOME: Yes. And I actually -- thank you for bringing that up. You might have to wait one moment, but I'll give you the quotation which is CEC MH VII 373, I think, and that's where you guys outlined -- you'll have to give me one

second, I'm just going to try to pull it up. If you can bear with me, it's much appreciated. I'm sorry about this. I'm just trying to locate that I don't have it in front of me. If I was to read that one correctly, though, it says that you guys are, on some of the calculations you are making the assumption of the new 500-kilovolt line with the States. That's correct? Just let me see if I can find that.

MR. MAZUR: I'm having some trouble hearing you.

THE CHAIRMAN: You need to speak directly into the mic.

MR. BEDDOME: I apologize, I will re-ask that again, and perhaps I'll be able to find the direct quotation. In CEC MH VII 373, I believe it assumes that there will be 500 kilovolt new connection line to the States that is in the planning process, if I'm to understand correctly?

MR. MAZUR: I believe that's incorrect. The response to the IR says that we assume that that would not exist, and the deficit curve is shown assuming that Bipole III is not built. That's the fundamental premise of the need for Bipole III is that if it's built, it will

address the deficit. Any future line to the U.S. will likely be contingent on Manitoba Hydro going ahead with plans to develop future generation. And you know, the construction of any tie line like that would I assume be for some future export contracts. It will not exist, you know, unless those presumptions should occur. So the deficit is assuming that there is no Bipole III, there is no future development like that.

MR. BEDDOME: Okay. That definitely helps clarify. And you did mention sort of some of the assumptions of future development. Would it not be fair to say that a lot of the planning, let's say the placement of the northern converter station, as well as the placement of the southern converter station, were both made with a lot of those assumptions as to future development in mind?

MR. MAZUR: I'm not sure that would be entirely correct. One of the criteria for the location of the Keewatinoow converter station was to maintain some separation. I believe there is a couple of IRs that we responded to in this regard. And one of them asked about putting it at the existing Henday station. Well, that would create

another 4,000-megawatt station that we presumably are -- you know, that we have right now at Dorsey. So separation was one of the aspects, and so we decided to move it away from Henday. In making that decision, we also are cognizant of the fact that there is potential for a future generating station in the area where Keewatinoow is proposed to be cited, and so it was a logical location.

MR. BEDDOME: Yes. Thank you. I think the information request you're referring to is in information request package number 6. And it's CEC MH VI 245 A and B, and it says I think sort of exactly what you're saying, that the ultimate site of the Keewatinoow converter, alternatives that were looked at was locating it close to Long Spruce and/or Keeyask, but the decision was to put it close to where Conawapa would be as Conawapa is the largest planned dam. That would be correct?

MR. MAZUR: I believe that's what it says, yes.

MR. BEDDOME: And now in terms of the Riel converter station, the choice of locating it on the east side of Winnipeg is to facilitate planned future interconnections with the U.S.,

correct?

MR. MAZUR: That is incorrect.

MR. BEDDOME: Okay.

MR. MAZUR: The Riel site was identified in the mid '70s, from a planning perspective, as a site for power injection to serve the City of Winnipeg load for several reasons. But one of the main ones being that it's remote from Dorsey, or at least as remote as physically possible in a configuration of our system that we have. Additionally, it's on a corridor of 230 kV transmission that surrounds the City of Winnipeg. So it's ideally suited to connect into the 230 and load serving grids around Winnipeg. So those were some of the primary reasons for Riel, it's going to be a primary injection point for load serving.

The other factor is that the 500 kV line from Dorsey into the United States, which terminates at substation called Forbes near Duluth, is a key import line. At this point in time, that 500 kV line terminates at Dorsey. And I think Mr. Tymofichuk, in his presentation, indicated when we lost the DC lines, how close we came to losing the 500 kV line. So it's a second

termination point for that 500 kV line, and primary purpose is it will protect the existing import capability we have. If we lose the 500 line, we lose some of the existing import capability we have.

MR. BEDDOME: And there wouldn't be -- were there other locations that were looked at, perhaps going down a little bit further south in the province and still stay on the west side of the city, in terms of offering some of the same advantages? Or do you think that in the end of the site selection -- what was the rationale in the planning?

MR. MAZUR: See any other location would be dragging some eight or 10 230 kV lines like an elastic band, wherever you placed it.

MR. BEDDOME: Thank you.

MR. MAZUR: Totally inefficient.

MR. BEDDOME: Thank you very much. That does help add some clarification and I definitely appreciate it.

In CEC MH VII 374, I think you indicate public appeals during the near failure previously resulted in about a hundred megawatt reduction?

MR. MAZUR: For the event where we lost the two DC lines in September of '96, I believe we had approximately a hundred megawatts of load reduction from public appeal. The operations people have asked for subsequent appeals and found they never really achieved any effective reduction. So our assumption -- I shouldn't say assumption -- our experiences that they are not effective, certainly not to the point of making up a 1500-megawatt deficit or 30 percent of our load.

MR. BEDDOME: Which would make sense. So you think public appeals have very minimal effect. Are you saying the hundred megawatt is an over-estimation? Is it sort of being fairly generous?

MR. MAZUR: I think my response was that we experienced, or we achieved the hundred megawatts on the one occasion and have not been successful on any other locations.

MR. BEDDOME: In your opinion, what reasons do you think it's been less successful than other occasions?

MR. MAZUR: I really couldn't speculate on reasons. I'd say it's human nature.

No one typically volunteers to shut off their lights.

MR. BEDDOME: Turning a little bit to the Sustainable Development Act in Manitoba -- hold on one second, I'll move up the slide. So this would be in the presentation made by Mr. Neufeld, and it would be on page 6, it talks about the integration of environmental and economic decisions, and provides how, in Manitoba Hydro's opinion, it has met that integration.

I'm sort of curious as to what Manitoba Hydro's perspective is. Obviously, there's always a need to balance. And certainly there is a need to enhance reliability. I think there certainly is an aspect of reliability to this project, but I think there's also an aspect of future generation to it.

And so can you comment on what this project will mean economically to Manitobans, and particularly ratepayers, if only Bipole III was built, and how that would contrast if future planned interconnections in future generating stations were also built?

MR. NEUFELD: So in terms of the economic impact of building Bipole III, as it

relates to the ratepayer?

MR. BEDDOME: Yeah. I guess to give further elaboration, the Public Utilities Board in order 5/12 has estimated that Bipole III on its own would be 3 cents a kilowatt to Manitoba consumers. I mean, they don't really give a good outline of what their numbers are. I'm wondering what Manitoba Hydro's opinion is on this estimate?

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Beddome, you're not going to get an NFAT review in by the back door by referring to the principles and guidelines of sustainable development. We have already -- it's the Minister's clarification on the terms of reference, that has been taken out of our terms of reference. Where you're going is not within the terms of reference of this review.

MR. BEDDOME: Did the Minister's reference remove the principles and guidelines of sustainable development?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, but you're trying to get an NFAT review in through the back door and I won't allow it.

MR. BEDDOME: Okay. Please note my objection as I think that this is a question, it's required to answer the integration of the two.

But certainly I'll note my objection and I won't move necessarily any further than that.

I think then, if that's the case, I will leave it at that and perhaps we'll return to it at a later date.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are there any members of the public who have questions of Manitoba Hydro specific to these three presentations? If not, we'll take a break right now for 20 minutes. So please come back at quarter after 3:00.

(Recessed at 2:55 p.m.)

(Reconvened at 3:15 p.m.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Could we come back to order, please. Just a couple of clarifications. There was a misunderstanding about some commitments that were made to the Consumers Association of Canada. One of their lawyers, Byron Williams, is engaged in another tribunal setting yesterday and today I believe. He had requested the opportunity to have his cross-examination delayed. I misunderstood the terms of it, but if Mr. Williams has any questions of the three panelists, or the two panelists representing three presentations this afternoon,

if he has any questions of them tomorrow morning, we will allow him to do that. That will also mean that if Ms. Whalen Enns is here in the morning, she will be given an opportunity to cross-examine the same witnesses.

In relation to the cross-examination we are soon to get into, Mr. Joyal's consultation program, Mr. Madden, you may recall this morning Mr. Madden said that he would be tied up at this time this afternoon. So if we do complete Mr. Joyal's examination this afternoon, we will come back to it tomorrow morning for Mr. Madden. We may or may not complete it this afternoon, we will see.

Just before we leave the opening examination, I'll give panelists an opportunity to ask any questions if they have any? No? I do have one. When will Bipole IV be needed?

MR. MAZUR: I guess that will depend a lot on the future development plans that Hydro will follow, so I can't really give you a date at this point in time.

THE CHAIRMAN: So it's not in the current thinking?

MR. MAZUR: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.

So we will move on now to examination of Mr. Joyal. Let me find my list. In order, Tataskweyak, okay, thank you. Pine Creek, Mr. Mills.

MR. MILLS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman Warren Mills on behalf of Pine Creek First Nation.

Mr. Joyal, I thank you for your presentation, and we do have some questions with regards to it.

Just some housecleaning for me before I actually get into it. Do you recognize the names Hani Khalidi or Emily Linnemann?

MR. JOYAL: Not off the top of my head, no.

MR. MILLS: Okay. Thank you.

Pine Creek First Nation is of the strong opinion that there is a large gap in the path of the consultation process. We agree with you that the invitations to the party were certainly sent out, and we have heard the reviews of the party. We sense we missed chunks of the party, the consultation process. That may well be through our own negligence or oversight or failure to respond, and we're quick to recognize that.

There were conditions within the First Nation that prevented a good communication to take place, but we're here now and we'd like to try and put some pieces together.

I understand that you are the manager of the environmental assessment consultation program, or that you are the manager?

MR. JOYAL: I was a part of the process since round two.

MR. MILLS: Okay. Does Hydro have a definition of having achieved successful consultation?

MR. JOYAL: Sorry, can you repeat the question?

MR. MILLS: Does Manitoba Hydro have a definition that you used of having achieved successful consultation, or having completed consultation, or is there a definition that you use as to when consultation has occurred?

MR. JOYAL: There is no concrete definition of it being terminated. The goal is to engage the public and receive feedback with regards to the route itself.

MR. McGARRY: I would just add to that, we follow I guess recognized guidance, if

you will, for consultation for environmental assessment purposes, which we did in this case.

MR. MILLS: Okay. Previously on August 16th, we weren't present or participating at the time, but I read the minutes. And Mr. Hannon, who announced himself as general counsel and the provincial team leader introduced a definition of consultation. And he seemed to indicate that it didn't need to be perfect, but that every reasonable attempt needed to have been made in order for consultation to have been achieved.

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Mr. Mills. He was speaking specifically in respect of the constitutional requirement to consult Aboriginal communities in respect of Treaty and Constitutional rights. That's a different, an entirely different process than the one Mr. Joyal is speaking to this afternoon.

MR. MILLS: I respect that, Mr. Chairman. I'm trying to understand when we can agree that Pine Creek has been consulted with, and I'm looking for a threshold or a test or a measure. I have asked and they haven't been able to provide me with one.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think they have told you they don't have a defined definition.

MR. MILLS: And I have offered one and I was going to ask them if they would consider accepting that definition.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, go ahead. I will allow that.

MR. MILLS: Thank you.

Mr. Hannon indicated that the process didn't need to be perfect, and I think both sides of the table could agree that at least in Pine Creek's case to date it hasn't been. But he did emphasize that every reasonable effort needed to be made. And I was wondering if that was a definition that might come close to the threshold you are using?

MR. McGARRY: I would say that reasonable measures were taken to engage Pine Creek and many other First Nations, and Metis Federation as well, during the course of the conductance of our process. Again, keeping in mind this is an engagement for environmental assessment purposes, and as Mr. Chairman pointed out, we weren't following any guideline related to section 35 consultation.

MR. MILLS: I appreciate that. I'm just trying to understand. There is a significant portion of Hydro's work which is consultation. Mr. Joyal made a very thorough description of it. And like most projects, I at least would like to understand the end game. So can Hydro give me any parameters or margins as to the extent of consultation that would take place? I mean, consultation could be anything from a suggestion box to meeting with the community addressing all of the points raised, and discussing thoroughly with them the mitigation. Have I come close at either end of those descriptions to matching up to what Hydro's sense of their consultation obligation is?

MR. McGARRY: I think we understand our obligation, and reasonable process was taken. I think that's fair to say. We did get input from Pine Creek First Nation and from neighboring communities that were considered as part of the overall route selection process.

MS. ZEBROWSKI: I would just, if I may add to that, as I referenced in my presentation. Manitoba Hydro is continuing to meet with communities and will continue to meet with

communities who have concerns related to the project, and indeed we have been doing that with Pine Creek.

MR. MILLS: Deirdre, we don't disagree with you and I thank you for that comment. Can I extend from that then, you have just indicated you were going to continue to meet with communities, Pine Creek were meeting with you I believe on Thursday. Does the consultation process continue until such time as we stop asking you to consult? I'm trying to understand this thing that we're all referring to as consultation.

MS. ZEBROWSKI: I think on behalf of Manitoba Hydro, we would term what we do is Aboriginal engagement, just because the word consultation does get to be somewhat confusing after a time. The Province of Manitoba is undertaking the Crown consultation process, and we are participating in that Crown consultation meeting with Pine Creek on Thursday, as you referenced, next week, but that is the provincial government process, and we're coming because we have been requested to come by both the government and Pine Creek First Nation to participate.

I think that Manitoba Hydro would be

interested to continue to discuss with Pine Creek what their concerns are and see how we can seek to resolve and address those concerns.

MR. MILLS: Deirdre, we appreciate that and we look forward to working with you in a collegial forthright manner to get to where I think we both want to get to. We are just trying to understand, quite simply, we have an environmental assessment consultation program, your words. Mr. Joyal assured us that Aboriginal stakeholders were engaged in this consultation process, not the provincial consultation process. And I'm just trying to put some end game, some definition to what Hydro's understanding of that consultation is. But I don't want to belabour the point, and I sense the Chair's style, so I'd like to move on from that. We'll get back to that in our further discussions. But I guess we believe that the consultation that's taking place with Pine Creek is at a very immature, naive, just getting started phase. And again, I'm quick to say that we don't lay blame or we don't look for cause or fault. We're trying to understand where we're going and when we might both get there.

And we're looking at the consultation

process and we're looking at the spectacular route selection matrix that Mr. McGarry presented to us. And it strikes us as odd, but we don't see anywhere in that matrix where, and perhaps Mr. McGarry can help me, or Diedre, you can.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mills, that's not on this afternoon's examination, that will be tomorrow.

MR. MILLS: Okay, I agree. I'll leave it with Mr. Joyal's scope.

Mr. Joyal, anticipating that I'm going to be talking to Mr. McGarry about that matter, as the Chair points out, later, what format or information does your process forward to Mr. McGarry, if any, to incorporate into the route selection matrix? So when you undergo a consultation, and let's use Pine Creek, do you or does Diedre's process or department forward information to Mr. McGarry to enter into that matrix which he explained Hydro uses so capably to establish or adjust route?

MR. JOYAL: As explained by Mr. McGarry yesterday, the RSM was made up of 23 criteria but also had another piece, which is the response from stakeholders which included

Aboriginal communities, and was fed directly into the route selection matrix. We all sat around that table and made those determinations.

MR. MILLS: To date, Pine Creek's input to date, has it been summarized and provided to Mr. McGarry downstream for that matrix selection? Are you aware of Creek's input having been summarized around the table, as you just described, and provided for input into the design route matrix?

MR. McGARRY: Well, the way the process works, yes, people who conducted discussions with Pine Creek and other communities brought that information to the table while we were completing that matrix.

MR. MILLS: Mr. McGarry, I opened by asking you the names of those two individuals, and you didn't even recognize their names. So if they conducted the interview in our community and brought the information to you, I would have thought that you would at least know their names. And the disconnect, and we're looking to understand it and hopefully together cure it if there is a disconnect. But we feel a real disconnect between the completion of consultation

and the effect that it has on the route selection through Pine Creek's traditional territory. And we'll come back to this in our longer presentation. But I'd like to provide you with our concerns now as questions, and you can answer them I think on the 20th of November when we're next scheduled.

But the consultation process, as it passed through Pine Creek, we observe that there were 87 specific concerns registered with the consultation program. And they were documented by Khalidi and Linnemann, the names you don't recognize, Mr. Joyal. But I was wondering, are you aware of those 87 concerns having been shared around this table, as you described with Mr. Penner's group, or pardon me, with Mr. McGarry's group?

MR. JOYAL: Are these the individuals that conducted the ATK workshops as opposed to the community open houses, which is a part of the EACP?

MR. MILLS: This is the ATK workshop in the community.

MR. JOYAL: The ATK workshops were not directly fed in through the EACP process, but done

as a separate measure in the RSM, which you see in red in most of the sections, through the sections of the RSM. I believe Pine Creek's in five or six. But the feedback that was received from Pine Creek through community open houses which occurred through round one, two and three, were incorporated into the RSM under stakeholder response.

MR. MILLS: I see. So the 87 concerns would have been summarized, or would they have been passed on in whole?

THE CHAIRMAN: Again, Mr. Mills, it might appear to be a little choppy, but for the panel's benefit, we decided to cross-examine sort of distinct presentations. The ATK presentation will not be cross-examined probably until Friday.

MR. MILLS: My only concern, Mr. Chairman, was I didn't want to miss this bus and have you tell me on Friday that I missed that opportunity.

THE CHAIRMAN: I won't do that.

MR. MILLS: I'm lapping forward in order to ensure --

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't want you to be jumping into another presentation or examining

another presentation today. You'll have that opportunity on Friday.

MR. MILLS: Very good.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps tomorrow if we're really speedy.

MR. MILLS: I'm moving quickly, sir.

Mr. Joyal, of all the public input received, does Hydro have any statistics or can you give me any sense of the percentage of specific concerns that were raised, that had a true effect on the final preferred route? For instance, if Pine Creek tabled -- bad choice, I'll back up. If a community within your jurisdiction tabled 40 or 50 or 60 concerns, does Hydro have any sense, or do you have any documentation or summary of how much of that information affected the route selection?

MR. JOYAL: It would be dependent on the nature of the concern. With regards to diagonal routing on agricultural lands, it played a large determination in the final preferred route. Other concerns such as potentially vegetation management would feed directly into our environmental protection plans.

MR. MILLS: Okay. Your slide five

point, incorporation of feedback. I take it this is a description of all of the consultation that you -- that your environmental assessment program has undertaken, and this is a reference to that information being incorporated into the route selection?

MR. JOYAL: This would be incorporation of feedback throughout the entire EACP and through all stages.

MR. MILLS: I see. Do you assemble that information in a document, or by client, or by process, and forward it to Mr. McGarry's matrix program, or is it done by general discussion? Is it a series of e-mails? If my community's input consultation was summarized and forwarded to Mr. McGarry, would you have a document summary of that that I could view?

MR. JOYAL: Appendix F-1 to M-4 is the complete summary of meeting notes and community open houses, which would summarize all comments heard in those venues. As for a large scale document, there is one example which is what we heard in round three, which you can find on the Manitoban Hydro website.

MR. MILLS: Okay. And again, I don't

want to get ahead to Mr. McGarry's process, but we do know that it includes weightings of the matrix items. And I was wondering if you provide those weightings as a result of your process, or if those weightings are applied by Mr. McGarry's as he receives it? In other words, if something really jumps off the page in your process, do you tape a nine to it and pass it on, or is there any input at all on your part in that regard?

MR. JOYAL: The EACP team determined the -- I don't want to use the term weighting that you used but --

MR. MILLS: Mr. McGarry used it.

MR. JOYAL: -- the method of rating that we used in stakeholder didn't have any weighting. We broke it up into four simple categories to simplify the data that we had on hand.

MR. McGARRY: I can clarify that. The weighting I referred to yesterday was in regard to ATK input, which Pine Creek had some apparent in the matrix as well, that that information was used to possibly raise the score value on any of the 23 criteria. So weighting in a sense that it provided opportunity for any segment we reviewed

to score higher based on ATK input. That's how it was considered.

MR. MILLS: And again, I don't want to cross the line that the Chairman has drawn, but a specific anecdote, the community expressed great concern about Bipole's routing and their blueberry fields. There was an alternative --

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you're crossing the line now. This is in the ATK section.

MR. MILLS: I was just responding to Mr. McGarry's point.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are not to be answering questions, you are to be asking questions at this point.

MR. MILLS: You're a tough man, Mr. Sargeant.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's why I'm here.

MR. MILLS: I would like to wrap up but I'm still unsatisfied with consultation. Is it neverending? Does it have, does Hydro place, does Hydro set a bar? Are there margins to it? We are not sure where and when consultation -- we have a vague feeling of when it may have started, but it's a very unsatisfactory undefined process. And as Hydro certainly has the handle on it, could

you help us better understand consultation?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you have asked that question two or three times and received whatever answer Hydro is prepared to give you today. But you can certainly make that in your argument as these hearings continue.

MR. MILLS: In closing, could I ask Hydro to give me a 30 second summary of consultation being complete?

THE CHAIRMAN: You can ask them, but I think they have already answered, but you can ask them again.

MR. MILLS: Please?

THE CHAIRMAN: Thirty seconds.

MR. McGARRY: Thirty seconds, yeah.

MR. MILLS: If you can't do it in 30 seconds, I'll pass.

MR. McGARRY: I can be fairly brief.

MR. MILLS: Thank you.

MR. McGARRY: Sorry to hear the frustration at Pine Creek, but the process in terms of consultation is for the purposes of selecting a final preferred route and moving into this stage of environmental review, which we have done. We have also committed to meeting and

discussing with communities on an ongoing basis in a number of areas related to the implementation of the project, things such as access management, review of our environmental protection plan, biophysical and socioeconomic monitoring. We don't believe the discussion has ended. The portion of the assessment that Mr. Joyal presented was for the purpose of moving through the regulatory process. But in addition to that, we have a whole area of implementation, discussion that we have committed to going forward.

MR. MILLS: I'll close with my opening question. So who are these people who came to our community and asked these questions?

MS. ZEBROWSKI: If you are speaking to the ATK workshop process, then that was Northern Lights Heritage Services who lead and planned those workshops on Manitoba Hydro's behalf, as I indicated in my presentation earlier today. And there will be a presentation specifically on the ATK workshop process coming up later in October.

MR. MILLS: Do you have any idea when, Deirdre?

MS. ZEBROWSKI: I'm not sure of the precise schedule of that presentation.

THE CHAIRMAN: It will be after we return to Winnipeg on October 29th, so sometime in late October, early November.

MR. MILLS: One last question, Trevor, if I may?

THE CHAIRMAN: This is about your third last now.

MR. MILLS: We're pretty efficient, Mr. Chairman.

One last question, Trevor, if I may. Do you sense or do you feel that the consultation process has been equitable across the regions and across the stakeholders?

MR. JOYAL: Many efforts were made to receive feedback throughout all rounds, and we believe that all goals that we set forward at the onset of the EACP have been met.

MR. MILLS: I see. If I observe that the Metis community surrounding Pine Creek, a population of 600, received nine consultations, and Pine Creek, a community of two and a half times that, received one-third of that, would that seem unusual to you or just typical of the peaks and valleys of the process?

MR. JOYAL: Do you have a specific

example on a community that received more or less than, besides Pine Creek?

MR. MILLS: The Metis community surrounding Pine Creek, and we don't begrudge them the terrific access they seem to have received to your consultation process. Their records indicate to us that they have had nine community visits. Pine Creek recognizes three community visits attempting to address the population of two and a half times the size. Did we cause that? Is that unusual to the process? Are there attempts made to buffer the consultation? It just jumps off the page at me that the consultation in two very adjacent, very similar communities, the consultation time spent with Hydro or Northern Lights staff seems so -- there seems to be such a disconnect. Can you help me, Diedre?

MS. ZEBROWSKI: I think there's two different processes. So the EACP process was separate from the ATK workshop process. And so the two are not necessarily comparable. I would also suggest that through the EACP process, Manitoba Hydro sent out mail-outs, materials, and invited communities to participate. And I'm not sure what Pine Creek's situation was at the time

when those invitations were made. But if a community responded and indicated they wanted to have an open house or a meeting, then Manitoba Hydro was responsive to that.

So I think that the other thing that Pine Creek may have been involved in, which I'm not sure, may have been including was what I mentioned in my presentation, we provided funding to Southern Chiefs Organization to provide a two day gathering to share information about the Bipole III project, and that occurred during round three of the EACP process, and that is for Treaty 2 and Treaty 4 First Nations, so that would have included Pine Creek First Nation as well.

MR. MILLS: Thank you. In closing, Chief Bouchet asked me to just read a short note. He wanted me to assure you that although Chief and Council of Pine Creek believe that the process to date hasn't really begun to constitute a complete or fair consultation, he wants to be clear that he is prepared and looking forward to continuing the process, and working with you to arrive at a mutually agreeable and productive understanding of the process. And he wanted me to be clear that Pine Creek is not here to be difficult or

obstreperous, he just wants the opportunity to pick up what the community missed through a variety of reasons.

So we're just trying to understand where we have been, and more importantly where we are yet to go. And he believes that there's a fair amount of work to be done.

Those are my comments, and my other concerns I guess I'll get back when Mr. McGarry and Diedre are available.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Mills.

MR. MILLS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Meronek?

MR. MERONEK: It's all about underground consultation. Good afternoon, Mr. Joyal.

MR. JOYAL: Mr. Meronek.

MR. MERONEK: First of all, let me congratulate you on a prodigious effort, and you have been very helpful to us in the process. So don't take anything I say personally.

MR. JOYAL: I won't.

MR. MERONEK: You indicated earlier that you got involved starting in round two?

MR. JOYAL: That's correct.

MR. MERONEK: And that's because you are a recent graduate from Environmental Science?

MR. JOYAL: That's correct.

MR. MERONEK: Was this your first project?

MR. JOYAL: I worked on other projects as well with the consulting firm I was with.

MR. MERONEK: I'm sorry, in terms of the consultation aspect?

MR. JOYAL: I was part of other consultation processes as well, but this was my primary project, yes.

MR. MERONEK: And forgive me if I missed this, but could you just give me a slight overview of what your function was? What was your role?

MR. JOYAL: My role in the EACP began with attending open houses and preparing materials, drafting the newsletters, preparing feedback forms, attending Landowner Information Centres, as well as the creation of the What We Heard report, as well as the portion of the EIS chapter, as well as the technical report, and the Tourond adjustment.

MR. MERONEK: And I take it the four round process had already been developed prior to you joining Manitoba Hydro?

MR. JOYAL: That's correct.

MR. McGARRY: If I may just add to that. Mr. Joyal was working for another firm at the time and that firm was a consultant to Hydro, under my direction and my manager's direction. And there was a public consultation team that was run, and Mr. Joyal was a major part of that.

MR. MERONEK: Thank you for that. I guess it is beyond controversy that stakeholder consultation was and is an integral part to the SSEA?

MR. JOYAL: That's correct.

MR. MERONEK: And the earlier that one can get feedback and information to assimilate, the better the process. Would you agree with that?

MR. JOYAL: Any project would like to have as much feedback as possible.

MR. MERONEK: Now, would you confirm for me that round one did not include consultation with landowners per se?

MR. JOYAL: Indirectly it could have.

MR. MERONEK: But the landowners were not a focal group?

MR. JOYAL: At the point of round one, and being in the large scale broad study area, landowners would have been considered at that point the general public, and use broad notification methods.

MR. MERONEK: I'm just trying to get the timing down here.

And round one took place in 2008, correct?

MR. JOYAL: Correct.

MR. MERONEK: And would you confirm for me that -- first of all, round two, did that involve landowners?

MR. JOYAL: Once again, we were in the same phase of acquiring opportunities and constraints for routing alternative routes.

MR. McGARRY: I'll just add to that. There is open houses in every round, there is public advertising, there is meeting with municipal councillors. Direct landowner notification didn't occur during those rounds, but there was advertised opportunity for landowner participation.

MR. MERONEK: Fair enough, but I'm focusing on direct contact. So I'm correct that that didn't take place in round two?

MR. JOYAL: A specific direct mailing did not occur in round two, no.

MR. MERONEK: And that was in 2009, round two, that process.

MR. JOYAL: That's correct.

MR. MERONEK: And round three, that took place in 2009/2010. That didn't target directly affected landowners, correct, other than through open houses and mass communication?

MR. JOYAL: At that point, a 66 metre right-of-way had yet to be determined, and we were presenting three, three mile wide corridors as well as some smaller sub routes. And direct notification to landowners was not undertaken in that general sense, but broad notification in those areas in proximity to the alternatives was utilized.

MR. McGARRY: I'll just add as well, Mr. Meronek, that there was a decision that because of the nature of the alternatives of round three, which we had three 1,300 kilometres plus routes three miles wide each, the number of

landowners we realized we would have to contact and the implication of doing so, we didn't feel that would necessarily serve the purpose in that round, because it would be probably 10,000 people we would have to directly notify.

MR. MERONEK: So the answer is no, but with that qualification?

MR. McGARRY: Yes.

MR. MERONEK: There is a phrase that was used in the EIS, key person interviews. That was certain key persons were identified and specifically interviewed; is that correct?

MR. JOYAL: We did not identify the key person itself, but it was introduced during round four where we -- in this case rural municipalities informed us of who we should interview as a key person for their jurisdiction.

But there were no individual landowners in that key person category.

MR. JOYAL: Landowners were notified by mail to attend the Landowner Information Centre, and were all considered a valuable piece to that puzzle.

MR. MERONEK: But the answer is no, under the definition of key person interview,

there were no landowners?

MR. JOYAL: Some of the individuals who were invited to participate could have very well been landowners. One does come to mind, but it was not the purpose of the key person interview process.

MR. MERONEK: Now, I'm not clear on the number of landowners impacted. Mr. McGarry opined that there could have been 10,000 potential people in that right-of-way with three alternatives. But I note in the executive summary the reference to 750 landowners affected. And in other places I see other numbers. Were 750 landowners affected by this particular project?

MR. JOYAL: Just give me one second to pull up an information request. 480 landowners, and I'll give you the reference.

MR. MERONEK: That's information request 445?

MR. JOYAL: Thank you. 440 private property owners, this is a newly pulled number from the property department within Hydro. When we did receive the initial listing, we did not scale back any of the listings. Some landowners own land with their significant other, or brother

or sister. The list was lengthy, but we didn't -- we notified anyone based on those land titles. This number, I have shaved some of those down based on the information we have received through some of the coordination with the property department.

MR. MERONEK: Do you know why the executive summary would have identified 750 landowners?

MR. McGARRY: Mr. Meronek, there was an incomplete count until we actually got down to the level of starting to look at easement acquisition from private landowners that a more detailed accounting was done. At that time, it's roughly what was believed to be the number of affected private landowners.

MR. MERONEK: So this would have been after the filing of the EIS in December of 2011?

MR. McGARRY: That's correct.

MR. MERONEK: So the more accurate number then would be the 440 private owners identified in Manitoba Hydro VII 445, plus 80 renters of leased land?

MR. JOYAL: That's correct.

MR. MERONEK: So the process of

attempting to inform individual landowners took place in the summer of 2010. That's when it commenced; is that correct?

MR. JOYAL: The initial goal of round one was to inform the public of the process, and the project itself. I wouldn't use that term for what occurred in 2010.

MR. MERONEK: 2010, the beginning of round four was the first time that there was a direct communication with each and every landowner by mail?

MR. JOYAL: At that point, yes, the direct mailing occurred to affected landowners within a half mile of the preliminary preferred route. But it was not just to inform them of the process, it was to inform them of the process but to also elicit feedback from those individuals.

MR. MERONEK: We'll get into that. I'm just trying to get dates sorted out here. So I was correct in the dates?

MR. JOYAL: Yes. July 26th, 2010.

MR. MERONEK: And in a July 26th mailing, letters went out to how many landowners?

MR. JOYAL: I would have to pull that exact number. Based on the listing we had at the

time, it would have been in approximation of the number you quoted earlier.

MR. MERONEK: I quoted several numbers, sorry.

MR. JOYAL: The number of directly traversed, or those within the half mile, sir?

MR. MERONEK: With respect to both?

MR. JOYAL: If you give me a moment, I do believe I have those numbers.

MR. MERONEK: If you want to do it by way of undertaking, that is fine.

MR. JOYAL: That would be great, thank you.

MR. MERONEK: Were those letters by ordinary mail or by registered mail?

MR. JOYAL: It was sent by Canada Post, just regular mail.

MR. MERONEK: So you don't have any knowledge of -- I would take it Manitoba Hydro doesn't have any knowledge of how many letters were sent out which were actually received?

MR. JOYAL: Any letter that did get sent back based on incorrect title at the time, or mailing address, we took efforts to find the correct mailing address and just sent it back out.

MR. MERONEK: And in the July 26th, 2010 letter, and that would be found in the technical report I take it, that would have all the information, correct?

MR. JOYAL: I'm trying to think back to the appendices. If it is not there, we can acquire it for you.

MR. MERONEK: That's not necessary, but I understand that in the letters, the recipient was notified that a preferred, preliminary preferred route had been chosen?

MR. JOYAL: That's correct.

MR. MERONEK: So the first time that a person who wasn't involved in prior processes would have had any ability to have input would be after a preliminary preferred route had been chosen; is that correct?

MR. JOYAL: As mentioned, landowners were indirectly notified throughout rounds one, two and three to participate in the program, the process, and route determination.

MR. MERONEK: Now, the letter also, one of the purposes of the letter was to invite the recipient to a Landowner Information Centre meeting, correct?

MR. JOYAL: That's correct.

MR. MERONEK: It was to be held during August and September, but at that point in time, July 26th, 2010, no specific dates or schedules had been conveyed to the landowners?

MR. JOYAL: A subsequent letter had been mailed out with the listing.

MR. MERONEK: We're at July 26th, I'll get to the subsequent letters. But you will confirm that there was no schedule of Landowner Information Centre meetings that accompanied that letter of July 26th?

MR. JOYAL: There was no schedule at that time on the 26th.

MR. MERONEK: And also with that letter, there was a map that was provided. And I believe it was a large map in Manitoba Hydro VI 280?

MR. JOYAL: Yes, we call that the landowner map book.

MR. MERONEK: That's a very nice map but it really doesn't give the reader much information about the direct impact it might have on any particular property. Would you agree with that?

MR. JOYAL: Are you referring to the map book in general or the index?

MR. MERONEK: I'm referring to this particular map.

MR. JOYAL: The index map was sent with the map associated inside. We sent the index to ensure if there was an error in mapping in the stuffing of envelopes that the individual could contact us on the information line and we would send out subsequent mapping.

MR. MERONEK: You can be rest assured, Mr. Joyal, I will not leave any stone unturned. So let's be patient with me.

MR. JOYAL: I will be.

MR. MERONEK: And this is not a very informative map to an individual landowner, would you agree with that?

MR. JOYAL: As a reference grid, it would be.

MR. MERONEK: Now, we'll mine down a bit here. In the information request, there are a lot of more detailed maps, correct, in this particular document?

MR. JOYAL: I might be stepping ahead of you here, so bear with.

MR. MERONEK: Let me do it this way. There are some more detailed maps in this particular package that refer to various municipalities, and more, there's more precision in terms of sections, correct?

MR. JOYAL: In the maps themselves, there are 50,000 scale, and topographic maps were provided with those mailings.

MR. MERONEK: Right. In the mailing, any particular landowner with particular sections, a map that showed sections would be included in the letter?

MR. JOYAL: Yes. At the end of every letter was a section where we had incorporated the parcels in question and associated maps, which were listed on the back of each letter, and assisted us with stuffing each one of those letters.

MR. MERONEK: But they don't pinpoint precisely where the line would potentially cross any landowner in terms of feet or in terms of distances from any existing right-of-ways or where towers might be located. Would you agree with that?

MR. JOYAL: Tower location had yet to

be determined at that point. More detailed mapping of distance and separation was offered at the Landowner Information Centres and open houses.

MR. MERONEK: All right. And then there is also a brochure with general information that was included, correct?

MR. JOYAL: That's correct. The round four preliminary preferred route newsletter.

MR. MERONEK: Now, were there any follow-up phone calls made to anyone on the mailing list, to assure or to follow up to see whether letters had been received and people were informed of these Landowner Information Centre meetings?

MR. JOYAL: The direct mailings were sent out with a Bipole III information line, as well as the e-mail address, but no follow-up calls. Those letters were sent based on land title information, based on ownership address and postal code.

MR. MERONEK: So the next bit of communication was a letter of August 26, 2010, to the same mailing list?

MR. JOYAL: I believe you are correct.

MR. MERONEK: And in that particular

letter, there was a schedule of Landowner Information Center meetings that were available, with an invitation from people to attend, correct?

MR. JOYAL: It was Landowner Information Centres and all locations of open houses and regional open houses as well.

MR. MERONEK: And they were taking place roughly from the end of August to beginning of November.

MR. JOYAL: November 9th.

MR. MERONEK: And how many of the landowners were farmers in the sense of being in intensive farming agricultural land?

MR. JOYAL: At that given time, it was not a number that we had in hand.

MR. MERONEK: And you were aware that that's the busiest time of year for farmers?

MR. JOYAL: We were aware of the timelines.

MR. MERONEK: Did you make any effort to ensure that farmers who are otherwise in their fields would be made aware of these meetings and would otherwise have an opportunity to meet with individuals from Manitoba Hydro?

MR. JOYAL: Until the direct mailing

we did have, like I said, the Bipole III information line, as well as the e-mail address. And all locations where we did begin up north in Birch River, we moved our way south understanding that some may not have been able to make it in September, moved back up into The Pas, and then went back down south again, stopping in the same locations. We also did site visits at the request of individuals who were unable to attend Landowner Information Centres. And they provided us that information if they had to stop in at an open house or through the information line.

MR. MERONEK: I think my question was, did Manitoba Hydro make any efforts, by phoning or otherwise visiting landowners after August of 2010, during a very busy time of year, to ascertain whether or not they got the information?

MR. JOYAL: The initial mailing -- let me step back one moment. The broad notification would have also informed individuals not only -- would have informed individuals of the open house, as well as the location of the preliminary preferred route in general proximity to their land, but no direct follow-up calls were made per se.

MR. MERONEK: And the Land Information Centre meetings were held, and those who attended, and those who decided to fill out a form did so; is that correct?

MR. JOYAL: That's correct.

MR. MERONEK: And you assimilated that information?

MR. JOYAL: That is correct.

MR. MERONEK: Was there any follow-up from those meetings to catch those people who either didn't attend, or if they attended, didn't fill out any information forms?

MR. JOYAL: We did have some attendees who did not want to fill out a form. We also had the open houses. We also had information, the information line, which some people deemed appropriate. Some people didn't want to give us their locations, some people didn't want to give us their names, therefore, very difficult to determine who attended and who did not.

MR. MERONEK: Is there any reason why Manitoba Hydro couldn't have gone out to visit each and every one of the affected landowners to advise them of the -- in my words, you can debate it if you want -- significant impact that a

transmission line might have on their lands?

MR. JOYAL: The two direct mailings, as well as the broad notification, was deemed appropriate notification from our perspective.

MR. MERONEK: Who made that decision that it was appropriate?

MR. McGARRY: The team decided that what we are doing seemed reasonable. And could we have done? Well, you could ask that I guess of many project components. We decided that the input we were getting was pretty plain in some issues and areas. And at that time, there was also a lot of free advertising that went on from the media. So I'm sure many landowners were well aware of the project and that preliminary preferred route, and we felt we provided ample opportunity for them to participate.

MR. MERONEK: You will agree with me, though, that this last summer, Manitoba Hydro contracted out, to a firm called Evolve in Alberta, the task of going to each and every landowner affected, to have them sign up easement agreements?

MR. JOYAL: As outlined in the information requests, that is correct.

MR. MERONEK: So you have, after the final preferred route was chosen, to go out to each and every landowner to have them sign up an easement agreement, correct?

MR. JOYAL: A signature would be required for an easement agreement, yes.

MR. MERONEK: But you didn't deem it appropriate to do that before the final preferred route was chosen?

MR. McGARRY: The team was out in advance of the project, that is all subject to environmental licence. The details of the agreement, I don't have, but it may be the subject of a future discussion from our property department.

MR. MERONEK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I think those are my questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Meronek.

MR. MERONEK: I'm sorry, I may be treading in something tomorrow, but dealing with this matrix, Mr. Joyal, under what category, if any, were you involved?

MR. JOYAL: I'll give you the exact numbers in one second. Number 25, 26 and 27 of the top, under response.

MR. MERONEK: Okay. Are you going to be around tomorrow to delve into that?

MR. JOYAL: I am going nowhere.

MR. MERONEK: I'll wait. Thank you, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Meronek.

Consumers Association, Ms. Craft, are you going to lead any questioning on this area or is this Mr. Williams?

MS. CRAFT: Mr. Williams.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will Mr. Williams be doing that this afternoon or tomorrow morning?

MS. CRAFT: Tomorrow morning.

THE CHAIRMAN: He's just going to sit at the back of the hall and enjoy the rest of the show?

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I just got here, my mind is in another place.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'm just having a little fun. Mr. Dawson, any questions on behalf of Peguis?

MR. DAWSON: I wasn't going to ask questions but, of course, Mr. Williams is here and he is president of the fan club, so I have to oblige him.

Mr. Joyal, I'd like to follow up on something that Mr. Mills was asking, much to the enjoyment of the Chair. Help us understand. You gave us a slide show, you conducted community, we'll call it consultations. Ms. Zebrowski gave us a slide show and she made reference to, we'll call it Aboriginal engagements. Just clarify for us, what do you do, what does she do, and what did you do different than what she did?

MR. JOYAL: The EACP process was kind of an overarching theme which had two teams working simultaneously. We conducted community open houses, regional open houses, and seeing as we're talking with regards to First Nation communities, community open houses. Ms. Zebrowski would be more directly involved with some community open houses as well as Aboriginal traditional knowledge, but I'll pass that to her.

MS. ZEBROWSKI: Due to the time when I joined Manitoba Hydro, I wasn't actively involved in some of the rounds of the EACP process, but there was a separate team that went out to undertake the Aboriginal and northern community meetings and community open houses. And as I referenced in my presentation, they were split

because there was an understanding that the needs in terms of meeting with communities might be different. One example that I gave in my presentation was that for the non-Aboriginal group, I think the focus was largely on regional open houses. For the northern and Aboriginal community part of the EACP process, feedback was received that community open houses would be a more effective way to share information, and that was one of the things that was done differently between the two pieces.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Joyal, when the EACP process began, and I appreciate you weren't actually there at that beginning, so I'm hoping that you'll have institutional knowledge as opposed to personal knowledge. When the EACP process began at the very start back in 2009 or so, do I understand correctly that it would have been under your department or your unit's oversight that the list of stakeholders, whether they were Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal, would have been identified, or was there already that distinction between the work that Ms. Zebrowski has done and that you were doing?

MR. McGARRY: I may just clarify.

Back in 2008, when the program began, it was under different management, shall we say. And myself and others joined the team in 2009, and there was a group of consultants on Hydro staff, including Mr. Joyal, to determine how the process was going to be carried out for each round of consultation engagement.

MR. DAWSON: So again the question is, from the very beginning do we start from the assumption that there is someone, either Hydro itself or someone that Hydro has retained, to go out and ask questions of stakeholders. And the question at this point is, already at that point, have you identified that there will be one stream, shall we call it, for Aboriginal groups and another stream for non-Aboriginal groups, or at this stage are we just saying, we're going to go out and look for feedback?

MR. McGARRY: In 2008, 2009, as Mr. Joyal explained, there was two teams working side-by-side, one to deal with Aboriginal communities and First Nations, NAC communities, that was going on at the same time as the work Mr. Joyal was doing in the rest of Manitoba for municipalities, private landowners, and areas

probably up to The Pas. The other team was in process consecutively -- or simultaneously, sorry.

MR. DAWSON: So I think the answer to the question then, Mr. Joyal, is yes, there is a distinction between your work and the work that Ms. Zebrowski does; is that correct?

MR. JOYAL: Yes.

MR. DAWSON: And I'm not trying to trap you, I'm trying to clarify. Because Mr. Mills has asked questions and I think where we were going generally, we were trying to find out what questions to ask of whom. It's fair to say that the questions that should be directed and that you feel comfortable in answering deal with questions that do not involve Aboriginal groups, or Aboriginal individuals or Aboriginal interests?

MR. JOYAL: In a general sense, yes, in the broad scheme of the EACP.

MR. DAWSON: Unless tomorrow I get the same answer from Ms. Zebrowski, I'll flip it around and make sure that Ms. Zebrowski feels comfortable asking, when her turn comes, answering questions about Aboriginal groups, Aboriginal individuals and Aboriginal interests in terms of the engagement process, quite apart from Crown

consultation. This is where you say yes or no.

MS. ZEBROWSKI: Yes.

MR. McGARRY: If that's being addressed to me, yes, I would say yes.

MR. DAWSON: You have thrown your voice, Ms. Zebrowski. I think the problem for the record was that microphone didn't come on while she was saying yes. And so for the record, she has indicated yes and it's been re-echoed by Mr. McGarry.

MR. McGARRY: My apologies, I thought you were looking directly at me for an answer, sir.

MR. DAWSON: It's my trick. Having had that clarification, Mr. Chair, I'm happy to hold all of my questions for Ms. Zebrowski tomorrow. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Dawson. Mr. Beddome, any questions in this area?

MR. BEDDOME: Maybe two or three quick ones, it shouldn't take very long. James Beddome leader of the Green Party of Manitoba, for the record.

I just want to start out with a similar question again, and sorry to go over and

repeat, but could someone once again -- Mr. Madden asked this question -- but sort of state Manitoba Hydro's definition or understanding of consultation?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we have visited that quite a bit already this afternoon.

MR. BEDDOME: It's just sort of a way of leading in. If you want, I can try to restate it, but I'd rather have the proponent put it in their own words.

THE CHAIRMAN: A quick response, Mr. McGarry's 30 second response.

MR. McGARRY: Mr. Chairman, what did I say last time? Can we just go to the record for that 30 seconds? If I gather, the question is what is our approach to public consultation?

MR. BEDDOME: Or understanding or a quick definition, yeah.

MR. McGARRY: The objective is to engage people in reviewing and understanding our project primarily, to help us with identifying constraints to routing, to provide feedback on alternatives, and then to review preliminary preferred route when we determine it. And participate in that way, with the objective of the

project, the proponent and the people being well-informed on the intentions of the project, with the intention of course of making a better project.

MR. BEDDOME: And so with the intention of making a better project, the aim is to incorporate as much of the feedback received as possible in terms of the consultation process, in terms of adjusting the route or considering options?

MR. JOYAL: Yes.

MR. BEDDOME: And so then my final question, I have just noted something or I guess, so the idea is -- let me backtrack there, my apologies. However, in all cases or in many cases you weren't able to incorporate much of the feedback that you received into amending the planning for the project, would that not be correct?

MR. McGARRY: Sorry, I missed the last part of that. Incorporate what?

MR. BEDDOME: In some cases, there were constraints that you couldn't incorporate the feedback received. Would I be correct in saying that?

MR. McGARRY: I'm having trouble understanding. Did you say could or couldn't incorporate?

MR. BEDDOME: I apologize, I said you could not incorporate some of the concerns received?

MR. McGARRY: Well, it was subject to review. As you saw from the matrix, I don't mean to step over the line here, but there is a multiple of criteria in consideration. So one interest wouldn't necessarily make a change, but as you can see in reading the material, that we did make a number of changes along the way in response to input from consultation.

MR. BEDDOME: And I want to just put on the record, this is in no way meant to say it supports this concern raised. But in section 5.521, one of the most common themes received during the EIS process was desire to change the route onto the other side of the province, correct?

MR. McGARRY: That's correct. And we reported that because we were conducting a public consultation process and we felt it important to report what we heard, and that's why you see it in

the material.

MR. BEDDOME: But because of the constraints, you couldn't incorporate those suggestions into adjusting plans, correct?

MR. McGARRY: That's correct. We had a terms of reference, the study area was limited, and we worked within that terms of reference to select a route.

MR. BEDDOME: Would it also be fair to say the same was true for alternatives in terms of expanding southern generation or demand side management, in terms of you weren't able to incorporate those suggestions if you received any as well?

MR. McGARRY: Again, I apologize, I missed the last part of that.

MR. BEDDOME: I speak fast and I fully acknowledge that. Ms. Johnson and the stenographer will agree.

Once again, I was just saying, would it be fair to say on the basis of the terms of reference, any alternative suggestions as to demand side management and/or further southern generation also couldn't be incorporated, based on the terms of reference, as to what your scope of,

what you were looking to do on the consultation?

MR. McGARRY: The direction of the study team was to find a route for a high voltage DC line and site other components of the Bipole III project. That didn't include a review of other alternatives.

MR. BEDDOME: Thank you. That concludes my questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Beddome. Any members of the public have questions specifically on this topic?

Okay. Then that brings us close to the end of the day for today. Tomorrow morning, we will continue with Mr. Williams and Ms. Whalen Enns, if she is here, with examination of Mr. Mazur and Mr. Neufeld. Following that, Mr. Madden and Mr. Williams may have some examination of Mr. Joyal.

Once we have concluded that, and I fully hope that that's relatively early in the day, we will then turn to the route selection process that Mr. McGarry and others presented yesterday afternoon, Mr. McGarry and Mr. Dyck's presentation from yesterday afternoon. That could take a fair chunk of the day tomorrow. If it

doesn't by some strange happening, then we will continue with Mr. MacInnes and Ms. Zebrowski and their presentations. I would expect we won't get to them until Friday morning, but it is possible we could get to them mid-afternoon tomorrow.

Any other technical matters to take care of?

MS. JOHNSON: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just had a question from Mr. Gibbons whether panelists could have questions now or after tomorrow morning's examination. We'll do it right now. Mr. Gibbons has a question, I believe, for Mr. Joyal.

MR. GIBBONS: Yes, a couple of questions if I may. One has to do with getting a clarification in the difference between three of the engagement or consultative mechanisms, open houses, Landowner Information Centres, and the meetings. The meetings and open houses are classified as distinct. I have to say that upon my first reading of the term before this session of the LIC term, I thought the name centre implied something of a greater duration than a few hours or a day or so, that somehow temporary centres were set up in communities and so on. I may be

completely off the wall in that, I don't know. Could I get just a brief description of how they differ, with the following footnote added to that, that quite often in consultative literature, there is a sense that open houses or more information sessions, meetings are intended to generate a more bilateral discussion and so on. And I'm not quite sure whether LICs are closer to one than the other.

MR. JOYAL: That's no problem. I'll start with open houses. We do have two noted, community and regional. We noted community open houses being in First Nation communities or in more remote communities, whereas regional open houses were determined based on proximity for the general public. These open houses, as you do mention, it is for information on the project, but we do provide venues to provide feedback to Hydro staff, construction staff, as well as feedback forms are present. So it is a method to inform the public about the project, but it is a mechanism as well to receive feedback from the general public.

As for meetings, a lot of the meetings that we had were with rural municipal councils,

planning district levels, as well as general stakeholders groups. These meetings usually would start with a presentation, somewhat like I did today, but outlining the goals of where we were, some of the project components, as well as where we intended to go, as well as inform those council members of what we intended to do in their communities. Any individual who receives a notification will likely go to their municipal council member first. So we wanted to ensure that they had the information ready to provide to their constituents.

As for Landowner Information Centres, we did have the anticipation of inviting those within a half mile, to receive feedback on potential routing, small adjustments that could potentially occur. This was something that went on for just over two months. We were there in certain communities for a full day and then went back for another full day. In areas where we assumed there would be high concentration of individuals, or those that would have some constraints such as Carmen, we had two days in a row when we were there. And these allowed for one-on-one discussions to really get down to what

was on their land, how would this potentially affect them, where could tower spotting be done, and what potential adjustments could be done to offset some of those potential impacts. And to answer questions, of course, still to inform but to get feedback on everything. And we had devised what we call a Landowner Information Centre form. And you can see that information request 301, which allowed us to document those concerns and pieces of feedback.

MR. GIBBONS: So I take it then that the Landlord Information Centre might have been open for a day, and you gave the example of Carmen, so you went one day, it was open and closed in the context of that day, went back a second time. So in a typical rural community, if Carmen is typical, you might have been there twice for the duration of what, an eight hour meeting, a two hour meeting?

MR. JOYAL: It wasn't necessarily a meeting, it was a drop-in. So it allowed flexibility with schedules. We did generally see in this early session, where we did start going from Birch River down south in that first stretch, it was in that prime time of September, we did see

increased attendance during rainy days, but then going back the secondary time. And in appendix B of the technical report, or actually the EIS, there is a listing of where we were and when we were there, the specific dates. And that's listed in table 9.

MR. GIBBONS: One other question, and it relates to slide number 33, so that would be page 17 if you have it in the paper form. And perhaps just if you would be patient with my curiosity, because I'm not quite sure where I'm going with this. But just quite simply, the indication of the acceptance of the change in routing that occurred in Tourond indicates that 47.6 percent were accepting of the potential route adjustment. The first route had the support of one-third. What it doesn't tell me, though, is was there an intensity involved there in the sense that it may not just be a yes or no, because it could be that one is less popular than the other in terms of being a first choice, but the other is no one's second choice. Is there anything that we should know about?

MR. JOYAL: If you do get a chance at the -- when you do look at the Tourond adjustment

report, we actually broke it down on where that specific landowner that attended lived, or what parcels were affected. Sometimes landowners actually lived on both. Some only lived on what we titled the PRA, the potential route adjustment, and some only on the final preferred. This is kind of just a summary of everything. In the sections previous to this write-up, you'll see it broken down by those within a half mile of the PRA, on the PRA, half mile of the FPR and on the FPR. It kind of gives you a better indication of where people were and how they responded to the two adjustments, as well as some of the concerns raised by both sides of those routing options.

MR. GIBBONS: In summary, from what you're saying, you wouldn't then be concerned about the people who preferred the first alternative being strongly opposed to the fact that a larger group like the second alternative?

MR. JOYAL: What we intended to do, and we knew that this would come up, was our intention was never to pit one line against the other line, but to understand what the concerns were, how it would potentially affect landowners on either route. Because we had the knowledge in

our background that either one could very well go. And seeing as there was a localized concern, this was an option that we believed better met our routing criteria. Therefore, we presented it, but we were willing to go with the initial route if that was one that was preferred by locals in the area.

MR. GIBBONS: Thank you.

MS. MacKAY: Yes. I have one question. During the consultation program, what did Manitoba Hydro consider its responsibility to be in a situation where you perceived that there was a group or a community that had poor leadership, that wasn't responding, did you have a responsibility to be proactive, or did you not consider that your responsibility?

MR. JOYAL: Are you mentioning in just a general sense of either a municipal council or First Nation leadership, or is there a specific?

MS. MacKAY: No, no, rather general.

MR. JOYAL: In general -- actually just give me a moment. Sorry, just making a clarification. In some cases where we hadn't received feedback or hadn't heard from communities, we did send an addition letter or

tried to contact them directly as well. With what I was involved with mostly, municipal levels, we always followed up with a call to try to schedule a council meeting. Whether they wanted us there or not, we were always there to try to get on the agenda.

MS. MacKAY: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's it for this afternoon. Thank you very much. We stand adjourned and we'll be back here tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m.

(Proceedings adjourned at 4:36 p.m.)

OFFICIAL EXAMINER'S CERTIFICATE

Debra Kot and Jill Proctor, duly appointed Official Examiners in the Province of Manitoba, do hereby certify the foregoing pages are a true and correct transcript of my Stenotype notes as taken by me at the time and place hereinbefore stated, to the best of our skill and ability.

Debra Kot

Jill Proctor