

Conservation and Water Stewardship

Climate Change and Environmental Protection Division Environmental Approvals Branch 123 Main Street, Suite 160, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3C 1A5 T 204 945-8321 F 204 945-5229 www.gov.mb.ca/conservation/eal

File: 5433.00 November 9, 2012

Mr. Patrick T. McGarry, B.Sc. Hons., M.N.R.M. Senior Environmental Assessment Officer Licensing and Environmental Assessment Transmission and Distribution Division Manitoba Hydro 820 Taylor Avenue Winnipeg, MB R3C 2P4

Dear Mr. McGarry:

Re: Bipole III Transmission Project Environmental Impact Statement

Further to my letter to you of November 2, 2012, it has been brought to my attention that there has been some confusion about what my "approval of the alteration" under section 14(2) of *The Environment Act* means, in the context of the current Clean Environment Commission review of the Bipole III Transmission Project. Section 14(2) states as follows:

- 14(2) Where
- (a) the director or the minister has received notice of a proposed alteration in accordance with subsection (1);
- (b) the potential environmental effects resulting from the alteration are insignificant or will be accommodated by the ongoing assessment process; and
- (c) in the case of a proposed alteration to the development as licensed, the proposed alteration is not an alteration to any limit, term or condition that was amended as a result of an appeal under section 27 or 28; the director or the minister may in writing, and with such limits, terms and conditions as he or she consider advisable, give approval to the proponent to implement the alteration.

The purpose of this letter is to clarify for the public record what is meant when an alteration is approved, and in accordance with Section 14(2), to confirm that as a condition of my approval of the alteration, the proposed route changes must be presented to the CEC for full consideration in the public review process for the proposed Bipole III development.



By my letter to you, Manitoba Hydro was being advised that your alteration proposal (outlined in your letter of October 23, 2012 to Elise Dagdick of my office) was acceptable for presentation to the Clean Environment Commission in the current Bipole III hearings. That approval of the alteration request is by no means a final approval of a particular route for the Bipole III transmission line project. That is, no licensing decisions have or will be made about the proposed route changes, including whether to approve them or not, until the review process has been completed. Instead, this approval only means that your proposed route changes, as outlined, are acceptable for presentation to the CEC in the ongoing public review process.

For greater certainty, in order to ensure that the proposed route adjustments that Manitoba Hydro has proposed in its letter of October 23, 2012 are fully and transparently considered in the public review process, I believe it is necessary for Manitoba Hydro to prepare a written supplemental report to its environmental impact statement, in which it outlines the environmental effects of the route changes in sufficient detail for the identified effects to be considered by the CEC, as well as any affected parties and registered participants in the current public review process.

If you have any questions about my position on this issue, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours truly,

Tracey Braun, M. Sc.

Director

Environmental Approvals Branch

Tracy Braun

c. Public Registries, File: 5433.00
Cathy Johnson, Clean Environment Commission
Don Labossiere, Environmental Compliance and Enforcement
Shannon Johnson, Manitoba Hydro