

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ix
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1 OVERVIEW	1-1
1.2 PROJECT NEED AND PURPOSE	1-1
1.3 SCOPE OF THE PROJECT	1-1
1.4 SCOPE OF THE ASSESSMENT	1-2
1.4.1 Overview.....	1-2
1.4.2 Spatial and Temporal Scope	1-2
1.4.2.1 Spatial Scope.....	1-2
1.4.2.2 Temporal Scope.....	1-4
1.4.3 Assessment Approach.....	1-4
2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2-1
2.1 OVERVIEW	2-1
2.2 PROJECT COMPONENTS	2-3
2.2.1 Start-up Camp	2-3
2.2.1.1 Facilities	2-3
2.2.1.2 Utilities	2-4
2.2.1.3 Material Sources	2-5
2.2.2 Road and Stream Crossing	2-5
2.2.2.1 Design Criteria	2-5
2.2.2.2 Road Facilities.....	2-6
2.2.2.3 Material Sources	2-7
2.2.3 Main Camp (Phase One)	2-7
2.2.3.1 Facilities	2-7
2.2.3.2 Utilities	2-8
2.2.3.3 Material Sources	2-8
2.3 CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES	2-9
2.3.1 Start-up Camp	2-9
2.3.2 Road	2-10

2.3.2.1	Stream Crossings	2-11
2.3.3	Main Camp (Phase One) Construction	2-12
2.3.4	Construction Schedule.....	2-13
2.4	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	2-13
2.4.1	Start-up Camp Operation	2-13
2.4.2	Access Management	2-14
2.4.3	Camp Maintenance	2-14
2.4.4	Vegetation Management.....	2-14
2.4.5	Stream Crossing Protection	2-14
2.5	CONTRACTS AND WORKFORCE REQUIREMENTS	2-14
2.6	RECLAMATION	2-17
2.7	DECOMMISSIONING	2-17
3.0	ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING.....	3-1
3.1	OVERVIEW	3-1
3.2	PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	3-1
3.2.1	Climate, Noise and Air Quality	3-1
3.2.2	Physiography.....	3-2
3.2.2.1	Topography	3-2
3.2.2.2	Geology	3-2
3.2.2.3	Soils and Permafrost.....	3-3
3.2.3	Surface Water	3-4
3.2.3.1	Hydrology	3-4
3.2.3.2	Surface Water Quality.....	3-5
3.2.4	Groundwater	3-6
3.2.4.1	Hydrogeology	3-6
3.2.4.2	Groundwater Quality	3-7
3.3	AQUATIC HABITAT AND BIOTA.....	3-7
3.3.1	Aquatic Habitat.....	3-7
3.3.1.1	Looking Back Creek.....	3-8
3.3.1.2	Unnamed Tributary.....	3-8
3.3.2	Aquatic Biota	3-8
3.3.2.1	Invertebrates.....	3-8

	3.3.2.2 Fish	3-8
	3.3.2.3 Aquatic Species at Risk	3-10
3.4	TERRESTRIAL ENVIRONMENT	3-10
3.4.1	Terrestrial Ecosystems and Habitat	3-10
	3.4.1.1 General.....	3-10
	3.4.1.2 Regional Overview	3-10
	3.4.1.3 Ecosystem Diversity	3-11
	3.4.1.4 Habitat Types.....	3-12
	3.4.1.5 Wetland Function	3-13
	3.4.1.6 Plants	3-14
	3.4.1.7 Fragmentation	3-14
3.4.2	Wildlife	3-15
	3.4.2.1 Invertebrates	3-15
	3.4.2.2 Amphibians	3-15
	3.4.2.3 Reptiles	3-16
	3.4.2.4 Birds.....	3-16
	3.4.2.5 Mammals	3-19
3.5	SOCIO-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT	3-25
3.5.1	Overview.....	3-25
3.5.2	Population and Demographics	3-25
3.5.3	Land and Resource Use	3-27
	3.5.3.1 Community and Domestic Resource Use.....	3-27
	3.5.3.2 Other Resource Use Activities	3-28
3.5.4	Infrastructure and Services	3-29
	3.5.4.1 Roads and Trails.....	3-29
	3.5.4.2 Public Services.....	3-29
3.5.5	Labour Force and Employment	3-31
	3.5.5.1 Labour Force	3-31
	3.5.5.2 Employment Levels.....	3-32
	3.5.5.3 Unemployment Levels.....	3-32
	3.5.5.4 Barriers to Employment	3-32
	3.5.5.5 Skills Available in the Communities	3-33

3.5.5.6	Education Levels	3-34
3.5.6	Community and Family Life.....	3-34
3.5.6.1	Workplace Public Health and Safety	3-35
3.6	HERITAGE RESOURCES	3-36
3.6.1	Overview.....	3-36
3.6.2	Regional Context	3-36
3.6.3	Project Area.....	3-37
3.6.3	Addendum.....	3-37a
4.0	PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM	4-1
4.1.	PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT.....	4-1
4.1.1	Route Selection Process Summary	4-1
4.1.2	2009 Public Involvement Summary	4-2
4.1.3	Introduction to Addendum Filing	4-3a
4.1.4	Leadership and Community Meetings (Addendum Filing)	4-3a
4.1.5	Open Houses (Addendum Filing).....	4-5a
4.1.6	Environmental Non-Government Organizations Meeting (Addendum Filing).....	4-6a
5.0	POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS & MITIGATION.....	5-1
5.1	ASSESSMENT APPROACH.....	5-1
5.2	ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION	5-2
5.3	ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES	5-3
5.4	PHYSICAL EFFECTS AND MIGITATION	5-3
5.4.1	Atmosphere, Air Quality and Noise	5-3
5.4.2	Physiography and Topography	5-5
5.4.3	Soil and Permafrost	5-5
5.4.4	Surface Water	5-7
5.4.5	Groundwater	5-8
5.5	AQUATIC EFFECTS AND MITIGATION.....	5-10
5.5.1	Potential Environmental Effects	5-10
5.5.2	Proposed Mitigation Measures.....	5-10
5.6	TERRESTRIAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION	5-12
5.6.1	Terrestrial Ecosystems and Habitat.....	5-12

5.6.1.1	Ecosystem Diversity	5-12
5.6.1.2	Habitat Types.....	5-13
5.6.1.3	Wetland Function	5-15
5.6.1.4	Plant Species.....	5-16
5.6.1.5	Fragmentation	5-19
5.6.2	Wildlife	5-19
5.6.2.1	Invertebrates.....	5-19
5.6.2.2	Amphibians	5-20
5.6.2.3	Reptiles	5-22
5.6.2.4	Birds.....	5-22
5.6.2.5	Mammals	5-26
5.7	SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS AND MITIGATION.....	5-31
5.7.1	Direct Employment and Business Opportunities	5-31
5.7.1.1	KCN Community Study Area Direct Employment Effects ...	5-32
5.7.1.2	KCN Community Study Area Business Opportunities.....	5-35
5.7.2	Regional Supplies and Services	5-36
5.7.3	Resource Use	5-36
5.7.3.1	Community and Domestic Resource Use.....	5-36
5.7.3.2	Commercial Resource Use	5-37
5.7.4	Individual and Community Health, Safety and Wellness	5-38
5.7.5	Traffic.....	5-40
5.7.6	Access.....	5-41
5.8	HERITAGE RESOURCES EFFECTS AND MITIGATION	5-42
	ADDENDUM	5-43a
6.0	MONITORING AND FOLLOW UP	6-1
7.0	REFERENCES.....	7-1
7.1	LITERATURE CITED	7-1
7.2	PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS	7-8
8.0	GLOSSARY	8-1

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
APPENDIX A1	Concept Design for Wastewater Disposal
APPENDIX A2	Analysis of Alternatives
APPENDIX A3	Contracts and Workforce Requirements
APPENDIX B	ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING INFORMATION
APPENDIX B1	Aquatic Environmental Information
APPENDIX B2	Terrestrial Ecosystems and Habitat Information
APPENDIX B3	Terrestrial Bird Information
APPENDIX B4	Mammals Information
APPENDIX B5	Socio-Economic Information
APPENDIX B6	Heritage Resources Information (including Addendums)
APPENDIX C	OVERVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION PROGRAM
APPENDIX D	PUBLIC CONSULTATION (including Addendums)
APPENDIX E	PRELIMINARY ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 2.1-1: Project Components and Related Activities	2-2
Table 2.2-1: Current Manitoba Infrastructure and Transportation Geometric Design Criteria for Secondary Arterial Roadways.....	2-5
Table 2.3-1: Project Construction Schedule	2-13
Table 3.5-1: Registered On and Off Reserve Population as of June 2006.....	3-27
Table 4.1-1: Fox Lake Cree Nation Community Consultation Events	4-4a
Table 4.1-2: Keeyask Infrastructure Project Open Houses.....	4-5a
Table 5.1-1: Factors Considered in Assessment of Environmental Effects	5-1
Table 5.4-1: Atmosphere, Air Quality and Noise Effects Assessment Summary.....	5-4
Table 5.4-2: Physiography and Topography Effects Assessment Summary	5-5
Table 5.4-3: Soil and Permafrost Effects Assessment Summary	5-6
Table 5.4-4: Surface Water Effects Assessment Summary.....	5-8
Table 5.4-5: Groundwater Effects Assessment Summary.....	5-9
Table 5.5-1: Aquatic Biota and Habitat Effects Assessment Summary	5-12
Table 5.6-1: Ecosystem Diversity and Habitat Effects Assessment Summary	5-14
Table 5.6-2: Wetland Function Effects Assessment Summary	5-16
Table 5.6-3: Plant Species Effects Assessment Summary	5-18
Table 5.6-4: Fragmentation Effects Assessment Summary	5-19
Table 5.6-5: Amphibian Effects Assessment Summary.....	5-21
Table 5.6-6: Bird Population Effects Assessment Summary	5-25
Table 5.6-7: Mammal Population Effects Assessment Summary	5-29
Table 5.7-1: Occupations Where KCN Participation Could be High.....	5-32
Table 5.7-2: KCN Community Study Area Employment Effects Assessment Summary.....	5-34
Table 5.7-3: KCN Community Study Area Employment Effects Assessment Summary.....	5-35
Table 5.7-4: Regional Supplies and Services Effects Assessment Summary	5-36
Table 5.7-5: Resource Use Effects Assessment Summary	5-38
Table 5.7-6: Health, Safety and Wellness Effects Assessment Summary	5-39

Table 5.7-7:	Traffic Effects Assessment Summary	5-41
Table 5.7-8:	Access Effects Assessment Summary	5-42
Table 5.8-1:	Heritage Resources Effects Assessment Summary	5-43

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1.1-1 Project Area Location in Manitoba	1-1
Figure 1.3-1 Keeyask Infrastructure Project Site	1-1
Figure 1.4-1 Northern Manitoba Study Area	1-3
Figure 1.4-2 KCN Community Study Area	1-3
Figure 1.4-3 Project Footprint and Study Areas	1-3
Figure 2.1-1 Location of Borrow Sources and Infrastructure	2-1
Figure 2.2-1 Water Well Locations in the Study Area	2-4
Figure 2.3-1 Road Cross Sections	2-6
Figure 2.3-2 Looking Back Creek Bridge.....	2-7
Figure 2.3-3 Infrastructure Road - General Arrangement	2-7
Figure 3.1-1 Ecological Land Classifications in the Infrastructure Project Study Area.....	3-1
Figure 3.2-1 Keeyask Infrastructure Project Digital Elevation Model	3-2
Figure 3.2-2 Nelson River Drainage Basin	3-4
Figure 3.4-1 Land Cover Composition	3-10
Figure 3.4-2 Recent Fire History.....	3-11
Figure 3.4-3 Habitat Composition	3-11
Figure 3.4-4 Priority Habitat* Distribution	3-13
Figure 3.4-5 High Quality Wetlands	3-13
Figure 3.4-6 Invasive and Non-Native Species Locations in the Local Study Area.....	3-14
Figure 3.4-7 Summer Resident Caribou Calving Sites in the Habitat Mapping Area	3-14

KEYYASK INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT – PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM ADDENDUM FILING

4.1.3 Introduction to Addendum Filing

The following section provides additional information on public involvement activities and outcomes of the Keeyask Hydropower Limited Partnership for the proposed Project. This information is being provided as an Addendum Filing to information initially provided in the Environmental Assessment Report filed July 31, 2009. The public involvement program is intended to provide communities and stakeholders with an interest in the project with the opportunity to identify concerns and offer suggestions.

This document contains information on leadership and community meetings conducted by Keeyask Cree Nation (KCN) members, a description of open houses held in Thompson and Gillam, and a description of a meeting held with Environmental Non-Government Organizations (ENGOS) in Winnipeg.

4.1.4 Leadership and Community Meetings

During the environmental assessment process, the KCN communities have held meetings on the proposed project. The format and process for member consultation was different for each First Nation; however, for the majority of the KCN communities, the process was initiated by meeting with Chief and Council followed by a community information session with the membership. The following summarizes the process and outcomes from each of these public involvement activities.

Tataskweyak Cree Nation

Tataskweyak Cree Nation (TCN) Chief and Council and members have been involved with and informed about the Keeyask Infrastructure Project since early 2009. As part of the planning that occurred for public information sessions in the KCN communities, briefings were conducted with Chief and Council and Elders, and a date planned for early July for a community meeting. The event was advertised in the community. Early dates in July were considered and then postponed due to pressing community issues. Rescheduled meeting dates set for July 22 and August 5 were unable to proceed.

On the basis of feedback from Members, TCN Chief and Council considered that the project related concerns were minimal, although some matters regarding commercial trapping remained outstanding with Manitoba Hydro. TCN Elders have expressed that matters related to the access road and construction camps had been discussed for a decade and it was “time to get on with the job”.

Additional information about TCN’s public information process can be found in Appendix D2.

Fox Lake Cree Nation

Fox Lake Cree Nation held community meetings with its members that reside in different communities throughout Manitoba. The events were advertised on the Fox Lake Cree Nation

website (see Appendix D3). Table 4.1-1 identifies the community, date, location and time of each event held with its members.

Table 4.1-1: Fox Lake Cree Nation Community Consultation Events			
Community	Date	Location	Time
Winnipeg	July 14, 2009	Charter House	6:00-8:00 p.m.
Gillam	July 15, 2009	Gillam Recreation Centre	6:00-8:00 p.m.
Bird	July 16, 2009	Band Hall	6:00-8:00 p.m.
Thompson	July 17, 2009	Meridian Hotel	6:00-8:00 p.m.
Churchill	July 18, 2009	Town Complex	2:00-4:00 p.m.

At each meeting, a presentation was provided by the Fox Lake Environment Department staff on the project, including a summary of the construction work, business opportunities, training and employment opportunities, and environmental and adverse effects impacts of the project. An additional meeting was held with Fox Lake Elders in Bird on Wednesday, August 5, 2009, with 19 community members present.

Four main issues were identified and discussed from the discussions related to (1) upgrading and on-going maintenance of PR 280 from Thompson to the North Access Road because of increased traffic and possible heavy equipment; (2) concerns about access to resources in the area if the highway is transferred to the province when the Keeyask Generation Station is constructed and in operation; (3) the effect the accelerated infrastructure would have on the effective design and implementation of the adverse effects mitigation; and (4) the effect of the accelerated infrastructure on the Fox Lake resource users including their Aboriginal and Treaty Rights under s. 35.

War Lake First Nation

War Lake First Nation held a band council meeting on July 9, 2009, to review and discuss the proposed project. An information session with War Lake First Nation community members to discuss the proposed project was held in Ilford on July 23, 2009. A few of the key project-related issues raised at the information session included the following:

- Questions were raised about access to and distribution of employment and business opportunities among Keeyask Cree Nations, including Direct Negotiated Contracts.
- Participants identified interest in access issues between Ilford and the Project area.
- There was interest in the current status of negotiation processes between War Lake and Manitoba Hydro.
- Participants were interested in opportunities for ongoing and future consultation.

Meeting notes from the information session are located in Appendix D5.

York Factory First Nation

York Factory First Nation notified its members in York Landing of the proposed project in its July 2009 Future Development Newsletter (see Appendix D4). This was followed by a community information session with its members in York Landing on August 13, 2009. Manitoba Hydro

representatives were invited to share information with community members about the Infrastructure Agreement, details about the proposed Infrastructure Project, and the environmental assessment work that has been carried out on the project.

A summary of key project-related issues raised at the meeting is provided below:

- An elder commented that he was pleased to be receiving information about the proposed project by both Manitoba Hydro and York Factory First Nation in York Landing and would appreciate further opportunities to receive more information.
- An attendee suggested that project hiring services for community members should be located within York Landing in order to attract and assist local hires.
- Numerous attendees stated that caribou are important to their diet.
- Attendees were concerned that caribou would be scared away from the project area, particularly during their annual migration. They noted that caribou move throughout the area and wondered whether they would continue to use the area.
- A concern was raised about whether heavy equipment would arrive at the construction site from the south via Gillam or north via Thompson, and that PR 280 would likely need improvements.

Meeting notes from the community meeting are provided in Appendix D6.

4.1.5 Open Houses

Open houses for the proposed project were held in Thompson and Gillam, Manitoba. Table 4.1-2 outlines the community, date, location, time and number of individuals who signed-in at each open house.

Table 4.1-2: Keeyask Infrastructure Project Open Houses				
Community	Date	Location	Time	Number of Attendees
Thompson	August 5, 2009	St. John's United Church	5:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.	9 signed-in
Gillam	August 6, 2009	Gillam Recreation Centre	11:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.	23 signed-in

Prior to the open houses, advertisements were placed in local newspapers and were also provided to the Manitoba Hydro customer service centres in Gillam and Thompson for distribution (see Appendix D7). Both open houses were approximately three to four hours in length. After signing-in (see Appendices D8 and D9), members of the Environmental Assessment Study Team offered to guide individuals through each of the 22 information panels (See Appendix D10) explaining and answering questions on the project, environmental approvals process, employment and business opportunities, and potential impacts and associated mitigation measures. In addition to speaking with members of the Environmental Assessment Study Team, members of the public were encouraged to fill-out a comment form on the project; however, none of the attendees chose to fill-out a comment form at the open houses (see Appendix D11). Meeting notes outlining what was discussed and perspectives raised at each meeting can be found in Appendices D12 and D-13. Some of the common themes identified by attendees at the events included the following:

- The need to educate and motivate youth, in particular upcoming graduates, so they know what education and training programs are available related to future projects, and also what type of high school courses are needed to enter these training programs.
- Participants were interested in knowing more about available training and employment opportunities associated with the project.
- Participants expressed interest in knowing whether or not local people would be able to access the area for traditional resource use activities, and also whether access to the area by employees on the project and other non-local people would increase.
- People identified issues associated with the existing condition of PR 280 and the need for improvements to PR 280 because of the anticipated increase in traffic volumes.
- Concerns were raised about the location of caribou and how they may be affected or disturbed by the project.

4.1.6 Environmental Non-Government Organizations Meeting

A meeting for the proposed project occurred with Environmental Non-Government Organizations (ENGOS) in Winnipeg on August 19, 2009. The purpose of the meeting was to provide information about the proposed Keeyask Infrastructure Project, the environmental assessment process and to discuss the attendees' interests and concerns.

Seven organizations that had participated in an earlier workshop regarding the Keeyask Project were contacted by telephone during the week of August 2, 2009 and by email on August 9, 2009 to participate in a meeting to discuss the Project. Attached to the initial email were copies of the Environmental Act Proposal Form (EAPF) and Navigable Waters Protection Act Application that were filed in support of the Keeyask Infrastructure Project.

Upon acknowledgment from interested parties, another email was sent confirming their attendance. A letter was sent by courier to each participant on August 12, 2009 confirming logistics (Appendix D14). It included CD copies of the EA Report and Preliminary Environmental Protection Plan. Draft meeting notes were prepared following the meeting outlining what was discussed and perspectives raised at the meeting can be found in Appendix D15. These notes are currently being reviewed and finalized with participants.

Meeting Process

The meeting was held at the Delta Hotel in Winnipeg. In total, 12 people attended, representing four ENGOS and two of the four KCN partner communities. Victor Spence (TCN) and Betsy Kennedy (WLFN) expressed their regrets and York Factory First Nation did not attend the meeting.

The meeting began with a prayer by John Garson of Tataskweyak Cree Nation and introductions by the attendees. A brief presentation was provided, describing the project, the environmental assessment process and related studies. Participants were encouraged to ask questions and raise perspectives during the presentation and additional discussion occurred afterwards.

A few of the key project-related issues that were raised at the meeting included the following:

- Attendees emphasized the need to work cooperatively with all parties to address environmental, social, economic and regulatory issues.
- Given the size of capital expenditures (approximately \$175 million or about \$300 million with interest), an ENGO representative said it is important to ensure that an economic/financial review is completed, including consideration for the need for and alternatives to the project.
- Interest was expressed about how consultation between First Nations and governments would take place prior to the anticipated approval date for the project.
- Questions were raised about what would occur with the proposed project if the Keeyask Generation Project did not proceed.
- There was discussion on the scope of the project, including study areas, defined baseline and cumulative effects in an area with other projects and uncertainty.
- A KCN representative highlighted the importance of harvesting caribou in the area for food and noted that they have been working with scientists and their members to understand the potential impacts on caribou.

APPENDIX D

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Appendix D2

Tataskweyak Cree Nation Information Regarding Community Participation

The following letter was provided by Tataskweyak Cree Nation describing their public information process and activities:

TATASKWEYAK CREE NATION PARTICIPATION IN THE KEEYASK INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT PUBLIC INFORMATION PROCESS

Since the signing of the Northern Flood Agreement in 1977, Tataskweyak Cree Nation (TCN) has been aware of specific plans by Manitoba Hydro (Hydro) to develop the energy potential of TCN's well-traveled river system, particularly the Burntwood and Nelson Rivers. Since the signing of the 1992 Implementation Agreement, TCN leaders and Members have been involved with Hydro in a process of joint study and negotiation around the location and size of possible generating stations in the Split Lake area. Most recently they have been involved in developing plans for the proposed Keeyask Infrastructure Project, for which application has now been made for regulatory approval.

From 1992 to 2000, TCN met with Hydro many times and explored the options for possible future developments – High Head Gull, Intermediate Level Gull and several dual Birthday Rapids/Gull Rapids options. These explorations culminated in the choice of a modified low head development, should a generating station be proposed and developed at some time in the foreseeable future at Gull Rapids, as described in the Agreement In Principle of October 2000.

Throughout the negotiation of the Joint Keeyask Development Agreement (JKDA) from 2000 until 2009, TCN played a significant role influencing the size of a potential future project at Gull Rapids: the location of the powerhouse on the north side of the river and even the naming of the project – “keeyask” which means “gull” in Cree. TCN negotiated arrangements for Hydro-related training and employment, both during construction and in ongoing permanent employment and negotiated arrangements for direct negotiated contracts, including those for the works contemplated in the proposed Keeyask Infrastructure Project. TCN also argued for and won a form of veto over the Keeyask Project. It was agreed that, unless TCN Members approved the Keeyask Project by referendum, it would not proceed for the foreseeable future.

With particular reference to the works included in the proposed Keeyask Infrastructure Project, TCN Members influenced the route selection for the north access road along the Gull Esker and the location of the main construction camp on the north side of the river at Gull Rapids.

Over the whole period of discussions from 1990 through to 2009 there were more than a hundred TCN community meetings and up to a thousand additional meetings, either in preparation for meetings with Hydro or directly with Hydro regarding potential future development.

Community meetings played a vital role in ensuring that TCN Members were making informed decisions. The meetings took a variety of forms and each served a unique purpose. They included internal and external information meetings, Reference Group Meetings and Split Lake Cree General Membership Meetings.

Split Lake Cree General Membership Meetings included all willing participants from the community, and often numbered in the hundreds of Members in attendance. The meetings were generally held with the intention of sharing important information and upcoming plans with the community, as well as giving Members an opportunity to ask questions and share their opinions.

Reference Group Meetings included six distinct groups, each with a unique focus on a crucial issue related to Keeyask. The Reference Groups consisted of a smaller number of Members, usually 10-20, who were considered knowledgeable in the relevant field of study. The Reference Groups were integral in informing the community on important issues through various reports and studies, as well as guiding the negotiating team on matters related to their subject areas.

Internal and external information meetings were held prior to negotiating meetings with Hydro. They included Chief and Council, TCN's Manager of Future Development and TCN's advisors and negotiators. These meetings were utilized for planning, agenda-setting and discussion in order to prepare for the negotiations with Hydro or other relevant parties.

TCN Members voted to approve the signing of the JKDA and the associated Adverse Effects Agreement by Chief and Council in January 2009 and, shortly thereafter, TCN entered into discussions with Hydro about taking preliminary steps in advance of a decision being made by the Partnership whether to propose the Keeyask Generating Station for development. The Keeyask Infrastructure Project was conceived to describe these preliminary steps and TCN, together with the other Keeyask Cree Nations, worked jointly with Hydro in the preparation of a Keeyask Infrastructure Agreement and the required filings with regulatory bodies – including the EAPF and the EIA – for permission to construct the proposed Keeyask Infrastructure Project. Throughout the early months of 2009, discussions focused on the Keeyask Infrastructure Project to keep Chief and Council and Members informed of the progress of negotiations.

In parallel with the JKDA Signing Ceremony in June 2009, representatives of the Keeyask Hydropower Limited Partnership began intensive planning for the public information programs regarding the proposed Keeyask Infrastructure Project in the Keeyask Cree Nation communities and in Thompson and Gillam. Briefings were conducted with TCN Chief and Council and Elders, following which the Chief and Council directed that a community meeting be planned for July. Early dates in July were considered and then postponed owing to a number of pressing local community issues including the continuing H1N1 pandemic, housing issues and the ongoing flooding and erosion of the TCN shoreline from high waters.

Wednesday, July 22nd was chosen for the community meeting and duly advertised by way of posters and community radio broadcasts. The Public Information Process (PIP) Team, composed of TCN's Manager of Future Development, TCN advisors, and a representative of Hydro's EIA/EIS group flew to Thompson in preparation for driving into Split Lake. The meeting was postponed at the last minute, due to an H1N1-related death. As part of TCN's cultural and religious traditions, it is customary to cancel community meetings when a Member passes away.

At the direction of Chief and Council, the meeting was re-scheduled for Wednesday, August 5th and advertised once again. The PIP Team went into Split Lake that morning and set up the

community hall with PIP panels and a projector for a PowerPoint presentation. Brochures were handed out to all Members entering the meeting hall. Participation at that meeting reached approximately 20 Members. TCN leadership determined there were too few Members in attendance to formally convene the meeting in accordance with TCN custom and tradition regarding quorum.

Upon debriefing with Chief and Council, it was apparent that TCN Members saw no need for more information on a subject they had considered in detail and, following years of meetings and a thorough referendum process, had already approved by clear majority.

On the basis of feedback from Members, TCN Chief and Council considered that Project-related concerns were minimal, although some matters regarding commercial trapping in RTL 15 remained to be negotiated with Hydro. TCN Elders expressed the opinion that matters related to the access road and construction camps had been discussed for a decade and it was “time to get on with the job”.

The current situation in the TCN community is that, with the number of required ongoing meetings to deal with H1N1 planning for the fall flu season, critical housing shortages, flooding, ongoing rock protection work around the peninsula, joint venture partners for the Direct Negotiated contracts, and preparations for a week of activities associated with the consecration of the new church on September 10th, there is meeting burnout at the community level. In addition, the Chief has been in the hospital for the past week.

Overall, TCN’s position on the matter of the Keeyask Infrastructure Project is that there has been TCN Members’ participation and intensive discussion regarding the Project components, including those specifically related to the Keeyask Infrastructure Project, for ten full years involving more than 1,000 Members.

Appendix D3

Fox Lake Cree Nation Website Notification of Public Involvement Opportunities

The following was posted on the Fox Lake Cree Nation website online Monday July 13, 2009:
<http://www.foxlakecreenation.com/news.php>

NOTICE OF KEEYASK PRELIMINARY INFRASTRUCTURE COMMUNITY CONSULTATIONS

Monday 13 July 2009 - 13:48:11

Manitoba Hydro and the Keeyask Cree Nation Partners are proposing to accelerate certain aspects of the Keeyask Project Work by 2 years. It is being proposed that work on the preparation of the North Access Road and Construction Camp Site would be beneficial to all parties if started sooner.

Fox Lake will be holding community consultations to discuss and inform members on the proposed work and potential implications of and early start date.

There will also be an opportunity to provide information on the JKDA itself if members require further clarification.

Community Consultations are as follows:

- * 6pm to 8pm: Tuesday July 14 – Best Western Charter House Hotel – Winnipeg.**
- * 6pm to 8pm: Wednesday July 15 – Rec Centre Blue Room – Gillam.**
- * 6pm to 8pm: Thursday July 16 – Bird Band Hall – Bird**
- * 6pm to 8pm: Friday July 17 – Meridian Hotel – Thompson.**
- * 2pm to 4pm: Saturday July 18 – Curling Lounge, Complex – Churchill Manitoba**

Meals and refreshments will be provided at the sessions.

For more information please contact: Laura Kirkness @ 953-2760 or Arnold Henderson @ 652-5423.

Appendix D4

York Factory First Nation Future Development Newsletter

PAGE 4

YORK FACTORY FUTURE DEVELOPMENT - KEYASK UPDATE NEWSLETTER

YORK FACTORY FUTURE DEVELOPMENT - KEYASK UPDATE NEWSLETTER

KEYASK INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT

Since the JKDA ratification process, Manitoba Hydro has approached the Keeyask Cree Nations (YFFN, FLCN, WLFN, and TCN) with a proposal to begin work on construction of certain infrastructure in advance of the Keeyask Project. The Keeyask Infrastructure Project includes construction of a start-up camp; the north access road from PR 280 to Gull Rapids; and construction of the main work camp at Gull Rapids.

Manitoba Hydro has proposed submitting an environmental assessment report for the Keeyask Infrastructure Project to regulators later this summer, with the intent of receiving licences and beginning construction in the fall of 2009. The preliminary infrastructure would be constructed between 2009 and 2011. A separate environmental impact statement (EIS) would then be developed for the remainder of the Keeyask project, and submitted to regulators in late 2011.

Manitoba Hydro is currently planning a Public Involvement Program (PIP) to share information about the Keeyask Infrastructure Project. The PIP will include open-house meetings in Thompson and Gillam. YFFN has requested that Manitoba Hydro also present the proposed Preliminary Infrastructure Project to YFFN members in York Landing. These meetings are expected to take place in July.

THE ABOVE MAP HIGHLIGHTS THE KEY PROJECT COMPONENTS OF THE KEESKAW INFRASCTURURE PROJECT. THIS INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING:

- LOCATION OF THE START-UP CAMP
- THE ROUTE OF THE PROPOSED NORTH ACCESS ROAD
- LOCATION OF THE MAIN CAMP

Δ°Λ ΔΛ JKDA βρ<σ Λα><
Δ>Δ° ΡΔΠΔCJΓ° ΔΔ· Ρβ°
ΔσσΔ· (YFFN, FLCN, WLFN, Γσ
TCN) ∇Ραε/αΔβυ' Δ>ηΔ° ΡC
ΔΠΛΓ<σ' ΔΠ· ηδσ CΓ<σ ∇δC
Δ°C Ρβ° Δ>ηβυ' ∇δ Ρβ°Δ>ηΔ°
βC∇CδΡ CΠΛΓCσΔϕ CΛ'ηδ ∇C
η/ δβγ' ΔC'ηΔ· Δ>β γ'βα ρ∇Π°ω
ΔΓ ΠR 280 Ρβ°ηδ <'ηδ ΔΓ.
ΓαΔ°C ηΠΓΓ/Γ'ηΓ' ΔC'ηΔ· ∇δCσ
Ρβ°ηδ <'ηδ' ∇δL CΠ<ω Δω
βγ'ηΔ' 2009 Δ'ηδ 2011 Δ'ηβγ.

Λα>< Δ>Δ> Cα'ηC ∇δL
Δ'ηρ σΓδαεΓΡηΔ° Δσδ η°<σ'
Δαε/αΔβ° (EIS) ∇δL ΔΓ Ρβ°
βΔ>βΠC'βσΔ' Ρ<Δβ° ηδΠσΛ'
∇δ CΡββηΠαP V<β L'C. βΓβυ'
∇δC LB ηΠLC'βσΔ' Cδ'Ρ'η 2009.
∇δ Γα <β° EIS CΠΔ>ηβυ' ∇δL
ΔΓ Ρβ° Δ>ηΔ° Γα ΔΠCδΡ'η
2011.

∇δ Γα Λα>< Δ>Δ° Cα'ηCΔ·
βΡα Δ∇α Cρ'ηC ΔΛ βΔΓ'βσΔ'
(PIP) Cρ'ηCΔΓ' ∇δL Ρβ° ηΠ.
<σ' Δ>ηΔ° ∇δL (PIP) C-<ω
CCσβυ' LΔΓΔ)Δ° Δ'ηρ Thomp-
son, Γα βΓ'PLβ' Gillam, YFFN
PC∇σΓΔ· Λα>< Δ>Δ° ΔσσΔ
ΔC βΔΓΔϕΥ' York Landing, ∇δσ
Δ>Δ° LΔΓΔ)Δα CΠ<σΔ α'η
ηΠσCΛ'.

LEGEND

Borrow Areas Main Camp (Phase One)

100m ROW Winter Trail

Keeyask Infrastructure Project Site

PAGE 4

PAGE 5

Appendix D5

War Lake First Nation Community Information Session Meeting Notes



Proposed Keeyask Infrastructure Project:

War Lake First Nation (WLFN) Community Information Session

Meeting Notes

Date of Meeting: July 23, 2009
11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.
Location: Ilford, MB
Community Hall

In Attendance:	Phillip Morris	War Lake First Nation Band Councillor
	Harold Westdal	CNP Advisor
	Bob Roddick	CNP Advisor
	Norman Flett	CNP Advisor
	Bill Kennedy	CNP Advisor
	Janet Kinley	InterGroup Consultants

In Attendance from Community: 23 community members

PURPOSE OF MEETING

The meeting was requested by War Lake First Nation for the proposed Keeyask Infrastructure Project to receive information and ask questions about:

- the Infrastructure Agreement and how it relates to the JKDA;
- the key project components of the Keeyask Infrastructure Project; and
- the Environmental Assessment Process

MEETING PROCESS

The meeting opened with a prayer. Harold Westdal welcomed everyone to the meeting. He noted that the purpose of the meeting was to talk about the Keeyask Infrastructure Project (the Project) and to invite questions, comments and concerns about it. Not all of the comments related directly to the Project, but are noted as part of the meeting record. The following topics were discussed:

- Harold Westdal provided an overview presentation about the Keeyask Infrastructure Project and the environmental approvals process for the project. The presentation reviewed the location of the Project, the Keeyask Partnership, the joint route selection process (including involvement of WLFN members), objectives of the Project, key components of the Project, construction schedule, start-up

camp activities, access road activities, phase one main camp activities, environmental approvals, employment and business opportunities, direct negotiated contracts, effects on the natural environment, caribou, stream crossings and heritage resources. A handout of the presentation was provided to participants.

- He noted that, in June of this year, the JKDA was signed for the whole Keeyask Generation Project, a remarkable agreement for Aboriginal people. He noted that Manitoba Hydro has proposed to begin to construct the Keeyask Infrastructure Project beginning in the fall of 2009 rather than three years later as originally planned. The Keeyask Infrastructure Project would include a 25 kilometre access road, a bridge over Looking Back Creek, a temporary construction camp for those building the road and a portion of the main construction camp closer to the Gull Rapids site.
- Harold indicated that the Keeyask Infrastructure Project would require a licence under the *Manitoba Environment Act* before it could begin. One of the requirements of the Act is that information about the project is provided to the public and that they have an opportunity to ask questions or voice their concerns; then these comments are taken back to see if the project could be improved. He noted that comments from the public will be provided to the forum making the decision about whether or not to licence the Project. He noted that the Keeyask Infrastructure Project was already introduced at a War Lake First Nation Band meeting and that, at that time, it was felt to be a good thing.
- He noted that the application by the Keeyask Hydropower Limited Partnership (KHLP) to governments for environmental approvals for the Project will likely be made by the end of July. The governments consider the application, invite public comment and make a decision about whether to approve the Project. It is hoped that the licence will be available by the end of November.
- Following that, the parties (Manitoba Hydro and Keeyask Cree Nations) will have to consider whether to go ahead and sign the Infrastructure Agreement; this would be required before construction could begin.
- Harold noted that a certain number of people from War Lake could be hired for the Project; however, they would have to be qualified to do the work.
- He noted that Schedule 5 to the Infrastructure Agreement talks about the Direct Negotiated Contracts (DNCs). A DNC is a contract that has been designated for negotiation only with one group – several have been identified for the Cree Nation Partners (CNP) and others for Fox Lake Cree Nation (FLCN) and York Factory First Nation (YFFN). A copy of the Infrastructure Agreement is available for members to see.
- He indicated that a Joint Route Selection Process was undertaken to align the route (e.g., moved from calving sites). The process included people from WLFN.

The following are highlights of the meeting and are intended to capture the key points that were raised. They are not presented in the sequence that they were raised at the meeting, nor are they a detailed or verbatim transcription of what was said.

KEY QUESTIONS, PERSPECTIVES AND ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY MEMBERS

Contracts, Employment, Training and Unions

- Members asked how Direct Negotiated Contracts for the Project were distributed among the Keeyask Cree Nation communities.
- They asked whether there would be any opportunities to be employed on Direct Negotiated Contracts held by other communities.
- Members asked if the northern preference clause for Aboriginal workers would be in place for this Project and whether War Lake members in locations outside the north could take advantage of the opportunities.
- It was noted that WLFN, along with TCN, is currently seeking a joint venture partner for the access road construction.
- Members asked whether training funds from the CETP program would continue to be available to support skill development among members.
- Members asked if workers would be required to join a union.
- Members asked if WLFN members living in Winnipeg could be considered in the northern preference for the Wuskwatim Project, currently underway.

WLFN advisors noted the following:

- DNC contracts were distributed among Keeyask Cree Nation communities to provide a sharing of opportunities.
- Employment opportunities on Direct Negotiated Contracts held by other communities likely would be available, based on the Wuskwatim experience where opportunities were filled by members of communities other than NCN.
- Employment opportunities on Direct Negotiated Contracts are filled by the northern contractor naming workers (a provision of the Burntwood-Nelson Agreement). This means that qualified WLFN members can be hired directly by their own contractor.
- WLFN members in other locations are included in this provision.
- An extension to CETP training funds is being sought. No final word has been received regarding this application.
- Members would be required to join a union.
- WLFN members living in Winnipeg would not be eligible for the northern preference clause on the Wuskwatim contract.

Access Issues

- Members asked if an access road would be built from Ilford to the new access road being discussed as part of this Project.
- Members asked if the south access road would be built at the same time as this Infrastructure Project.

WLFN advisors noted the following:

- A road between Ilford and the Project area is not part of the Project.
- The south access road is not part of the Infrastructure Project.

Negotiations Process and Funding

- Members asked if all negotiations are complete on the Keeyask Project and whether members would be asked to participate in any further negotiation meetings in Winnipeg.
- Members asked if Manitoba Hydro would continue to provide funding for the Keeyask process.
- Members asked if changes can be made to the way that moneys received by the community for offset programs are used in the future.

WLFN advisors noted the following:

- The negotiation of the main JKDA is complete. Negotiations now centre around the Direct Negotiated Contracts.
- Manitoba Hydro will continue to provide transition funding to cover the environmental review process and negotiations for the Keeyask Project; however, the level of funding will be less.
- How the offset program funds are used is up to Chief and Council, as long as the objectives are consistent with what was set out in the Adverse Effects Agreement.

Consultation Process

- Members asked if there would be more consultation if changes were made in the Project.
- Members asked when there would be further updates about the Project.

WLFN advisors noted the following:

- It is important that the community is informed about the Project and the latest status. It was also noted that the environmental approval process will be in the hands of the Manitoba Government.
- No fixed date has been set for the next community meeting about the Project, but regular updates will be provided. It is anticipated that another meeting will be held in late August or early September, in order that Chief and Council can explain the Infrastructure Agreement to the members before it is signed.

Other

- Members asked a series of questions about the proposed Bipole III transmission line project. They also noted that they would like an update regarding this project.
- Members also set out a question for Chief and Council regarding how decisions would be made about future applications for membership to the First Nation.

CLOSING

The meeting closed with a prayer.

Appendix D6

York Factory First Nation Community Information Session Meeting Notes

York Factory First Nation Community Information Session

Meeting Notes

Date of Meeting: August 13th 2009 – 1:30 pm to 3:00 pm

Location: York Landing, MB
George Saunders Memorial School

In Attendance from EA Study Team:	Nick Barnes	Manitoba Hydro
	Brian Beyak	Manitoba Hydro
	Richard Goulet	Manitoba Hydro
	Marilynn Kullman	Manitoba Hydro
	Brenda Froese	Manitoba Hydro
	John Osler	InterGroup Consultants
	David Lane	InterGroup Consultants

Community Attendance: Approximately 30 community members attended

1. PURPOSE OF MEETING

The meeting was requested by the community of York Landing for the proposed Keeyask Infrastructure Project to receive information and ask questions about:

- the Infrastructure Agreement and how it relates to the JKDA;
- the key project components of the Keeyask Infrastructure Project; and
- the Environmental Assessment Process

2. MEETING PROCESS

Following an opening prayer, Roy Redhead provided a brief introduction in Cree and English to explain the purpose of the meeting and to welcome the attendees. This was followed by brief introductions by the study team members. A PowerPoint presentation was then provided by Richard Goulet, Brian Beyak and Nick Barnes of Manitoba Hydro, which included information on the Infrastructure Agreement and its relationship to the JKDA; detailed information on the project description, schedule and location; and the environmental assessment process and overview of biophysical studies that have been undertaken for the project. Hard copies of the presentation were distributed for all attendees and extra copies were left in the community for future review and circulation. In total, approximately 30 community members attended the session, including approximately 20-22 adults, 5 children and 4-5 elders. Throughout and following the discussion:

- Community members asked questions, offered perspectives, and identified issues about the proposed project, the Infrastructure Agreement and the EIA; and

- Where appropriate, representatives from Manitoba Hydro responded to questions and offered perspectives.

The following are highlights of the meeting and are intended to capture the key points that were raised or presented. They are not presented in the sequence that they were raised at the meeting, nor are they a detailed or verbatim transcription of what was said. Not all of the comments relate directly to the Keeyask Infrastructure Project, but are noted as part of the meeting record.

3. KEY PERSPECTIVES AND ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY COMMUNITY MEMBERS:

Project impacts and perspectives/issues

- The project hiring services for community members should be located within York Landing in order to attract and assist local hires, and not in Thompson like it is for Wuskwatim.
- Numerous attendees stated that caribou are an important source of food.
- Attendees were concerned that caribou would be scared away from the project area, particularly during their annual migration. They noted that caribou move throughout the area and wondered whether they would continue to be there in the future.
- A concern was raised about whether heavy equipment would arrive at the construction site from the south via Gillam or north via Thompson, and that PR 280 would likely need improvements.
- An Elder commented that water quality is not good in York Landing, specifically stating that he has noticed that there is a lot of sediment in their drinking water. Concern was that after development of both Kelsey and Keeyask Hydroelectric generation stations, water quality will be further reduced and that compensation should be provide equally because water is a public good.
- Others commented on skin issues that people have as a result of the poor water.
- Stated that they continue to be impacted by water regulation on Split Lake and concerned about what will happen with the Keeyask GS Project.

Environmental assessment perspectives/issues

- An individual was concerned about whether the access road is still a proposed route or if there are still opportunities to consider alternatives.
- An elder commented that he was pleased to be receiving information about the proposed project by both Manitoba Hydro and York Factory First Nation in York Landing, and would appreciate further opportunities to receive more information.

Other

- Community members were curious about the water quality monitoring being undertaken by Manitoba Hydro and whether the results were available for review.

- Community members noted that there are islands and other areas near the GS that have calving sites and were curious how the caribou may be affected by disturbance.
- A concern was raised regarding caribou calving sites south of the Phase 1 work site (forbay) being destroyed by the proposed Generating Station Project.
- Community member expressed interest in all-weather access road to site and improved ferry service. It was explained that York Factory First Nation has funds to contribute to such projects but discussion on this is ongoing and not part of the Keeyask Infrastructure Project.

4. KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT TEAM

- The Infrastructure Agreement (Agreement) is an agreement between Manitoba Hydro, York Factory First Nation, Tataskweyak Cree Nation and War Lake First Nation, operating as the Cree Nation Partners, and Fox Lake First Nation. It changes the timeframe for some of the infrastructure work agreed to in the Joint Keeyask Development Agreement (JKDA), signed on May 29th of this year.
- The Agreement advances certain work packages earlier in order to benefit all parties to the Agreement. Benefits include:
 - Earlier employment and business opportunities for the KCN with potential to increase overall employment by:
 - enhancing the total value of work packages by extending services contracts by about two years
 - removing the overlap of concurrent work packages and spreading those out for a longer period
 - Completing some of the Keeyask infrastructure in a more cost-effective manner
 - Minimize the risk that infrastructure delays that could result in a delay in completion of Project
- This Agreement has to be approved by the Chiefs and Councils of all KCN before it is signed.
- If construction of Infrastructure not commenced within three years from date of signing the Agreement, the Agreement will be terminated and all applicable works will be constructed under JKDA.
- Employment and business opportunities will be available to KCN communities and their members through Direct Negotiated Contracts (DNCs) (e.g., road construction, services contract, catering, and security). Services contracts, such as catering and security have been identified for DNCs from YFFN.
- As part of the EIA, some of the environmental studies most important to local people are related to employment and business opportunities, caribou, stream crossings and heritage resources. A workshop is planned for August 18 to specifically discuss the community's concerns around

caribou with Rob Berger. Input from community members is very important since they have been living there for many years.

- A preliminary Environmental Protection Plan and an Access Management Plan have been developed to address potential adverse effects. With monitoring and the use of the protection and management plans, it is expected that all adverse effects can be managed.
- The identification and consideration of route alternatives and selection of a preferred route was completed by the Keeyask North Access Road Technical Sub-committee, made up of representatives from Tataskweyak Cree Nation, War Lake First Nation, York Factory First Nation and Fox Lake Cree Nation (collectively known as the Keeyask Cree Nations or KCN), Manitoba Hydro and their engineering and environmental consultants, and Manitoba Infrastructure and Transportation.
- Final route alignment reflected a balance between environmental and engineering constraints and stakeholder interests.

Action Item: Nick Barnes to find out who in the community receives Manitoba Hydro's water quality monitoring results and to find out if they are available to community members.

Appendix D7

Advertisements for Open Houses in Thompson and Gillam

Keeyask Infrastructure Project

An Invitation to an Open House

The Keeyask Hydropower Limited Partnership is currently planning the Keeyask Infrastructure Project. The Infrastructure Project consists of three main components: a 125-person start-up camp, a 25 km all-weather gravel road from Provincial Road (PR) 280 to Gull Rapids on the Nelson River, and a 500 person camp at Gull Rapids. The start-up camp will be decommissioned and the site converted to a maintenance yard when the road and main camp are completed; and the road and main camp will be maintained.

The Project is being proposed at this time to achieve the following objectives:

- To provide early business opportunities for the Keeyask Cree Nations
- To provide early and more employment opportunities for First Nation members, northern Aboriginal people, and other northern and Manitoba workers
- To provide more time for Cree Nation businesses to develop their management capacities
- To provide more time for First Nation members and other northern Aboriginal people to develop their skills and capacities
- To respond to present economic conditions to complete these works on a more cost-effective basis

The Keeyask Hydropower Limited Partnership, which is being established by Manitoba Hydro and its Cree Nation partners: Tataskeweyak Cree Nation (TCN); War Lake First Nation (WLFN); York Factory First Nation (YFFN); and Fox Lake Cree Nation (FLCN), is currently considering development of the Keeyask Generating Station at Gull Rapids on the Nelson River in Northern Manitoba. At this time the Partnership is seeking regulatory approval only for the Keeyask Infrastructure Project. No application is being made at this time for regulatory review and approval of the GS Project.

- To accelerate investment to support the promotion of sustainable economic growth in the Province of Manitoba
- To provide for timely and efficient construction of the proposed Keeyask Generating Station (GS) Project, should the Partnership decide to proceed with that project, and if and when an application is made and regulatory approvals are received to construct and operate that project.

The Keeyask Hydropower Limited Partnership is applying for a licence under the Environment Act (Manitoba) for this Infrastructure Project, as well as required federal authorizations.

You are invited to attend an open house to learn more about the proposed Infrastructure Project at the following locations:

THOMPSON

When: Wednesday, August 5, 2009

Where: St. John's United Church

Time: 5:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

GILLAM

When: Thursday, August 6, 2009

Where: Gillam Recreation Centre

Time: 11:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m.

For more information please contact:

Nick Barnes

Senior Environmental Specialist

Manitoba Hydro

phone: (204) 360-3999

email: nebarnes@hydro.mb.ca

Appendix D8

Thompson Open House Sign-In-Sheet

Wednesday August 5th, 2009 @ 5:00 p.m.

4 others

Appendix D8 D8-2a

Appendix D9

Gillam Open House Sign-In-Sheet

Thursday August 6th, 2009 @ 11:00 a.m.

Keeyask Infrastructure Environmental Assessment
Addendum Filing

Appendix D10

Open House Information Panels

**Keeyask Hydropower
Limited Partnership**

Welcome

Keeyask Infrastructure Project Environmental Impact Assessment

