



Keeyask Generation Project  
Terrestrial Effects Monitoring Plan

Priority Habitats Monitoring Report  
TEMP-2021-02



# **KEEYASK GENERATION PROJECT**

## **TERRESTRIAL EFFECTS MONITORING PLAN**

REPORT #TEMP-2021-02

### **PRIORITY HABITATS MONITORING**

Prepared for  
Manitoba Hydro

By  
ECOSTEM Ltd.  
June 2021

This report should be cited as follows:

ECOSTEM Ltd. 2021. Keeyask Generation Project Terrestrial Effects Monitoring Plan Report #TEMP-2021-02: Priority Habitats Monitoring. A report prepared for Manitoba Hydro by ECOSTEM Ltd., June 2021.

# SUMMARY

## Background


Construction of the Keeyask Generation Project (the Project) at Gull Rapids began in July 2014. The Keeyask Hydropower Limited Partnership (KHLP) was required to prepare a plan to monitor the effects of construction and operation of the generating station on the terrestrial environment. Monitoring results will help the KHLP, government regulators, members of local First Nation communities, and the general public understand how construction and operation of the generating station are affecting the environment, and whether or not more needs to be done to reduce harmful effects.

This report describes the results of the priority habitat and other terrestrial sensitive site monitoring conducted during 2020, the seventh summer of Project construction.

## Why is the study being done?

Some of the land habitat types in the Keeyask region are especially important for ecosystem health and/or to people. These include habitat types that are rare or uncommon, support more plant or animal species than other habitat types, or are very sensitive to disturbance from Project construction (called “priority habitat types”). Additional habitat types are included in the Project’s Environmental Protection Plans (EnvPPs) because they are very important to wildlife (e.g., caribou calving islands, vegetation along streams). The terrestrial sensitive sites monitored by this study include all of these habitat types.

The purpose of this study is to confirm the predicted Project effects on the terrestrial sensitive sites.



**A sensitive riparian site being monitored for disturbance**



**A rare white birch stand along Gull Lake being monitored for disturbance**

### **What was done?**

This study monitors Project effects on terrestrial sensitive sites that could be affected by the Project. The total area being monitored is larger than where Project effects on terrestrial sensitive sites are expected to occur so that unanticipated effects, if there are any, can be found.

Some of the monitored sites include more than one type of sensitivity. For example, some areas are both caribou calving habitat and a priority habitat type. In total, approximately 6,684 ha of terrestrial sensitive sites are being monitored.

Another terrestrial monitoring study mapped Project clearing or physical disturbance areas as of September 2020. This mapping was used to determine which sensitive sites and how much of each type of sensitive site was impacted as of September 2020. Ground surveys were also carried out at nine sensitive sites because they were of special interest (e.g. vegetation beside streams) or they were already being visited for other studies.



Project clearing or disturbance had impacted 220.1 ha, or 3.3%, of the total pre-Project sensitive site area (6,684 ha) as of September 2020. Compared with September 2019, this was an increase of 0.3 ha, or less than 0.01% of total sensitive site area. Approximately 0.1% of the impacted sensitive site area was outside of the approved Project areas.

## What does it mean?

Project clearing or disturbance in terrestrial sensitive sites was very low as of September 2020, impacting only 3% of the total sensitive site area. The increase in total impacted area between 2019 and 2020 was the lowest observed since construction monitoring began.

While a higher proportion of priority habitat has been impacted by the Project compared with the other types of sensitive sites, these impacts were still less than 7% of the maximum amount predicted in the EIS.

It was expected that a higher proportion of priority habitat has been impacted by the Project compared with the other types of sensitive sites. Many of the priority habitat types occur on areas with gravelly or sandy soils, which is a preferred location for Project borrow areas and roads. Conversely, off-system marsh and mammal riparian habitat sites are found in wet and/or peaty areas, which are not locations where these features are typically placed.

The clearing recorded outside of the approved Project areas is not a major ecological concern for two reasons. Only 14% of the terrestrial sensitive site area within the licensed Project footprint had been cleared or disturbed as of September 2020, and it is expected that most of this area will remain undisturbed since Project clearing and disturbance are essentially complete. Also, there are no specialized concerns with the specific sensitive sites that were impacted.

### **What will be done next?**

Surveys to document Project impacts on priority habitats and the other types of terrestrial sensitive sites will continue in summer 2021.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ECOSTEM Ltd. would like to thank Rachel Boone, Sherrie Mason and the on-site Manitoba Hydro staff, including Kim Bryson, Rachelle Budge and Nathan Ricard for their support and assistance in planning field activities and providing access to the sites. Rachel Boone and Sherrie Mason are also gratefully acknowledged for coordinating the terrestrial monitoring studies.

Chiefs and Councils of Tataskweyak Cree Nation (TCN), War Lake First Nation (WLFN), York Factory First Nation (YFFN) and Fox Lake Cree Nation (FLCN) are gratefully acknowledged for their support of this program.

We would also like to thank North/South Consultants Inc., in particular Ron Bretecher and Shari Fournier, for their guidance, logistical support and other resources that made these studies possible.

Prairie Helicopters is thanked for providing transportation during fieldwork and Derek Longley for coordinating the logistics.

## STUDY TEAM

Dr. James Ehnes was the project manager and study designer.

Fieldwork in 2020 was conducted by Alex Snitowski.

Data analysis and report writing in 2020 were completed by Brock Epp, Alex Snitowski and James Ehnes. GIS analysis and cartography was completed by James Ehnes and Alex Snitowski.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>METHODS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	SENSITIVE SITES MONITORED.....	5
2.2	PROJECT AREAS .....	5
2.3	IMPACT MAPPING.....	8
<b>3.0</b>	<b>RESULTS.....</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1	OVERALL IMPACTS ON SENSITIVE SITES.....	10
3.2	IMPACTS ON MAMMAL RIPARIAN HABITAT SITES .....	21
3.3	IMPACTS ON OFF-SYSTEM MARSH SITES .....	23
3.4	IMPACTS ON CARIBOU CALVING AND REARING HABITAT SITES .....	24
3.5	IMPACTS ON PRIORITY HABITAT SITES .....	24
<b>4.0</b>	<b>DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>LITERATURE CITED.....</b>	<b>33</b>

# LIST OF TABLES

Table 3-1:	Cumulative number and area of impacted sensitive sites as of September 2020.....	10
Table 3-2:	Project clearing or disturbance in sensitive sites as of September 2020, by Project area.....	14
Table 3-3:	Cumulative Project clearing or disturbance in sensitive sites as of September 2020, by Project area and year.....	14
Table 3-4:	Number and area of terrestrial sensitive sites with documented Project clearing or disturbance as of September 2020, by type of sensitivity .....	16
Table 3-5:	Impacts on terrestrial sensitive sites, as a percentage of pre-Project totals, as of September 2020, by type of sensitivity .....	17
Table 3-6:	Area of terrestrial sensitive sites with documented Project impacts as of September 2020, by clearing or disturbance and by type of sensitivity .....	18
Table 3-7:	Area of terrestrial sensitive sites impacted by the Project as of September 2020, by Project area.....	19
Table 3-8:	Change in area of sensitive sites impacted by the Project between September 2019 and 2020, by Project area and type of sensitivity.....	20
Table 3-9:	Composition of impacts on priority habitats as of September 2020.....	27
Table 6-1:	Number and area of terrestrial sensitive sites impacted by the Project as of September 2020, by broad/priority habitat type .....	35
Table 6-2:	Area of terrestrial sensitive sites disturbed or cleared by the Project as of September 2020 by broad/priority habitat type .....	39
Table 6-3:	Area of terrestrial sensitive sites impacted by the Project as of September, 2020 by Project Area .....	43

## LIST OF MAPS

Map 2-1:	Terrestrial sensitive sites included in the Priority Habitat study.....	4
Map 2-2:	Project areas as of September 2020.....	7
Map 2-3:	Terrestrial sensitive sites in the licensed Project footprint .....	9
Map 3-1:	Project impacts on terrestrial sensitive sites outside of the planned Project footprint as of September 2020 – western portion of Project footprint.....	11
Map 3-2:	Project impacts on terrestrial sensitive sites outside of the planned Project footprint as of September 2020 – eastern portion of Project footprint.....	12

## LIST OF PHOTOS

Photo 3-1:	Example of 2019 Project clearing in a priority habitat type (black spruce mixture vegetation on shallow peatland) .....	13
Photo 3-2:	Example of an area with sediment deposition in recently burned priority habitat (Jack pine mixture vegetation on thin peatland site) in September, 2020.....	13
Photo 3-3:	Mammal riparian habitat sensitive site in Ellis Esker access corridor in 2018. Yellow arrow points to clearing visible at lower left of photo .....	21
Photo 3-4:	Erosion and sedimentation from the North Access Road (yellow area) into a natural waterbody adjacent to Looking Back Creek in 2020 .....	22
Photo 3-5:	“Bundled log” sediment barrier in riparian zone near base of NAR bank in 2018.....	23
Photo 3-6:	Trails and reservoir clearing adjacent to the western boundary of the “N-6 priority habitat site to avoid” in 2020.....	25

## LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Detailed Results.....	34
-----------------------------------	----

# GLOSSARY

Term	Definition
approved Project footprint areas	All areas that were either initially licenced or subsequently approved for use by the Government of Manitoba.
DOI	A spatial dataset produced from satellite images or digital stereo photos that have been stitched together and processed so that all pixels are positioned in an accurate ground position. Such processing is necessary because the earth's surface is round and has topography.
ecosystem diversity	The number of different ecosystem types, as well as their size and distribution, within a defined geographic area.
habitat loss	Permanent physical removal or alteration of previously undisturbed habitat.
licensed Project footprint	Footprint licensed for Project use under the Project's <i>Environment Act</i> Licence.
marsh	A class in the Canadian Wetland Classification System which includes non-peat wetlands having at least 25% emergent vegetation cover in the water fluctuation zone.
off-system	Water body or waterway outside of the Nelson River hydraulic zone of influence.
planned Project footprint	A subdivision of the licensed Project footprint where clearing or disturbance was expected and is largely comprised of permanent Project features.
possibly disturbed Project footprint	A subdivision of the licensed Project footprint where clearing or disturbance could potentially occur.
priority habitat	Native habitat types that are particularly important for ecological and/or social reasons.
Project clearing	Project areas with complete removal of trees and tall shrubs. Includes terrestrial areas that were flooded, or formerly aquatic areas that were dewatered.

Term	Definition
Project component	Defined areas within the Project footprint that serve a specified general purpose.
Project disturbance	Physical disturbance in an area of intact vegetation or use of pre-existing trails or borrow areas.
Project effect	Ecological consequences resulting from the physical impact of Project activity.
Project impact	Physical impact on terrestrial habitat and ecosystems as a result of Project activity.
Project footprint	Boundary of all areas affected by Project activities.

# ACRONYMS

Acronym	Name
DOI	Digital orthorectified imagery
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EMPA	Excavated material placement area
EnvPP	Environmental Protection Plan
GIS	Geographic Information System
GS	Generating Station
KHLP	Keeyask Hydropower Limited Partnership
KIP	Keeyask Infrastructure Project
KM	Kilometre
NAR	North Access Road
TEMP	Terrestrial Effects Monitoring Plan

# 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Construction of the Keeyask Generation Project (the Project), a 695-megawatt hydroelectric generating station (GS) and associated facilities, began in July 2014. The Project is located at Gull Rapids on the lower Nelson River in northern Manitoba where Gull Lake flows into Stephens Lake, 35 km upstream of the existing Kettle GS.

The *Keeyask Generation Project Response to EIS Guidelines* (the EIS), completed in June 2012, provides a summary of predicted effects and planned mitigation for the Project (KHLP 2012a). Technical supporting information for the terrestrial environment, including a description of the environmental setting, effects and mitigation, and a summary of proposed monitoring and follow-up programs is provided in the *Keeyask Generation Project Environmental Impact Statement Terrestrial Supporting Volume* (TE SV; KHLP 2012b). The *Terrestrial Effects Monitoring Plan* (TEMP) was developed as part of the licensing process for the Project (KHLP 2015). Monitoring activities for various components of the terrestrial environment were described, including priority habitats, which is the focus of this report.

Ecosystem diversity refers to the number of different ecosystem types, as well as their size and distribution, within a defined geographic area. The Project's ecosystem diversity monitoring program includes a single study, the Priority Habitats study, which evaluates changes to ecosystem diversity based on effects to the various priority habitat types. This study also monitors the sensitive terrestrial sites that are not being monitored by other TEMP studies.

Habitat composition and priority habitat types were the indicators for Project effects on ecosystem diversity in the EIS. Habitat composition provides an overall representation of ecosystem diversity. Priority habitat types are those native habitat types that are particularly important for ecological and/or social reasons. In this monitoring study, priority habitat types are the native habitat types in the Keeyask region that were rare or uncommon, highly diverse (i.e., species rich and/or structurally complex), highly sensitive to disturbance, had a high potential to support rare plants and/or were highly valued by people.

The goal of the Priority Habitats study is to determine the nature of Project effects on ecosystem diversity. The objectives of this study are to:

- Confirm that the N-6 priority habitat site identified for avoidance in the EIS is not disturbed;
- Determine the degree to which the other priority habitat types and other terrestrial sensitive sites identified in the EnvPP (excluding sites whose condition is being monitored by another program) are disturbed;
- Quantify and locate the amounts and locations of priority habitat types affected by the Project; and,
- Quantify and locate Project effects on ecosystem diversity.

Monitoring for this study has been conducted in 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020. ECOSTEM (2016; 2017; 2018; 2019; 2020) provides results for the priority habitat monitoring conducted from 2015 to 2019. The following presents the monitoring conducted during 2020.

## 2.0 METHODS

The terrestrial sensitive sites included in this study (Section 2.1) are monitored to meet the first and second objectives of this study, which are to:

- Confirm that the N-6 priority habitat site identified for avoidance in the EIS is not disturbed; and,
- Determine the degree to which the other priority habitat types and other terrestrial sensitive sites identified in the EnvPP (excluding sites whose condition is being monitored by another program) are disturbed.


The remaining sensitive sites within Study Zone 3 (Map 2-1) are also monitored to meet the third and fourth objectives of this study, which are to:

- Quantify and locate the amounts and locations of priority habitat types affected by the Project; and,
- Quantify and locate Project effects on ecosystem diversity.

Reporting for the first and second objectives occurs annually during construction, and in the year following construction completion. Reporting for the third and fourth objectives occurs the year after construction ends, and then at years 3, 5, 10, 15 and 25 of operation.

Section 2.3.2 of the TEMP details the methods for this study. This section summarizes the activities conducted during 2020. The methods were the same as in 2019 (ECOSTEM 2020).

In the terrestrial habitat, ecosystems and plant studies reports, clearing is defined as complete vegetation removal in a patch that was at least 400 m<sup>2</sup> in size. Disturbance is defined as either physical disturbance in an area of intact vegetation (e.g., machinery trail, test pits), use of a pre-existing trail or a clearing smaller than 400 m<sup>2</sup>. Also, an “impact” refers to what the Project does in terms of the physical impact (e.g., vegetation clearing), while an “effect” refers to the ecological consequences resulting from the physical impact (e.g., marsh habitat loss, reduced wetland function).



Map 2-1: Terrestrial sensitive sites included in the Priority Habitat study

## 2.1 SENSITIVE SITES MONITORED

The general types of terrestrial sensitivities included in this monitoring study are priority habitats, off-system marsh habitat, mammal riparian habitat and caribou calving and rearing habitat. Map 2-1 shows the terrestrial sensitive sites that are being monitored for this study, by general type of sensitivity. As shown on the map, a given sensitive site may include more than one of the four general types of sensitivities (see above).

Portions of sites within the planned Project footprint are not being monitored because we expect these areas will be lost to Project construction. Also, some individual sites that had a very small area are not being monitored. The primary reason for the occurrence of very small sites was that the majority of the site was removed by a permanent Project feature.

The total area of terrestrial sensitive sites being monitored is 6,684 ha. This total area has not changed since 2018.

The total monitored area included 2,878 individual sites (i.e., with one or more sensitivities) that may or may not be adjacent to another site. The total areas included 1,503 spatially distinct sensitive areas (i.e., contiguous sites combined with each other).

One sensitive site, referred to as the “N-6 priority habitat to avoid” in the EIS, was of particular interest because it encompasses a priority habitat type (white birch dominant or mixed forest on mineral soil) that is very rare in the Keeyask region. Project mitigation includes avoiding clearing in this site or indirectly affecting it.

## 2.2 PROJECT AREAS

In this study, four distinct Project areas (Map 2-2) are used when reporting on where Project clearing or disturbance in sensitive sites occurred. This is being done to facilitate future comparisons with EIS predictions.

The first two areas are a subdivision of the footprint licensed for Project use under the Project's *Environment Act* Licence (i.e., licensed Project footprint): the planned Project footprint and the possibly disturbed Project footprint. The planned Project footprint is largely comprised of permanent Project features. There is little to no opportunity to reduce Project impacts in these areas.

The possibly disturbed Project footprint provided for some of the unknown components of the Project design at the time the Project was being licensed (e.g., the actual volume of suitable material available in each borrow area, or the actual area needed for each of the Excavated Material Placement Areas (EMPAs)). There is some flexibility in locating clearing, disturbance or material placement within the possibly disturbed Project footprint. Project environmental protection plans (EnvPPs) include provisions to minimize clearing or disturbance within the

possibly disturbed Project footprint, and the avoidance of environmentally sensitive sites to the extent feasible within this area.


After the Project was licensed, several additional areas (called “subsequently approved Project areas” in this report) were approved for Project use by Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship (now Manitoba Conservation and Climate). This is the third type of Project area. Portions of the licensed KIP footprint that have been used for the Project are included as a subsequently approved area. These areas primarily include the former KIP start-up camp (which was originally planned as only a temporary camp for the KIP), Borrow Area G-5 and trails that were used to access reservoir clearing areas.

The trails were evaluated for potential effects by the Project’s terrestrial specialists prior to their submission to Manitoba Conservation and Climate, and their locations were modified to alleviate any ecological concerns that were identified at that time. Given the modifications recommended by terrestrial specialists, the subsequently approved areas were not a concern from the terrestrial ecosystem health perspective.

An important consideration for the evaluations of the subsequently approved areas was how these areas would alter predicted cumulative effects, which was largely related to the characteristics of the areas and the amount of the licensed Project footprint that was expected to remain undisturbed at the end of construction. It was expected that a large proportion of the licensed Project footprint would remain undisturbed because the EIS intentionally erred on the side of overestimating the amount of habitat loss and disturbance. As of September 2020, more than half (56%) of the licensed Project footprint had not been impacted by the Project (ECOSTEM 2020a).

This report refers to the licensed Project footprint and the subsequently approved areas as the “approved Project footprint”.

The last type of Project area in this report is any areas cleared or disturbed outside the approved Project footprint. This includes all areas that are not part of the approved Project footprint.



Map 2-2: Project areas as of September 2020

## 2.3 IMPACT MAPPING

Initial site selection for the 2020 aerial surveys was based on sites surveyed in 2019. This occurred because digital orthorectified imagery (DOI) showing the entire Project footprint in summer 2020 was not available. Aerial surveys conducted on September 10 and 13, 2020 were used to identify any other sensitive sites that may have been affected by recent clearing. The aerial surveys showed that the footprint clearing boundaries had not grown substantially since September 2018.


Ground surveys were also carried out at 9 sensitive sites because they were of special interest or because they were already being visited for other reasons. Four of the terrestrial sensitive sites along Looking Back Creek or at stream crossings along the south access road were surveyed because staff were already there conducting surveys for other TEMP monitoring studies. The remaining four sites were surveyed as part of the Wetland Loss and Disturbance study, the results of which are provided in a separate report (ECOSTEM 2021b).

Ground surveys were not done at the “N-6 priority habitat to avoid” because low altitude aerial surveys in 2020 found that there had been no additional clearing or construction activity within or near this site since 2016. Ground surveys were conducted at this site in 2015 and 2016.

Ground sampling recorded conditions in the visited sensitive sites using reconnaissance surveys, geo-referenced photographs, marked-up maps and notes. Field data were mapped in a GIS using digital orthorectified imagery (DOI) as the base maps. The DOI was created from composite Worldview 2 imagery acquired on August 3, August 27 and September 10, 2020.

This study used the Project clearing or disturbance mapping produced by the Habitat Loss and Disturbance study (ECOSTEM 2021a) to quantify and locate the terrestrial sensitive sites that were impacted as of September 2020. Mapping in 2020 did not include changing the disturbance type for the newly formed reservoir from clearing to flooding (all of the flooding falls within the mapped reservoir clearing).

Clearing or disturbance boundaries were overlaid on the sensitive sites map in a GIS, and then the boundaries were used to subdivide each sensitive site into cleared, disturbed or undisturbed.



Map 2-3: Terrestrial sensitive sites in the licensed Project footprint

## 3.0 RESULTS

### 3.1 OVERALL IMPACTS ON SENSITIVE SITES

The 2,878 sensitive sites being monitored for this study covered 6,684 ha.

Map 3-1 and Map 3-2 show the sensitive sites that were cleared (see Photo 3-1 for an example) or disturbed (see Photo 3-2 for an example) by the Project as of September 2020 (see Section 2.0 for definitions of clearing and disturbance).


As of September 2020, Project impacts in the form of clearing or disturbance had affected 443 of the 2,878 sensitive sites. The total impacted area was 220.1 ha, or 3.3%, of total sensitive site area (Table 3-1).

The total amount of impacted sensitive site area increased by only 0.3 ha from September 2019 to September 2020 (less than 0.01% of total pre-Project sensitive site area).


**Table 3-1: Cumulative number and area of impacted sensitive sites as of September 2020**

Parameter	Pre-Project	Project Impacts (cleared or disturbed)						Change from 2019 to 2020
		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	
Number of Sites								
Total number	2,878	159	282	383	440	441	443	2
Cumulative number of sites impacted as a percentage of pre-Project total <sup>1</sup>	0.0	5.5	9.8	13.3	15.3	15.3	15.4	0.07
Area (ha)								
Total area	6,684.4	131.1	167.6	187.8	215.7	219.8	220.1	0.34
Cumulative area impacted as a percentage of pre-Project total <sup>1</sup>	0.0	2.0	2.5	2.8	3.2	3.3	3.3	0.01


Notes: <sup>1</sup> Percentages differ from those reported in ECOSTEM (2018b) due to the addition of sensitive sites for the Ellis Esker borrow area in 2018.



Map 3-1: Project impacts on terrestrial sensitive sites outside of the planned Project footprint as of September 2020 – western portion of Project footprint



Map 3-2: Project impacts on terrestrial sensitive sites outside of the planned Project footprint as of September 2020 – eastern portion of Project footprint



**Photo 3-1: Example of 2019 Project clearing in a priority habitat type (black spruce mixture vegetation on shallow peatland)**



**Photo 3-2: Example of an area with sediment deposition in recently burned priority habitat (Jack pine mixture vegetation on thin peatland site) in September, 2020**

In September 2020, 94% of the terrestrial sensitive site area identified within the possibly disturbed Project footprint had not been cleared or disturbed. Additionally, 86% of the sensitive site area within the entire licensed Project footprint had not been cleared or disturbed.

Of the total sensitive site area cleared or disturbed as of 2020, 149 ha (or 68%) was located within the planned Project footprint (Table 3-2). This was a 0.1 ha increase over 2019 (Table 3-3).

Nearly 24% of the impacted sensitive site area was in the possibly disturbed Project footprint, or 51.9 ha of area. This was an increase of 0.1 ha over 2019.

Clearing or disturbance of sensitive sites within areas subsequently approved for Project use was 14.6 ha in 2020 (Table 3-2), which has been unchanged since 2017 (Table 3-3).

As of September 2020, clearing or disturbance of terrestrial sensitive sites outside of the approved Project areas was 4.7 ha, or 2.1% of total impacted area, which was an increase of approximately 0.2 ha.

**Table 3-2: Project clearing or disturbance in sensitive sites as of September 2020, by Project area**

Project Area	Total Pre-Project Area (ha)	Clearing or Disturbance		
		Impacted Area (ha)	Percent of Pre- Project Area	Percent of Impacted Area
Within the planned Project footprint	585.4	148.9	2.2	67.7
Within the possibly disturbed Project footprint	845.4	51.9	0.8	23.6
Within subsequently approved Project areas	14.6	14.6	0.2	6.6
Outside of the approved Project footprint	-	4.7	0.1	2.1
All other area being monitored	5,239.0	-	-	-
<b>Total<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>6,684.4</b>	<b>220.1</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Notes: <sup>1</sup> Sum of numbers in table may not equal totals due to rounding.

**Table 3-3: Cumulative Project clearing or disturbance in sensitive sites as of September 2020, by Project area and year**

Project Area	Clearing or Disturbance (ha)						
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Increase
Within the planned Project footprint	117.3	134.6	144.3	145.7	148.9	148.9	<b>0.1</b>
Within the possibly disturbed Project footprint	1.8	16.6	25.2	50.9	51.8	51.9	<b>0.1</b>
Within the subsequently approved Project areas	10.6	13.2	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.6	-
Outside of the approved Project footprint	1.3	3.2	3.8	4.6	4.6	4.7	<b>0.2</b>
<b>Total<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>131.6</b>	<b>167.6</b>	<b>187.8</b>	<b>215.7</b>	<b>219.8</b>	<b>220.1</b>	<b>0.3</b>

Notes: <sup>1</sup> Sum of numbers in table may not equal totals due to rounding.

Priority habitat, off-system marsh, mammal riparian habitat, or caribou calving and rearing habitat were the four types of sensitive sites included in this monitoring study (Section 2.1). Since a particular monitored site may include more than one terrestrial sensitivity, the rest of the tables in this sub-section report impacts in two ways. The top section of each table provides total areas for each general type of sensitivity while the bottom section provides totals for the various combinations of sensitivities found in individual sites. Adding the rows in the top half of a table yields a higher total than shown in the last row (e.g., 220.1 ha for total sensitive site area impacted) because some sites included more than one sensitivity, creating double or triple counting of the same area.

Priority habitat was the sensitivity type with the highest total number of sites and total area before Project construction started (Table 3-4). The next most abundant types, in descending order by total area, were off-system marsh, caribou calving and rearing habitat and mammal riparian habitat. Note that off-system marsh sites include the waterbody containing marsh and marsh habitat, plus a 100 m buffer of the waterbody. Off-system marsh was the only type of sensitivity that included a buffer of the sensitive habitat area.

As of September 2020, priority habitat was the sensitivity type that had the highest impacted area (Table 3-4). These impacts tended to be the areas with granular mineral material, which was a preferred location for Project borrow areas and roads. Caribou calving and rearing habitat had the second highest Project impacts with respect to number of sites and area, followed by off-system marsh.

When considering the total number of sites and area of sensitive sites prior to Project construction, relative impacts were highest on caribou calving and rearing habitat (Table 3-5). Sixty-seven percent of its pre-Project sites, and 4% of its pre-Project area had clearing or disturbance as of September 2020. Priority habitat also had 4% of its pre-Project area impacted, but only in 14% of the sites. Only 2% of the pre-Project off-system marsh sites (0.1% of pre-Project area) had clearing or disturbance as of 2020. For mammal riparian habitat sites, one (3%) of the pre-Project sites and 0.2% of the total area had clearing or disturbance at the time of the 2020 surveys. Impacts on caribou calving and rearing habitat did not change since 2018.

Priority habitat and off-system marsh were the only sensitive habitat types that increased in impacted area from 2019 to 2020 (0.3 ha). Most of the area was due to sediment deposition and water ponding disturbances in Borrow Areas G-1 and G-3, and EMPAs D16 and D28(1)-E.

**Table 3-4: Number and area of terrestrial sensitive sites with documented Project clearing or disturbance as of September 2020, by type of sensitivity**

Sensitivity <sup>1</sup>	Number				Area (ha)			
	Pre- Project	Project Impacts			Pre- Project	Project Impacts		
		2019	2020	Change		2019	2020	Change
Total Including Sites with More Than One Sensitivity <sup>2</sup>								
P	2,704	389	390	1	4,864.3	203.6	204.0	0.3
M	276	4	5	1	1,564.7	1.1	1.1	0.0
R	35	1	1	-	227.2	0.5	0.5	-
C	99	66	66	-	392.9	16.7	16.7	-
All	2,878	441	443	2	6,684.4	219.8	220.1	0.3
Total by Combination of Sensitivities								
P	2,481	370	371	1	4,528.8	201.5	201.8	0.3
P, M	173	1	1	-	79.0	0.0	0.0	-
P, C	34	18	18	-	78.3	2.1	2.1	-
P, R	10	-	-	-	161.0	-	-	-
P, M, R	6	-	-	-	17.2	-	-	-
M	90	3	4	1	1,456.4	1.1	1.1	0.0
R	12	1	1	-	37.0	0.5	0.5	-
M, R	7	-	-	-	12.1	-	-	-
C	65	48	48	-	314.7	14.6	14.6	-
All	2,878	441	443	2	6,684.4	219.8	220.1	0.3

Notes: a "-" indicates absence or no area, a 0 indicates an area less than 0.05 ha. <sup>1</sup> P = Priority Habitat, M = Off-system Marsh Habitat, R = Mammal Riparian Habitat, C = Caribou Calving and Rearing Habitat. <sup>2</sup> Sum of is greater than total number of sites or total area because some sites have more than one sensitivity.

**Table 3-5: Impacts on terrestrial sensitive sites, as a percentage of pre-Project totals, as of September 2020, by type of sensitivity**

Sensitivity <sup>1</sup>	Number			Area		
	Pre-Project	Percent Impacted		Pre-Project (ha)	Percent Impacted	
		2019	2020		2019	2020
Total Including Sites with More Than One Sensitivity <sup>2</sup>						
P	2,704	14.4	14.4	4,864.3	4.2	4.2
M	276	1.4	1.8	1,564.7	0.1	0.1
R	35	2.9	2.9	227.2	0.2	0.2
C	99	66.7	66.7	392.9	4.2	4.2
Total by Combination of Sensitivities						
P	2,481	14.9	15.0	4,528.8	4.4	4.5
P, M	173	0.6	0.6	79.0	0.0	0.0
P, C	34	52.9	52.9	78.3	2.7	2.7
P, R	10	-	-	161.0	-	-
P, M, R	6	-	-	17.2	-	-
M	90	3.3	4.4	1,456.4	0.1	0.1
R	12	8.3	8.3	37.0	1.4	1.4
M, R	7	-	-	12.1	-	-
C	65	73.8	73.8	314.7	4.6	4.6
All	2,878	15.3	15.4	6,684.4	3.3	3.3

Notes: a "-" indicates absence or no area, a 0 indicates a percentage less than 0.05 ha. <sup>1</sup> P = Priority Habitat, M = Off-system Marsh Habitat, R = Mammal Riparian Habitat, C = Caribou Calving and Rearing Habitat.

<sup>2</sup> Sum of is greater than total number of sites or total area because some sites have more than one sensitivity.

Of the sensitive sites impacted to date, priority and off-system marsh habitat were the only types with Project disturbance (Table 3-6; see Section 2.0 for definitions of disturbance versus clearing). The 7.5 ha of disturbance was low compared to the 197.6 ha of clearing that occurred in these sensitive site types.

In total, 73% of the impacted priority habitat area and 72% of the impacted off-system marsh area were in the planned Project footprint (Table 3-7). In contrast, most (88%) of the impacted caribou calving and rearing habitat, and the entire impacted mammal riparian habitat, was in the possibly disturbed Project footprint.

For priority habitat, clearing or disturbance in the possibly disturbed Project footprint increased by 0.1 ha since 2019 (Table 3-8). This is the smallest annual increase since Project construction began in 2014.

There was an increase of disturbance by approximately 0.2 ha of outside of the approved Project footprint for the priority habitat type between September 2019 and 2020 (Table 3-8). No clearing has occurred in any sensitive site since 2019.

**Table 3-6: Area of terrestrial sensitive sites with documented Project impacts as of September 2020, by clearing or disturbance and by type of sensitivity**

Sensitivity <sup>1</sup>	Pre-Project Area (ha)	Cleared or Disturbed Area (ha)					
		Disturbed 2019	Disturbed 2020	Change	Cleared 2019	Cleared 2020	Change
Total Area, Including Sites with More Than One Sensitivity <sup>2</sup>							
P	4,864.3	7.2	7.5	0.3	196.4	196.4	-
M	1,564.7	-	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.1	-
R	227.2	-	-	-	0.5	0.5	-
C	392.9	-	-	-	16.7	16.7	-
Total Area by Combination of Sensitivities							
P	4,528.8	7.2	7.5	0.3	194.3	194.3	-
P, M	79.0	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-
P, C	78.3	-	-	-	2.1	2.1	-
P, R	161.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
P, M, R	17.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
M	1,456.4	-	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.1	-
R	37.0	-	-	-	0.5	0.5	-
M, R	12.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
C	314.7	-	-	-	14.6	14.6	-
All	6,684.4	7.2	7.5	0.3	212.6	212.6	-

Notes: a "-" indicates no area, a 0 indicates an area less than 0.05 ha. <sup>1</sup> P = Priority Habitat, M = Off-system Marsh Habitat, R = Mammal Riparian Habitat, C = Caribou Calving and Rearing Habitat. <sup>2</sup> Sum of is greater than total number of sites or total area because some sites have more than one sensitivity.

**Table 3-7: Area of terrestrial sensitive sites impacted by the Project as of September 2020, by Project area**

Sensitivity <sup>1</sup>	Pre-Project Area (ha)	Cleared or Disturbed Area (ha)				Total Area Impacted
		Planned Project Footprint	Possibly Disturbed Project Footprint	Subsequently Approved Project Areas	Outside the Approved Project Footprint	
Total Area, Including Sites with More Than One Sensitivity <sup>2</sup>						
P	4,864.3	147.9	37.6	14.3	4.2	204.0
M	1,564.7	0.8	0.3	-	0.0	1.1
R	227.2	-	0.5	-	-	0.5
C	392.9	0.4	14.7	0.6	1.0	16.7
Total Area by Combination of Sensitivities						
P	4,528.8	147.8	36.3	14.0	3.7	201.8
P, M	79.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0
P, C	78.3	0.1	1.2	0.3	0.5	2.1
P, R	161.0	-	-	-	-	-
P, M, R	17.2	-	-	-	-	-
M	1,456.4	0.8	0.3	-	-	1.1
R	37.0	-	0.5	-	-	0.5
M,R	12.1	-	-	-	-	-
C	314.7	0.2	13.5	0.3	0.5	14.6
All	6,684.4	148.9	51.9	14.6	4.7	220.1

Notes: a "-" indicates no area, a 0 indicates an area less than 0.05 ha. <sup>1</sup> P = Priority Habitat, M = Off-system Marsh Habitat, R = Mammal Riparian Habitat, C = Caribou Calving and Rearing Habitat. <sup>2</sup> Sum of is greater than total number of sites or total area because some sites have more than one sensitivity.

**Table 3-8: Change in area of sensitive sites impacted by the Project between September 2019 and 2020, by Project area and type of sensitivity**


Sensitivity <sup>1</sup>	Pre-Project Area (ha)	Planned Project Footprint (ha)			Possibly Disturbed Project Footprint (ha)			Subsequently Approved Project Areas (ha)			Outside the Approved Project Footprint (ha)		
		2019	2020	Change	2019	2020	Change	2019	2020	Change	2019	2020	Change
	Total Area, Including Sites with More Than One Sensitivity <sup>2</sup>												
P	4,864.3	147.8	147.9	0.1	37.5	37.6	0.1	14.3	14.3	-	4.1	4.2	0.2
M	1,564.7	0.8	0.8	-	0.3	0.3	-	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-
R	227.2	-	-	-	0.5	0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
C	392.9	0.4	0.4	-	14.7	14.7	-	0.6	0.6	-	1.0	1.0	-
Total Area by Combination of Sensitivities													
P	4,528.8	147.7	147.8	0.1	36.2	36.3	0.1	14.0	14.0	-	3.6	3.7	0.2
P, M	79.0	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-
P, C	78.3	0.1	0.1	-	1.2	1.2	-	0.3	0.3	-	0.5	0.5	-
P, R	161.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
P, M, R	17.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
M	1,456.4	0.8	0.8	-	0.3	0.3	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
R	37.0	-	-	-	0.5	0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
M,R	12.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
C	314.7	0.2	0.2	-	13.5	13.5	-	0.3	0.3	-	0.5	0.5	-
All	6,684.4	148.9	148.9	0.1	51.8	51.9	0.1	14.6	14.6	-	4.6	4.7	0.2

Notes: a "-" indicates no area, a 0 indicates an area less than 0.05 ha. <sup>1</sup> P = Priority Habitat, M = Off-system Marsh Habitat, R = Mammal Riparian Habitat, C = Caribou Calving and Rearing Habitat. <sup>2</sup> Sum of is greater than total number of sites or total area because some sites have more than one sensitivity.

## 3.2 IMPACTS ON MAMMAL RIPARIAN HABITAT SITES

Mammal riparian habitat made up a very small portion (3.4%) of the pre-Project sensitive site area (Table 3-4).

Project clearing or disturbance occurred for the first time at one mammal riparian habitat site during the winter between 2017 and 2018. A small portion of the site was cleared for the Ellis Esker access road corridor (Photo 3-3). The cleared area was within the possibly disturbed portion of the licensed Project footprint, and the Ellis Esker access road was only used in winter.



**Photo 3-3: Mammal riparian habitat sensitive site in Ellis Esker access corridor in 2018. Yellow arrow points to clearing visible at lower left of photo**

Ground surveys at Looking Back Creek since 2017 found that erosion from the North Access Road (NAR) shoulder was depositing sediment into natural waterbodies adjacent to the creek near the northeast corner of the NAR bridge (Photo 3-4). In 2017, sediment from a natural high-water event were deposited into the shrub and graminoid-dominated riparian area just downstream of the Looking Back Creek NAR crossing. Both of these disturbances covered a negligible area, and were not included in the mapped disturbed areas. Mitigation recommendations were not made for either of these situations as the sediment was still confined to the pool next to the road bank, and the source for the sediment in the high-water event appeared to be from upstream of the NAR.



**Photo 3-4: Erosion and sedimentation from the North Access Road (yellow area) into a natural waterbody adjacent to Looking Back Creek in 2020**

Ground surveys in 2020 found that the spatial extent of the sediment deposition from the NAR appeared to be the same as in 2019 (Photo 3-4). Sediment barriers, constructed from bundled logs, were installed at the base of the banks adjacent to Looking Back Creek (Photo 3-5). The barriers have continued to stop the majority of the sediment moving down the road bank. Sediment was still bypassing barriers on the northeast side of the bridge. A further mitigation recommendation is not being made at this time since the affected area was small, and it appeared that impacts were mostly contained.



**Photo 3-5: “Bundled log” sediment barrier in riparian zone near base of NAR bank in 2018**

### **3.3 IMPACTS ON OFF-SYSTEM MARSH SITES**

The Priority Habitats monitoring is focusing on the off-system marsh sites included in the licensed Project footprint. Impacts on off-system marsh are also being studied in more detail by the Wetland Loss and Disturbance monitoring study (KHLP 2015; Section 2.5.2).

Off-system marsh was the second-least impacted sensitive habitat type. As of September 2020, only 1.1 ha (Table 3-4), or 0.1% (Table 3-5) of its pre-Project area was impacted. Project clearing had affected four of the 66 off-system marsh sensitive sites included in the licensed Project footprint, which was unchanged since 2016.

Approximately 0.02 ha of Project disturbance in the form of sediment deposition occurred in one off-system marsh site adjacent to a work area as of September 2020 (Table 3-6). All of the affected area occurred within the possibly disturbed Project footprint.

The greatest proportion of cleared off-system marsh habitat (74%) was found within the planned Project footprint (where clearing was expected) and virtually all the remainder was found within the possibly disturbed Project footprint (Table 3-8).

See the Wetland Function annual report (ECOSTEM 2021b) for further details.

### **3.4 IMPACTS ON CARIBOU CALVING AND REARING HABITAT SITES**

Of the four types of sensitive site types, caribou calving and rearing habitat was the second most impacted type as of September 2020 (Table 3-4). Caribou calving and rearing habitat impacts were solely in the future reservoir area, and consisted of clearing which occurred under the Project's reservoir clearing program during the winters prior to the 2016, 2017 and 2018 terrestrial sensitive site surveys.

About 16.7 ha of reservoir clearing impacted two-thirds of the total number of pre-Project caribou sensitive sites as of September 2020, which is unchanged from 2018, since reservoir clearing had been completed the winter prior to that year. Where these impacts occurred, they were generally a long, very narrow band along the boundaries of the sensitive sites.

The bulk of the impacted caribou calving and rearing habitat was within the possibly disturbed Project footprint, where 14.7 ha was cleared (Table 3-8). The remaining impacted area included only 0.4 ha of clearing in the planned Project footprint, 0.6 ha of clearing in subsequently approved Project areas, and an additional 1.0 ha of clearing occurred outside the approved Project footprint.

Of the four types of sensitive sites, caribou calving and rearing habitat had the second-largest area impacted (14.7 ha) within the possibly disturbed Project footprint in 2020 (Appendix 1, Table 6-3).

### **3.5 IMPACTS ON PRIORITY HABITAT SITES**

As of September 2020, 14.4% (390) of the 2,704 priority habitat sites being monitored had been impacted (Table 3-4; Table 3-5). Impacts on total priority habitat area were much lower at 4.2% (204 ha) of total area (Table 3-4; Table 3-5).

The vast majority of impacted priority habitat (147.9 ha; 73%) was within the planned Project footprint (Table 3-7). Possibly disturbed Project footprint areas included the next highest amount of priority habitat (37.6 ha) cleared or disturbed, followed by the subsequently approved Project areas (14.3 ha) and areas outside the approved Project areas (4.2 ha).

Compared with September 2019, the amount of priority habitat area disturbed by the Project in 2020 increased by 0.3 ha (93% of newly disturbed area), but the amount of cleared area remained unchanged (Table 3-6).

Approximately 0.1 ha (19%) of the increased impacts on priority habitat between 2019 and 2020 were in the planned Project footprint (Table 3-8). The amount of impacted priority habitat in the possibly disturbed Project footprint also increased by 0.1 ha. Clearing or disturbance within the subsequently approved areas was unchanged from 2019 and increased by 0.2 ha (49%) outside the approved Project footprint.

For the “N-6 priority habitat site to avoid”, monitoring in 2016 found that some priority habitat adjacent to it was impacted by reservoir clearing to the southwest, and by geotechnical explorations for a potential fish egress channel location to the northwest (Photo 3-6). Aerial surveys from 2017 to 2020 found no evidence of additional activity in the already cleared areas near the N-6 site or in the site itself. Note that the 2013 wildfire, which was unrelated to the Project, affected a portion of the N-6 site.



**Photo 3-6: Trails and reservoir clearing adjacent to the western boundary of the “N-6 priority habitat site to avoid” in 2020**

Thirty-nine of the 50 priority habitat types monitored in 2020 (including those discussed in Sections 3.1 to 3.4) had been impacted by the Project (Table 3-9). For most priority habitat types, increases in area impacted between September of 2018 and 2019 were small (less than 1% of their pre-Project area).

Between the 2019 and 2020 surveys, only six priority habitat types had increases in the area impacted. The priority habitat type with the largest increase in impacted area both in absolute terms (0.1 ha), and relative to its pre-Project area was tall shrub on thin peatland ecosites (0.1%; Appendix 1, Table 6-1). The remaining priority habitat types had increases less than 0.1% of their pre-Project area.

The priority habitat types with the highest Project impacts in absolute terms as of September 2020 (Table 3-9), were black spruce mixture vegetation on mineral ecosites (67.9 ha) and jack pine

dominant vegetation on mineral ecosites (35.7 ha). This represents only 28% and 31% of the area predicted to be impacted by the project for these two habitat types, respectively.

In relative terms, black spruce dominant vegetation on mineral ecosites had the highest impacts at 37% (19.8 ha) of the total pre-Project area being monitored, which has been unchanged since 2018. Impacts on tamarack mixture vegetation on mineral ecosites totaled 14% of the total pre-Project area and none of the remaining habitat types had impacts on more than 13% of their total pre-Project area.

For Project disturbance, impacts were highest in the jack pine dominant vegetation on mineral ecosites, with 2.4 ha in 2016 (Appendix 1, Table 6-2), which amounted to only 0.6% of the total pre-Project area. This increased slightly in 2020 by 0.01 ha since 2016.

Appendix 1, Table 6-3 provides the areas impacted by the Project as of September 2020 by habitat type and Project area. Black spruce mixture vegetation on mineral ecosites had the largest area impacted within the planned Project footprint (58.7 ha), followed by jack pine dominant vegetation on mineral ecosites (30.7 ha) and black spruce mixture vegetation on thin peatland ecosites (11.2 ha). Black spruce mixture on mineral and black spruce mixture on thin peatland ecosites had the highest increase in impacted area from 2019 to 2020 (0.02 ha), followed by jack pine dominant vegetation on mineral ecosites (0.01 ha).

Within the possibly disturbed Project footprint, black spruce dominant vegetation on mineral ecosites had the largest area impacted by far (19.0 ha; Appendix 1, Table 6-3). The next highest impacts in this Project area were in black spruce mixture on mineral ecosites (3.8 ha) and in tall shrub on thin peatland ecosites (2.2 ha).

Within the subsequently approved Project areas, the priority habitat type with the largest cleared or disturbed area in 2020 (Appendix 1, Table 6-3) was black spruce mixture vegetation on mineral ecosites (4.8 ha). Jack pine dominant vegetation on mineral ecosites and jack pine mixture vegetation on thin peatland ecosites were similarly impacted with 4.3 and 3.8 ha, respectively. These amounts were unchanged since 2017.

Outside the approved Project footprint, jack pine mixture vegetation on thin peatland ecosites had the largest area impacted with 1.2 ha in 2020 (Appendix 1, Table 6-3). This area increased by 0.1 ha in 2020 which was the first increase since 2016. Black spruce dominant on mineral, jack pine dominant vegetation on mineral ecosites and trembling aspen mixedwood vegetation on all ecosites made up the majority of the remaining impacted areas with 0.8 ha, 0.7 ha and 0.7 ha, respectively. There was also a slight increase in tall shrub on thin peatland ecosites of 0.1 ha since 2019.

**Table 3-9: Composition of impacts on priority habitats as of September 2020**

Priority Habitat Type	Number of Sites		Area		
	Pre-Project	Impacted	Pre-Project (ha)	Impacted (ha)	Pre-Project Area Impacted (%)
Balsam poplar dominant on all ecosites	2	1	1.0	0.0	3.1
Trembling aspen dominant on all ecosites	86	14	242.6	5.4	2.2
Trembling aspen mixedwood on all ecosites	49	3	217.5	2.0	0.9
White birch dominant on all ecosites	26	2	40.1	0.1	0.3
White birch mixedwood on all ecosites	16	2	38.3	0.0	0.0
Jack pine dominant on mineral	81	27	381.4	35.7	9.4
Jack pine dominant on shallow peatland	2	-	4.7	-	-
Jack pine dominant on thin peatland	17	1	74.0	0.6	0.8
Jack pine mixedwood on mineral	26	4	122.7	0.7	0.6
Jack pine mixedwood on shallow peatland	4	-	7.6	-	-
Jack pine mixedwood on thin peatland	20	4	83.4	1.9	2.3
Jack pine mixture on shallow peatland	11	2	44.2	0.3	0.6
Jack pine mixture on thin peatland	81	16	294.9	13.0	4.4
Black spruce dominant on mineral	34	3	54.0	19.8	36.8
Black spruce dominant on riparian peatland	17	2	5.6	0.1	1.1
Black spruce dominant on wet peatland	474	30	513.7	6.9	1.3
Black spruce mixedwood on mineral	37	6	169.0	1.6	1.0
Black spruce mixedwood on shallow peatland	7	1	5.1	0.0	0.6
Black spruce mixedwood on thin peatland	18	2	9.3	0.0	0.2
Black spruce mixture on mineral	143	52	539.6	67.9	12.6
Black spruce mixture on shallow peatland	226	18	231.3	2.8	1.2
Black spruce mixture on thin peatland	302	87	335.3	13.3	4.0
Black spruce mixture on wet peatland	23	1	18.7	0.1	0.3
Tamarack- black spruce mixture on riparian peatland	5	-	1.0	-	-
Tamarack dominant on mineral	7	3	6.1	0.4	6.7
Tamarack dominant on riparian peatland	1	-	1.1	-	-

Priority Habitat Type	Number of Sites		Area		
	Pre-Project	Impacted	Pre-Project (ha)	Impacted (ha)	Pre-Project Area Impacted (%)
Tamarack dominant on shallow peatland	12	-	5.6	-	-
Tamarack dominant on thin peatland	7	1	8.2	0.4	4.6
Tamarack dominant on wet peatland	19	1	27.7	0.0	0.1
Tamarack mixture on mineral	47	16	88.6	12.6	14.2
Tamarack mixture on shallow peatland	185	15	165.2	1.3	0.8
Tamarack mixture on thin peatland	146	27	155.0	3.1	2.0
Tamarack mixture on wet peatland	100	7	123.4	0.8	0.7
Tall shrub on mineral	18	7	35.3	0.8	2.2
Tall shrub on riparian peatland	1	-	0.0	-	-
Tall shrub on shallow peatland	64	5	150.0	0.2	0.2
Tall shrub on thin peatland	53	11	77.2	10.1	13.1
Tall shrub on wet peatland	59	3	51.3	0.1	0.3
Low vegetation on riparian peatland	23	4	41.4	0.1	0.2
Low vegetation on shallow peatland	126	9	196.5	0.6	0.3
Low Vegetation on thin peatland	3	1	1.1	0.1	11.5
Low vegetation on wet peatland	56	2	97.5	0.9	0.9
Emergent island in littoral	9	-	6.7	-	-
Emergent on lower beach	11	-	4.2	-	-
Emergent on upper beach	41	-	9.5	-	-
Riparian- Looking Back Creek	8	-	177.6	-	-
Riparian	12	1	37.0	0.5	1.4
Marsh, Riparian	7	-	12.1	-	-
Marsh	91	4	1,456.4	1.1	0.1
Caribou Calving and Rearing Habitat	65	48	314.7	14.6	4.6
<b>All</b>	<b>2,878</b>	<b>443</b>	<b>6,684.4</b>	<b>220.1</b>	<b>3.3</b>

Notes: a "-" indicates absence or no area, a 0 indicates a value less than 0.05.

## 4.0 DISCUSSION

When predicting Project effects on ecosystem diversity, the EIS anticipated that a substantial proportion of the area within the licensed Project footprint area would not be used (e.g., it was unlikely that all of the planned borrow areas would be required for Project construction). Even after considering this, the percentage of total sensitive site area impacted to September 2020 was lower than expected. As of September 2020, the Project had disturbed or completely cleared only 3.3% (220.1 ha) of the total pre-Project sensitive site area being monitored by this study, leaving nearly 97% of the total sensitive site area as unimpacted, and 86% of the sensitive site area within the licensed Project footprint unimpacted.

The previous annual report (ECOSTEM 2020) anticipated that there would be very little Project clearing after September 2019 given that Project clearing and disturbance were essentially complete. At 0.3 ha, the increase in impacted area between 2019 and 2020 was the lowest observed since Project construction began in 2014 (the next lowest being 4.1 ha between 2018 and 2019).

The affected percentages of the four general types of sensitive sites were also low. Percentage of impacted area for all monitored sites ranged from 0.1% for off-system marsh sites to 4.2% each for priority habitat and caribou calving and rearing habitat (all of the latter's impacts were within the future reservoir area, which at the time of the 2020 survey, had just been impounded). The percentage of impacted area for sites within the licensed Project footprint ranged from 0.6% (off-system marsh site) to 39.8% (caribou calving and rearing habitat).

The distribution of impacts within the Project areas was as expected. The planned Project footprint encompassed the majority (68%) of the impacted sensitive site area, while 24% of impacted area was within the possibly disturbed Project footprint.

Approximately 7% (14.6 ha) of the impacted sensitive site area was within areas subsequently approved as Project areas by Manitoba Conservation and Climate (Manitoba Sustainable Development at the time). These additional areas were needed to address construction issues that could not be foreseen when the Project was licensed (see ECOSTEM (2021a) for details). These additional effects on ecosystem diversity and other sensitivities were not a concern. Prior to submission to Manitoba Conservation and Climate for approval, the possible additional areas were evaluated by the Project's terrestrial specialists for potential effects on the sensitive sites, and their locations were modified to reduce any ecological concerns. It was determined that cumulative effects on ecosystem diversity and other sensitivities would still be within the limits of acceptability used in the EIS. This was primarily due to two factors - a very small percentage (3%) of the total monitored sensitive site area had been impacted to date, and a high percentage (86%) of sensitive site area within the licensed Project footprint was expected to remain undisturbed at the end of construction.

Two percent (4.7 ha) of the total impacts on sensitive sites, or 0.1% of pre-impact sensitive site area, was outside of the approved Project areas. This very small amount of clearing was not a

concern for the affected sensitive sites for the same reasons described above for the subsequently approved Project areas. This was an increase of about 0.2 ha since September 2019.

With respect to the four general types of sensitive sites, Project impacts were highest on priority habitat types (93% of total impacted area). This was expected because a much higher proportion of the area in priority habitat included granular mineral deposits, which was a preferred location for Project borrow areas and roads. Off-system marsh and mammal riparian habitat sites were in wet and/or peat dominated areas, which are the least desirable areas for construction purposes.

Of the four general sensitivity types, priority habitat is the only one with sub-types. As of the 2020 surveys, 36 of the 46 priority habitat types had been impacted by the Project. Only five of these types had a percentage of area impacted that was substantially higher than the overall average for priority habitat. In order of descending percentage of area impacted, these included black spruce dominant vegetation on mineral, tamarack mixture vegetation on mineral, tall shrub vegetation on thin peatland, black spruce mixture vegetation on mineral, and low vegetation on thin peatland ecosites. For low vegetation on thin peatland, the percentage of area impacted was high because of the low total area for that type of sensitive habitat in the study area (i.e., 0.1 ha of 1.1 ha was impacted). In the case of the three habitat types on mineral ecosites, impacts were higher because they occurred on granular mineral material (see above).

Near the Looking Back Creek mammal riparian habitat sites, ground surveys further investigated potential Project impacts at one location. Erosion from the North Access Road (NAR) shoulder has been depositing sediment into small waterbodies adjacent to the creek since 2016. A mitigation recommendation was not made because the sediment appeared to be confined to the pool next to the road bank, and the affected area had not noticeably expanded since 2017. The sediment barriers installed during the Keeyask Infrastructure Project (KIP) appeared to be intercepting the sediment at all locations except the pool.

## 5.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

As of September 2020, the Project had disturbed or completely cleared only 220.1 ha of the total pre-Project sensitive site area being monitored by this study. This meant that only 3.3% of the total sensitive site area was impacted, and only 14% of the total sensitive site area within the licensed Project footprint was impacted. Impacts on priority habitat types were less than 7% of the maximum amount that was assumed in the EIS.

Total Project clearing and disturbance increased by 0.3 ha (less than 0.01%) between the September 2019 and September 2020 monitoring surveys. This was the lowest increase since construction monitoring began. The majority of this increase was associated with disturbance from nearby borrow areas and EMPAs.

As expected, the majority (68%) of impacts on total sensitive site area was within the planned Project footprint, followed by the possibly disturbed Project footprint (24%). The areas subsequently approved for use by the Project included 7% of the impacted sensitive site area.

To date, 4.7 ha (2%) of the impacted sensitive site area was outside of approved Project areas. This very small amount of sensitive site clearing outside of the originally licensed Project footprint was not a major ecological concern given that impacts to date within the licensed Project footprint have been considerably lower than expected when construction began, and that it is now expected that close to 86% of the area within the licensed Project footprint will remain undisturbed at the end of construction.

There was no clearing or disturbance in the “N-6 priority habitat site to avoid” as of September 2020. Additionally, there was no evidence of activity within the nearby areas that had been cleared in 2016 for geotechnical explorations.

With respect to the four general types of sensitive sites, Project impacts were highest on priority habitat by far (93% of total impacted area). This was expected because there was much more priority habitat to start with and because a much higher proportion of priority habitat is on substrates that are preferred for Project borrow areas and roads.

While Project impacts were highest on priority habitat, these impacts were still quite low. Relative to its total pre-Project area, the Project had impacted 4% of priority habitat as of September 2020.

Of the 46 types of priority habitat types being monitored by this study, 10 remained entirely unimpacted by the Project in September 2020. The priority habitat types with the highest Project impacts included black spruce mixture vegetation on mineral ecosites and jack pine dominant vegetation on mineral ecosites, with 67.9 ha and 35.7 ha of area impacted, respectively. In both cases, less than 30% of the pre-Project area within the approved Project areas was impacted.

Caribou calving and rearing habitat had the second highest degree of Project impacts as of September 2020, followed by off-system marsh sites.

Monitoring to September 2020 did not identify any major unanticipated Project effects on the sensitive sites. Additionally, as assumed in the EIS, much of the area within the licensed Project

footprint remains undisturbed, which means construction impacts on the sensitive sites being monitored by this study have been relatively low to date. Project clearing and disturbance are now essentially complete.

Monitoring to document the amount of priority habitat and other sensitive sites affected by Project development will continue in 2021.

## 6.0 LITERATURE CITED

- ECOSTEM 2016. Terrestrial Effects Monitoring Plan Annual Report 2015 – 2016: Keeyask Generation Project: Terrestrial Plant, Habitat, and Ecosystem Monitoring: Annual Report 2015-2016. A report prepared for Manitoba Hydro by ECOSTEM Ltd., June 2016.
- ECOSTEM. 2017. Keeyask Generation Project Terrestrial Effects Monitoring Plan Report #TEMP-2017-02: Priority Habitats Monitoring Report. A report prepared for Manitoba Hydro by ECOSTEM Ltd., June 2017.
- ECOSTEM Ltd. 2018. Keeyask Generation Project Terrestrial Effects Monitoring Plan Report #TEMP-2018-02: Priority Habitats Monitoring. A report prepared for Manitoba Hydro by ECOSTEM Ltd., June 2018.
- ECOSTEM Ltd. 2019. Keeyask Generation Project Terrestrial Effects Monitoring Plan Report #TEMP-2019-02: Priority Habitats Monitoring. A report prepared for Manitoba Hydro by ECOSTEM Ltd., June 2019.
- ECOSTEM Ltd. 2020. Keeyask Generation Project Terrestrial Effects Monitoring Plan Report #TEMP-2020-02: Priority Habitats Monitoring. A report prepared for Manitoba Hydro by ECOSTEM Ltd., June 2020.
- ECOSTEM Ltd. 2021a. Keeyask Generation Project Terrestrial Effects Monitoring Plan Report #TEMP-2021-01: Habitat Loss and Disturbance Monitoring. A report prepared for Manitoba Hydro by ECOSTEM Ltd., June 2021.
- ECOSTEM Ltd. 2021b. Keeyask Generation Project Terrestrial Effects Monitoring Plan Report #TEMP-2021-03: Wetland Loss and Disturbance Monitoring. A report prepared for Manitoba Hydro by ECOSTEM Ltd., June 2021.
- Keeyask Hydropower Limited Partnership (KHLP). 2012a. Keeyask Generation Project Environmental Impact Statement: Response to EIS Guidelines, Winnipeg, Manitoba. June 2012.
- Keeyask Hydropower Limited Partnership (KHLP). 2012b. Keeyask Generation Project Environmental Impact Statement: Terrestrial Environment Supporting Volume, Winnipeg, Manitoba. June 2012.
- Keeyask Hydropower Limited Partnership (KHLP). 2015. Keeyask Generation Project Terrestrial Effects Monitoring Plan. Winnipeg, Manitoba. December 2015.

## **APPENDIX 1: DETAILED RESULTS**

**Table 6-1: Number and area of terrestrial sensitive sites impacted by the Project as of September 2020, by broad/priority habitat type**

Priority Habitat Type	Sensitivity <sup>1</sup>	Number of Sensitive Sites				Total Area (ha) Impacted			
		Pre-Project	Impacted			Pre-Project	Impacted		
			2019	2020	Change		2019	2020	Change
Balsam poplar dominant on all ecosites	P	2	1	1	-	1.0	0.0	0.0	-
Trembling aspen dominant on all ecosites	P	72	11	11	-	217.8	4.5	4.5	-
	P,C	8	3	3	-	16.6	0.9	0.9	-
	P,M	6	-	-	-	8.3	-	-	-
Trembling aspen mixedwood on all ecosites	P	45	3	3	-	214.7	2.0	2.0	-
	P,M	4	-	-	-	2.8	-	-	-
	P	16	2	2	-	25.3	0.1	0.1	-
White birch dominant on all ecosites	P,C	4	-	-	-	11.1	-	-	-
	P,M	6	-	-	-	3.7	-	-	-
	P	14	2	2	-	11.2	0.0	0.0	-
White birch mixedwood on all ecosites	P,C	1	-	-	-	26.3	-	-	-
	P,M	1	-	-	-	0.8	-	-	-
	P	80	27	27	-	380.8	35.7	35.7	<b>0.0</b>
Jack pine dominant on mineral	P,M	1	-	-	-	0.6	-	-	-
	P	2	-	-	-	4.7	-	-	-
Jack pine dominant on shallow peatland	P	16	1	1	-	74.0	0.6	0.6	-
	P,M	1	-	-	-	0.0	-	-	-
	P	23	4	4	-	119.7	0.7	0.7	-
Jack pine mixedwood on mineral	P,M	3	-	-	-	3.0	-	-	-
	P	4	-	-	-	7.6	-	-	-
Jack pine mixedwood on shallow peatland	P	4	-	-	-	7.6	-	-	-
Jack pine mixedwood on thin	P	18	4	4	-	80.4	1.9	1.9	-

Priority Habitat Type	Sensitivity <sup>1</sup>	Number of Sensitive Sites				Total Area (ha) Impacted			
		Pre-Project	Impacted			Pre-Project	Impacted		
			2019	2020	Change		2019	2020	Change
peatland	P,M	2	-	-	-	3.0	-	-	-
Jack pine mixture on shallow peatland	P	10	2	2	-	43.8	0.3	0.3	-
peatland	P,M	1	-	-	-	0.4	-	-	-
Jack pine mixture on thin peatland	P	77	16	16	-	292.6	13.0	13.0	<b>0.1</b>
	P,M	4	-	-	-	2.3	-	-	-
Black spruce dominant on mineral	P	29	3	3	-	51.8	19.8	19.8	-
	P,M	5	-	-	-	2.1	-	-	-
Black spruce dominant on riparian peatland	P	16	2	2	-	5.5	0.1	0.1	-
	P,R	1	-	-	-	0.0	-	-	-
Black spruce dominant on wet peatland	P	449	30	30	-	505.9	6.9	6.9	-
	P,M	25	-	-	-	7.9	-	-	-
Black spruce mixedwood on mineral	P	36	5	5	-	167.9	1.6	1.6	-
	P,C	1	1	1	-	1.0	0.0	0.0	-
Black spruce mixedwood on shallow peatland	P	7	1	1	-	5.1	0.0	0.0	-
Black spruce mixedwood on thin peatland	P	18	2	2	-	9.3	0.0	0.0	-
	P	127	46	46	-	517.1	67.1	67.1	<b>0.1</b>
Black spruce mixture on mineral	P,C	9	6	6	-	15.9	0.8	0.8	-
	P,M	7	-	-	-	6.7	-	-	-
Black spruce mixture on shallow peatland	P	222	17	17	-	228.3	2.8	2.8	-
	P,C	1	1	1	-	0.2	0.0	0.0	-
	P,M	3	-	-	-	2.8	-	-	-
Black spruce mixture on thin peatland	P	290	82	82	-	328.7	13.2	13.3	<b>0.1</b>
	P,C	8	5	5	-	3.1	0.1	0.1	-
	P,M	4	-	-	-	3.4	-	-	-
Black spruce mixture on wet peatland	P	23	1	1	-	18.7	0.1	0.1	-
Tamarack- black spruce mixture on	P	5	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	-

Priority Habitat Type	Sensitivity <sup>1</sup>	Number of Sensitive Sites				Total Area (ha) Impacted			
		Pre-Project	Impacted			Pre-Project	Impacted		
			2019	2020	Change		2019	2020	Change
riparian peatland									
Tamarack dominant on mineral	P	7	3	3	-	6.1	0.4	0.4	-
Tamarack dominant on riparian peatland	P	1	-	-	-	1.1	-	-	-
Tamarack dominant on shallow peatland	P	11	-	-	-	5.5	-	-	-
	P,M	1	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	-
Tamarack dominant on thin peatland	P	7	1	1	-	8.2	0.4	0.4	-
Tamarack dominant on wet peatland	P	17	1	1	-	27.6	0.0	0.0	-
	P,M	2	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	-
Tamarack mixture on mineral	P	45	16	16	-	88.2	12.6	12.6	-
	P,M	2	-	-	-	0.4	-	-	-
Tamarack mixture on shallow peatland	P	177	14	14	-	163.1	1.2	1.2	-
	P,C	1	1	1	-	0.3	0.0	0.0	-
	P,M	7	-	-	-	1.8	-	-	-
Tamarack mixture on thin peatland	P	143	26	26	-	149.7	2.9	2.9	-
	P,C	1	1	1	-	3.8	0.2	0.2	-
	P,M	2	-	-	-	1.5	-	-	-
Tamarack mixture on wet peatland	P	90	7	7	-	119.5	0.8	0.8	-
	P,M	10	-	-	-	4.0	-	-	-
Tall shrub on mineral	P	18	7	7	-	35.3	0.8	0.8	-
Tall shrub on riparian peatland	P	1	-	-	-	0.0	-	-	-
Tall shrub on shallow peatland	P	61	5	5	-	149.7	0.2	0.2	-
	P,M	3	-	-	-	0.3	-	-	-
Tall shrub on thin peatland	P	52	9	10	1	77.1	10.0	10.1	<b>0.1</b>
	P,M	1	1	1	-	0.1	0.0	0.0	-
Tall shrub on wet peatland	P	53	3	3	-	49.6	0.1	0.1	-
	P,M	6	-	-	-	1.7	-	-	-

Priority Habitat Type	Sensitivity <sup>1</sup>	Number of Sensitive Sites				Total Area (ha) Impacted			
		Pre-Project	Impacted			Pre-Project	Impacted		
			2019	2020	Change		2019	2020	Change
Low vegetation on riparian peatland	P	21	4	4	-	40.9	0.1	0.1	-
	P,R	2	-	-	-	0.5	-	-	-
Low vegetation on shallow peatland	P	118	9	9	-	196.2	0.6	0.6	-
	P,M	4	-	-	-	0.3	-	-	-
	P,R	1	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	-
	P,M,R	3	-	-	-	0.0	-	-	-
Low Vegetation on thin peatland	P	3	1	1	-	1.1	0.1	0.1	-
Low vegetation on wet peatland	P	55	2	2	-	97.0	0.9	0.9	-
	P,M	1	-	-	-	0.5	-	-	-
Emergent island in littoral	P,M	9	-	-	-	6.7	-	-	-
Emergent on lower beach	P,M	11	-	-	-	4.2	-	-	-
Emergent on upper beach	P,M	40	-	-	-	9.5	-	-	-
	P,M,R	1	-	-	-	0.0	-	-	-
Riparian- Looking Back Creek	P,R	4	-	-	-	17.1	-	-	-
	P,M,R	4	-	-	-	160.4	-	-	-
Riparian	R	12	1	1	-	37.0	0.5	0.5	-
Marsh, Riparian	M,R	7	-	-	-	12.1	-	-	-
Marsh	M	91	3	4	1	1,456.4	1.1	1.1	0.0
Caribou Calving and Rearing Habitat	C	65	48	48	-	314.7	14.6	14.6	-
<b>All</b>		<b>2,878</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>443</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6,684.4</b>	<b>219.8</b>	<b>220.1</b>	<b>0.3</b>

Notes: a "-" indicates absence or no area, a 0 indicates a value less than 0.05. <sup>1</sup> P = Priority Habitat, M = Off-system Marsh Habitat, R = Mammal Riparian Habitat, C = Caribou Calving and Rearing Habitat

**Table 6-2: Area of terrestrial sensitive sites disturbed or cleared by the Project as of September 2020 by broad/priority habitat type**

Priority Habitat Type	Sensitivity <sup>1</sup>	Total Area Pre-Project	Area (ha) Cleared or Disturbed					
			Disturbed 2019	Disturbed 2020	Change	Cleared 2019	Cleared 2020	Change
Balsam poplar dominant on all ecosites	P	1.0	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-
Trembling aspen dominant on all ecosites	P	217.8	0.0	0.0	-	4.5	4.5	-
	P,M	8.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P,C	16.6	-	-	-	0.9	0.9	-
Trembling aspen mixedwood on all ecosites	P	214.7	1.4	1.4	-	0.6	0.6	-
	P,M	2.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P	25.3	-	-	-	0.1	0.1	-
White birch dominant on all ecosites	P,M	3.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P,C	11.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P	11.2	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-
White birch mixedwood on all ecosites	P,M	0.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P,C	26.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P	380.8	2.4	2.4	<b>0.0</b>	33.3	33.3	-
Jack pine dominant on mineral	P,M	0.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P	4.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P	74.0	-	-	-	0.6	0.6	-
Jack pine dominant on thin peatland	P,M	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P	119.7	0.6	0.6	-	0.1	0.1	-
	P,M	3.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jack pine mixedwood on mineral	P	7.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P	80.4	0.0	0.0	-	1.9	1.9	-
	P,M	3.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jack pine mixedwood on shallow peatland	P	43.8	-	-	-	0.3	0.3	-
	P,M	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P	43.8	-	-	-	0.3	0.3	-
Jack pine mixture on shallow peatland	P,M	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P	43.8	-	-	-	0.3	0.3	-
	P,M	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-

Priority Habitat Type	Sensi- tivity <sup>1</sup>	Total Area Pre- Project	Area (ha) Cleared or Disturbed					
			Disturbed 2019	Disturbed 2020	Change	Cleared 2019	Cleared 2020	Change
Jack pine mixture on thin peatland	P	292.6	0.6	0.7	<b>0.1</b>	12.3	12.3	-
	P,M	2.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black spruce dominant on mineral	P	51.8	0.0	0.0	-	19.8	19.8	-
	P,M	2.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black spruce dominant on riparian peatland	P	5.5	-	-	-	0.1	0.1	-
	P,R	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black spruce dominant on wet peatland	P	505.9	-	-	-	6.9	6.9	-
	P,M	7.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black spruce mixedwood on mineral	P	167.9	0.2	0.2	-	1.4	1.4	-
	P,C	1.0	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-
Black spruce mixedwood on shallow peatland	P	5.1	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-
Black spruce mixedwood on thin peatland	P	9.3	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-
Black spruce mixture on mineral	P	517.1	1.2	1.2	<b>0.1</b>	65.9	65.9	-
	P,M	6.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P,C	15.9	-	-	-	0.8	0.8	-
Black spruce mixture on shallow peatland	P	228.3	-	-	-	2.8	2.8	-
	P,M	2.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P,C	0.2	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-
Black spruce mixture on thin peatland	P	328.7	0.2	0.2	<b>0.1</b>	13.0	13.0	-
	P,M	3.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P,C	3.1	-	-	-	0.1	0.1	-
Black spruce mixture on wet peatland	P	18.7	-	-	-	0.1	0.1	-
Tamarack- black spruce mixture on riparian peatland	P	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tamarack dominant on mineral	P	6.1	-	-	-	0.4	0.4	-
Tamarack dominant on riparian	P	1.1	-	-	-	-	-	-

Priority Habitat Type	Sensi- tivity <sup>1</sup>	Total Area Pre- Project	Area (ha) Cleared or Disturbed					
			Disturbed 2019	Disturbed 2020	Change	Cleared 2019	Cleared 2020	Change
peatland								
Tamarack dominant on shallow	P	5.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
peatland	P,M	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tamarack dominant on thin peatland	P	8.2	-	-	-	0.4	0.4	-
Tamarack dominant on wet peatland	P	27.6	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-
	P,M	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tamarack mixture on mineral	P	88.2	-	-	-	12.6	12.6	-
	P,M	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tamarack mixture on shallow peatland	P	163.1	0.2	0.2	-	1.0	1.0	-
	P,M	1.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P,C	0.3	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-
Tamarack mixture on thin peatland	P	149.7	0.0	0.0	-	2.9	2.9	-
	P,M	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P,C	3.8	-	-	-	0.2	0.2	-
Tamarack mixture on wet peatland	P	119.5	-	-	-	0.8	0.8	-
	P,M	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tall shrub on mineral	P	35.3	-	-	-	0.8	0.8	-
Tall shrub on riparian peatland	P	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tall shrub on shallow peatland	P	149.7	0.1	0.1	-	0.1	0.1	-
	P,M	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tall shrub on thin peatland	P	77.1	0.2	0.3	<b>0.1</b>	9.7	9.7	-
	P,M	0.1	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-
Tall shrub on wet peatland	P	49.6	0.0	0.0	-	0.1	0.1	-
	P,M	1.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low vegetation on riparian peatland	P	40.9	-	-	-	0.1	0.1	-
	P,R	0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low vegetation on shallow peatland	P	196.2	-	-	-	0.6	0.6	-
	P,M	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-

Priority Habitat Type	Sensi- tivity <sup>1</sup>	Total Area Pre- Project	Area (ha) Cleared or Disturbed					
			Disturbed 2019	Disturbed 2020	Change	Cleared 2019	Cleared 2020	Change
	P,R	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P,M,R	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Vegetation on thin peatland	P	1.1	-	-	-	0.1	0.1	-
Low vegetation on wet peatland	P	97.0	-	-	-	0.9	0.9	-
	P,M	0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
Emergent island in littoral	P,M	6.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Emergent on lower beach	P,M	4.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Emergent on upper beach	P,M	9.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P,M,R	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Riparian- Looking Back Creek	P,R	160.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P,M,R	17.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Riparian	R	37.0	-	-	-	0.5	0.5	-
Marsh, Riparian	M,R	12.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marsh	M	1,456.4	-	0.0	<b>0.0</b>	1.1	1.1	-
Caribou Calving and Rearing Habitat	C	314.7	-	-	-	14.6	14.6	-
<b>All</b>		<b>6,684.4</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>212.6</b>	<b>212.6</b>	<b>-</b>

Notes: a "-" indicates no area, a 0 indicates an area less than 0.05 ha. <sup>1</sup> P = Priority Habitat, M = Off-system Marsh Habitat, R = Mammal Riparian Habitat, C = Caribou Calving and Rearing Habitat

**Table 6-3: Area of terrestrial sensitive sites impacted by the Project as of September, 2020 by Project Area**

Priority Habitat Type	Sensitivity <sup>1</sup>	Total Area Impacted by the Project (ha)	EnvPP Green Zone (ha)			EnvPP Yellow and Red Zones (ha)			Within Subsequently Approved Areas (ha)			Outside of Subsequently Approved Areas (ha)		
			2019	2020	Change	2019	2020	Change	2019	2020	Change	2019	2020	Change
Balsam poplar dominant on all ecosites	P	0.0	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-
Trembling aspen dominant on all ecosites	P	4.5	3.9	3.9	-	0.6	0.6	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-
Trembling aspen mixedwood on all ecosites	P,C	0.9	0.1	0.1	-	0.2	0.2	-	0.1	0.1	-	0.5	0.5	-
White birch dominant on all ecosites	P	2.0	-	-	-	0.6	0.6	-	0.8	0.8	-	0.7	0.7	-
White birch mixedwood on all ecosites	P	0.1	-	-	-	0.1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jack pine dominant on mineral	P	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-
Jack pine dominant on thin peatland	P	35.7	30.7	30.7	<b>0.0</b>	0.3	0.3	-	3.9	3.9	-	0.7	0.7	-
Jack pine mixedwood on mineral	P	0.6	0.6	0.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jack pine mixedwood on thin peatland	P	0.7	0.6	0.6	-	0.1	0.1	-	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-
Jack pine mixture on shallow peatland	P	1.9	1.9	1.9	-	-	-	-	0.1	0.1	-	-	-	-
Jack pine mixture on thin peatland	P	0.3	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	0.2	-
Black spruce dominant on mineral	P	13.0	8.3	8.3	-	0.0	0.0	-	3.5	3.5	-	1.1	1.2	<b>0.1</b>
Black spruce dominant on riparian peatland	P	19.8	0.0	0.0	-	19.0	19.0	-	-	-	-	0.8	0.8	-
	P	0.1	-	-	-	0.1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Priority Habitat Type	Sensitivity <sup>1</sup>	Total Area Impacted by the Project (ha)	EnvPP Green Zone (ha)			EnvPP Yellow and Red Zones (ha)			Within Subsequently Approved Areas (ha)			Outside of Subsequently Approved Areas (ha)		
			2019	2020	Change	2019	2020	Change	2019	2020	Change	2019	2020	Change
Black spruce dominant on wet peatland	P	6.9	6.2	6.2	-	0.7	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black spruce mixedwood on mineral	P	1.6	1.2	1.2	-	0.2	0.2	-	0.2	0.2	-	-	-	-
	P,C	0.0	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black spruce mixedwood on shallow peatland	P	0.0	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-
Black spruce mixedwood on thin peatland	P	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black spruce mixture on mineral	P	67.1	58.7	58.7	<b>0.0</b>	3.7	3.8	0.0	4.6	4.6	-	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
	P,C	0.8	-	-	-	0.7	0.7	-	0.2	0.2	-	-	-	-
Black spruce mixture on shallow peatland	P	2.8	2.4	2.4	-	0.3	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P,C	0.0	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black spruce mixture on thin peatland	P	13.3	11.2	11.2	<b>0.0</b>	1.7	1.8	0.1	0.2	0.2	-	-	-	-
	P,C	0.1	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-
Black spruce mixture on wet peatland	P	0.1	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tamarack dominant on mineral	P	0.4	0.4	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tamarack dominant on thin peatland	P	0.4	0.4	0.4	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tamarack dominant on wet peatland	P	0.0	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tamarack mixture on mineral	P	12.6	10.7	10.7	-	1.9	1.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tamarack mixture on shallow peatland	P	1.2	0.3	0.3	-	0.9	0.9	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-
	P,C	0.0	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tamarack mixture on thin	P	2.9	1.3	1.3	-	1.2	1.2	-	0.4	0.4	-	0.0	0.0	-

Priority Habitat Type	Sensitivity <sup>1</sup>	Total Area Impacted by the Project (ha)	EnvPP Green Zone (ha)			EnvPP Yellow and Red Zones (ha)			Within Subsequently Approved Areas (ha)			Outside of Subsequently Approved Areas (ha)		
			2019	2020	Change	2019	2020	Change	2019	2020	Change	2019	2020	Change
peatland	P,C	0.2	-	-	-	0.2	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tamarack mixture on wet peatland	P	0.8	0.6	0.6	-	0.2	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tall shrub on mineral	P	0.8	0.4	0.4	-	0.4	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tall shrub on shallow peatland	P	0.2	0.0	0.0	-	0.1	0.1	-	0.1	0.1	-	-	-	-
Tall shrub on thin peatland	P	10.1	7.5	7.5	<b>0.0</b>	2.2	2.2	-	0.2	0.2	-	0.0	0.1	<b>0.1</b>
Tall shrub on wet peatland	P,M	0.0	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-
Tall shrub on wet peatland	P	0.1	-	-	-	0.1	0.1	-	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-
Low vegetation on riparian peatland	P	0.1	-	-	-	0.1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low vegetation on shallow peatland	P	0.6	-	-	-	0.6	0.6	-	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-
Low Vegetation on thin peatland	P	0.1	0.1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low vegetation on wet peatland	P	0.9	-	-	-	0.9	0.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Riparian	R	0.5	-	-	-	0.5	0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marsh	M	1.1	0.8	0.8	-	0.3	0.3	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Caribou Calving and Rearing Habitat	C	14.6	0.2	0.2	-	13.5	13.5	-	0.3	0.3	-	0.5	0.5	-
<b>All</b>		<b>220.1</b>	<b>148.9</b>	<b>148.9</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>51.8</b>	<b>51.9</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>0.2</b>

Notes: a "-" indicates no area, a 0 indicates an area less than 0.05 ha. <sup>1</sup> P = Priority Habitat, M = Off-system Marsh Habitat, R = Mammal Riparian Habitat, C = Caribou Calving and Rearing Habitat