

July 30, 2014

Honourable Minister Gord Mackintosh
Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship
Room 330
Manitoba Legislature
Winnipeg, Manitoba
MB R3C 0V8

Dear Minister Mackintosh:

Re: **Environmental Licence # 3107 for Keeyask Generation Station – Letter of Appeal**

Minister's cover letter, Manitoba Wildlands comments:

1) Pesticides

Manitoba Wildlands assumes that the Minister's reference to **“the objective of eliminating or reducing pesticide use and moving to lower risk pesticides”** includes public notification and review of the June 2015 Manitoba Hydro report. This means this report, and comments, will be posted in the public registry. It should be noted that when a licensing requirement of this sort applies to “new and existing operations” then the public registry staff will need to determine how to cross reference the posting of the report and the following requirements, changes in practice, and reporting by our utility, for each facility or operation. This is not just a Keeyask Generation Station licensing requirement.

2) Regional Cumulative Effects Assessment (RCEA)

The Minister's direction to the Director omits the obvious requirement for public posting (which is starting now) and public review of the RCEA materials from Manitoba Hydro. In particular the Minister's letter suggests the Director can **“require Manitoba Hydro to conduct additional monitoring or corrective action.”** Except the next reference in the letter is to the project area. The RCEA is not only about the Keeyask Generation project area. Though this project area is within the RCEA terms of reference since 1970 installations on the Nelson River. Unfortunately the self-interest of our utility continues in the approach Hydro being taken for the RCEA.

Only independent analysis and assessment, external and public review of RCEA materials, and a clear understanding that the RCEA is not only about “what would be environmentally beneficial in the project area” will provide the credibility required for this RCEA. The RCEA is one of the few tools with a potential to assist decision making for the Hydro system, beyond what the directors and staff of the utility think should guide decisions. A credible RCEA is essential for Reconciliation.

Perhaps the Minister's advisors have forgotten that the Northern Flood Agreement is a Treaty under law in Canada, specific to the rights of and impacts on affected communities (social, environmental, and economic) from the Hydro system, over time. This means the RCEA must be meaningful, and credible, or perhaps risk being a breach in the NFA. Manitoba, Canada, Manitoba Hydro are signatory.

3) Trapping and knowledge transfer

The Minister's letter fails to specify **Hydro who the "affected communities" referenced may be**. It should not be left to Manitoba Hydro to identify which communities are affected, as those affected go beyond the Keeyask Cree Nation Partners. Department staff would have been able to advise the Minister based on the CEC hearings official record. In fact this topic was consistent in the hearings. Manitoba Wildlands assumes affected communities refers to **any community, or community member who may be affected by the Keeyask project**.

We note the Minister included Manitoba's Aboriginal Communities, as is appropriate given as many as 30 Manitoba First Nations are affected by Manitoba Hydro operations.

4) Reconciliation

It is important that Minister Mackintosh has encouraged Manitoba Hydro to "continue along this path of reconciliation with all of Manitoba's Aboriginal and northern communities." This paragraph in his letter confirms the importance of the RCEA results. Still, entering into a business arrangement with four First Nations is not reconciliation. None of those Cree Nations indicated this is reconciliation in the hearings, and the transcript is very clear, during many days of hearings from participants, experts, and presenters, that Manitoba Hydro is not yet on a path of reconciliation. The closing days of the hearings (in transcript) include questions from the CEC, and recommendations as to the steps Manitoba Hydro needs to take for Reconciliation with the communities to begin.

Compliance

We note that Don Labossiere, Director of environmental compliance and enforcement, is copied on the Minister's letter. Manitoba Wildlands assumes that Mr. Labossiere has a role in fulfilling the requirements of this licence and the contents and direction in the Minister's letter. Unfortunately the language used, and structure of the licence leaves it unclear which Director under the Act, and which Director in the department, is responsible for what under this Environment Act licence. In fact the responsibilities of the Director of environmental compliance and enforcement with respect to Environment Act licences in Manitoba are simply not clear. The public record does not show review, actions, orders, new requirements on licences, or identification of gaps in proponent activity under the Act. Surely we can all stop assuming that every proponent under every environmental licence in Manitoba has a perfect record. Significant steps are needed so that the public registry is complete in regard to all phases of a licence after it is issued. Far too much environmental licence reporting is either not happening or is secret. Perhaps it is environmental compliance and enforcement that is missing from the process and public registry.

The Licence Document

We note that the introduction to this licence indicates that '**decommissioning**' of the generation station is included in the terms of the licence. Does this mean Manitoba Conservation is now directing Manitoba Hydro to have decommissioning plans for all generation stations in our hydro system? Manitoba Hydro clearly stated during the CEC hearings that no decommissioning plan was required for Keeyask. Clarity is required in this matter, especially as a decommissioning plan is a federal government requirement for Keeyask Generation Station.

The introduction to the licence appears to say the licence leaves out any commitments made in the administrative tribunal that is the CEC hearing, by Manitoba Hydro personnel and their experts, under

oath. We wonder if executive council can actually ignore commitments made under oath regarding a licence under a Manitoba law. We have wondered for some time why a proponent in a CEC hearing is not **required to stipulate** to all such commitments, especially as they **often apply to corrections, improvements or reconsideration of the contents of the EIS and materials filed under the Act.**

Definitions – page 2 - Deficient

The set of definitions provided in the Licence are incomplete, and do not reflect the contents of the licence itself. One simple example is the definition of **‘wetlands’** used in the licence. This definition was corrected during the regulatory hearings, with Manitoba Hydro acknowledging that most wetlands in northern Manitoba do not fit the definition. Why is it here?

The **‘Director’** definition does not indicate director of what, and there are at least three directors in MCWS with authority under this licence. Does the Director of Licensing direct the activity and responses of the other Directors under the Act with respect to this Licence?

Study Area definition: “**‘study area’** means the geographical limits within which effects on an element of the environment or key topic is assessed in the Environmental Impact Statement for the Development.” Manitoba Conservation staff and the Minister’s advisors will be aware that this self assessment definition used by the proponent did not provide the answers required during the CEC hearings. Further, Manitoba Hydro and the proponents changed its application of this definition for each element of the environment as if the ecosystems do not exist, and as if there is no relationship between the environmental elements in the whole study area for this development. Best practice in environmental assessment with respect to this approach was identified during the hearings. This definition is not sufficient to uphold the responsibility and requirements under the Environment Act.

We suggest that the Minister’s staff review the Manitoba Wildlands “Keeyask Study Areas Report” and rethink this definition for the Licence. See: <http://manitobawildlands.org/pdfs/1.4.1-KeeyaskStudyAreasReport-FNL.pdf>

Several other Manitoba Wildlands technical reports written at the end of the CECKeeyask hearings are also posted on our website in the Products section of site Resources. See attached.

The summer resident caribou definition fails to define the several sub species and major herds of caribou in the project region. Why ?

There are no **aquatic** definitions provided in the Licence, why not?

There is no definition of **rehabilitation** in the Licence despite repeated use of the term. Given the difference between rehabilitation and restoration, including potential risk to a northern ecosystem if rehabilitation is mismanaged, we recommend that this definition be added.

The definition of **particulate matter** may also be a copy from some dated and past licence. The regulatory and scientific regimes in Canada include specific definitions of particulate matter, including primary and secondary particulate matter.

<http://www.ec.gc.ca/Air/default.asp?lang=En&n=2C68B45C-0>

Why are we ignoring essential definitions under the Environment Act licence for such a complex project where primary, secondary, and residue particulate matter will occur?

There is no definition of **adverse effects**. Why?

Compliance

This clause essentially tells the proponent that the utility can use whatever is in its filings and proposal, EIS etc to fulfill the Licence. The public reviews, Information Requests, expert evidence during hearings, cross examination, acknowledgement of corrections, improvements and changes from the Proposal made by the Licencee during the hearings, and participant evidence, including during cross examination, appear to be irrelevant. See our note about requiring the Proponent to substantiate and list all commitments made during regulatory hearings.

It is not clear whether Manitoba can make the Proposal the basis for a Licence under the Environment Act when several other regulatory processes have occurred. Can MCWS select among the regulatory processes and results from those processes, ignoring some? Can the department ignore its own public reviews of the Proposal? Can MCWS ignore the Scoping Document for this project? Does the Proponent/ Licencee have to fulfill what is in that Scoping Document? The same questions apply to the EIS Guidelines for the Keeyask Generation Station project. Does our Act indicate that only the CEC recommendations are relevant, ignoring the record of the administrative tribunal?

Additional Permits

These two clauses do not make sense. All permits are not able to be obtained before construction begins – because a several year construction period can include alterations to a project due to one necessity or another. Further there is **nothing here to specify kinds of permits**, or list regulatory authority for all permits. Nor is there any indication that permits are public. Regional offices of the department are not responding to request for information. Turning everything into a freedom of information request (FIPPA in Manitoba) simply creates a barrier.

Environmental Inspection

There is nothing here about **where environmental inspection reports go, or are kept**. No information about providing these inspection reports under the Licence is stated. Is it legal under our Environment Act for proponent, or developers to inspect their own projects, because this clause reads that way? **It reads as if Manitoba will not inspect this project during construction or operation**. Does Manitoba have a responsibility to inspect the project during construction and during operation? Can the Licencee refuse inspection by Manitoba, based on the language in this licence?

Public Distribution List

The list for public distribution provided in the posted Licence includes Manitoba Wildlands. There was no distribution to our office of this licence. We assume the same is true for other organizations and communities listed.

Additional Reporting

This clause needs to assure Manitobans that all such reports, etc will be posted, and will be public. It is not unnecessary repetition, to include in these clauses the location of the reports, clarity on what will be made public. These comments also pertain to the **requirement of Manitoba Hydro to maintain a website for the life of the project. Posting on that website could be 5 d) in this clause.**

Reporting Format

This clause is copy and paste from past ancient licences, we presume. Clearly in our times all reporting, maps, diagrams etc. **should be provided under the Act in both digital and paper formats.** Clearly that standard is in place in other jurisdictions. More specifically department and branch staff should not need to handle and scan materials, unnecessarily. In particular this clause avoids the obvious, which is that regional staff, policy analysts, and other government experts may well need these same materials, which means they must be filed digitally. Considering the life of this project is essential in all licensing standards.

Notification

The information regarding stated dates and contractors, that must be provided to the Officer responsible for this project **must also be made public**, and placed in the registry.

Access Routes

These clauses omit the commitments made during the CEC hearings by the proponent as to the timing of construction, decommissioning, rehabilitation and **all public notifications regarding access routes.** The licence lacks clarity in this matter.

It may be a typo but we suggest clarification about whether the requirement for access route plans applies to **each route**, as the licence language is not clear.

Air Quality

This clause appears again to be a copy and paste clause from another licence. We would ask what **residences in the Keeyask project region** may be affected by smoke from burning? Why is there no reference to smoke affecting traffic, safety on the roads, safety operating equipment, etc? Does the reference to 'residences' refer to the 2000 person camp for workers? Why does this clause not simply say "The Licencee shall minimize the burning of slash generated during clearing of the Development."?

Dust control measures are rarely conducted using water only. Manitoba government and municipal practices for the last 20 years or more use additives with the water.

Where are the other Manitoba regulatory requirements regarding air quality?

Blasting

Are there no Manitoba regulatory measures regarding blasting? Or are these being ignored for the project? Manitoba Conservation staff will be quite aware that blasting for the Keeyask Generation Station **is not only at aquatic sites.**

A simple online search immediately identifies the Use of Explosives Guidelines for Manitoba, and various other regulatory requirements.

Environment Protection Plans

Manitoba Wildlands recommends that the MCWS branch staff be provided with the resources to review the Keeyask Environmental Protection, Management and Monitoring Plans and reports under these. Currently the capacity does not exist in the branch. As this and other new and upcoming

Manitoba Hydro projects all include similar sets of plans and reports regarding protection, management and monitoring of the environment, our recommendation applies to these other projects – and the need for capacity over the life of these projects to be able to assess not just the plans but the activity and reporting required under these plans for these Hydro projects.

Manitoba Hydro project Environment Act licences that do not include these three sets of plans should be reviewed, opened and updated so that the level of planning and reporting is on the same standard for all Hydro projects. This is consistent with the intent of the RCEA ordered by the Minister.

The requirements in 18 are strong. But 18 k) does not fulfill the evidence in the hearing, and reality about the Keeyask project. A three year study for these summer resident caribou is not sufficient, and of course has to be combined with traditional knowledge. Independent research regarding woodland caribou in this region, as reflected in the evidence from experts during the CEC hearings, will provide better information than Manitoba Hydro appears to have regarding this summer population.

We would correct 18 m) as **Stephens Lake is also a reservoir**. Our office can provide the maps to department or regional staff to show when Stephens Lake did not exist, prior to Hydro installations on the Nelson River. These are part of the CEC exhibits. 18 q) is simply wrong. Providing this information to RMA boards which are populated by government and hydro staff is inadequate. The regulatory hearings record reflects questions on this matter. All of this information needs to be provided to the First Nations affected also. This includes First Nations beyond the Keeyask Cree Partners. Providing information to a First Nation who may be a proponent and then the Licencee is not the same. We recommend this provision be improved. Currently this clause could literally keep the information from the affected First Nation individuals and communities.

The minimum required reports listed does not include a report on species, aquatic and terrestrial. There is no guarantee in the detail in clause 18 that species would be included in the reports required. Further **the 18 a to t sections do not include a requirement regarding endangered, threatened, or listed species**. Why?

Environmental Management Plans

Clause 17 f) which lists minimum management plans required corresponds to the Environmental Protection Plan list plus additions, and has the same risk or weakness. Specifications to include species, terrestrial and aquatic beyond those named in the Licence are absent and should be added.

These plans, and reports under these plans, should all be posted and available to the public.

Environmental Monitoring Plans

See our comments above starting with Environmental Protection Plans.

It is an important step forward in environmental licensing in Manitoba, particularly in relation to Hydro installations and projects in our province, to see the detail and specifics required in these plans. The lack of clarity about what will be needed over the life of the project, including in reviewing the plans and results decade over decade can be solved through the plans and reporting processes. The lack of certain plans – and certainty about what will be in those plans – is a weakness.

Manitoba Hydro wished to ignore the Scoping Document as guidance for the project EIS, and changed its position about the EIS Guidelines during the proceedings and regulatory hearings. So the terrestrial , management and monitoring plans may or may not include the species which, in the future, will need attention, caution and protection. These sections of the Licence need to include the kind of language elsewhere in the Licence so that **future situations, future regulation, and the species throughout the project region** can be identified, with mitigation measures in place as needed. This licence is for 100 years. Does MCWS realize the species mix and species status would change over 100 years?

Who is responsible for environmental monitoring the Keeyask project site until the Plans are filed, approved and operational? June 2015 is when the monitoring plan is to be filed. Do any of these plans actually take effect as of the Licence being issued?

Imagine a silly conversation 25 years from now: Manitoba Hydro is saying ‘no we don’t need to do anything about all those species that are in trouble now.’ This is essentially what has happened with existing dams and hydro installations in Manitoba.

Annual Reporting

This clause does not provide clear information about the time period for each report. Being required to report annually does not provide the time period for that report. This clause should also specify that such reports will be posted and kept public, both by the public registry and on the Keeyask project website, which will be in place for the life of the project.

Lake Sturgeon Advisory Committee

The composition of this advisory committee is insufficient, and does not reflect the record in the regulatory hearings. Having three public sector staff persons form a committee lacks transparency, and risks inability to fulfill the Licence requirements for lake sturgeon. The hearings record is clear about the expertise needed, the experts available, and the best practice make up of such an advisory committee. Why is best practice being ignored?

Meeting once a year is a rubber stamp. Will the advisory committee review the previous year’s management results or the year previous to that ? There is nothing here to say **who this advisory committee reports to, what their accountability is.**

Dangerous Goods

There is no scientific basis for a minimum of 100 meters from a water body for location of dangerous goods storage. The licence should be clear about **not storing dangerous goods on permafrost.**

Spill Response

Clause 25 needs clear language about identification of **what has been spilled.** It may be time to update the language about dangerous goods and spills in Manitoba Environment Act licences. Clause 28 is contradictory. Does the Licencee have to report any ‘contamination of the environment’ when it happens or not ? When will areas of contamination be remediated? Ten years later?

Heritage Resources

Clause 29 requires clarity. There is **no definition in the Licence for heritage resources.** This topic was discussed thoroughly in the regulatory hearing record. Given we have a Heritage Act in Manitoba,

it is unclear whether the Act applies to the actions under the Licence or whether the Heritage Resources Branch may from time to time be asked a question or direct activities.

Onsite Wastewater Disposal

Clause 30 contradicts the introduction to the Licence about the basis for the licence. Does this clause mean the Licencee does not need to abide by the contents of its Proposal regarding onsite wastewater disposal? Why do we have a contradiction in this clause, relative to other clauses in the licence?

The regulatory hearings, and the record of those hearings contain specific and detailed content and questions, plus commitments from the Licencee, about waste water disposal in relation to water quality etc. So does this clause mean that waste water can be disposed of in Keeyask Lake?

Pesticide Application

Clause 31 shows the same problem as Clause 30, see questions above.

Waste Disposal

Clause 33 has the same problem, see above re Clause 30 and 31.

The regulatory hearings include specific information, questions, and commitments about waste disposal. Will the fees Manitoba Hydro has to pay the waste disposal ground come anywhere close to covering the extra costs to that operation, for that municipality?

This clause should include **incentives to recycle and reuse all possible solid materials**. Commitments in the transcript have been ignored.

Water Crossings

Clause 34 has a specific problem. The Manitoba Guidelines are 20 years old and inconsistent with current public policy regarding Manitoba waterways. These also only pertain to fish. Where are the regulatory Licence requirements regarding other aquatic species? Where are the references to possible future Guidelines?

Riparian Areas

Clause 35 clearly reflects the CEC hearings, including participant expert evidence, cross examination content etc. It would be helpful to see direction about seed mix, as there is a high risk of invasive species in the Nelson River sub basin from 'rehabilitation' of sites. Inspection of riparian areas by MCWS will be needed. 35 d) is not clear. "where possible, maintain 30 metres from the high water mark of creeks, streams and rivers;" Maintain what 30 metres from the high water mark?

35 f) is also not clear: "avoid use of organic soil, silt, or clay in temporary winter stream crossings;" as it leaves out instruction to remove any residue from blasting, digging, making cement etc.

Sedimentation and Erosion

Clause 36 appears to provide permission to the Licencee to **add sediment from construction to Keeyask Lake**. This contradicts other clauses in the Licence with respect to Environmental Protection, Management and Monitoring Plans and reporting. Unless those plans do not apply to Keeyask Lake. If they do not apply the Licence should state this clearly. The record of the regulatory hearings provides clarity on these matters especially with respect to **aquatic and terrestrial species in Keeyask**

Lake, and on its islands. Commitments were made by the Licencee during the hearings to maintain habitat for these various species, including in Keeyask Lake, which is the impoundment area.

Instream Works

Clause 37 should include Environment Protection, Management and Monitoring Plans.

Wetlands

Clause 39 is problematic as there is **no definition provide for ‘native upland habitat’**.

Clause 40 is good to see. Manitoba Wildlands recommends that MCWS require Manitoba Hydro – in relation to the RCEA content about lost wetlands – to begin a program of three to one replacement of wetlands lost due to other Hydro developments in Manitoba.

Migratory Birds

Clause 44 is federal only. There are birds under both Manitoba law (MESA) and SARA, and listed otherwise by Manitoba authorities, which may become at risk, listed, endangered etc in this project area during the life of the project. This clause ignores this fact.

Endangered or Threatened Species

Clause 45 **ignores the full regulatory framework in Manitoba for species**. There is recent legislation not referenced in this clause. Why? Again the 100 year life of this project appears to be ignored.

Why are the Manitoba Acts regarding species and their habitat not named here? We recommend that the branch review and update this clause based on both Manitoba Acts. See

<http://web2.gov.mb.ca/laws/statutes/ccsm/e111e.php>

It is false to refer to the species only without their habitat, as the language in the Licence currently reads. There are other references in this Licence to future regulation, upcoming policy and regulation and yet here they are omitted. Why ?

Revegetation

Clause 47: “The Licencee shall revegetate soil in areas of the Development exposed by construction with a mixture of native or introduced grasses or legumes.” Our utility should have long ago been funding research into the ability to regenerate indigenous northern species on their sites. Considering **the medicinal plant loss** alone due to this project MCWS should consider updating their expectations and assumptions for requirements of the Licencee.

Concrete Batch Operations

Clause 51 refers to **‘future versions thereof’**. On what basis does MCWS omit this requirement in other areas of this licence?

Clause 53 has a problem as there is no definition of **“the property line of the Development”** in the Licence or any material our office has seen about the Keeyask generation station project. Who will do these measurements? How are they reported to MCWS? Does our government have the ability to go in and inspect and make these measurements? Is this language Mines Act language?

Clause 54 and 55 are important steps. This **“standard operating procedural manual and a**

maintenance schedule for each air emission pollution control device” should be public also.

Clause 64 is similar and the **“sampling and analysis plan approved pursuant to Clause 60”** should be public. Clause 66 again makes reference to “Manitoba Water Quality Standards, Objectives, and Guidelines (dated November 28, 2011 or **future versions thereof.**)” Each instance in the Licence where reference is made to future versions strengthens this licence. They also bring attention to the clauses and requirements in the licence where **future versions of regulatory standards are omitted.**

Environmental Audit

Clause 67 is a welcome addition to the licence for a Hydro project in Manitoba. Manitoba Wildlands recommends that licences **for existing Hydro installations in Manitoba be opened so this requirement is added.** This would include Limestone, which is grandfathered under the Environment Act, Wuskwatim generation station, and all recent and upcoming transmission projects.

An audit, by definition, is conducted by an independent third party. We recommend that MCWS staff check the definitions and consider being specific about any audit conducted under this Licence in fact being conducted by independent experts.

Website

Clause 68 falls short of the commitments made by the Licencee in the regulatory hearings. All the reports identified in this Licence should be in the public registry. They and all monitoring reports, subsequent bulletins, newsletters, minutes etc **should be on the Keeyask Generation Station website.**

It is also clear that the **Bipole III, and Wuskwatim Generation Station licences can be opened and updated to require this kind of public information online** and that we need to see this requirement in any future licences, especially the Manitoba-Minnesota Transmission Project. Bipole III includes the converter stations for various future hydro projects. It is also 1400 km of corridor through our province. On these bases alone the licence should be updated to require a similar website.

RCEA

Clause 69 is supported by Manitoba Wildlands. See our comments at the beginning of this set of comments regarding the RCEA, directed by Minister Mackintosh as part of the requirements for the Bipole III licence.

Omission

We question why the **Workers Camp is not included** in the Licence. It is in the EIS. The camp in the 2009 Infrastructure Licence is not the same. Up to 2000 persons will be in this camp for up to several years. The regulatory process, at every step, includes information about the camp. The CEC hearings spent a considerable amount of time on the workers camp or complex, including on matters that pertain to an environmental licence. **Perhaps we will see problems in the future with the construction, maintenance, operation of the workers complex due to its absence from the licence. Certainly it will have effects.**

General Comments.

The reader will see Manitoba Wildlands is concerned about omissions, or variances inside this licence

document. We in particular wish to see the Licence reflect the 100 year life of this project in all clauses and requirements.

The Licence identifies regulatory authority within MCWS, and also MIT, thought not all MCWS regulatory authorities are included. It does not identify the regulatory authority and requirements necessary for this Project under other Manitoba laws. Why not?

The Licence does not elicit faith in compliance under Manitoba Laws. We are well past the point when all the regulatory authorities should be identified in an Environmental Act licence. Then the licence should be clear about the responsibilities of those authorities, including under the Environment Act, and other Acts. Manitoba Wildlands looks forward to the day when all licences under the Environment Act will be clear, understandable, and based on accountability with respect to regulatory authority and responsibility.

The Environmental Protection, Management and Monitoring sections of the Licence are strong. See our comments above about having the capacity and know how in place in MCWS branch to be able to receive, review, advise, and direct action based on the reports from these plans.

Access to information is not clear enough in the licence document. The Keeyask website section falls short of the commitments made by the Licencee in regulatory hearings. Given the life of this project the Licence should be clearer about what will be posted, what will be public.

Generally there are other sections of the Licence that ignore or omit commitments made by our utility in the regulatory hearings. See our comments and questions above.

While being quite specific about certain species **the Licence fails to be specific that species** may be effected over the 100 year life of the project. We anticipate that results from the Protection, Management and Monitoring requirements will show this to be true. It is an obvious lack though especially given how **many sections of the Licence clearly refer to future** versions, conditions, and regulatory requirements. Why are no Species and Habitat plans required beyond those species relevant in our decade? Why are the Manitoba and Canada Acts regarding species and their habitat omitted? Does MCWS seriously think that the VECs that were studied for the EIS are the only species of importance for the next 100 years?

We were concerned throughout the Environment Act and CEC proceedings, information requests, and hearings about the **cavalier attitude concerning climate change effects in the Keeyask region adopted by the Licencee and its advisors**. The repeat questions asked by Manitoba Wildlands during the CEC hearings, regarding climate change effects already happening in the Keeyask region, are part of the official record. It is disconcerting that the **Licence document leaves climate change out**, despite our regulatory and public policy framework in Manitoba and the standards in the EIS Guidelines for Keeyask. (Air pollution clauses for the cement plant are not the same thing.)

We can state with certainty that Climate Change effects during the life of this project are most likely to be the trigger that opens this licence for review and changes in the future. Climate change effects should be one of the requirements in the Environmental Protection, Management and Monitoring Plans section of this licence.

We recommend to the reader, including our online audience of 12,000 website and 5,000 – 10,000 social media visitors per month, to take a look at Manitoba Wildlands' website content about the Keeyask project. We posted a set of technical reports from the independent experts Manitoba Wildlands brought into the hearings on the Keeyask page. We posted a late set of Manitoba Wildlands technical reports, finished after the CEC hearings, based on the '**cumulative issues**' during the hearings on our website in the Resources Section, under Products. See http://manitobawildlands.org/work_products.htm

We have attached here the Manitoba Wildlands closing statements for the Keeyask hearings, containing our recommendations to the CEC.

Manitobans, and especially those who have or will have responsibilities regarding this new generation station are at the beginning of the Keeyask work and the Keeyask story. We all need to make sure it is an improved story compared to former generation station projects in Manitoba.

Yours truly

Gaile Whelan Enns
Director, Manitoba Wildlands

Attached:
Manitoba Wildlands closing statements – Keeyask Generation CEC hearings

Copy to:
T Braun, MCWS Director



MANITOBA
WILDLANDS

565 - 167 Lombard Ave Winnipeg MB Canada R3B 0V3
info@ManitobaWildlands.org Ph 204-944-9593
www. ManitobaWildlands.org Fax 204-947-3076
