

APPENDIX 7B
Preliminary Preferred Route
Adjustments

Table 7B-1: Route Adjustments

Section	#	Description	Input Source	Adjustment Consideration	Response	Outcome
1	1	Churchill WMA	Protected Areas Initiative	Suggested that the PPR should follow the Water Reserve boundary.	Terrain/ conditions are not favourable for the adjustment and an ecological rationale is not clear.	No change
1 & 2	2	PR 280	Tataskweyak Cree Nation	Suggested the PPR should follow PR 280 as much as possible.	PPR adjusted in several locations to generally follow PR 280 in this area.	PPR Adjusted
2	3	Assean Lake	Tataskweyak Cree Nation	Suggested maximizing separation from Assean Lake and Assean Reserve Lands.	PPR adjusted northerly to maximize separation as noted.	PPR Adjusted
4	4	Thompson Nickel Belt	Mining Industry, Town of Wabowden, Caribou Research, Recreation Interests, Study team	Multiple competing rationale for adjustments including concern for caribou habitat, concern for potential restriction to mining exploration techniques, impact to recreational areas, and proximity to Bipole I & II.	Five alternatives to the PPR were identified, evaluated and preferred route chosen.	PPR Adjusted (major route adjustment)
4	5	Forestry Seed Orchard	Manitoba Conservation, Forestry Branch	PPR runs near an existing seed orchard considered a high value site.	PPR relocated approximately 125 metres away from the site.	PPR Adjusted (major incidental route)

Section	#	Description	Input Source	Adjustment Consideration	Response	Outcome
						adjustment)
5	6	Finger Lake Camping Area	IRMT	Suggested that the PPR should avoid a campground parking area north of The Pas.	Separation distance deemed acceptable.	No change based on this value
6	7	Proposed Red Deer Wildlife Management Area	Protected Areas Initiative	Suggestion to avoid a local Salt Spring.	Current routing option is the most viable. Tower placement adjustment will avoid identified areas of concern.	No change to PPR
7	8	Red Deer Lake Quarry Area	Project Team	Concern that the PPR would negatively impact future quarrying activity.	Quarry leaseholder notification letter sent out providing opportunity for feedback. No other viable options available in area. Impact to operations unlikely.	No change
7	9	Birch River Area - Private Land	Landowners	A PPR corner tower was located on the highest point of the landowner's field where grain bins are currently located.	Corner tower location can be adjusted to the north side of the road allowance to avoid the concern. Change will be accommodated by adjacent	PPR adjusted

Section #	Description	Input Source	Adjustment Consideration	Response	Outcome
				landowners.	
7	10 RM of Mountain - East of Birch River (LIC Form 13)	Landowner	Would like to see the PPR adjusted to fall north of the road allowance.	Request can be accommodated.	PPR adjusted
7	11 RM of Mountain - East of Birch River (LIC Form 14)	Landowner	Landowner willing to accommodate an angle tower (see adjustment 10) if PPR adjusted northerly to these lands.	Adjustment accommodates the PPR and does not affect grain bins on adjacent property.	PPR adjusted
7	12 RM of Mountain - East of Birch River (LIC Form 15)	Landowner	Would like to see the PPR adjusted to fall north of the road allowance.	Request can be accommodated.	PPR adjusted
7	13 Lenswood Community Pasture	Rural Municipality of Mountain	Numerous suggestions to re-route the PPR to take advantage of the Lenswood Community Pasture marginal land. Adjustment will avoid substantial private land holdings.	Adjustment was considered. Correspondence with AESB suggests crossing of Community Pasture not preferred and may cause federal approval triggers which jeopardize project timing.	No change
7	14 RM of Mountain - Lenswood Area (LIC Form	Landowner	Would like to see the PPR adjusted one mile east or to the municipal boundary.	Crossing of Community Pasture strongly discouraged by AESB and may	No change

Section	#	Description	Input Source	Adjustment Consideration	Response	Outcome
		21)			cause federal approval triggers which jeopardize project timing.	
7	15	RM of Mountain - Lenswood Area (LIC Form 24 & 25)	Landowner	Would like to see the line moved to the municipal boundary.	Crossing of Community Pasture strongly discouraged by AESB and may cause federal approval triggers which jeopardize project timing.	No change
7	16	RM of Mountain - Lenswood Area (LIC Form 65)	Landowner	Would like to see the PPR go through the Lenswood Community Pasture	Crossing of Community Pasture strongly discouraged by AESB and may cause federal approval triggers which jeopardize project timing.	No change
8	17	RM of Mountain - East of Cowan (LIC Form 1)	Landowner	Would like tower placement adjusted to avoid view from residence.	Due to location of parcel, 2 to 3 towers could be expected, which may limit ability to eliminate view shed concerns. Design team will consider adjustment.	No change to PPR. Tower adjustment will be considered.
8	18	Winnipegosis - Quarry Area	Municipal Councillor and Project Team	Concern that the PPR would negatively impact future quarrying	Quarry Holder Notification Letter sent out.	No change

Section	#	Description	Input Source	Adjustment Consideration	Response	Outcome
				activity.		
8	19	RM of Alonsa - At north boundary of Westlake WMA	General Stakeholder Feedback	Consider precise tower placements to half mile alignments to minimize potential impacts.	There are existing fences on the half mile line. Adjust PPR to fall north of the half mile line.	PPR Adjusted
8 & 9	20	Portia Area - Wetlands concern	Ducks Unlimited Canada	Suggested to move the PPR further westerly due to concentration of wetlands and DU projects.	Adjustment is not preferred from multiple other variables including high value agriculture lands at alternative site and substantial change at late stage of route selection process. Other mitigation measures available.	No change
9	21	RM of Alonsa	Landowner	Requested that the PPR be relocated out of "front yard".	Adjusted PPR to be further from yard and within forest cover to minimize visibility.	PPR adjusted
9	22	RM of Alonsa - South of Alonsa (LIC Form 83)	Landowner	Would like the PPR to be adjusted easterly, further from the residence.	No viable adjustment options exist. Distance from residences maximized in area. Current location of the PPR is 640	No change

Section	#	Description	Input Source	Adjustment Consideration	Response	Outcome
					meters from the residence.	
9	23	RM of Alonsa	Landowner	Indicated concern regarding the proximity of the PPR to Robertson Lake (concern for waterfowl).	Adjusted PPR slightly west to avoid open water and wetlands. Mitigation may include bird diverters. No additional landowners affected.	PPR adjusted
9	24	RM of Lakeview – West of PTH 50 and SW of Langruth (LIC Form 111)	Landowner	Suggestion to adjust PPR through the Langruth Community Pasture.	Adjustment was considered. Correspondence with AESB suggests crossing of Community Pasture not preferred and may cause federal approval triggers which jeopardize project timing.	No change
9	25	Navigation Canada Radar Site	Landowner and Project Team	PPR is located relatively near to the RAMP project radar site. Concern regarding potential for negative effects on radar functionality.	No objections received as a result of follow up with Navigation Canada.	No change
9	26	RM of Westbourne - Northeast of Woodside (LIC Form	Landowner	Would like tower placement adjusted to avoid the trail/access road.	Current tower location is south of the trail noted. Design team will	No change to PPR. Tower adjustment will be

Section #	Description	Input Source	Adjustment Consideration	Response	Outcome
	110)			consider adjustment.	considered.
9	27 RM of Portage la Prairie - West of MacDonald (Towers 62 - 63)	General Stakeholder Feedback	Consider precise tower placements to half mile alignments to minimize potential impacts.	PPR should remain on half mile line to maximize separation distance to residences and reduce management unit splits.	No change
9	28 RM of Portage la Prairie - North of PTH 1 (LIC Form 279)	Landowner	Would like to see the PPR placed directly on the half mile line to split compensation with two landowners and limit impact.	Request can be accommodated.	PPR adjusted
9	29 RM of Portage la Prairie - North of Junction of PTH 1 and the PPR (LIC Form 254)	Landowner	Would like towers located close to the roadway and directly north of the railway tracks.	Possible issue regarding overlap with PTH 1 right-of-way. Design team will consider adjustment.	No change to PPR. Tower adjustment will be considered.
9	30 RM of North Norfolk - West of Edwin (Towers 56 - 59)	General Stakeholder Feedback	Consider precise tower placements to half mile alignments to minimize potential impacts.	There are existing fences on the half mile line. Adjust PPR to fall east of the half mile line.	PPR Adjusted
9	31 RM of Portage la Prairie - North of PTH 1 (LIC Form	Landowner	Would like to see the PPR placed directly on the half mile line to split compensation with	Request can be accommodated.	PPR adjusted

Section	#	Description	Input Source	Adjustment Consideration	Response	Outcome
		280)		two landowners and limit impact.		
9	32	RM of North Norfolk - Rossendale area (LIC Form 175)	Landowner	Concern that the PPR would interfere with the management parcel and future irrigation. Suggested moving the PPR 1 mile east of property.	Adjustment could negatively impact other existing residential properties and First Nation lands. Other mitigation measures available.	No change
9	33	RM of South Norfolk - North of Assiniboine River Crossing (LIC Form 167)	Landowner	Would like the PPR adjusted to avoid impact to existing irrigation pivot and splitting the management unit.	PPR can be adjusted slightly northerly to reduce impacts noted. A further adjustment to eliminate impact is not preferred due to impact to Wildlife Management Area and the constraints of the Assiniboine River crossing.	PPR adjusted
9	34	RM of North Norfolk - Rossendale area (Towers 50 - 51)	General Stakeholder Feedback	Consider precise tower placements to half mile alignments to minimize potential impacts.	There are fences located on the half mile line. Adjust PPR to fall east of the half mile line. Land uses (grazing and forage) are compatible.	PPR adjusted

Section	#	Description	Input Source	Adjustment Consideration	Response	Outcome
9	35	RM of North Norfolk - Rossendale area (LIC Form 276)	Landowner	Would like to see the line moved east a half mile to avoid splitting the management parcel.	Adjustment could negatively impact other existing residential properties and First Nation lands. Other mitigation measures available.	No change
10	36	St. Claude West (LIC Form 28 & 50)	Landowner	Landowner has a 'natural park' on the property and would like to see the PPR moved off their property. There are fences located on half mile line.	Adjustment was done to move the PPR to the east of the 1/2 mile line, which will also avoid winter cattle shelterbelt.	PPR adjusted
10	37	RM of Grey - South of St. Claude (Towers 54 - 55)	General Stakeholder Feedback; Study Team	Consider precise tower placements to half mile alignments to minimize potential impacts; On half mile line affects numerous fence lines and shelterbelts; also in very close proximity to residence.	PPR offset from half mile line to minimize effect to fence lines, shelterbelts and create separation from residence.	PPR adjusted
10	38	RM of Grey - South of Haywood (LIC Form 169)	Landowner	Would like the PPR to be adjusted to the mile road north of this quarter section.	Adjustment likely to create additional concerns for other existing residences.	No change

Section	#	Description	Input Source	Adjustment Consideration	Response	Outcome
11	39	RM of MacDonald - East of Brunkild (Towers 30 - 31)	General Stakeholder Feedback	Consider precise tower placements to half mile alignments to minimize potential impacts.	Discussions with neighbours suggest placement on half mile line to be the most accommodating.	PPR adjusted
11	40	RM of MacDonald - West of Brunkild (LIC Form 292)	Landowner	Would like tower placement adjusted to eliminate view from residence.	Design team will consider adjustment.	No change to PPR. Tower adjustment will be considered
11	41	RM of MacDonald - West of Brunkild (LIC Form 292)	Landowner	Would like to see the line adjusted further away from the residence and off their property.	A re-routing option was considered, however it would have generated identical or greater concern from other landowners.	No change
11	42	RM of MacDonald - East of Brunkild (LIC Form 252)	Landowner	Would like to see the line fall directly on the half mile line as opposed to north of the half mile line.	The PPR was originally aligned on the ½ mile line.	PPR adjusted
11	43	RM of MacDonald - East of Brunkild (LIC Form 168)	Landowner	Would like the PPR adjusted to be located on the owners property.	Discussions with neighbours suggest placement on half mile line to be the most accommodating.	PPR adjusted
11	44	RM of MacDonald - East of Brunkild	Landowner	Would like the PPR adjusted southerly to the half mile line.	Adjustment can be accommodated.	PPR adjusted

Section	#	Description	Input Source	Adjustment Consideration	Response	Outcome
		(LIC Form 296)				
11	45	RM of MacDonald - West of Ste. Agathe (LIC Form 286)	Landowner	Would like tower placed closer to the half mile line and east of the drainage ditch to minimize impact to property.	Design team will consider adjustment.	No change to PPR Tower adjustment will be considered
11	46	RM of MacDonald - West of Red River Crossing (Towers 24 - 29)	General Stakeholder Feedback	Consider precise tower placements to half mile alignments to minimize potential impacts.	PPR should remain on half mile line to maximize separation distance to residences and reduce management unit splits.	No change
12	47	RM of Ritchot - East of Ste. Agathe (LIC Form 278)	Landowner	Would like to see the line moved to the western portion of the section then follow the northern portion.	Accommodating the re-routing request would require significant additional cost for angle tower structures.	No change
12	48	RM of Ritchot - East of Red River Crossing (Towers 20 - 21)	General Stakeholder Feedback	Consider precise tower placements to half mile alignments to minimize potential impacts.	PPR should remain on half mile line to maximize separation distance to residences.	No change
12	49	RM of Hanover - East of PTH 59	Landowner/ Project Team	Landowner would like the PPR relocated away from the property.	PPR can be slightly adjusted to increase separation to residence, but remains on	PPR adjusted

Section	#	Description	Input Source	Adjustment Consideration	Response	Outcome
					property.	
12	50	RM of Hanover - Junction of PR 305 and PR 622 (LIC Form 184)	Landowner	Would like the PPR to be adjusted to the mile road north of this quarter section.	Adjustment would create additional concerns for other existing residences.	No change
13	51	RM of Hanover - North of Randolph (LIC Form 121)	Landowner	Would like the PPR adjusted to the half mile line as opposed to the quarter mile line.	Adjustment would create additional concerns for other existing residences.	No change
13	52	RM of Hanover - North of Randolph (LIC Form 117)	Landowner	Would like the PPR adjusted to the half mile line as opposed to the quarter mile line.	Adjustment would create additional concerns for other existing residences.	No change
13	53	RM of Tache - East of Landmark (LIC Form 131)	Landowner	Would like the PPR adjusted to the half mile line as opposed to the quarter mile line.	Adjustment would create additional concerns for other existing residences.	No change
13	54	RM of Ste. Anne - Crossing at PTH 1 (LIC Form 272)	Landowner	Would like any adjustment that moves the PPR further west to avoid residence.	A routing change in this location would require an alternate PTH 1 crossing option, none of which were seen as satisfactory to the PPR alignment.	No change
13	55	RM of Springfield - North of PTH	General Stakeholder Feedback	Consider precise tower placements to half mile	PPR should remain on half mile line to	No change

Section #	Description	Input Source	Adjustment Consideration	Response	Outcome	
	1 (Towers 7 - 8)			alignments to minimize potential impacts.	maximize separation distance to residences.	
9 - 13	56* All PPR route sections that parallel road allowances or are off-sets from the half mile line (south of PTH 16)	General Stakeholder Feedback	Numerous farmers suggested that the distance between the proposed tower locations and the edge of many farm properties may be insufficient to allow certain wide farm equipment (e.g. sprayers) to pass between the towers and the property line, thus reducing their ability to farm that land effectively.	Where the PPR runs parallel to a road allowance towers will be placed to be offset 130 feet) between the property line and the tower footing. This will be implemented south of PTH 16 only where farming practices use such large equipment.	PPR adjusted	
1 - 9	57* All PPR segments that parallel existing transmission rights-of-way in forested areas.	General Stakeholder Feedback and Study team	To address a general concern regarding wildlife habitat, consideration should be given to establishing a habitat buffer/refuge area between the PPR and any existing transmission ROW in a forested area.	Consideration was given to maintaining a buffer between the ROWs, Technical review indicates that this change would subject the buffer to unacceptable blow-down potential and that the buffer width would need to be substantial to	No change (paralleling lines will share one double wide ROW)	

Section #	Description	Input Source	Adjustment Consideration	Response	Outcome
				create a habitat benefit.	