

Workshop Date \_\_\_\_\_

Team No. \_\_\_\_\_

## Workshop - Work Book

### St. Vital Transmission Complex

1. **Issues and concerns** regarding the alternative routes. (Please refer to the route segments noted on the maps included with this workbook. If there are no concerns, then circle “No concerns”. Please indicated the importance/level of the issues and concerns by designating them “H”, for High, “M”, for Medium, and “L”, for Low.)

**Some examples of issues and concerns might be as follows:**

Access to the Right-of-way	Health & Safety Issues	Impacts on Wetlands
Aesthetics of the Line	Location of the Line/Station	Impacts on Wildlife/Wildfowl
Impact on Agricultural Activities	Property Issues	Other:
Construction of the Line	Reclamation	
Economic Considerations	Protection of Vegetation	

a. North Routes, Segment N-1 No Concerns  
 (Common to all Alternative Routes.)

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

b. North Routes, Segment N-2 No Concerns

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



Workshop Date \_\_\_\_\_

Team No. \_\_\_\_\_

c. North Routes, Segment N-3 No Concerns

---

---

---

---

---

d. North Routes, Segment N-4 No Concerns

---

---

---

---

---

e. North Routes, Segment N-5 No Concerns  
(Include Alternative Route between N-2 and N-6)

---

---

---

---

---

f. North Routes, Segment N-6 No Concerns

---

---

---

---

---

Workshop Date \_\_\_\_\_

Team No. \_\_\_\_\_

g. North Routes, Segment N-7

No Concerns

---

---

---

---

---

h. North Routes, Segment N-8

No Concerns

---

---

---

---

---

i. North Routes, Segment N-9

No Concerns

---

---

---

---

---

j. North Routes, Segment N-10

No Concerns

---

---

---

---

---

---

Workshop Date \_\_\_\_\_

Team No. \_\_\_\_\_

k. North Routes, Segment N-11  
(Common to all Alternative Routes)

No Concerns

---

---

---

---

---

l. South Routes, Segment S-1

No Concerns

---

---

---

---

---

m. South Routes, Segment S-2

No Concerns

---

---

---

---

---

n. South Routes, Segment S-3  
(Common to all Alternative Routes)

No Concerns

---

---

---

---

---



Workshop Date \_\_\_\_\_

Team No. \_\_\_\_\_

o. South Routes, Segment S-4

No Concerns

---

---

---

---

---

p. South Routes, Segment S-5

No Concerns

---

---

---

---

---

q. South Routes, Segment S-6

No Concerns

---

---

---

---

---

r. South Routes, Segment S-7

No Concerns

---

---

---

---

---

---

Workshop Date \_\_\_\_\_

Team No. \_\_\_\_\_

s. South Routes, Segment S-8

No Concerns

---

---

---

---

---

t. South Routes, Segment S-9  
(Common to all Alternative Routes)

No Concerns

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

2. **Constraints** (physical barriers, impediments, or sensitive sites) along or near the proposed alternative routes. Please note severity as “H”, High (significant constraint), “M”, Medium, or “L”, Low. If there are no constraints, then circle “No Constraints”.

a. North Routes, Segment N-1  
(Common to all Alternative Routes)

No Constraints

---

---

---

---

---

Workshop Date \_\_\_\_\_

Team No. \_\_\_\_\_

b. North Routes, Segment N-2

No Constraints

---

---

---

---

---

c. North Routes, Segment N-3

No Constraints

---

---

---

---

---

d. North Routes, Segment N-4

No Constraints

---

---

---

---

---

e. North Routes, Segment N-5

No Constraints

---

---

---

---

---



Workshop Date \_\_\_\_\_

Team No. \_\_\_\_\_

f. North Routes, Segment N-6 No Constraints

---

---

---

---

---

g. North Routes, Segment N-7 No Constraints

---

---

---

---

---

h. North Routes, Segment N-8 No Constraints

---

---

---

---

---

i. North Routes, Segment N-9 No Constraints

---

---

---

---

---



Workshop Date \_\_\_\_\_

Team No. \_\_\_\_\_

j. North Routes, Segment N-10 No Constraints

---



---



---



---



---

k. North Routes, Segment N-11 No Constraints  
(Common to all Alternative Routes)

---



---



---



---



---

l. South Routes, Segment S-1 No Constraints

---



---



---



---



---

m. South Routes, Segment S-2 No Constraints

---



---



---



---



---

Workshop Date \_\_\_\_\_

Team No. \_\_\_\_\_

n. South Routes, Segment S-3  
(Common to all Alternative Routes)

No Constraints

---

---

---

---

---

---

o. South Routes, Segment S-4

No Constraints

---

---

---

---

---

---

p. South Routes, Segment S-5

No Constraints

---

---

---

---

---

---

q. South Routes, Segment S-6

No Constraints

---

---

---

---

---

---

Workshop Date \_\_\_\_\_

Team No. \_\_\_\_\_

r. South Routes, Segment S-7

No Constraints

---

---

---

---

---

---

s. South Routes, Segment S-8

No Constraints

---

---

---

---

---

---

t. South Routes, Segment S-9  
(Common to all Alternative Routes)

No Constraints

---

---

---

---

---

---

Workshop Date \_\_\_\_\_

Team No. \_\_\_\_\_

3. Opportunities (for co-location, sites needing power) along or near the proposed alternative routes. Note importance as “H”, High (significant opportunity), “M”, Medium, or “L”, Low.

**Some site factors for transmission lines:**

Factors	Rank (1 to 3)
Parallel existing transmission infrastructure	
Follow existing roadways	
Follow existing rail lines	
Follow existing drainage ditches	
Follow mile (Section) lines	
Follow half-mile (Quarter-section) lines	
Avoid agricultural lands (typically grain and oilseed)	
Avoid forest and natural areas	

- a. North Routes, Segment N-1 (Common to all Alternative Routes)

---



---



---



---



---

- b. North Routes, Segment N-2

---



---



---



---



---

- c. North Routes, Segment N-3

---



---



---



---



---

Workshop Date \_\_\_\_\_

Team No. \_\_\_\_\_

d. North Routes, Segment N-4

---

---

---

---

---

---

e. North Routes, Segment N-5

---

---

---

---

---

---

f. North Routes, Segment N-6

---

---

---

---

---

---

g. North Routes, Segment N-7

---

---

---

---

---

---

h. North Routes, Segment N-8

---

---

---

---

---

---

Workshop Date \_\_\_\_\_

Team No. \_\_\_\_\_

i. North Routes, Segment N-9

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

j. North Routes, Segment N-10

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

k. North Routes, Segment N-11 (Common to all Alternative Routes)

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

l. South Routes, Segment S-1

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Workshop Date \_\_\_\_\_

Team No. \_\_\_\_\_

m. South Routes, Segment S-2

---

---

---

---

---

---

n. South Routes, Segment S-3  
(Common to all Alternative Routes)

---

---

---

---

---

---

o. South Routes, Segment S-4

---

---

---

---

---

---

p. South Routes, Segment S-5

---

---

---

---

---

---

Workshop Date \_\_\_\_\_

Team No. \_\_\_\_\_

q. South Routes, Segment S-6

---

---

---

---

---

r. South Routes, Segment S-7

---

---

---

---

---

---

s. South Routes, Segment S-8

---

---

---

---

---

t. South Routes, Segment S-9  
(Common to all Alternative Routes)

---

---

---

---

---

---



Workshop Date \_\_\_\_\_

Team No. \_\_\_\_\_

4. Preferred Route

a. List Route Segments that make up your Preferred Route (Please include a map sheet with the route coloured. For example, a complete route might be as follows: N-1, N-3, N6, N9, N-11, S-1, S-3, S-6, S-7, S-9. The highlighted segments would be common to every Preferred Route. )

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

b. Rationale for this Choice of Preferred Route (point form)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Workshop Date \_\_\_\_\_

Team No. \_\_\_\_\_

5. Recommendations to Manitoba Hydro on minimizing/mitigating any potential effect of the Preferred Route.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Facilitators – should document on this form.



Summary of Team Notes for Route Segments

Date	Team Color	Segment ID	Constraint	Concerns	Benefits	Dotmocracy
20/08/2013	Green	N1	-	First half of line is agricultural land, existing residential development	potential bike path partnership/development	-
20/08/2013	Yellow	N1	-	-	-	-
21/08/2013	Blue	N1	-	-	Brief parallel ok, no concerns	-
21/08/2013	Green	N1	-	-	Minimal impact to MIT right of way and infrastructure	-
22/08/2013	Blue	N1	area likely to be designated as residential- labeled on map	-	No concern	-
22/08/2013	Green	N1	-	Floodway crossing- bird strikes- divertors, new path needed for avoidance	-	+1
22/08/2013	Purple	N1	No constraints	Distance from water courses, flight path of migratory birds, riparian buffer, little intact connecting habitat connecting parcels, right angle crossing of Seine	-	-
20/08/2013	Green	N2	-	High concern- lots of corners, more land impacted, 'Separation to the rural residential	-	-
20/08/2013	Yellow	N2	Tache development - prompt change	-	The segment is not straight, but the area in question has numerous constraints, therefore the staircase tends to decrease the impact on residential and commercial	+3 -3 = 0
21/08/2013	Blue	N2	-	Cuts through dairy farm - proximity to production facility-stray voltage more of a concern than proximity to pasture, not preferred but little other options	Maintained gravel road, low traffic, MIT preferred because of PTH crossings and intersection	-13 +1 = -12
21/08/2013	Blue	N2 Alternative (not selected as preferred route)	-	-	-	-
21/08/2013	Green	N2	-	More angle towers required, too long, larger footprint- high concern, homes in area constrained by flooding, so development an issue	2 PR crossings, better than paralleling road, longer than N3, but N3 doesn't get us as far	-
22/08/2013	Blue	N2	-	Length, route outside of corridor, convoluted and unknown constraints	Preferred over N3	-
22/08/2013	Green	N2	Residences in flooded areas, so homes are constrained by flooding already and not just built anywhere	Lots of jogs	Parks ok with this route	-
22/08/2013	Purple	N2	-	Impediments to agricultural operations- alignment appears to be through fields, not along existing roads, intersection on Seine River, more and better quality habitat (isolated pockets) on East side	-	-
20/08/2013	Green	N3	-	-	Potentially fewer yard sites, shorter than N2	+1, -1 = 0
20/08/2013	Yellow	N3	-	-	-	-
21/08/2013	Blue	N3	-	Tower height at Hwy 59, 210 intersection possible twinning and at intersection (potential up to 52 twinning), two crossings of Hwy 59	Dairy farms further away than N2 located, straight line preferred over N3, Still in proximity to dairy operations, but N3 further away than N2	-1
21/08/2013	Blue	N3 Alternative (not selected as preferred route)	-	-	-	+2 -1 = +1
21/08/2013	Green	N3	Potential flood issue	2 HWY 59 crossings: Diagonal crossing - high concern, 90 ° crossing - medium concern, homes in area constrained by flooding, so development an issue	Preferred over N2 because it is shorter, following an existing developed area	+8 -4 = +4
22/08/2013	Blue	N3	east of N3-area identified on map that was purchased for future lagoon expansion (completed by 2014), landfill and lagoon identified on map. North of lagoon to be developed for residential, need coordination with the RM (more info needed). 160 acres purchased and shown on map.	Future landfill expansion and residential development- RM of Richot- high concern	MMF preferred route. This land (landfill, lagoon etc) likely not used by MMF, potential to share land with landfill and lagoon	-
22/08/2013	Green	N3	-	-	Parks ok with this route, subdivisions are outside of this area	-4 + 1 = -3

Summary of Team Notes for Route Segments

Date	Team Color	Segment ID	Constraint	Concerns	Benefits	Dotmocracy
22/08/2013	Purple	N3	No constraints		Preferred over N2 due to better quality habitat near N2	-3
20/08/2013	Green	N4	-	If the line is too offset from the Manning Canal, it will be affecting farming practices	A benefit if the line is close enough to the ditch because it follows the Manning Canal, potentially less people are affected	-1
20/08/2013	Yellow	N4	-	-	-	-
21/08/2013	Blue	N4	-	-	MB Dairy Farmers Ok, KAP indifferent, least preferred by Conservation	-
21/08/2013	Green	N4	-	-	Minimal impacts to the farmer. Farmer already impacted by the canal	+4
22/08/2013	Blue	N4	depends on lagoon constraint	-	preferred over N6	-
22/08/2013	Green	N4	-	Minor concern of waterway	Parks ok with this route	-
22/08/2013	Purple	N4	Few constraints	Channel provides waterfowl habitat - waterfowl require a certain area for landing, potential habitat along drain		-
20/08/2013	Green	N5	-	-	-	-
20/08/2013	Yellow	N5	-	-	-	-
21/08/2013	Blue	N5	-	-	No major concerns	-
21/08/2013	Green	N5	-	Potential impact for one RM depending on routing, homes in area constrained by flooding, so development an issue		+1
22/08/2013	Blue	N5	No constraints	-	shorter piece of N5 is preferred	-
22/08/2013	Green	N5	-	-	Parks ok with this route	-
22/08/2013	Purple	N5	No constraints			-
20/08/2013	Green	N6	-	-	More direct than N4	-
20/08/2013	Yellow	N6	-	-	-	-
21/08/2013	Blue	N6	canal future expansion, PTH 59 might go around new growth just west of N6. Entire area pocketed with small subdivisions and rural neighborhoods	-	MB Dairy Farmers Ok, KAP either or	-1
21/08/2013	Green	N6	-	Potential for relocation conflicts with Hwy 59 twinning - high concern		-
22/08/2013	Blue	N6	depends on lagoon constraint	bisects residential development to E & W- potentially low concern	-	-
22/08/2013	Green	N6	-	Potential for subdivision, why go through least preferred circle- depends what the circle is		-
22/08/2013	Purple	N6	Few constraints		Follows roads, less agricultural impact	-
22/08/2013	Green	N6 Alternative (N6-1)	-	possible subdivisions	Minimize crossing at PTH 59 (only crosses once) - avoids junction at PR 210	+4 -3 = +1
20/08/2013	Green	N7	Agriculture operations circled on map - livestock constraint - high concern	-	-	-
20/08/2013	Yellow	N7	-	-	-	+1 -1 = 0
21/08/2013	Blue	N7	at Hwy 52, sensitive wetland and Tourond Discovery Centre- backed by KAP. Massive chicken operation.	Paralleling Hwy 52 as opposed to crossing once, large poultry	-	-1
21/08/2013	Green	N7	Cemetery identified on map, Bipole final routing uncertain	Potential future upgrade of Hwy 59 - high concern		+2 -3 = -1
21/08/2013	Green	N7 Alternative (N7-1)	-	-	Go around landfill identified on map	-4 +3 = -1
22/08/2013	Blue	N7	-	-	More direct when connected with N10	-3
22/08/2013	Green	N7	-	-	preferable	-
22/08/2013	Purple	N7	-	Wetland near PTH 52 junction - proximity - need to avoid		-
20/08/2013	Green	N8	Agriculture operations circled on map - livestock constraint - high concern	-	-	-
20/08/2013	Yellow	N8	-	-	-	-1
21/08/2013	Blue	N8	Aerial applicators	2 jogs, not well travelled, aerial spraying and ROW	Dairy farmers of MB and MIT preferred route, SRCD indifferent	-

Summary of Team Notes for Route Segments

Date	Team Color	Segment ID	Constraint	Concerns	Benefits	Dotmocracy
21/08/2013	Green	N8	Cemetery identified on map	1/2 mile line less preferred for farmers, 52 crossing- high concern	Crossing with 52 is preferred compared to N7	-
22/08/2013	Blue	N8	-	Less direct than N7 (depending on what segment it is connecting to), not on RM boundary line	-	-
22/08/2013	Green	N8	-	substantial development - industry and commercial, east/west direction of lines- may result in bird strikes	-	-
22/08/2013	Purple	N8	-	-	Not as intrusive as N7	-
20/08/2013	Green	N9	Agriculture operations circled on map - livestock constraint - high concern	-	May impact fewer livestock operations than N7 or N8	-1
20/08/2013	Yellow	N9	-	-	-	-
21/08/2013	Blue	N9	-	Paralleling Hwy 52 as opposed to crossing once, dairy farms, hog operation proximity	SCRD indifferent, KAP preferred, MIT not preferred (re: discussion with MH/MIT)	+6 -6 = 0
21/08/2013	Green	N9	-	52 crossing and Bipole III final routing - high concern, future plans for Hwy 52 and 59	Potential Hwy 59 parallel - same ROW or adjacent to-benefit, depends on MIT plans	-
22/08/2013	Blue	N9	-	Segment outside of study area (corridor), consider showing to 5% of corridor to see if this is a big impact	-	-
22/08/2013	Green	N9	Possible staging and feed	Possible waterfowl staging and feeding area south of connection, native habitat	-	+1
22/08/2013	Purple	N9	-	-	N9 ok until 1 mile south of 52, then jog east (alternative N9-1) to connect to N-10 to avoid creek to the west	-
22/08/2013	Green	N9 Alternative (N9-2)	-	-	Moving north from staging and feeding area (located south of connection in terms of N9), clearing space further from line and location of N9 Alternative would mitigate concern with birds	+2
22/08/2013	Green	N9 Alternative (not selected as preferred route)	-	-	would mitigate concern with birds	-
22/08/2013	Purple	N9 Alternative (N9-1)	-	-	N9 ok until 1 mile south of 52, then jog east (N9-1) to connect to N-10 to avoid creek to the west	+2
20/08/2013	Green	N10	Potential municipal lagoon location (located on map)- low concern	-	-	-
20/08/2013	Yellow	N10	-	-	-	+1
21/08/2013	Blue	N10	-	Dairy operations between N9 and N10	MB Dairy preferred route/issues with N10	-
21/08/2013	Green	N10	Municipal lagoon (Kleefeld) indicated on map. Don't want to span over lagoon. West side of line preferred because of lagoon and Tourond drain	-	straddling a municipal boundary, west side of line will minimize impact on residents on Hanover side	+1
22/08/2013	Blue	N10	-	-	Follow RM boundaries - it can reduce conflicts between RMs - equal impact to both RMs	+1
22/08/2013	Green	N10	-	east of Hwy 75 (close to Red River crossing) a high number of geese, tree stand and wintering area - avoid taking down trees (leave trees), airstrip, don't want to cross through river lots, need to speak to landowner	-	-
22/08/2013	Purple	N10	-	-	N9 ok until 1 mile south of 52, then jog east (N-91) to connect to N-10, then south to N-11	-
20/08/2013	Green	N11	-	Barn identified on map (5 structures) - high concern, livestock, potentially dairy farms, designated rural residential identified east of N11	-	-
20/08/2013	Yellow	N11	-	-	-	-
21/08/2013	Blue	N11	Road used for water retention and has been raised in the past- it is the first line of defense for the village from flooding, but not impacted by trans line	Hog operations close to northern section of N11- labeled on map, southern section of N11 in conflict with dairy operations, riding stables almost under N11	-	-

Summary of Team Notes for Route Segments

Date	Team Color	Segment ID	Constraint	Concerns	Benefits	Dotmocracy
21/08/2013	Blue	N11 Alternative (N11-5)	-	-	Proposed for safety, distance to livestock and avoid horse stable, close to hog operations on northern portion of N11	+7
21/08/2013	Green	N11	Dairy farms indicated on map - high, Landfill and Trans-Canada Trail and organic century farms identified on map	Unnamed creek and Joubert Crossing, some clearing - low concern	straddling a municipal boundary	-
21/08/2013	Green	N11 Alternative (N11-6)	-	A lot of natural land - potential environmental concern	Avoids dairy and incorporates Crow Wing trail	+6
22/08/2013	Blue	N11	-	-	Follow RM boundaries	+1
22/08/2013	Green	N11	-	Crossing of River and marsh	-	-
22/08/2013	Green	N11 alternative (not selected as preferred route)	-	Closer to St. Pierre, so might get more push back	Route pending review	-
22/08/2013	Purple	N11	-	Concern with river crossing/paralleling riparian zone and conserving riparian zone, impact. Suggest follow existing roadway to minimize impact	Along ROW, less impact to residences	-
20/08/2013	Green	S1	-	Livestock operations identified on map - high concern	Fewer livestock operations in S1 than S2	-
20/08/2013	Yellow	S1	-	Physical crossings. No concern with parallel.	-	-
21/08/2013	Blue	S1	-	Possible conservation easements along the Rat River	Conservation OK	-1
21/08/2013	Green	S1	-	Airstrip proximity identified on map (less preferred to N11), paralleling Hwy 59	Well maintained road	-
22/08/2013	Blue	S1	-	Depends on future connection with Grunthal, MMF concerned with impacts on waterbody- examine how line would be constructed - would access be removed, MMF would want input on operational practices ie. cutting vs spraying and access	-	-
22/08/2013	Green	S1	-	Proximity to pond not preferred	-	-
22/08/2013	Purple	S1	-	woodland/forest, stream crossing, wetlands, equal impacts between S1 and S2 (no immediate obvious choice between the two)	-	-1
20/08/2013	Green	S2	-	Livestock operations identified on map - high concern	-	-
20/08/2013	Yellow	S2	-	-	No concern	-
21/08/2013	Blue	S2	-	Multiple stream crossings, less preferred by MB Dairy	MIT preferred/conservation ok	-
21/08/2013	Green	S2	Coulee located here (but runs dry)- not a high concern	-	One 59 crossing and gravel road- preferred over S1, aerial applicator not as impacted as N11	+2
22/08/2013	Blue	S2	-	3 water body crossings and access concerns, max intrusion at crossing at junction of 2 watersheds, flooding and erosion - major concern, route selection depends on connection at Grunthal	Less concerns than S1 due to simplicity reasons, less impact on river (not paralleling river)	-
22/08/2013	Green	S2	-	-	Location of ponds preferred as they are further away, multiple stream crossings, but lower class habitat - can mitigate with bird divertors, one angle structure preferred, S2 preferred over S1	-
22/08/2013	Purple	S2	-	woodland/forest, stream crossing, wetlands, equal impacts between S1 and S2 (no immediate obvious choice between the two)	-	-
20/08/2013	Green	S3	Larochelle was inundated in 1997 flood	Prime agricultural land - high concern	-	-
20/08/2013	Green	S3 Alternative (S3-4)	-	-	Minimize impacts on agriculture and maximize use of ROW/transportation corridors	-3 +3 = 0
20/08/2013	Green	S3 Alternative (S3-5)	-	-	Avoid landing strip and prime agricultural land	+10-3 = +7
20/08/2013	Yellow	S3	-	to be reviewed with MIT upon decision, "Drain" connects to Rat River	-	-
21/08/2013	Blue	S3	-	SRCD landowner	MIT preferred/KAP OK/Conservation ok/Dairy OK	-
21/08/2013	Blue	S3 Alternative (S3-6)	-	-	MB Dairy/MIT preferred route	-9 +1 = -8

Summary of Team Notes for Route Segments

Date	Team Color	Segment ID	Constraint	Concerns	Benefits	Dotmocracy
21/08/2013	Green	S3	-	Prefer to be on east side of road to avoid landowner- high concern	Follows gravel road before it jobs south - benefit from Municipal perspective	+3
22/08/2013	Blue	S3	-	water crossings - high concern, environmental impact and access	-	-
22/08/2013	Green	S3	-	-	-	-
22/08/2013	Purple	S3	No constraints	-	-	-
20/08/2013	Green	S4	-	Larger parcels and larger equipment - maneuverability a concern, prime agricultural land	-	-
20/08/2013	Yellow	S4	Unmaintained, stay on the west side because there is a creekbed: huge provincial drain that always backs up	-	Descent, clear path	-
21/08/2013	Blue	S4	-	SRCD landowner	MIT preferred/KAP OK	+2
21/08/2013	Green	S4	St. Malo lagoon identified east of S4 on map	-	De Salaberry Wind Co-op east of S4 - identified on map, less impact on highways	+2
22/08/2013	Blue	S4	-	-	straighter/more simpler than S6	-1
22/08/2013	Green	S4	-	-	Clear strip- no obstruction, straighter route so preferred	-
22/08/2013	Purple	S4	No constraints	-	Preferred over S6	-
20/08/2013	Green	S5	-	Barns identified on map - high concern	-	-
20/08/2013	Yellow	S5	unmaintained-stay within road allowances	-	-	-
21/08/2013	Blue	S5	-	-	No major concerns from dairy perspective	-
21/08/2013	Green	S5	-	-	Municipal Boundary	-
22/08/2013	Blue	S5	-	-	On a municipal boundary	-1
22/08/2013	Green	S5	-	Close to Dufrost	-	-
22/08/2013	Purple	S5	No constraints	-	-	-
20/08/2013	Green	S6	-	Barns identified on map - potential livestock operations - high concern	-	-
20/08/2013	Yellow	S6	Trans Canada Pipeline ROW (200 ft of ROW) in field alignment would be needed. Preliminary work being done for additional oil pipe.	-	Gravel road maintained	-
21/08/2013	Blue	S6	-	2 miles parallel not preferred	-	-
21/08/2013	Green	S6	-	Parallel Hwy 23, railway near by	Less impact compared to S4	-
22/08/2013	Blue	S6	-	Less direct than S4	-	-
22/08/2013	Green	S6	-	-	-	-
22/08/2013	Purple	S6	Has a few more constraints from the model	Few more least preference- use S4	-	-
20/08/2013	Green	S7	-	Close location to aerial applicator - high concern	Further than S8 from aerial applicator, but still within buffer	-
20/08/2013	Green	S7 Alternative (S7-1)	-	-	Avoid landing strip	1
20/08/2013	Yellow	S7	Unmaintained except where defined on map. Runway (mile minimum). Lower towers needed	-	Maintained Roadway shown on map (C1)	-
21/08/2013	Blue	S7	Study being undertaken by KGS for raising Hwy 75 - potential construction clash	-	Preferred because of the flooding that occurs near Reserve, no dairy concerns, parallels only a PR, so MIT OK	-
21/08/2013	Green	S7	Potential Hwy 75 raises - high concern, rail crossing identified on map	Parallel concern for PR 217 and PTH 75 - limited ROW available	-	-
22/08/2013	Blue	S7	-	outside of corridor for Red River crossing and impacting river	Further from exclusion zones (First Nation), uses more existing infrastructure than S8, more direct (likely preferred to S8 but have to look at current land use), avoids Reserve land	-7 + 1 = -6
22/08/2013	Green	S7	-	landing airstrip, river crossing (east side of the river) because of development, don't want to cross through river lots	Preferred over S8 because it avoids landing strip, preferable to stay north of landing strip	-2

Summary of Team Notes for Route Segments

Date	Team Color	Segment ID	Constraint	Concerns	Benefits	Dotmocracy
22/08/2013	Green	S7 Alternative (S7-2 and incorporates part of S8)	-	-	Preferred - Safety, north of landing strip, avoids river lots, residential, advantage of mile line, prefer north of road	+10 -5 = +5
22/08/2013	Purple	S7	-	Streams	Further away from Roseau than S8, less concerns than S8, fewer stream crossings	-4 +2 = -2
20/08/2013	Green	S8	-	Barn indicated on map- high concern, aerial applicator location - high concern, due to number of corners may have a larger footprint on agricultural land	-	-
20/08/2013	Yellow	S8	Overlap concerns on line on 200 (east), dirt road and in winter is unmaintained and labeled on map as C6, stay within road allowances as S8 is unmaintained, yards indicated on map (C4)	Aerial applicators, split fields - issues with landowners and easements	Maintained Roadway, a small section highlighted on map is maintained by the RM. Maintained identified as C2 on map. (1/2 full glass-use shortest towers)	-
20/08/2013	Yellow	S8 Alternative (S8-5)	-	-	follows marginal land	+4
21/08/2013	Blue	S8	-	Lot of angles and turns	No dairy concerns	+1
21/08/2013	Blue	S8 Alternative (S8-6)	-	Crossing the Roseau River- high flows and velocities, require a larger span than crossing the marsh	Less paralleling than S7	-2 +1 = -1
21/08/2013	Green	S8	rail crossing identified on map	-	Less parallel on highways than S7	-2 +1 = -1
22/08/2013	Blue	S8	-	impacting river crossing, less direct than S7, closer to First Nation - maybe Métis use as well	-	+1
22/08/2013	Green	S8	-	east of Hwy 75 (close to Red River crossing) a high number of geese, tree stand and wintering area - avoid taking down trees (leave trees), airstrip, don't want to cross through river lots, need to speak to landowner	Preferable river crossing because less development	-1
22/08/2013	Purple	S8	-	Closer to Roseau and potential glide path interference (S8 less preferable)	-	-
20/08/2013	Green	S9	-	If the line is not paralleling an existing line, it is dissecting agricultural land	If parallels an existing line - benefit	-1
20/08/2013	Yellow	S9	Cross at Hwy 75 would have to be underground. Truck haul route. "Super expressway" work on 8, 16, 10, 1, 75 in progress. (also underground required)	Span and cross 75. Property and easements likely to go expropriate. Old PTH 14-dwelling concerns	-	-
21/08/2013	Blue	S9	Study being undertaken by KGS (from St. Jean to Morris) for raising Hwy 75 - potential construction clash, raise bridge in St. Jean Baptiste	Seedex, windfarm and Letellier grain separation on west side of Letellier	-	-
21/08/2013	Green	S9	-	-	No concern	-2 +2 = 0
22/08/2013	Blue	S9	-	-	Visual impacts already exist and route is along an existing corridor	-
22/08/2013	Green	S9	-	-	No issue as long as windmills taken into consideration	-
22/08/2013	Purple	S9	-	-	Parallel to Hwy 75	-



Workshop Team Rational for Route Selection

Group	Date	Rationale for Route Selection	Dot Mocracy Segment Votes for Rationale (each blue = +1 each red = -1)
Yellow	20/08/2013	Uses more 'marginal' lands	+2
Yellow	20/08/2013	Less agricultural and aerial application interference	+2
Yellow	20/08/2013	Uses PR/PTH ROW where possible	+2
Yellow	20/08/2013	Less homes/businesses affected - S4 & S3 preferred and S1 & S2 pending dwellings & Rat River Crossing	+2
Green	20/08/2013	Minimize impacts on agriculture (land and operations) and residences	+2
Green	20/08/2013	Maximize use of government right of ways and transportation corridors	+2
Green	20/08/2013	Straight routes preferred	-
Green	20/08/2013	Fair compensation for land (overarching criteria)	+1
Blue	21/08/2013	Minimize major PTH crossings	-
Blue	21/08/2013	No parallel of PTH/PR	+2
Blue	21/08/2013	Avoidance of dairy (preferably by at least 1 mile)	+2
Blue	21/08/2013	Follow existing ROWs (MH,water)	-
Blue	21/08/2013	No 1/2 mile allowance (edge of field)	+2
Green	21/08/2013	Utilize existing municipal right of way and minimize impact on major provincial roads	+1
Green	21/08/2013	Minimize impact on agricultural and natural areas	+2
Green	21/08/2013	Opportunities for beneficial co-location with trails and proximity to De Salaberry wind Co-op and Trans Canada Trail	+4
Green	21/08/2013	Future PTH 59 and 52 twinning and Bipole III final routing	+4
Blue	22/08/2013	Follow existing corridors & political boundaries	-
Blue	22/08/2013	Simplicity of route	-1
Blue	22/08/2013	More information needed on specific areas	+3
Green	22/08/2013	Avoidance of residential and commercial/industry	+2
Green	22/08/2013	Avoidance of ecological and protected areas	+2
Green	22/08/2013	Aerial application and irrigation to be considered	+1
Green	22/08/2013	Avoidance of urban and high density areas	+1
Green	22/08/2013	Minimize east/west alignment	-
Green	22/08/2013	S7-1 - safety, aerial application, residential	-
Green	22/08/2013	N6-1 - min crossing at PTH 59 (avoids junction at PR 210)	-
Green	22/08/2013	N9-1 - moving north from staging and feeding area	-
Purple	22/08/2013	Minimize impacts to existing, intact wildlife - habitat and natural areas	+2
Purple	22/08/2013	Minimize impacts to farming operations	+3
Purple	22/08/2013	Minimize overall impacts by using existing infrastructure corridor ie. minimizing footprint of project	+3
Purple	22/08/2013	Recognizing the exercise of treaty and aboriginal rights by minimizing the project footprint	+1

Workshop Proposed Mitigation Measures

Group	Date	Mitigation Measures	Dot Mocracy Segment Votes for Mitigation (each blue = +1 each red = -1)
Yellow	20/08/2013	-	-
Yellow	20/08/2013	-	-
Yellow	20/08/2013	-	-
Yellow	20/08/2013	-	-
Yellow	20/08/2013	-	-
Yellow	20/08/2013	-	-
Yellow	20/08/2013	-	-
Green	20/08/2013	To mitigate biosecurity issues (diseases- crop and animal)and spread of noxious weeds - follow Noxious Weeds Act	-
Green	20/08/2013	Contact Landowners and Producers	-
Green	20/08/2013	Avoid designated and zoned residential areas/residentially developed lands	+1
Blue	21/08/2013	No team consensus for N2-N6. Alternatives presented to mitigate	-
Blue	21/08/2013	Dairy farms mitigated by using N-11 alternative	-
Blue	21/08/2013	S8 alternative- avoids PTH 75, 1 mile south of PR201 and stream vs marsh crossing	-
Green	21/08/2013	Open communication with Trails Association (timing, detours etc.) & MIT (planning for Hwy 59)	-
Green	21/08/2013	Functional study of PTH 59 & PTH 52 to be completed	+3
Blue	22/08/2013	Areas where additional information is required to make decisions on routing are identified: information needed for informed decisions	+2
Green	22/08/2013	Avoid east/west alignment	+1
Green	22/08/2013	Bird diverters used in specific areas	-
Purple	22/08/2013	Reclamation Recommendations - replace with native plants, particularly grass species - what has been removed has to be compensated ie. no net loss	+3
Purple	22/08/2013	Recommendation: Minimize footprint on agricultural land	+2