

MANITOBA-MINNESOTA TRANSMISSION PROJECT ERRATA LIST

May 2, 2017

ID#	EIS Chapter Name	EIS Chapter Number	Section or Page #	What EIS Currently Says (ERROR)	What EIS Should Say (CORRECTION)
1	Transmission Line Routing	5	Table 5-28	Table 5-28 states SGZ's System Reliability score is 1 and notes "Routes AY and SIL parallel M602F therefore slightly higher scores due to higher risk to reliability."	<p>Tables 5-28 SGZ's System Reliability score is 1.5 and should read "Routes AY, SGZ and SIL parallel M602F therefore slightly higher scores due to higher risk to reliability."</p> <p>Table 5-28 is corrected to indicate that SGZ and SIL/AY received the same reliability score (1.5) in Round 2 preference determination. This corrects the table to accurately reflect the values assigned in the route evaluation workshop as captured on PDF page 248 of 261 in the EIS. AY/SIL/SGZ received the same preference score for reliability as reflected on the last page of the notes for the day for that session. This does not affect any of the decisions made.</p>
2	Transmission Line Routing	5	Table 5-29	Table 5-29 incorrectly states SGZ's System Reliability score is 1 and SGZ's total score is 1.85.	<p>Further to the correction to Table 5-28, Table 5-29 SGZ's System Reliability score is corrected to 1.5 and total score to 1.90. Correcting this value to accurately reflect the preference scores assigned in the workshops results in a 0.05 increase to the overall score of Route SGZ. The rank order preference of routes remains the same. This does not affect any of the decisions made.</p>

Table 5-28 Round 2 Preference Determination Scores and Rationale

Criteria	Route	Scores¹	Rationale
Cost	AY	1.05	A scaling factor was used to calculate the scores based on estimates for the costs.
	SGZ	1	
	URV	1.01	
	URQ	1.03	
	SIL	1.14	
System Reliability	AY	1.5	Routes AY, SGZ and SIL parallel M602F therefore slightly higher scores due to higher risk to reliability.
	SGZ	1.5	
	URV	1	
	URQ	1	
	SIL	1.5	
Risk to Schedule	AY	2	Routes AY and SGZ cross more Crown Land therefore there is more risk to schedule and uncertainty around the potential length of associated Crown consultation process, than the private land acquisition process.
	SGZ	2	
	URV	1	
	URQ	1	
	SIL	1	
Environment (natural)	AY	3	Route AY affected the most natural areas (forests, wetlands) and affects the most species at risk (habitat)
	SGZ	2.7	Route SGZ slightly preferred over AY based on route statistics (Table 5-27).
	URV	1.2	Route URV (one segment difference from URQ) crossed through a large wetland complex.
	URQ	1	Route URQ affected the least forested area and had the best intactness score.
	SIL	2.2	Route SIL scored slightly better than AY and SGZ but not as good as URV and URQ because it affects less natural areas (forests/wetlands and Species at Risk Habitat))
Environment (built)	AY	1	Route AY affects fewer residences and less high value farmland, less public land uses (e.g., recreation, heritage) and development potential than the other routes.
	SGZ	2	Route SGZ affects fewer residences and high value farmland.
	URV	3	Routes URV and URQ affect more residences and development potential.
	URQ	3	
	SIL	2.7	Route SIL scored better than URV and URQ but worse than the others for most built metrics.

Criteria	Route	Scores¹	Rationale
Community	AY	2	Route AY was the public's preferred route as it avoids more residences, communities, and prime agricultural land.
	SGZ	3	Route SGZ was the least preferred because of the sensitive cultural, spiritual and resource use areas.
	URV	2	Route URV was the FNMEP perspective's preferred route as it avoids the most sensitive cultural, spiritual and resource use areas
	URQ	3	Route URQ was the least preferred, as it would travel through the most residential areas.
	SIL	1	Route SIL was the best compromise between the two perspectives (PEP/FNMEP) covered by the group as it balanced future and existing residential and commercial development, paralleling existing transmission lines, and avoidance of sensitive cultural, spiritual and resource use areas.

NOTE:

¹ Scores are between 1 (preferred) and 3 (least preferred).

Table 5-29 Round 2 Preference Determination for the Preferred Route for MMTP*(showing relative scores, weighted scores and total sum; lower values are preferred for routing)*

Criteria	Weight	Routes				
		URV	SIL	AY	URQ	SGZ
Cost ¹	40%	1.01	1.14	1.05	1.03	1
Weighted		0.40	0.46	0.42	0.41	0.4
System Reliability	10%	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5
Weighted		0.1	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15
Risk to Schedule	5%	1	1	2	1	2
Weighted		0.05	0.05	0.1	0.05	0.1
Environment (natural)	7.50%	1.2	2.2	3	1	2.7
Weighted		0.09	0.17	0.23	0.075	0.20
Environment (built)	7.50%	3	2.7	1	3	2
Weighted		0.23	0.20	0.075	0.23	0.15
Community	30%	2	1	2	3	3
Weighted		0.6	0.3	0.6	0.9	0.9
TOTAL		1.47	1.32	1.57	1.81	1.90
RANK		2	1	3	4	5

NOTE:
¹ A scaling factor was used for cost.