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6.0 PUBLIC AND ABORIGINAL CONSULTATION

6.1 Consultation History

Glacier Power implemented the Public and Aboriginal Consultation Programs in 1999 before submitting the 2000 EIA and application and carried those programs through to the public hearings in 2002. Since then, Glacier Power has carried on with the original program throughout the 2006 EIA and application process. Therefore, Glacier Power has built a substantial consultation information base and developed an in-depth understanding of public and Aboriginal concerns. Glacier Power has made significant progress towards resolving concerns expressed by the public and First Nations, and will continue working to address concerns throughout the project development process.

6.2 Consultation Program Objectives

The objectives of the consultation program are to identify, contact, inform and obtain feedback from the general public, local stakeholders and Aboriginal groups who might have suggestions or concerns about the Project. Where concerns are identified, the objective is to engage in a dialogue with the interested party and to work to resolve the concerns. To meet these objectives, Glacier Power has been in contact with and received input from parties located from the Bennett Dam to the Peace–Athabasca Delta, including:

- the general public in the project development area
- all landowners (private and Crown Land tenures) within 2 km of project infrastructure
- interested parties (those individuals, groups or organizations that have expressed interest or concerns about the Project)
- towns and municipalities in the area roughly bounded by Taylor, British Columbia and Fairview, the Town of Peace River and Grande Prairie, Alberta
- provincial government (Alberta and British Columbia) and federal government agencies
- water licence holders upstream from the Project in British Columbia
- BC Hydro
- First Nations and Métis communities

6.3 Public Consultation Program

Public consultation for both the 2000 and the present EIA and applications was implemented through:

- formal public notices in local newspapers of the October 1999 and the July 2004 draft and final EIA Report Terms of Reference (ToR) issued by Alberta Environment (AENV)
- open houses in community centres near the project site
- newsletters sent out to interested parties, landowners and town and municipal administrations
- a project-dedicated website providing quick and easy access to project updates and documents
- formal public notices in local newspapers at the time of the 2000 and the present EIA and application submissions
- distribution of EIA and application materials at libraries, town and municipal offices and provincial buildings
- presentations, information sessions and workshops with special interest groups
- meetings, and e-mail and telephone communications with federal, provincial and municipal government and nearby towns administrations

A full record of consultation activities for the present EIA and application has been compiled in an electronic database.

### 6.3.1 Newsletters

On June 28, 2004, Glacier Power sent out 71 public consultation letters and a project update newsletter to known and potentially interested parties. The list of those interested parties was based primarily on groups and stakeholders identified from the 2002 EUB and NRCB hearing process (during the previous application for approval of the Project). The list included municipal and regional governments, First Nations and Métis groups, non-governmental organizations and members of the public known to have an interest in the Project. The newsletters (a two-sided page) gave a brief background of the Project, the status of the ToR for the EIA and any progress being made towards completing the various studies required to meet the ToR for the EIA report. In the cover letters attached to the newsletters, Glacier Power offered to meet with known interested parties to discuss their concerns. Glacier Power also offered to meet with all other potentially interested parties, First Nations and Métis groups at their convenience to discuss any concerns they might have.

Subsequent newsletters were sent out on November 26, 2004 and September 6, 2005 to the same distribution list as the June 2004 mail-out. These newsletters gave an update on the progress being made, information available and directions to the project website and reiterated offers to meet with interested parties.

No responses or requests to meet were received from interested parties.

### 6.3.2 Website

Glacier Power developed a project-dedicated website for use as a public consultation tool. The address for the project website is [http://www.dunveganhydroproject.com/](http://www.dunveganhydroproject.com/). The website went live on July 30, 2004 with these information resources:

- background about Glacier Power and Canadian Hydro
- an overview of the regulatory review and environmental assessment process (including both provincial and federal processes)
• a library containing official documents and submissions (such as the EIA ToR and material presented at public open houses)

• links guiding interested parties to related material such as regulatory agencies

• a list of frequently asked questions to inform the public

It was anticipated the website would provide an effective means of delivering information to the general public on an ongoing basis about the Project, and would assist in the process of public consultation. The EIA and applications will be posted on the website for those able to connect to the Internet.

6.3.3 Project Disclosure and Terms of Reference for the Present EIA

After submitting the disclosure document and draft ToR to AENV in February 2004, a series of newspaper advertisements were run in regional newspapers informing the public about the opportunity to comment on the draft ToR at open houses. Public notification advertisements for the draft ToR were submitted and published in the *Mile Zero News* (March 3, 2004), *The Signal* (March 2, 2004), *Fairview Post* (March 2, 2004), *Peace River Record-Gazette* (March 2, 2004), and *Daily Herald-Tribune* (March 3, 2004). The advertisements included information about the Project, means of obtaining the draft ToR and the process for submitting comments. Also, invitation advertisements for the open houses in the Town of Fairview, the Town of Peace River and the Town of Spirit River were published in the *Mile Zero News* (March 10, 2004), *The Signal* (March 9, 2004), *Fairview Post* (March 9, 2004), and *Peace River Record-Gazette* (March 9, 2004). Hard copies and digital copies of all notification and open house invitation advertisements were provided to AENV on July 7, 2004 as part of the regulatory review process. Hard copies of the final ToR, issued by AENV, were sent to interested parties and Aboriginal groups on July 23, 2004. Additional copies of the final ToR were also sent to regional municipal and town offices where Glacier Power requested they be made available for public viewing. A distribution list for the final ToR is integrated into a database for consultation activities. The final ToR were also made available for download (in pdf format) on the project website.

6.3.4 Open Houses

Since 1999, numerous open houses have been held in communities in the project area. As there are many communities relatively close to the Project, open houses could not feasibly be held at every community, and so open house communities were selected based on their location and accessibility from other nearby communities. The primary purpose for holding the open houses was to inform residents in these communities about the Project and give them an opportunity to bring forward any issues and concerns. The open houses were each advertised in local and regional newspapers as well as on local radio stations for two weeks before. Open houses were advertised in local newspapers such as the *Fairview Post, Peace River Record Gazette* and the *Spirit River Signal* as well as local radio stations.

Each open house format consisted of most or all of the following elements:

• a visitor count, kept by a sign-in record sheet that was administered by a reception team

• a PowerPoint presentation about the Project
• an information package that provided an overview of the project layout, site infrastructure, access roads, transmission line alternatives and technical parameters

• a response sheet for obtaining public comments about the Project and identifying specific issues

• a series of display panels based on the material in the information package, accompanied by company information

• encouragement of all visitors by the Glacier Power team to ask questions and submit their response sheets before leaving the open house

All visitors to open houses were asked to sign in, and were given a copy of the project information package and a comment sheet that they could complete during the open house or mail back to Glacier Power.

Table 6.2-1 presents a summary of attendance at the open houses held in the communities of Fairview, the Town of Peace River, Spirit River and Wanham since 1999.

Table 6.2-1: Open House Summary, 1999 to Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Written Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>April 22, 1999</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace River</td>
<td>July 6, 1999</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>July 7, 1999</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit River</td>
<td>July 8, 1999</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace River</td>
<td>August 28, 2000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>August 29, 2000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit River</td>
<td>August 30, 2000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>March 17, 2004</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace River</td>
<td>March 18, 2004</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit River</td>
<td>March 19, 2004</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanham</td>
<td>June 13, 2006</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace River</td>
<td>June 14, 2006</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>June 15, 2006</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>432</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. All attendees were encouraged to fill out response sheets, although many were not returned.
* All members of the Peace River Boating Association.

The first open house held in the Town of Fairview in April 1999 was well attended, whereas the subsequent open houses held in July 1999 in the towns of Fairview, Spirit River and Peace River were not as well attended, though they were equally advertised. Many of the attendees at the April 1999 open house were contractors, gravel pit operators, and individuals interested in finding employment. A small number of people were uncertain of the extent of assessment that would be required of Glacier Power and attended the second round of open houses held in July 1999. The July 1999 open houses were designed to provide an update on the Project and to discuss the ToR for developing the EIA.

Public open houses were held in the towns of Fairview, Peace River and Spirit River on March 17, 18, and 19, 2004, respectively, to introduce the new application process, initiate a new public consultation process, and inform the public about their opportunity to comment on the draft ToR for the EIA report. Each open house is briefly summarized in Table 6.2-1.
Public open houses were also held in the communities of Wanham, Peace River and Fairview on June 13, 14, and 15, 2006, respectively. Because of the time that had elapsed since the 2004 open houses, Glacier Power felt it was necessary to hold additional open houses, to provide an update on the Project and to give the public another opportunity to raise their concerns and voice support during the later stages of compiling the EIA and application documents. Public notification advertisements for the June 2006 open houses were submitted and published in the Mile Zero News, The Signal, Fairview Post and the Peace River Record-Gazette. The decision to hold an open house in Wanham as opposed to Spirit River was made so that travel distance for people in the Tangent area would be lessened, while keeping the venue close to Spirit River and the project site. Canada Post Admail™ was used to notify residents in the Tangent area (east of Wanham and west of the Smoky River) of the open house to encourage their attendance. Glacier Power used poster boards to provide information to encourage questions and one-on-one dialogue. Both the 2004 and 2006 open houses were well attended. As with the 1999 and 2000 venues, there was a cross section of interest from contractors, individuals looking for employment, nearby landowners, recreational users of the river, and interested parties keeping informed of project progress. Although the number of written comments returned to Glacier Power was low compared to the numbers of attendees, general support for the Project was expressed by attendees at all open house events.

6.3.5 Technical Workshops

A series of five technical workshops were held to discuss the Peace River Ice (PRICE) model being developed by Glacier Power to simulate ice conditions on the Peace River, before and after project development. These workshops were attended by representatives of parties potentially interested in or affected by the changed ice regime on the river post-Project, including AENV, Alberta Infrastructure and Transportation, the Town of Peace River, CROSS, BC Hydro, Environment Canada and Fisheries and Oceans Canada. Notes of each workshop were taken by Glacier Power, vetted by workshop participants, and subsequently used by Northwest Hydraulic Consultants to guide follow-up calibration and modelling work.

6.3.6 Special Interest Groups

Effective communication with individuals, interested parties, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) was implemented during the 2000 EIA and application and carried forward into the present EIA and application to encourage participation and resolution of potential environmental concerns at an early stage of planning.

It is Glacier Power’s intent to continue consultation with each of these important stakeholders throughout the regulatory approvals process. Glacier Power has either informed through newsletters and correspondence, made direct contact with, given presentations to, or conducted update meetings with each of the following organizations:

- landowners (within 2 km of the project infrastructure)
- Town of Peace River
- BC Hydro
Concerned Residents for Ongoing Service at Shaftesbury (CROSS)
Friends of the Peace
District of Taylor
regional water licensees
river users (boaters, guide outfitters and tourism operators such as Peace River Boaters Association, River Runner Tours, Peace Island Tours, Wilderness Adventures International Inc., and Jordy McAuley Outfitting Limited)
Dunvegan Historic Society
environmental institutions such as Pembina Institute and Trout Unlimited

The 2000 EIA and application process culminated in a Public Hearing in October 2002, by which time many but not all of the concerns raised by these stakeholders had been addressed. Since 2002, Glacier Power has consulted all interested parties but has focused its consultation efforts on specific issues that were left outstanding following the 2002 Public Hearing. A brief outline of those outstanding concerns is discussed by stakeholder below.

6.3.6.1 Landowners

In 1999, Glacier Power initiated contact with landowners and lease holders of Crown Land in the immediate vicinity of the project infrastructure (including the powerhouse, access roads and transmission line) and signed “Consent of Occupation” agreements with those landowners and lease holders to accommodate project infrastructure where necessary. In 2001, Glacier Power contacted all landowners within 1 km of the project infrastructure, according to EUB consultation guidelines, to inform them and allow them an opportunity to provide comment.

In 2005 Glacier Power retained Roy Northern Land and Environmental to identify and contact landowners within 2 km of the project infrastructure, in accordance with updated EUB guidelines. The purpose of these communications was to provide landowners near the Project with an opportunity to make direct comment and express concerns or objections. A total of 68 separate land title units within 2 km of the Project were listed, though several units were often held by a single landowner. The landowners were sent a letter and information sheet about the Project in September 2005, indicating they would be contacted by phone to discuss the Project. Landowners were contacted by telephone in May 2006 to confirm they had received the information package, and were asked if they had any concerns or objections regarding the Project.

A full list of landowner responses to the telephone contact is provided in Appendix G. Most of those contacted had no comments or concerns. Landowners, their concerns and the follow-up actions are summarized in Table 6.3-1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowner</th>
<th>Land Holdings</th>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Glacier Power’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jo Anne Shaw</td>
<td>SW-24-80-W6M, SE-24-80-W6M, Also holds grazing leases in the project area.</td>
<td>Concerns regarding what the river valley will look like, and north access routing and hill stability. Requested personal notification of public open houses</td>
<td>Ms. Shaw was notified of the June 13, 14, and 15 open houses. She attended Fairview on June 15. Glacier Power left one phone message in July and subsequently spoke with her in August to discuss her concerns. Glacier Power has committed to meet and work with her to ensure that fencing requirements for cattle (in relation to the north access road) are understood and met during and after construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohdan Marusiak</td>
<td>SE-18-80-4-W6M</td>
<td>Concerns regarding tamping the north access road along the river, which may flood due to ice buildup in the winter</td>
<td>Glacier Power left a message for Mr. Marusiak on August 1, 2006 to discuss his concern. As there will be no ice immediately downstream from the Project once it is operating, there will be no ice build up to affect the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny McLachlan</td>
<td>SW-18-80-4-W6M, NW-7-80-4-W6M</td>
<td>Concern over dust control on north access road and Glacier Power as a proponent, but no objection to the Project</td>
<td>Glacier Power met with Dan and Jeanette McLachlan on June 18, 2006, and after further correspondence, met with them again on July 19, 2006. The proposed north access road will run past their property. Glacier Power is continuing to work with the McLachlans to ensure that their concerns regarding construction noise and dust control, and vegetation control in front of their property are addressed to the McLachlans’ satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice and Lynda Wild</td>
<td>NW-17-80-4-W6M, SW-17-80-4-W6M</td>
<td>No concerns as long as transmission line and access road are on the south side of the river</td>
<td>Glacier Power left a phone message with the Wilds on August 1, 2006 to discuss their concern. The primary access road and the transmission line will be on the south bank, while the north access road is not adjacent or near to the Wild’s land, and will make use of existing roads and trails to a large extent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Barland (ASRD)</td>
<td>All public lands</td>
<td>Concern about the effects of the Project on grazing leases and erosion</td>
<td>Mr. Barland will review the Application and EIA documents, which address the potential for erosion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Newton (ACD)</td>
<td>NE-7-80-4-W6M (p), NE-8-80-4-W6M (p)</td>
<td>Has forwarded a letter citing ACD’s concerns previously. No further concerns</td>
<td>Glacier Power is in receipt of Mr. Newton’s letter and is prepared to meet Mr. Newton’s requirements with respect to certain historic and paleontological resources before and during construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.3-1: Summary of Landowner Concerns and Glacier Power’s Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowner</th>
<th>Land Holdings</th>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Glacier Power’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jordy McAuley</td>
<td>Lease holder NW-9-80-4-W6M</td>
<td>Concerned about ice floes, navigational delays, massive destruction, flooding of islands and deer calving areas, and other concerns noted in the previous application to the EUB</td>
<td>Glacier Power left a message for Mr. McAuley on July 7, 2006 and subsequently spoke with him on July 27, 2006. Mr. McAuley is a guide outfitter and spends May through October on Williston Lake with this business. Concerns discussed with him included silt deposition and its effects on the Ksituan River and the boat lock, as well as increased fog and ice on the Dunvegan Bridge. Mr. McAuley requested a copy of the EIA as he is interested to see how silt deposition and fogging have been addressed. Mr. McAuley does not support the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Sewell</td>
<td>Landowner SE-6-80-4-W6M</td>
<td>Concern regarding transmission line right-of-way and pasture access</td>
<td>Glacier Power met with Ian and Betty Sewell at their home on July 18, 2006. Glacier Power described the high fencing that would be used around the interconnection site and the Sewells’ concerns regarding effects of the fencing on pasture access and cattle were addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project infrastructure (including the headpond) potentially affects four landowners and five leaseholders, as described in Section 4.11. Each of these individuals or organizations has been informed of the Project and in most cases agreements have been reached between the landowner or leaseholder and Glacier Power. Formal agreements have not yet been signed with two landowners, Mr. and Mrs. McLachlan and Mr. Smook and Ms. Tolen, as discussions are ongoing to ensure their concerns are addressed, however neither party has any objections to the Project.

6.3.6.2 Town of Peace River

The Town of Peace River is approximately 100 km downstream from the Project and has historically experienced flooding due to ice jams on the Peace River (the expected effects of the Project on ice-related flooding at the Town of Peace River is addressed in Section 4.7.5.2.5.) During the 2000 Application process, Glacier Power consulted with the Town of Peace River and provided information on the potential effects of the Project on ice formation concerning ice-related flooding risks at the Town. Glacier Power also invited the Town of Peace River to participate in several meetings with AENV and BC Hydro, who are members of the Joint Task Force on Peace Ice (JTF) and play a role in the management of ice-related flood risks at the Town of Peace River. At the conclusion of the joint EUB and NRCB hearing in 2002, the Town of Peace River requested that the application be denied, citing concern about ice-related flooding.

Glacier Power continued discussions with the Town of Peace River immediately following the March 2003 Decision Report issued by the EUB and NRCB, and has made significant progress in understanding the potential effects of the Project on the ice regime as they relate to the Town’s concerns. A summary of the main correspondence and consultation with the Town is provided in Appendix G.
Glacier Power and the Town of Peace River have signed an Agreement in Principle, under which Glacier Power will help to identify and address infrastructure vulnerabilities pertinent to flooding risks. The agreement includes finalizing a security agreement for payment of funds. Glacier Power will work with the Town to develop a terms of reference for an engineering study to assess current flood-related infrastructure concerns, in particular stormwater outfalls and the groundwater issues in Lower West Peace, as these relate most directly to the potential effects of the Project. Glacier Power will pay for that study to be done, and will subsequently provide funding to the Town to use in implementing the flood mitigation measures identified in the engineering report.

6.3.6.3 BC Hydro

Consultation with BC Hydro has focused primarily on the potential changes to the Peace River ice regime that may result from the Project and the subsequent effects those changes may have on the control flow criteria enforced by the JTF (see Section 4.7.5.2.10). Any increases in the duration of control flows could affect BC Hydro’s ability to generate power at the Bennett Dam and Peace Canyon Dam hydroelectric facilities upstream from the Project in British Columbia.

Glacier Power has maintained relatively constant communication with BC Hydro about the Project over the past seven years. During the 2000 EIA and application process, Glacier Power met numerous times with BC Hydro, along with provincial regulatory agencies to discuss the question of “control flow”. During the 2002 Public Hearing, BC Hydro neither objected to nor supported the Project. Immediately following the 2002 Public Hearing, Glacier Power, BC Hydro and AENV began a rigorous winter ice data collection program to improve the database from which to consider potential changes to control flows, and from which to calibrate ice models. This program continued for three years and provided insightful data. The information was used directly by both Glacier Power and BC Hydro to calibrate and improve ice modelling. BC Hydro was invited to, and participated fully in, the five technical ice-modelling workshops mentioned earlier, and worked collaboratively as necessary with Northwest Hydraulic Consultants to share and interpret data to help calibrate the PRICE model.

A summary of communications with BC Hydro is provided in Appendix G. The majority of communications were focused on ice data collection and ice modelling; however, more general discussions of project status and timelines also occurred, either in conjunction with technical ice discussions, or at separate meetings. On July 21, 2004 Glacier Power met with several BC Hydro representatives at BC Hydro’s offices in Burnaby, British Columbia. Glacier Power presented an update on the Project, and on the regulatory process and timelines associated with the new application. BC Hydro activities and operations were briefly discussed, including the potential for future development at Site C, and plans for future consultation were established.

Glacier Power has made recommendations regarding ice management; particularly with respect to post-project flow controls (see Section 4.7.5.2.10). The acceptability of those recommendations to the JTF will to some extent determine the ultimate effects of the Project on BC Hydro. The JTF has not taken a formal position on the acceptability of the proposed post-project criteria yet; however, the acceptance of the recommended criteria will to some extent determine the potential effects of the Project on BC Hydro operations. As such, BC Hydro has not yet expressed either support for or opposition to the Project.
6.3.6.4 CROSS

The Shaftesbury ferry and ice bridge crossing of the Peace River is an important link between the communities of Grimshaw and Peace River on the north side of the river, and the community of Tangent on the south side of the river. The operation of the Shaftesbury ferry is not directly affected by the changed ice regime post-Project; however, the formation of the ice bridge each year is expected to be delayed. Analysis using the PRICE model suggests that the net annual reduction in crossing days for would be about two or three weeks for a wide range of current climate conditions (see Section 4.7.5.2.7.)

During the 2000 EIA and application process, the residents in the community of Tangent and surrounding region were represented by Ms. Carolyn Liefbroer-Chenard. At the 2002 Public Hearings, Ms. Liefbroer-Chenard noted uncertainty regarding the predicted effects of the Project on the ice regime and the Shaftesbury ice bridge, concluding that Glacier Power should be required to implement some type of mitigation measures at Shaftesbury, and that the construction of a bridge at the site before construction of the Project would be the only solution that would eliminate all of her group’s concerns.

In 2003 Glacier Power re-entered consultation with Ms. Liefbroer-Chenard to discuss possible mitigation solutions for her group. Glacier Power presented a travel-cost compensation plan to local residents, first via letter correspondence to Ms. Liefbroer-Chenard in July 2003, and subsequently at an open house held in Tangent in October 2003. Ms. Liefbroer-Chenard rejected the travel-cost plan on behalf of her group.

Since 2004, Ms. Chenard (formerly Liebroer-Chenard) and area residents have more formerly organized and formed the interest group CROSS, whose objective is to participate in the review of the Project with the goal of maintaining the status quo in terms of the ability to cross the Peace River at Shaftesbury. Thus any change to the ice bridge operation is considered by CROSS to represent an unacceptable effect on the community. CROSS has retained legal counsel, and has at Glacier Power’s expense retained the services of an ice expert to assist in the interpretation of the PRICE model and its outputs. A summary of communications with CROSS is provided in Appendix G.

CROSS was invited to, and participated in, all five technical ice-modelling workshops. At three of the five, CROSS was represented by Mr. Rick Carson, P.Eng. with the KGS Group, Winnipeg, in addition to Ms. Chenard. Mr. Carson provided excellent feedback on the ice modelling on behalf of CROSS, and was a valuable addition to the technical review group.

On July 5, 2006, Glacier Power proposed another possible solution to the Shaftesbury crossing issue: a public-private partnership that would see Glacier Power contribute funding to Alberta Infrastructure and Transportation (AIT) to accelerate the pending replacement of the current ferry at Shaftesbury with an improved ferry or shore infrastructure to extend ferry operation into the ice season and offset the two- or three-week reduction in ice bridge availability. Glacier Power has received positive feedback on this concept from AIT, but has not yet received formal feedback from CROSS on this mitigation proposal. Glacier Power will continue to communicate regularly with CROSS to address their concerns in a timely, reasonable manner.
6.3.6.5 Friends of the Peace

Friends of the Peace (FoP) have participated in the 2000 EIA and application, the 2002 public hearing process as well as the present EIA and application. Since 2002 Glacier Power has been informing the FoP primarily through newsletters and open house activities, and has offered to meet with the FoP several times. The FoP is represented by Mr. Bob Walsh, who has attended each of the open houses held in Fairview, including the most recent open house in Fairview held June 15, 2006. Mr. Walsh did not express any specific concerns at the June 2006 open house. Concerns expressed by the FoP during the 2002 hearing included uncertainty about ice, fisheries baseline data and fish passage design, effects of the headpond on slope erosion, and effects on wildlife river crossings. Glacier Power has done significant additional work in each of these areas, as included in this EIA, in an attempt to resolve these concerns. Glacier Power will continue to communicate with the FoP throughout the regulatory review process.

6.3.6.6 District of Taylor

The District of Taylor (Taylor) has a potable-water intake facility consisting of four wells within the Peace River mainstem at Taylor. Presently, the ice cover periodically reaches Taylor covering the wells and rendering maintenance of the wellheads problematic. With the Project, the ice cover is expected to reach Taylor and the well sites more frequently, potentially lengthening the time that the wellheads are ice-covered and inaccessible should maintenance be required.

During the 2000 EIA and application review, Glacier Power met several times with the town manager at Taylor to discuss these potential effects of the Project. In general, it is understood that no problems have developed during periods when ice cover has developed at the site. Operationally it may be important to plan pump maintenance for the late fall before the arrival of the ice front, as it will be more likely that access to the wellheads could be restricted for a period post-Project.

Glacier Power contacted Mr. Gord Davies, Public Works Superintendent with Taylor, in July 2006 and offered to make presentations to the District Council; however, these offers were deemed unnecessary and declined. The District of Taylor has not expressed any concerns with respect to the Project; however, Glacier Power will continue to share information and consult with Mr. Davies and District staff to ensure the potential effects of the Project on ice at Taylor continue to be well understood and acceptable.

6.3.6.7 Water Licensees

There are several water licence holders along the Peace River who could potentially be affected by the Project, primarily with respect to ice conditions.

The Town of Fairview has a water intake facility approximately 10 km downstream from the Project. It is understood that the Fairview intake has been designed to withdraw water from near the river bed to prevent ingestion of suspended ice, and to prevent the blockage of the intake ports by ice deposited along the bank. Therefore, although there will be open water year-round at the Fairview water intake, the changed ice regime is not expected to negatively affect this facility. Glacier Power has met with the Town management on numerous occasions and this does not appear to be a concern for the Town.
Upstream from the Project, there are several water licences in British Columbia near the District of Taylor and the British Columbia–Alberta border. The potential effects of the Project on these water licensees are related to water withdrawal during the winter in the event of an increased frequency of ice cover. Glacier Power initially contacted each of the water licensees in 2002, and subsequently received correspondence resolving any concerns regarding potential effects of the changed ice regime on the water withdrawals. Glacier Power has continued to keep these licensees informed through the regular distribution of project newsletters. A summary of the water licensees and the nature of their withdrawals is given in Table 6.3-2.

The Peace River Regional District water licence was awarded in September 2005. Mr. Shannon Anderson, Field Works Manager for the District, was contacted in August 2006. Glacier Power has provided Mr. Anderson with more detailed information on the Project, and the expected post-project ice regime, and has offered to make a presentation to the District Council. It is not expected that the Project will affect this water licence, but Glacier Power will continue to communicate with the Peace River Regional District to ensure that should they have any concerns they will be addressed.

Table 6.3-2: Peace River Water Licensees in British Columbia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Licensee</th>
<th>Nature of Water Licence</th>
<th>Status of Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Curtis</td>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>Summer withdrawal only – the Project will have no effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. Ministry of Transportation and Utilities</td>
<td>Dust control</td>
<td>Summer withdrawal only – the Project will have no effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nels Ostero Ltd.</td>
<td>Gravel pit</td>
<td>Letter from Tom Ostero, October 15, 2002, states the Project will have no effect on withdrawal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke Energy (formerly Westcoast Energy Inc.)</td>
<td>Cooling, fire protection</td>
<td>Correspondence with Carl Reimer and Bruce Kosugi in October 2002 concluded the Project is unlikely to affect intake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slocan/Taylor Pulp Division (formerly Fibreco Pulp)</td>
<td>Pulp mills</td>
<td>Correspondence with Darren Guliov in October 2002 concluded that Slocan shares the Duke Energy intake, and if Duke Energy is satisfied, then Slocan has no concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Oil Resources</td>
<td>Oil field injection</td>
<td>Communication with Mr. Reg Wisener concluded that the Imperial intakes consist of 5 source wells approximately 30 m from the river’s edge on a low terrace, and they withdraw from an aquifer. It is unlikely the Project will adversely affect their intakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace River Regional District</td>
<td>Waterworks – local</td>
<td>Shared intake with Imperial Oil. Consultation with Mr. Anderson in August 2006. No effects expected as above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.6.8 River Users

The river is used for numerous recreational activities including jet boating, canoeing and camping. Glacier Power identified two sets of organized river users in the project area; the Peace River Boaters’ Association centred in the Town of Peace River and the Grande Prairie River Rats centred in the City of Grande Prairie. Glacier Power has been in contact with both of these organizations as well as individual boaters in the Fairview and Spirit River areas throughout the 2002 and present EIA and application. The primary concerns expressed by river users is the ability for boaters to move past the Project and that river levels are not affected downstream from the Project. Glacier Power has communicated to
river users that downstream river levels will not be affected by the Project and that a boat lock has been integrated into the design and operation of the Project. Also, Glacier Power is proposing a boat ramp immediately upstream from the headworks structure to provide direct access to the river upstream from the Project.

In June 2006 Glacier Power offered to make presentations to both the Peace River Boaters’ Association and the Grande Prairie River Rats to update them on project activities, however due to conflicting schedules these presentations have not yet taken place. Glacier Power will continue to communicate with these groups throughout the project review and development process, as they have expressed their desire to be involved in the design of the boat lock and boat ramp in the headpond. During construction and operations, Glacier Power will be working with these boating groups, and other recreational groups in the region, to implement boater safety programs.

6.3.6.9 Non-Governmental Organizations

Both the Pembina Institute and Trout Unlimited were interested in the Project during the 2000 EIA and Application Process, although neither participated in the 2002 Hearing. The concerns of both groups centred on adequacy of fisheries information and potential effects on the fish resource. Through Glacier Power’s additional fisheries work, many of these concerns have been addressed. Both the Pembina Institute and Trout Unlimited have been sent regular update newsletters since 2003.

6.3.7 Government Communications

Glacier Power communicated information about the Project with the federal, provincial and municipal government representatives, and town administrations in several ways including meetings, presentations and information sessions, video conference calls and through the media (newspapers and radio).

6.3.7.1 Federal Government

Glacier Power initially met with the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency in Edmonton on February 3, 1999, at the beginning of the 2000 EIA and application process. Several federal agencies were represented at this meeting including Environment Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO), Canadian Coast Guard, and Indian and Northern Affairs. Project information was presented to representatives of Parks Canada in Wood Buffalo National Park on February 23, 2000. Each of these agencies was represented on the Project Review Committee and was involved in monthly video conference meetings, along with the provincial representatives.

Consultation with federal government agencies continued into the present EIA and application beginning with the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA) in February 2004 and again during the all-agencies meeting on April 21, 2004. Agencies present at the April 2004 meeting included Environment Canada, DFO and Parks Canada (Wood Buffalo National Park). The CEAA has been kept informed of project activities through correspondence and newsletters, although under the Canada–Alberta Agreement for Environmental Assessment Cooperation (2005), AENV has been the “one-window” contact for distributing information to various review agencies, both federal and provincial.
As the only responsible authority (RA) during the 2000 EIA and application process, and now one of two RAs (the other being Transport Canada under the authority of the *Navigable Waters Protection Act*), DFO has been involved continuously in the review of the Project since 2000. DFO involvement has focused primarily on fisheries aspects of the Project, and specifically on the design of fisheries-related studies and the fish passage facilities. During the physical hydraulic modelling program, which extended roughly from 2002 through 2005, DFO participated in reviews of modelling reports, attended model demonstrations, and collaborated on strategies to improve the fish passage design. DFO worked closely with Glacier Power during the following fisheries related programs:

- **Fish Community Baseline Study** to develop sufficient fisheries baseline information to assess project effects on the fish community and to provide a benchmark for operations monitoring. DFO provided comments on the adequacy of proposed programs and suggestions for improving the programs.

- **Fish Movement Study**, a three-year program for tracking fish movement in the Peace River between the Alberta–British Columbia border and the Notikewin River. DFO again reviewed and commented on the proposed programs.

- **Habitat No Net Loss Plan**, a document that quantified habitat losses and gains and identified the compensation works required

- **Monitoring Plan**, a document that outlines the monitoring program to verify project effects and that will become integrated into the operations plan to optimize safe fish passage. The development of this plan was linked with the Fish Community Baseline Study to ensure adequate baseline information would be available to conduct meaningful post-development monitoring.

A full record of consultation with the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, and other federal agencies, including DFO, has been kept in the project consultation tracking database.

### 6.3.7.2 Provincial Governments

Glacier Power initiated contact with the Board of Directors, Northwest Boreal Region, AENV, in the Town of Peace River in January 1999. After several subsequent meetings to determine the project review requirements, Glacier Power received a letter from AENV (June 1999) requesting that Glacier Power complete a full EIA under the *Alberta Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act (AEPEA)*. Glacier Power subsequently participated in monthly video conference calls with the project review committee, which consisted of a mix of provincial and federal agency representatives involved in the EIA review.

Glacier Power met with representatives of the British Columbia Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks (MELP) and BC Hydro in Victoria on March 24, 2000 to present information and to discuss the Project.

Since 2003, Glacier Power has had continuous communications with AENV staff. Glacier Power discussed the new EIA and application process with AENV in February and March 2004, prior to holding an all-agencies meeting on April 21, 2004. Provincial agencies represented at the meeting included:
• Alberta Environment (Environmental Assessment, River Engineering, and Dam Safety Branches)
• Alberta Sustainable Resource Development
• Alberta Community Development
• Alberta Infrastructure and Transportation
• Alberta Energy and Utilities Board
• Natural Resources Conservation Board

Since that meeting Glacier Power has maintained contact with the assigned Environmental Assessment coordinator (initially Mr. Laury North, then Mr. Jeff Sansom, and presently Ms. Lisa Sadownik), and submitted public consultation updates to AENV.

AENV, River Engineering Branch, has actively participated in the five ice modelling workshops, and in three years of winter ice data collection activities.

Alberta Sustainable Resources Development (ASRD) has participated alongside DFO during the review and design of each of the fisheries-related studies outlined above.

Alberta Community Development (ACD) was notified of the additional Historic Resources Overview Assessment completed for the transmission line route, and responded with letters (March and June 2005) of acknowledgment and recommendations for future work in the area. Glacier Power expects to continue to honour ACD’s initial letter of recommendation of October 2000 with respect to additional work before and during construction.

Glacier Power has met with AIT several times since 2003 as well, primarily regarding AIT’s concerns with respect to fog near the Dunvegan Bridge, slope stability related to access road construction, and also regarding the concerns of CROSS at Shaftesbury. Glacier Power has committed to working with AIT to install appropriate signage in the event of increased fogging, and to involve AIT in the final engineering review of the access road design. Several permits will be required in the future from AIT, and communication is expected to be ongoing and frequent throughout project development.

Glacier Power has also kept the EUB apprised of project status and schedule through regular telephone calls to Mr. Satwant Lota. The EUB and NRCB have also been kept informed of the project status through regular update newsletters.

A full record of communication with provincial government agencies has been kept in the project consultation tracking database.

6.3.7.3 Municipal Governments

Throughout both the 2000 and present EIA and applications, Glacier Power has given presentations and information sessions to councils, reeves, chief administrative officers, and economic development officers of municipalities in the project area. Mayors, councils and managers of communities potentially affected were also contacted and given updates and presentations.
The director of the Grande Prairie Chamber of Commerce was initially contacted in early 2000, and has been kept informed with project update newsletters. At the May 12, 2006 grand opening of the Grande Prairie EcoPower® Centre (a biomass electrical plant owned by Canadian Gas & Electric Company Ltd., a wholly owned subsidiary of Canadian Hydro), the mayor of Grand Prairie expressed the support of the city for the Project in a public speech. The Central Peace Chamber of Commerce and Fairview Chamber of Commerce have also been kept up-to-date with the regular newsletters.

The majority of project infrastructure will lie within the boundaries of the Municipal District (MD) of Fairview, which issued a Development Permit for the Project in 2002 that remains valid today. Regular update newsletters have been provided to the MD, and a presentation to Council was made on June 15, 2006, during which the Council expressed no objections to or concerns with the Project.

Regular update newsletters have also been sent to the following Towns and MDs since 2003:

- Municipal District of Fairview
- Saddle Hills County
- Birch Hills County
- Municipal District of Spirit River
- Northern Sunrise County
- Municipal District of Peace No. 135
- County of Grande Prairie No. 1
- Municipal District of Clear Hills
- Peace River Regional District, British Columbia
- District of Taylor, British Columbia
- City of Grande Prairie
- Town of Fairview
- Town of Peace River

In June and July 2006, Glacier Power either contacted, met with, or made a presentation to each of the towns and MDs listed above. Open houses held in 2006 in the towns of Wanham, Fairview and Peace River had representatives from the towns of Rycroft, Spirit River and Grimshaw in attendance. Overall good support for the Project was expressed at each of the 2006 open houses.

6.3.8 Public Input

The results of the public consultation program indicate very positive public support for the Project. There have been many questions and concerns identified by stakeholders. Over the course of Glacier Power’s public consultation program, similar issues and concerns have been identified by stakeholders. The most common concerns raised by stakeholders were related to:
- effects on local power supply
- ice formation and break-up
- fog and bridge icing
- sediment transport and deposition
- slope stability and erosion
- fisheries and water quality
- vegetation and wildlife
- recreation and navigation
- historic resources

Table 6.3-3 presents a list of project-related comments and concerns raised during the public consultation program and provides a brief response from Glacier Power.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Or Concern</th>
<th>Glacier Power’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What effects will the Project have on local power supply and price?</td>
<td>Power generated by the Project will enter the integrated transmission system at the point of interconnection with the existing ATCO line. While a stable supply of low-impact electricity in Alberta's northwest is positive for the overall stability and efficiency of the Alberta electrical grid, it will not directly affect the reliability of local distribution systems or local power prices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Effect on water levels in the Peace–Athabasca Delta from water storage in the headpond and regulation or reduction of flows downstream from the Project.</td>
<td>The Project is a low-head, run-of-river plant and will not affect flow downstream. The same volume of water entering the headpond will continue downstream from the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Where is the power going to be sold and will it be used in the local region?</td>
<td>Power will be sold to the Power Pool or specific parties under long-term contracts. The Project provides local generation in the event of plant failures in other parts of the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Partial or complete failure of headworks structure will cause property damage, potential for injury or loss of life.</td>
<td>The worst case is a failure of the structure (headworks break) which will result in a 3.3 m flood wave downstream from the Project. The predicted flood wave is below the 1:20 year pre-Bennett Dam flood level so will not affect property downstream. Boaters could be affected depending on season and type of watercraft being used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ice conditions will change and could cause floods in the Town of Peace River.</td>
<td>Ice conditions will change; however, the overall potential for ice-related flooding at Peace River is expected to be reduced due to the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Need to maintain flow release control from Bennett Dam during ice formation at the Town of Peace River.</td>
<td>Effects on the duration of flow release control are at the discretion of the JTF; however, Glacier Power has put forward a proposal that would not increase the duration of control flows, while maintaining flood protection at the Town of Peace River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ice conditions at Shaftesbury ferry will change and could affect the ice bridge.</td>
<td>Ice conditions will change at Shaftesbury and will affect the ice bridge crossing by an average of two to three weeks per year. Glacier Power has proposed to work with AIT to improve ferry crossing infrastructure to offset this two- to three-week delay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Or Concern</td>
<td>Glacier Power's Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ice cover could reach Taylor more frequently.</td>
<td>The frequency of ice cover forming at Taylor will increase, however, it is not expected to have significant effects on Taylor or water licensees between Dunvegan and Taylor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Open water downstream from the Project will increase frequency of fog and ice conditions on the Highway 2 Bridge.</td>
<td>There will be open water at the bridge for the entire winter, which will result in increased fog conditions and potentially increased ice conditions on the bridge. Glacier Power has committed to work with AIT to install appropriate signage to warn of fog conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Headpond will trap sediment and could affect plant operation or downstream river-bed scour.</td>
<td>Headpond will trap coarse bed material (sand and gravels) but fines (silt and clays) in suspension will be carried downstream. Downstream river bed scour is not expected to increase due to the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Inundation of land in headpond could cause slope failure.</td>
<td>Headpond inundation is largely within the pre-Bennett Dam flood levels and will form a new beach at a higher level, but due to stable bedrock, slope stability will not be affected. Erosion processes will increase slightly in localized areas but no deep-seated failure is expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Fish migration will be blocked by the headworks structure.</td>
<td>Fish blockage will be mitigated by placing upstream fish passage structures on each bank, and downstream fish passage structures across the entire structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Navigation on the river will be blocked.</td>
<td>Blockage to river navigation will be mitigated by incorporating a boat lock into the structure, and providing a boat ramp in the headpond, approximately 2 km upstream from the existing boat ramp below the Dunvegan Bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Headpond will provide a large, clean lake for boating, and will improve fishing.</td>
<td>The headpond will increase water depth for about 26 km upstream from the headworks but the water clarity is not expected to change from present conditions. Though it will move more slowly, water will continue to move through the headpond reach. Whether the headpond will improve the fishery is not certain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The formation of ice in the headpond could reduce the boating and hunting season upstream from the Project.</td>
<td>Ice will form in the headpond about 6 to 8 weeks earlier than present but will be more in line with pre-Bennett Dam conditions. There will be open water downstream from the Project 20 to 60 km each year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. What are the impacts of construction?</td>
<td>Construction will be a four-year process. Practices to mitigate or control effects, such as traffic and noise, have been addressed throughout the EIA. 500 person-years of employment will be created through construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. What will be the increase in traffic during construction?</td>
<td>Traffic is expected to increase by about 4 to 13 percent during construction. Improvements will be made to highway turnoffs at north and south access roads to increase safety.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4 First Nations Consultation Activities

The Aboriginal Consultation Program, initiated during the 2000 EIA and Application, has continued throughout the present application in 2006. The list of First Nations and Métis groups notified of the Project includes communities well upstream and downstream from potential effects of the Project. As noted in the Joint Panel's decision report (EUB and NRCB, March 2003) after the 2000 Application, effects on downstream communities such as Paddle Prairie (350 km away), Fort Smith and...
Fort Resolution (1000 km away or more) would be insignificant given the design and scale of the Project.

### 6.4.1 Initial Consultation and Information Meetings

Glacier Power initiated contact with the Treaty 8 First Nations office on March 28, 1999 and several individual First Nations near the Project including the Western Cree Tribal Council (Duncan’s First Nations, Horse Lake First Nation and Sturgeon Cree Nation) in May 1999. Several First Nation individuals were retained to accompany consultants during the 1999 fisheries and historic resources field programs.

Glacier Power held a series of information meetings with First Nations in February 2000 to discuss the Project and obtain feedback. The Aboriginal representative from the Northwest Territories on the Mackenzie River Basin Board (MRBB) was in attendance during an information meeting with First Nations and Métis held on February 23, 2000 in Fort Smith, Northwest Territories. Table 6.4-1 lists the meetings held with First Nations in 2000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>First Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 22</td>
<td>Mikisew Cree First Nation, Fort Chipewyan, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 23</td>
<td>Smith’s Landing First Nation, Fort Smith, NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 23</td>
<td>Salt River First Nation # 195, Fort Smith, NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24</td>
<td>Deninu K’ue First Nation, Fort Resolution, NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 28</td>
<td>Little Red River Cree Nation, John D’Or Prairie, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 28</td>
<td>North Peace Tribal Council, High Level, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 29</td>
<td>Tall Cree Band, Fort Vermilion, AB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact with the Athabasca-Fort Chipewyan First Nation was initially made in early January 2000. Glacier Power subsequently corresponded with their legal counsel through 2000.

Glacier Power initiated contact with Métis from the Fort Chipewyan area in January 2000 and held a series of information meetings in February 2000 with the following Métis organizations (outlined in Table 6.4-2) to discuss the Project and obtain initial feedback from these groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Métis Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 22</td>
<td>Métis Local # 125, Fort Chipewyan, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 23</td>
<td>Métis Local # 50, Fort Smith, NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24</td>
<td>South Slave Métis Tribal Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 28</td>
<td>Fort Vermilion Métis Nation Association, Ft. Vermilion, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 29</td>
<td>Métis Nation of Alberta, Zone 6, Peace River, AB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After submission of the EIA in June 2000, Glacier Power continued consultation with First Nations and Métis organizations along the Peace and Slave Rivers between the Town of Peace River, Alberta and Fort Resolution, Northwest Territories. The First Nations and Métis groups who indicated an interest in further information and consultation with respect to the Project were:

- Duncan’s First Nations (member of Western Cree Tribal Council)
- Mikisew Cree First Nation (MCFN) and MCFN Industry Relations Corporation
Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation (ACFN) and ACFN Industry Relations Corporation
Paddle Prairie Métis Settlement

Many of the actions taken to consult with these First Nations and Métis groups resulted in the creation of agreements defining the long-term relationships. Glacier Power met with each First Nation directly, and repeatedly attempted to meet with representatives of the Paddle Prairie Métis Settlement. A brief summary of the agreements and outcomes reached is provided below. These agreements define long-term understandings, which continue to be upheld through the present application process.

**Duncan’s First Nations**

The Duncan’s First Nations is a member of the Western Cree Tribal Council and is the closest First Nations reserve to the Project. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed with the Duncan’s First Nations in October 2002, defining employment opportunities for the First Nation, as well as allocating funding for a traditional land use study, to be conducted by the Duncan’s First Nations. Glacier Power has maintained contact with the Duncan’s First Nations and continues to honour the MOU.

**Mikisew Cree First Nation (MCFN)**

The MCFN indicated interest in participating in the hearing process in May 2001. Glacier Power representatives met with the Industry Relations Corporation (IRC) of the MCFN in Fort McMurray in March 2002, and agreed to fund an independent review of the Project to be conducted on behalf of the MCFN. The report concluded that the Project is highly unlikely to have an effect on the traditional lands of the MCFN (Inuvialuit Environmental and Geotechnical Inc. 2002). The MCFN issued a letter to Glacier Power in September 2002 confirming that Glacier Power had satisfactorily consulted with them.

**Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation (ACFN)**

The ACFN requested funding to pay for an independent consultant to review the EIA. An MOU with the ACFN was reached and signed in April 2002. Along with outlining long-term communication plans, this MOU allowed for the review of the EIA and other project information by an independent consultant. As the results of this review indicated that the Peace–Athabasca Delta and traditional lands of the ACFN would not be affected by the Project, the ACFN subsequently issued a letter withdrawing their intervention in the project review process (Hydroconsult 2002.)

**Paddle Prairie Métis Settlement**

Glacier Power was notified of the Paddle Prairie Métis interest in the Project by AENV in October 2000. Numerous phone calls and letters, as well as personal visits to the Paddle Prairie Métis Settlement, resulted in no response from the group. Glacier Power was notified in September 2001 that Ackroyd, Piasta, Roth & Day LLP (Barristers and Solicitors) would be representing Paddle Prairie as well as the ACFN. It was agreed that the independent review of project information requested by the ACFN would be expanded to consider potential impacts of the Project on Paddle Prairie. The independent review concluded that the Project is extremely unlikely to have any effect on the traditional lands and activities of the Paddle Prairie Métis Settlement. A representative of Paddle Prairie participated at the October 2002 hearing in Fairview (see below), and claimed inadequate consultation; however, the EUB and
NRCB Boards determined that the opportunity for adequate consultation had been provided, and that the Paddle Prairie traditional lands were not likely to be affected in any way by the Project.

6.4.2 2002 Public Hearing

The following First Nations and Métis groups made submissions or attended the joint EUB and NRCB hearing held in October 2002.

Submissions 2001
- Deninu K’ue First Nation, Fort Resolution, Environmental Working Committee
- Athabasca-Chipewyan First Nation (withdrawn)
- Paddle Prairie Métis Settlement (two submissions)

Submissions 2002
- Paddle Prairie Métis Settlement

Attended Hearing October 2002
- Deninu K’ue First Nation, Fort Resolution, Environmental Working Committee
- Paddle Prairie Métis Settlement (Bill McElhanney, Ackroyd, Piasta Roth & Day LLP)
- Duncan’s First Nations (Chief Don Testawich and Mr. Duane Goodstriker)
- Treaty 8 First Nation (Mr. Jim Graves)

After the hearing, the joint panel issued a written review and decision (March 2003). Section 7.3 and 8 of the joint panel review addresses effects on downstream communities and Glacier Power’s public and Aboriginal consultation program. The panel findings state that impacts on downstream communities such as Paddle Prairie (350 km), Fort Smith and Fort Resolution (1000 km plus) would be insignificant given the design and scale of the Project. The Project and its environmental effects with respect to downstream communities have not changed since the previous application in 2000.

6.4.3 2004 Disclosure and EIA Terms of Reference

In March 2004, copies of the draft Terms of Reference and Disclosure Document were distributed to all of the First Nations and Métis groups initially contacted during the 2000 EIA and application (see Table 6.4-3). Each of these groups has been kept informed of the progress of the present EIA and application regardless of their participation in the 2002 Hearings. Glacier Power followed up this mail distribution with advertisements and general open houses in Fairview, Peace River and Spirit River, Alberta to collect feedback on the draft ToR for the Project. No First Nations representatives attended these open houses.

In March 2004 Glacier Power received responses to the distribution of the Draft Terms of Reference from the ACFN Industry Relations Corporation, MCFN Industry Relations Corporation and Kee Tas Kee Now Tribal Council (Treaty 8). The response from the ACFN indicated their interest in engaging in a dialogue with Glacier Power, and reviewing the EIA when submitted. The response from the MCFN provided comments on the Draft Terms of Reference, primarily with respect to consideration of environmental and socio-economic effects on the Peace–Athabasca Delta, effects of climate change on the Project, and adaptive management planning. The Kee Tas Kee Now Tribal Council had received
notification of the Draft Terms of Reference through the Treaty 8 office, and provided a notice to Glacier Power to send future correspondence directly to the individual member nations of the council, being the Loon River Cree, Whitefish Lake and Woodland Cree First Nations. Glacier Power has directed subsequent correspondence accordingly.

6.4.4 Recent Consultation Activities

Since March 2004, Glacier Power has been working to resolve outstanding issues identified by the Boards, in particular fish- and ice-related issues. While this work was ongoing, telephone communication, e-mails, project update newsletters and written correspondence were undertaken to keep First Nations and Métis groups up-to-date on Glacier Power’s progress. A general summary of correspondence with First Nations and Métis groups is provided below in Table 6.4-3.

Table 6.4-3: First Nations and Métis Consultation and Information Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>First Nations and Métis Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2004</td>
<td>Disclosure document and draft terms of reference</td>
<td>Athabasca-Chipewyan First Nation¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athabasca-Chipewyan First Nation IRC²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paddle Prairie Métis Settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duncan’s First Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 6, 2004</td>
<td>Update newsletter and letter</td>
<td>Mikisew Cree First Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mikisew Cree First Nation IRC²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loon River Cree First Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whitefish Lake First Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodland Cree First Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treaty 8 First Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Western Cree Tribal Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Horse Lake First Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little Red River Cree First Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tall Cree Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2004</td>
<td>Update newsletter</td>
<td>North Peace Tribal Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deninu K’ue First Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salt River First Nation #195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2005</td>
<td>Update newsletter</td>
<td>Smith’s Landing First Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Métis Nation of Alberta, Zone 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Vermilion Métis Nation Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Métis Local #125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2006</td>
<td>Update letter and invitation to consult</td>
<td>Fort Resolution Métis Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Métis Local #50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mackenzie River Basin Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. July 2004 Terms of Reference and Letter sent only to Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation Industry Relations Corporation
2. IRC Industry Relations Corporation

The newsletters of June 2004, July 2004 and June 2006 were accompanied by letters offering to meet with each First Nations and Métis group. The only groups to respond to Glacier Power’s invitations to consult have come from the Duncan’s First Nations and the Mikisew Cree First Nation. To honour the spirit of the MOU signed with the ACFN in 2002, Glacier Power has continued its efforts to consult with the ACFN as well. Communications with these First Nations has been tracked in the consultation database, and are summarized below.
Duncan’s First Nations

Glacier Power has continued to uphold the MOU signed with the Duncan’s First Nations. Periodic telephone calls to update the Duncan’s First Nations on the Project, and to hear updates on the progress of the Traditional Land Use Study funded by Glacier Power, have occurred from 2003 to the present. Glacier Power met with the Duncan’s First Nations in Fairview on July 15, 2006, when the Duncan’s First Nations expressed their interest in seeing the Project proceed and gave full support to the Project. The Duncan’s First Nations Traditional Knowledge and Land Use Effects Assessment was submitted to Glacier Power on July 6, 2006. The study identified one gathering area for medicinal and sacred plants near the confluence of Hines Creek and the Peace River; however, due to the design of the access road using existing trails on the floodplain, the Project is not expected to conflict with this or any other traditional uses of the project area. Glacier Power will continue to communicate and consult with the Duncan’s First Nations throughout project development, construction and operations phases.

Mikisew Cree First Nation

Glacier Power has maintained contact with the MCFN since the 2002 hearing, both through mailed updates, and regular email correspondence with the MCFN IRC. Based on consultation to date, it is understood that the MCFN will once again require an independent technical review of the EIA and application documents when they are submitted. Glacier Power initiated this technical review of the Project with MCFN’s consultant, Management and Solutions in Environmental Science (MSES) at a meeting in Calgary on June 21, 2006. Glacier Power expects that the review will be similar in scope and outcome to the review done in 2002, as the Project and its environmental effects with respect to the Peace–Athabasca Delta have not changed.

Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation

Glacier Power has continued to send the ACFN regular newsletter updates, and has attempted to contact them directly via e-mail and phone to discuss the Project and the ACFN’s consultation requirements. Although Glacier Power has not had a response from the ACFN since the initial response to the draft ToR in 2004, Glacier Power expects to honour the spirit of the MOU signed in 2002, and is prepared to work with the ACFN in that regard.

Glacier Power understands that consultation is an ongoing process and intends to continue consultation with First Nations and Métis groups throughout the development of the Project. Glacier Power has been responding to, and taking into account, the interests and concerns of First Nations and Métis groups potentially affected by the Project, and will continue to build relationships, programs and communications with the First Nations and Métis groups.

6.5 Outstanding Issues

Glacier Power has made a concerted effort to inform the public, First Nations and Métis groups about the Project and to invite and respond to comments. Although the public information and consultation program has been very extensive, there will be individuals and organizations that have been missed. All outstanding consultation issues or tasks will continue throughout the review process enabling Glacier Power to reach those who were not informed earlier in the planning process.
Glacier Power is actively working with special interest groups, such as the Town of Peace River, CROSS and BC Hydro, to address and resolve their issues and concerns. Glacier Power is also continuing to facilitate review of project materials by interested or potentially affected First Nations. Although Glacier Power has made significant progress to inform, consult with and mitigate concerns raised by these groups, they have expressed a desire to review the formal EIA and applications before any final solutions or agreements can be reached.

### 6.6 Planned Public Consultation Activities

Glacier Power plans to continue the distribution of update newsletters and will keep the project website active throughout the regulatory approvals process.

The next general public open houses will be held after the submission of this EIA report and application documents. These open houses are intended to facilitate public understanding and receive feedback on the EIA.

Glacier Power will continue consulting with interested parties in the upcoming months. This consultation may take the form of individual or group meetings, telephone calls and e-mail correspondence to discuss specific concerns about the Project. Glacier Power will continue its proactive approach to stakeholder engagement and issue resolution throughout the development of the Project.

Glacier Power has been responding to and considering the interests and concerns of the public, First Nations and Métis groups potentially affected by the Project. Glacier Power will continue to build relationships, programs and communications with the First Nations and Métis groups.

### 6.7 Summary

Glacier Power has undertaken a broad public and Aboriginal consultation program that was initiated in 1999 and has continued to the present application in 2006. Glacier Power has consulted and built relationships with interested individuals and groups from British Columbia to the Peace–Athabasca Delta. Though not all parties consulted with are potentially directly affected by project activities, Glacier Power is committed to discussing the project with all interested parties to ensure widespread understanding of the scale and design of the Project, and of its potential effects. Consultation is an ongoing process that Glacier Power intends to continue throughout the development of the Project.

Glacier Power is continuing to work actively with special interest groups such as the Town of Peace River, CROSS and BC Hydro to address and resolve their issues and concerns. Glacier Power is also continuing to work to facilitate review of project materials by interested or potentially affected First Nations groups. Although Glacier Power has made significant progress to inform, consult with and mitigate concerns raised by these groups, some have expressed a desire to review the formal EIA and applications before any final solutions or agreements can be reached.

Overall, local and regional support for the Project is very strong. Many local residents and municipalities are excited about the economic and labour benefits, and about the appropriate use of vast energy resource in the Peace River for low-impact, long-term, stable, green power generation in northwestern Alberta.