

Mayall, Jane EAO:EX

FILE COPY

From: Eichenberger, Kathy EAO:EX
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2011 5:00 PM
To: 'dansoprovich'
Cc: Smith, Alanya C EAO:EX; Mayall, Jane EAO:EX
Subject: 30050-20/SREI-05-06 RE: Workshop or ? for Nation?

Not necessarily – however of we intend to ask them now best to consult them and their community.

From: dansoprovich
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2011 2:28 PM
To: Eichenberger, Kathy EAO:EX
Cc: Smith, Alanya C EAO:EX
Subject: Workshop or ? for Nation?

Kathy.

One thing I picked up some of during the call was the possibility of a workshop or other public consultation. Sounds good.

Were you thinking of anything like that for the Nation?

dan

Mayall, Jane EAO:EX

FILE COPY

From: Eichenberger, Kathy EAO:EX
Sent: Tuesday, April 5, 2011 5:29 PM
To: 'admin@robertsonenvironmental.com'; 'zoltan.fabian@ceaa-acee.gc.ca'; Motisca, Dan EAO:EX; 'Magnan, Alain'; Cowgill, Andrea N ILMB:EX; Motisca, Dan EAO:EX
Cc: Mayall, Jane EAO:EX
Subject: 30050-20/SREI-05-06 30050-20/SREI-05-02 Stl'ixwim March 14 draft meeting minutes

Hello all:

Attached are the draft minutes from our March 14th meeting. Please let me know if there are any errors or omissions.

I don't have the email addresses for everyone who attended, so please circulate as needed.

Thank you.

Kathy



Stl'ixwim_Mar14_1
1_ Meeting Mi...

Kathy Eichenberger P. Eng.
Project Assessment Director
Environmental Assessment Office
off.: 250 387-7983

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Stl'ixwim Renewable Energy Initiative Project

Dial-in Information:

| | |
|---------|-----------------|
| Phone # | Conference ID # |
|---------|-----------------|

EAO-2013-00009
Page 3

- Size of laydown areas have been reduced
- Chickwat Creek bridge location has been moved upstream to where the old railway bridge is.
- A letter has been provided by TC (Jim Shallenberg) saying that the creek is non-navigable.
- C1 and C2 intakes have been moved 50m and 300-400m, respectively, to lower risk areas that avoid terrain hazards
- KE told the Proponent that in their application they must state the reasons for any changes proposed to the design
- The diversion is 2.8km
- Fish-bearing- Dolly Varden

4. SS Creek:

- Dam removed
- Drawdown scenario is 30m below natural (where the intake will be constructed)
- Hydrometric analysis to show loss of flows on the SS and the Tzoonie. Id the contribution of SS on the mainstem.
- For 5 months the lake will not be contributing to the downstream flows (P.O.D)
- Barriers to fish passage exist near the confluence of SS and Tzoonie. The majority of the SS is non fish-bearing
- No engineered Instream Flow Release (IFR) is proposed. Natural 'spillage' will occur approx. 7 months of the year, depending on freshet. Analysis shows that the drainage experiences very irregular flows.
- It was recommended to the Proponent that they describe the change to instream flows, rather than say 'none'
- Requirement of application to describe the flows/ IFR and how the proposed drawdown may affect the instream flows.
- Proposed mitigation is to keep the lake full during the amphibian breeding period (May 20- July 31)
- Tunnel opening in SS lake is proposed at 40m
- DFO emphasized that the agency will have a serious concern with the large drawdowns being proposed. DFO would prefer to see positive fluctuations.
- DFO identifies that the level of risk with the proposed project is significant. The key issues for DFO are: 2 km movement of water; 30m drawdown; no IFR; geotechnical (stability); water quality (T, Chem, TDS)
- DFO will need to provide authorization for the project to proceed so these issues must be resolved.
- Peter Freely, geomorphologist/ geologist is mapping bathymetry

- Proponent has a Registered Professional assess all 3 lakes for geotechnical issues
- Proponent will have to demonstrate a very low probability of failure (operating plan to include monitoring)
- The EA may require certain project components excluded from the certificate if they are unacceptable.
- DFO recommends that an assessment of the natural hydrograph to determine the natural variation of the lake levels.

5. CC Creek

- Drawdown scenario is 5m up and 45m down.
- Positive storage on CC lake could be released to compensate the diversion reach
- Diversion reach is more than 1 km of tunnel from the lake to where on CC creek the water is re-introduced
- The tunnel proposed is longer (600-700 m)
- Fish access is poor/ the creek is sub-surface most of the year. An alluvial fan blocks entrance to the stream
- The Powerhouse has been moved due to being located within an avalanche zone
-

6. Upper Ramona

- Use of a floating surface pump rather than a tunnel tap
- Proponent needs to describe the length of the diversion length
- Drawdown scenario is 3m up and 45m down. A weir will be built.
- The lake level would be permanently lowered and would not spill again (projected variation of 9m -29m below natural)
-

7. Lower Ramona

- The R1 tributary moved upstream about 200m to re-align penstock with terrain and use existing roads
- A new, permanent road is proposed behind the residences, about 10-20m from their property line
- The plans have been shared with residents by the consultant
- About 600m of the tributary will be bypassed
- The mainstem (below the falls) has fish

- No fish have been found above the lower falls, except that MOE found cutthroat trout in a short section (50-100m) above the fall, near the proposed powerhouse site.
- Local residents fish this site

8. Transmission Line:

- A new underwater survey is planned for a new route to avoid a boat haven and the OGMA
- Need an impact assessment in the Application

9. Options/ Next steps:

- CEAA asked if the proposed transmission line will cross the Sechelt IR? Proponent states it is not crossing the IR

s.16

10. First Nations:

- A summary table of consultation and accommodation is available

s.16

s.16

- Al Magnan is the primary coordinator for FN consultation
- Andrea is the lead on coordinating the permitting and First Nations consultation for the Province, post-EA

11. Fish/ Fish Habitat:

- Dave Bates explained that Char have been confirmed through the entire diversion reach on Chickwat Creek, and throughout the creek
- MOE will need to confirm the presence of resident Dolly or Bull Trout

- Currently working under premise that they are Dolly
- By moving the powerhouse, a 50m stretch containing steelhead and used for local fishing spot will be impacted
- The lower reaches are salmon spawning habitat, while the upper contains steelhead, Char and Dolly
- Tributaries are not thought to be connected in the summer
- Dave Bates will provide the data on moving the re-introduction of the SS diversion downstream
- SS water contribution in the dry season is negligible.
- No firm HADD number has been calculated yet
- Working on the proposed IFR numbers
- Chickwat and Ramona are most concerning related to the IFR
- It is difficult and dangerous to access these steep streams to conduct assessments
- Work with MOE to determine how best to assess the pre/post populations of Char (Erin Stoddard and Scott Barrett)
- Look at the OEMP's from other projects to learn from them
- SS is also the control for monitoring of the Tyson Creek
- Ramona: there are access issues – landowners have not granted permission to go on their land to access the creek and collect data.
- Potential options: set a conservative IFR in the absence of actual data.
- Use RIC standards with some modification; depletion sampling, and DRIFT
- Recently, Interfor has logged a lot of the area.
- The Lakes are classed as non fish-bearing
- Proponent has been collecting data on T, WQ at depth
- KE suggested that the IFR discussion happen with the fisheries people prior to the submission of the Application.
- A fisheries technical working group will be held to discuss this issue.

Action: EAO will set up this meeting in mid-April and invite the right experts to attend

- There are new protocols/ rules for monitoring fish presence/ absence that MNRO can provide. Need to use this procedure.
- In the absence of info should assume fish presence.
- Min of 2 years of samplings with multiple methods is required (AM.)

12. Public Consultation Process:

- KE stated that the public consultation process may be 'enhanced'
- EAO and CEAA will discuss best format etc.
- Potential for a weekend workshop
- CEAA has opted out of the formal public consultation, but will participate the EAO's process

13. Concurrent Permitting:

- The applications for permitting will be required at the same time as the application
- The draft CEMP and OEMP need to also be included in the application. They need to be as complete as possible rather than just an outline. This is an important part of mitigation and more information provided up front will save time later on. Jim stated that they need solid numbers in the EMPs that can be put into the water licence
- Proponent expects to submit the Application by June 1, 2011