

Sept. 4, 2018

BC Hydro selects new alignment for Highway 29 redesign

Copyright



-30-

Backgrounder

Consultation process

In January 2018, BC Hydro began engaging with Indigenous groups and property owners to share information and seek feedback on two alternate realignment options. Indigenous groups and property owners were provided the draft evaluation criteria that would be used for selecting a new realignment and were invited to comment on the criteria.

A third realignment option was developed in early March as a result of the consultation process and became one of the realignment options that BC Hydro assessed.

Indigenous groups were asked to identify areas of cultural importance around the three realignment options. Several Indigenous groups conducted ground-truthing investigations and reported on their findings. Indigenous groups were also invited, and some participated, as cultural monitors and archaeological field assistants during the geotechnical and archaeological investigations.

Throughout the spring and summer of 2018, BC Hydro undertook a number of investigations to inform the evaluation process criteria, and continued consultations with property owners and Indigenous groups.

In late July 2018, BC Hydro met with five Indigenous groups and seven property owners to share and seek feedback on the preliminary findings of the investigations and evaluation criteria. Feedback received throughout the consultation was then considered as part of the final evaluation process.

Realignment options

The following is a description of the three realignment options that were assessed:

- Option 1: shifts the alignment north about 170 metres from a potential burial site and 90 metres from the sweat lodge. This option has a 145 metre longer bridge and an additional 80 metres of road length compared to the original alignment. The additional combined bridge and road length is 225 metres.
- Option 2: shifts the alignment even further north about 300 metres away from a potential burial site and 590 metres from the sweat lodge. This option has a 245 metre longer bridge and an additional 720 metres of road length compared to the original alignment. The additional combined bridge and road length is 965 metres.
- Option 3 (selected): shifts the alignment between the first and second options about 240 metres away from a potential burial site and 370 metres from the sweat lodge. This has a 195 metre longer bridge and an additional 250 metres of road length compared to the original alignment. The additional combined bridge and road length is 445 metres.

Lindsay Thompson
BC Hydro Indigenous Relations
10th Floor, 6911 Southpoint Drive
Burnaby, BC V3N 4X8

September 4, 2018

Attention: Chief and Council
[Indigenous group/property owner(s)]
Street address
[City], BC [postal code]

BY: [Email only]

RE: Site C Project: Selected Realignment Option for Redesign of Highway 29 at Cache Creek/Bear Flat

Dear [Chief and Council],

As follow up to our meeting on [Date] and our letter dated July 20, 2018, we would like to provide you with an update on our selected realignment option for the redesign of Highway 29 at Cache Creek/Bear Flat.

BC Hydro has selected **Option 3** (middle route) as the new realignment for Cache Creek east [see **Appendix A** for a description of the options and a map]. Option 3 shifts the alignment approximately 240 metres away from a potential burial site and 370 metres from the sweat lodge. We came to this decision using a structured decision making process. This letter contains a summary of the process, including how your input was used, and the final evaluation and rationale for the realignment selection.

Overview of the Decision-Making Process

In December 2017, the Province of B.C. requested BC Hydro and the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure to work with Treaty 8 First Nations and others to redesign the Highway 29 realignment at Cache Creek/Bear Flat to reduce the effects on potential burial and First Nation identified areas of cultural importance, including a sweat lodge.

In January 2018, BC Hydro began engaging with Indigenous groups and property owners to share information and seek feedback on two potential realignment options. The two realignment options were developed in response to the concerns of Indigenous groups, taking into account the existing Provincial and Federal environmental assessment authorizations and Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure design criteria. One option was developed within the Environmental Assessment Certificate corridor and one option was developed further north. In late February/early March, a third option was developed through the consultation process and included in the assessment process.

BC Hydro evaluated the three options using a structured decision making process that was outlined in our letter to you dated January 9 and 10, 2018. This process has been used by BC Hydro for other capital projects and includes the following key evaluation criteria:

- Indigenous and cultural interests
- Heritage
- Permitting and regulatory

- Properties
- Environmental impact
- Scheduling impact
- Engineering design standard
- Cost impact
- Road safety measures

Over several months, BC Hydro undertook a number of investigations to inform the evaluation process criteria, and continued consultation with Indigenous groups and property owners.

Through this process, BC Hydro determined that all three realignment options were feasible, and as a result, removed the original planned route (2017) as an option so that we were consistent with government's direction to redesign this portion of the highway.

Inclusion of First Nations' Feedback into the Realignment Selection

As part of the consultation process, we shared the decision making process with Indigenous groups, draft evaluation criteria and information on each of the options. Indigenous groups were invited to comment on the criteria, to review mapping and spatial data, and to conduct ground-truthing of each of the realignment options. Indigenous groups were also invited to participate as cultural monitors and archaeological field assistants during the geotechnical and archaeological investigations.

Feedback received through the consultation process was then considered as part of the final evaluation. The key issues raised by Indigenous groups during consultation were:

- Cultural impacts: Concerns over potential impacts and proximity to identified areas of cultural importance including gathering sites, potential burial sites, and the sweat lodge (primarily related to Option 1).
- Impacts to traditional gathering sites: For Options 2 and 3, Indigenous groups identified berry picking and medicinal plants sites, and expressed concerns with impacts to these areas. In recognition of these concerns, we have sent you a letter dated August 27, 2018, to invite you to carry out harvesting of plants in advance of work planned later this fall.
- Heritage impacts: General concerns over potential impacts and overlap of each of the route options on known archaeological sites.
- Vegetation impacts: Concerns over loss or degradation of plant and ecological communities at risk, as well as treed ecosystems that could provide habitat for wildlife. Concerns were also expressed about the potential introduction and spread of invasive plant and weed species.
- Wildlife impacts: Concerns were raised about potential impacts to wildlife including bears, elk, moose, deer, squirrels, and birds. As noted during the consultation process, going forward, we will continue to work with Indigenous groups on plans to avoid or mitigate these impacts where feasible.
- Ungulate impacts: For Options 1 and 2, concerns were also expressed over potential impacts to ungulate, proximity of the routes to ungulate winter range, and potential for vehicle collisions with ungulates.

Selection of Option 3 for the Highway Realignment

Based on the above evaluation process, including Indigenous and property owners' input, Option 3 was selected as the new realignment. Compared to the other options, the selected route:

- Indigenous group input:
 - is second furthest away from the potential burial site and sweat lodge;
 - affects the second lowest area of sites identified as potential gathering sites;
 - is expected to have lower ungulate collision risk;
- Environmental and heritage impacts:
 - is the second shortest route of the three considered;
 - has similar if not lower impacts to heritage sites;
- Property owner input: Has lower impacts to private lands and agricultural lands than Option 2;
- Safety: Meets or exceeds Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure design and safety requirements;
- Design and schedule: Has similar if not lower impacts to design and construction schedule; and
- Cost: Has the lowest overall cost than the other route options (though the variance between options was nominal).

In August 2018, the project team took its recommendation to BC Hydro executive who agreed with the selection of Option 3.

Attached is a summary of our final evaluation and summary structured decision making table [refer to **Appendix B**]. At your convenience, we would be happy to meet with you to discuss our findings and decision on the new realignment. In addition, we would also like to continue discussions on mitigation for potential environmental and archaeological impacts for this selected route.

We'll also be continuing with activities such as archaeological and geotechnical investigations, which will inform the final design of this route. Construction on this portion of highway realignment is planned to begin by spring/summer 2020. Construction on the western four kilometres of the highway realignment at Cache Creek/Bear Flat – which is not affected by the redesign – will begin in late September 2018.

Thank you for your participation throughout this consultation process, and if you have any questions, please feel free to reach out to myself (at Lindsay.thompson@bchydro.com) or one of the team members.

Sincerely,

Lindsay Thompson
Director, Indigenous Relations

cc:

Enclosure: Appendix A: Description and map of the Highway 29 realignment options at Cache Creek

Appendix B: Summary Structured Decision Making Evaluation Table

Appendix A: Description and map of the Highway 29 realignment options at Cache Creek

The following is a description of the three realignment options [please also see the map below]:

- **Option 1** shifts the alignment north, approximately 170 metres from a potential burial site and 90 metres from the sweat lodge. This option utilizes a 145 metre longer bridge and has an additional 80 metres of road length compared to the Environmental Impact Statement alignment. The combined additional length is 225 metres.
- **Option 2** shifts the alignment even further north, approximately 300 metres away from a potential burial site and 590 metres from the sweat lodge. This option utilizes a 245 metre longer bridge and has an additional 720 metres of road length compared to the Environmental Impact Statement alignment. The combined additional length is 965 metres.
- **Option 3 (selected)** was proposed in the consultation process. It shifts the alignment between the first and second options, approximately 240 metres away from a potential burial site and 370 metres from the sweat lodge. This option utilizes a 195 metre longer bridge and has an additional 250 metres of road length compared to the Environmental Impact Statement alignment. The combined additional length is 445 metres.

Appendix B: Summary Structured Decision Making Evaluation Table

s.19,s.22

BC Hydro Properties
12th Floor, 333 Dunsmuir Street
Vancouver, BC V6B 5R3

September 4, 2018

[Property owner(s)]

Street address

[City], BC [postal code]

RE: Site C Project: Selected Realignment Option for Redesign of Highway 29 at Cache Creek/Bear Flat

Dear [Property Owner],

As follow up to our meetings on January 16 and July 26, we would like to provide you with an update on our selected realignment option for the redesign of Highway 29 at Cache Creek/Bear Flat.

BC Hydro has selected **Option 3** (middle route) as the new realignment [see **Appendix A** for a description of the options and a map]. Option 3 shifts the alignment approximately 240 metres away from a potential burial site and 370 metres from the sweat lodge. We came to this decision using a structured decision making process. This letter contains a summary of the process, including how your input was used, and the final evaluation and rationale for the realignment selection.

Overview of the Decision Making Process

In December 2017, the Province of B.C. requested BC Hydro and the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure to work with Treaty 8 First Nations and others to redesign the Highway 29 realignment at Cache Creek/Bear Flat to reduce the effects on potential burial sites and First Nation identified areas of cultural importance, including a sweat lodge.

In January 2018, BC Hydro began engaging with Indigenous groups and property owners to share information and seek feedback on two potential realignment options. The two realignment options were developed in response to the concerns of Indigenous groups, taking into account the existing Provincial and Federal environmental assessment authorizations and Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure design criteria. One option was developed within the Environmental Assessment Certificate corridor and one option was developed further north. In late February/early March, a third option was developed through the consultation process and included in the assessment process.

BC Hydro evaluated the three options using a structured decision making process that was outlined in our letter to you dated January 9, 2018. This process has been used by BC Hydro for other capital projects and includes the following key evaluation criteria:

- Indigenous and cultural interests
- Heritage
- Permitting and regulatory
- Properties
- Environmental impact
- Scheduling impact
- Engineering design standard

- Cost impact
- Road safety measures

Over several months, BC Hydro undertook a number of investigations to inform the evaluation process criteria, and continued consultation with Indigenous groups and property owners.

Through this process, BC Hydro determined that all three realignment options were feasible, and therefore removed the original planned route (2017) as an option to be consistent with government's direction to redesign this portion of the highway.

Inclusion of Property Owner Feedback into the Project Team's Recommendation

As part of the consultation process, property owners were provided the draft evaluation criteria used in the decision making process and were invited to comment on the criteria and review mapping for the realignment options.

Feedback received through the consultation was then considered as part of the final evaluation. The key issues raised by property owners during the consultation process were:

- Third alignment option: Some property owners suggested Option 3 at the meeting in January. Following a determination that the route was feasible, Option 3 was included in the structured decision making process.
- Agricultural impacts: Property owners suggested that agricultural impacts were underrepresented in the structured decision making process. Suggestions were made to include assessments of size and quality of impacted agricultural lands. In response, the project updated the structured decision making process to include this information.
- Impacts to businesses: Concerns were raised that Option 2 would create the greatest impact to existing businesses and other agreements. Impacts to commercial operations were included in the structured decision making process.
- Wildlife impacts: Concerns were raised about potential impacts to wildlife including bears, elk, moose, deer, squirrels, and birds. As noted during the consultation process, going forward, we will continue to work on plans to avoid or mitigate these impacts where feasible.

Selection of Option 3 for the Highway Realignment

Based on the above evaluation process, including input from Indigenous groups and property owners, Option 3 was selected as the new realignment. Compared to the other options, the selected route:

- Indigenous group input:
 - is second furthest away from the potential burial site and sweat lodge;
 - affects the second lowest area of sites identified as potential gathering sites;
 - is expected to have lowest wildlife collision risk;
- Environmental and heritage impacts:
 - is the second shortest route of the three considered;
 - has similar if not lower impacts to heritage sites;
- Property owner input: Has lower impacts to private lands and agricultural lands than Option 2;
- Safety: meets or exceeds Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure design and safety requirements;

- Design and schedule: Has similar if not lower impacts to design and construction schedule; and
- Cost: Has the lowest overall cost than the other route options (though the variance between options was nominal).

During August 2018, the project team took its recommendation to BC Hydro executive who agreed with the selection of Option 3.

Attached is a summary of our final evaluation and structured decision making summary table [refer to **Appendix B**]. At your convenience, we would be happy to meet with you to discuss our findings and decision on the new realignment.

BC Hydro will be continuing with activities such as archaeological and geotechnical investigations, which will inform the final design of this route. We're happy to discuss these works with you in advance.

This fall we will meet with you to discuss the property acquisition that will be required as a result of the revised realignment. Construction on this portion of highway realignment is planned to begin by spring/summer 2020. Construction on the western four kilometres of the highway realignment at Cache Creek/Bear Flat – which is not affected by the redesign – will begin in late September 2018.

Thank you for your participation throughout this consultation process, and if you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [s.19,s.22](#)

Sincerely,

s.19,s.22

Property Representative, BC Hydro

cc:

Enclosure: Appendix A: Description and map of the Highway 29 realignment options at Cache Creek

Appendix B: Summary Structured Decision Making Evaluation Table

Appendix A: Description and map of the Highway 29 realignment options at Cache Creek

The following is a description of the three realignment options [please also see the attached map]:

- **Option 1** shifts the alignment north, approximately 170 metres from a potential burial site and 90 metres from the sweat lodge. This option utilizes a 145 metre longer bridge and has an additional 80 metres of road length compared to the Environmental Impact Statement alignment. The combined additional length is 225 metres.
- **Option 2** shifts the alignment even further north, approximately 300 metres away from a potential burial site and 590 metres from the sweat lodge. This option utilizes a 245 metre longer bridge and has an additional 720 metres of road length compared to the Environmental Impact Statement alignment. The combined additional length is 965 metres.
- **Option 3 (selected)** was proposed in the consultation process. It shifts the alignment between the first and second options, approximately 240 metres away from a potential burial site and 370 metres from the sweat lodge. This option utilizes a 195 metre longer bridge and has an additional 250 metres of road length compared to the Environmental Impact Statement alignment. The combined additional length is 445 metres.

Appendix B: Summary Structured Decision Making Evaluation Table

BC HYDRO ISSUES NOTE

Issue:	HIGHWAY 29 REDESIGN ANNOUNCEMENT
Spokesperson:	Dave Conway, Community Relations Manager, Site C

ISSUE SUMMARY

On September 4, BC Hydro will announce the selected realignment option for the redesign of Highway 29 at Cache Creek/Bear Flat.

BACKGROUND

- In December 2017, the Province of B.C. requested BC Hydro and the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure work with Treaty 8 First Nations and others to redesign the Highway 29 realignment at Cache Creek/Bear Flat to reduce the effects on potential burial sites and First Nation identified areas of cultural importance, including a sweat lodge.
- In January 2018, BC Hydro began engaging with Indigenous groups and landowners to share information and seek feedback on two alternate realignment options.
- Indigenous groups and property owners were provided the draft evaluation criteria that would be used for selecting a new realignment and were invited to comment on the criteria.
 - A third realignment option was developed through the consultation process in late February/early March and became one of the three realignment options that BC Hydro assessed.
- Indigenous groups were asked to identify areas of cultural importance around the three realignment options.
 - Several Indigenous groups conducted ground-truthing investigations and reported on their findings.
 - Indigenous groups were also invited, and some of them participated, as cultural monitors and archaeological field assistants during the geotechnical and archaeological investigations.
- The realignment options were evaluated using a structured decision making process, which has been used for other BC Hydro capital projects.
- The framework for the process includes key evaluation criteria that will be assessed and considered in the decision making process. The key criteria included in the framework are:
 - Indigenous and cultural interests
 - Heritage and archeological
 - Permitting and regulatory
 - Properties
 - Environmental impact
 - Schedule impact
 - Engineering design standard
 - Cost impact

- Road safety measures
- Over several months, BC Hydro undertook a number of investigations to inform the evaluation process criteria, and continued consultations with property owners and Indigenous groups.
- Feedback received throughout the consultation was then considered as part of the final evaluation process.

Selected route

- The selected realignment option – which emerged during the consultation process – is located north of the original route.
- This option is the second shortest route of the three considered, meets provincial design and safety requirements and includes a longer bridge at the Cache Creek crossing.
- Compared to the two other options that were considered, the selected route:
 - has similar or lower impacts to archaeological and heritage sites; and
 - has lower impacts to private lands and agricultural lands than Option 2.
- BC Hydro has committed to continue working with Indigenous groups on measures to avoid, mitigate or reduce impacts to identified cultural areas and environmental effects.
- BC Hydro estimates the cost will be about 10 per cent more than the cost of the original alignment.

Risks

- Several affected property owners and the two of the Treaty 8 First Nations maintain their general opposition to the project.
- It is unlikely that these groups will be satisfied with the realignment decision, and may voice their opposition and criticize the structured decision making process publicly.

KEY MESSAGES

- BC Hydro is committed to working with Treaty 8 First Nations and property owners on the redesign of the eastern portion of Highway 29 at Cache Creek/Bear Flat.
- Since the beginning of the year, we've been evaluating three realignment options in consultation with Indigenous groups and property owners.
- Feedback from the consultation process was used to develop the third option, the one that was ultimately chosen.

- The selected realignment option is located north of the original route and is approximately 240 metres away from a potential burial site and 370 metres from an area identified to be of cultural importance.
- Compared to the two other options we considered, this route:
 - has similar or lower impacts to archaeological and heritage sites; and
 - has lower impacts to private lands and agricultural lands than the most northern realignment evaluated.
- BC Hydro thanks the Indigenous groups and property owners that participated in our evaluation process and appreciate all of the feedback we received.

TOP QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. What realignment options were evaluated?

- There were three alternate route options evaluated:
 - Option 1 shifts the alignment north, approximately 170 metres from a potential burial site and 90 metres from the sweat lodge. This option utilizes a 145 metre longer bridge and has an additional 80 metres of road length compared to the original alignment. The combined additional road and bridge length is 225 metres.
 - Option 2 shifts the alignment even further north, approximately 300 metres away from a potential burial site and 590 metres from the sweat lodge. This option utilizes a 245 metre longer bridge and has an additional 720 metres of road length compared to the original alignment. The combined additional road and bridge length is 965 metres.
 - Option 3 (selected), proposed early in the consultation process, shifts the alignment between the first and second options, approximately 240 metres away from a potential burial site and 370 metres from the sweat lodge. This option utilizes a 195 metre longer bridge and has an additional 250 metres of road length compared to the original alignment. The combined additional road and bridge length is 445 metres.

2. Why didn't you consider the route proposed by Nun wa dee?

- There are a number of significant technical and engineering challenges, as well as significant costs arising from those challenges, related to the route proposed by Nun wa dee in March 2017. This includes:
 - West of Cache Creek, the route would traverse areas of anticipated instability at the toe of the bluff, based on evidence of numerous landslides in the area. The Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure advised that the highway should not be built along those unstable slopes; therefore further revisions to the route would be required to meet Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure standards.
 - East of Cache Creek, the route is substantially longer than the other options, and would require a large excavation of cut material (hundreds of thousands of cubic metres) and a large embankment of granular material (again, hundreds of thousands of cubic metres) to support the road. This is acknowledged in the Graham report prepared for Nun wa dee in March 2017.

- The technical challenges and related costs associated with this route are substantial.
- 3. Was the original realignment considered as part of the evaluation process?**
- After we determined that all three of the realignment options were feasible, we no longer considered the original route as an option.
 - This is in line with the Province's direction to redesign this portion of highway to reduce the effects on potential burial sites and First Nation identified areas of cultural importance.
- 4. Was the original realignment considered as part of the evaluation process?**
- After we determined that all three of the realignment options were feasible, we no longer considered the original route as an option.
 - This is in line with the Province's direction to redesign this portion of highway to reduce the effects on potential burial sites and First Nation identified areas of cultural importance.
- 5. Can you tell me more about the evaluation process?**
- Since early 2018, BC Hydro has been evaluating three realignment options, which included consultation with local property owners and Indigenous groups.
 - The framework for the evaluation included key evaluation criteria that were assessed and considered in the decision making process.
 - The key criteria included a number of factors, such as:
 - Indigenous and cultural interests
 - Properties
 - Environmental impacts
 - Schedule and cost impacts
 - Road safety measures
- 6. What did consultation entail?**
- In January 2018, we began engaging with Indigenous groups and property owners to share information and seek feedback on two alternate realignment options.
 - Indigenous groups and property owners were provided the draft evaluation criteria that would be used for selecting a new realignment and were invited to comment on the criteria.
 - A third realignment option was developed through the consultation process in late February/early March and became one of the three realignment options that BC Hydro assessed.
 - Indigenous groups were asked to identify areas of cultural importance around the three realignment options.
 - Several Indigenous groups conducted ground-truthing investigations and reported on their findings.

- Indigenous groups were also invited, and some of them participated, as cultural monitors and archaeological field assistants during the geotechnical and archaeological investigations.
- Throughout the spring and summer of 2018, BC Hydro undertook a number of investigations to inform the evaluation process criteria, and continued consultations with property owners and Indigenous groups.
- In late July 2018, following a package of preliminary findings that went to Indigenous groups, we met with five Indigenous groups and seven property owners to share and seek feedback on the preliminary findings of the investigations and evaluation criteria.
- Feedback received throughout the consultation was then considered as part of the final evaluation process.

7. How did you weigh the criteria?

- Due to the challenges and difficulties with assigning specific weights to each of the evaluation criteria, we chose an evaluation process that took all factors into account, with flexibility for additional feedback or inputs that were identified during consultation.

8. How much more is this realignment going to cost?

- We estimate the cost will be about 10 per cent more than the cost of the original alignment.
- Given the nominal variance between the route options, cost did not play a contributing factor in the overall decision.
- We are unable to provide a final cost at this time as this work has yet to be tendered.

9. Will this additional cost to complete the realignment impact the overall Site C budget?

- No, there will not be an impact to the overall budget as we built contingency into our revised budget to cover additional costs related to the redesign.

10. How will this realignment affect property owners?

- Additional impacts include:
 - Additional acquisition of land affecting agricultural fields and business operations of a gravel pit as well as the grazing of cattle.
 - Affects some personal use of the land for activities such as eliminating the ability to hunt on the property (400 metre distance to discharge single projectile firearm), camping and view of wildlife.
 - Opens up areas of the property that were not accessible to the general public.

11. What if property owners refuse to sell their land? Will you expropriate again?

- Our goal is to reach mutually agreed-upon settlements with property owners any time we need to acquire land for the Site C project and we will make every attempt to do so for these acquisitions.

12. Will you sell back property that is not needed back to the original owners?

- BC Hydro will need to work with the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure to transfer the land no longer required to the former landowners.

13. You've already cleared the land you're going to sell back. How are you going to account for that loss of land value?

- The process is different for each parcel of land depending on the property requirements for the project.
- Damage to the land has already been paid in the initial expropriation for the original alignment.
- The land that is no longer required for the project will be sold back to the landowners at reduced cost and a payment for the use of the property, from the date acquired, will be calculated into a settlement.

14. With this new alignment, can^{s.22} stay in their house?

- That's something we are looking into; we're currently conducting a number of investigations to see if it's possible for them to stay in their house.

15. When will work at Cache Creek West begin?

- Construction on the western four kilometres of the highway realignment at Cache Creek/Bear Flat will begin in late September.

16. Why don't you just wait until you're completing the rest of highway realignment at Cache Creek/Bear Flat?

- As the western four kilometres of the highway realignment are not affected by the alternate realignment options being studied in the eastern portion at Cache Creek/Bear Flat, we plan to begin construction this fall.
- Construction of the full Cache Creek/Bear Flat segment of highway realignment is expected to be underway by spring/summer 2020.

17. How much did you have to shift the schedule as a result of this process?

- Work on the highway realignment at Cache Creek/Bear Flat was scheduled to begin last summer, but was put on hold.
- This realignment needs to be complete prior to reservoir filling in 2023, and we're on track to meet this milestone.
- A temporary detour at Cache Creek/Bear Flat will be constructed to address road availability risks during diversion.

Highway 29 Realignment Route Options at Cache Creek – Summary SDM Table

Objective	Units	Option 1 Tweaked Alignment within EIS	Option 2 Northern Route	Option 3 Middle Route South of Gravel Pit	2017 EIS Alignment (Not Considered) *
Min Environmental Impact					
Fed/Prov approvals or amendment requirement	Y/N	Yes (Bridge Only)	Yes	Yes	Yes (Bridge Only)
EAC project description amendment req'd	Y/N	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Risk CEAA consider new alignment, bridge departure from Federal Decision Staten	H/M/L	Low	Med	Med	Vey Low
Risk of ungulate collision	H/M/L	Low	High	High	Vey Low
Riparian habitat cleared (area)	ha	1.3	1.3	1.3	6.0
Instream works (area)	ha	0.85	3.69	3.69	1.38
Forested land cleared (area)	ha	11.0	11.8	22.2	7.1
Rare plant potential	H/M/L	Low	Med	Med	High
Min Social Impact					
Farm operator consultation on boat launch required	Y/N	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cultivated Land Impacted (area)	ha	19.87	41.15	20.96	17.44
Cultivated Land Impacted % (all property ownership type)	%	9.3	19.2	9.8	8.2
Agricultural land severed	H/M/L	Low	Very High	Med	Low
Area of land in ALR occupied by RoW	ha	37.5	48.5	42.8	21.6
Min Impact to Arch & Heritage Sites					
Confirmed arch sites to be impacted	#	12	13	12	14
Confirmed Class 1 arch sites to be impacted	#	5	6	5	3
Percent of route overlapping with arch sites	%	26	13	13	10
Presence of Arch Branch recognized burial sites	Y/N	No	No	No	No
Min Impacts to Indigenous Groups					
Proximity to reported but unconfirmed burial site at 5 1	m	170	300	240	0
Proximity to Sweat Lodge (all options fall within buffer zone)	m	90	590	370	45
Potential impacts to other cultural areas incl. undocumented burials	H/M/L	High	Med	Low	High
Concerns with potential impacts to archaeological sites	H/M/L	High	Med	Med	High
Potential impacts to traditional gathering sites (medicinal plants & berry picking)	H/M/L	Low	High	Med	Low
Potential impacts to ecological resources (vegetation)	H/M/L	Low	Med	Med	Low
Potential impacts to ecological resources (wildlife)	H/M/L	High	Med	Low	High
Concerns with potential impacts to ungulate winter range	H/M/L	Med	Med	Low	Med
Min Properties Impact					
Crown land impacted	ha	24.1	22.2	18.6	0.0
BC Hydro owned land impacted	ha	9.7	5.1	6.3	43.3
Private land impacted (area)	ha	18.7	35.3	29.5	0
Private land impacted (parcels)	#	8	12	10	0
Known impacted businesses	#	6	7	6	0
Additional private holdings severed	#	1	1	3	0
Additional private land severed	ha	1.9	7.1	18.7	0
Land to be purchased/compensated	ha	5.2	25.3	10.9	0
Commercial operation impact (excluding agricultural)	H/M/L	Low	High	Low	Vey Low
Schedule Risk Impact					
Design Schedule	months	12	9	9	4
Construction Schedule	months	28	26	26	26
Schedule (design + construction)	months	40	35	35	30
Property acquisition schedule	months	18	18	18	0
Min Safety Impacts					
Meet or exceed MoT design guidelines	Y/N	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Min Cost Impact					
Commercial operations cost impact (excludes agricultural)	H/M/L	Low	High	Low	Vey Low
Construction risk	More/Less	More	Less	Less	Less
Min Overall Cost Impact					
O&M cost	\$/day	423	517	466	313
Total cost compare to 2017 alignment (incl. Cache Creek West)	%Premium	112%	124%	111%	100%
Legend					
Better than selected					
Worse than selected					
Selected					

*Note: 2017 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) alignment was not assessed as part of the realignment options effort between January and July 2018. It is included in this SDM table for reference.

From: s.19.s.22
To: [Davies, Brent M TRAN:EX](#); [Peet, Corrin TRAN:EX](#); [Phelps, Brendan GCPE:EX](#); [Lowe, Sonia GCPE:EX](#)
Cc: s.19.s.22 : [Alexis, Greg](#)
Subject: FYI: Highway 29 redesign announcement package
Date: Friday, August 31, 2018 9:00:27 AM
Attachments: [2018-08-30 IB - Highway 29 redesign decision.docx](#)
[2018-08-31 IN - Highway 29 redesign decision.docx](#)
[2018-08-31 - Indigenous group letter - Highway 29 redesign decision.docx](#)
[2018-08-31 - Property owner letter - Highway 29 redesign decision.docx](#)
[Appendix A- Map_CacheCr Hwy29 Realignment Options.pdf](#)
[Appendix B - SDM Summary Table.pdf](#)
Importance: High

Good morning,

As you may be aware, we are announcing the route selection for Cache Creek East on **Tuesday, September 4**. Attached is our communication package for the announcement. This is still going through final project approvals, so please do not circulate. Sonia/Brendan, this has been shared with David Haslam at GCPE.

Announcement package includes:

1. Information bulletin
2. Issue note
3. Notifications & appendices:
 - Indigenous groups letter
 - Property owners letter
 - Appendix A: realignment options map
 - Appendix B: SDM summary table

And here is our planned communications roll out:

TIME	ACTION
9:30 a.m.	Notify Indigenous groups and property owners by email (with attached letter).
10:00 a.m.	Update the court that BC Hydro has informed Indigenous groups and property owners of the chosen realignment option.
10:00 a.m.	Follow up with direct phone calls to property owners and Indigenous groups. Offer a follow up meeting to explain decision and next steps.
10:00 a.m.	Post IB and supporting materials to website. Notify local media via email.
10:30 a.m.	Notify local governments, local MLAs and general web subscribers.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Best,

s.19.s.22

This email and its attachments are intended solely for the personal use of the individual or entity named above. Any use of this communication by an unintended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, any publication, use, reproduction, disclosure or dissemination of its contents is strictly prohibited. Please immediately delete this message and its attachments from your computer and servers. We would also appreciate if you would contact us by a collect call or return email to notify us of this error. Thank you for your cooperation.

From: Macdonald, Michelle
To: Davies, Brent M TRAN:EX
Subject: FW: Site C Hwy 29 Realignment Options and BCH Project Update Meeting with s.16
Start: Tuesday, July 17, 2018 10:00:00 AM
End: Tuesday, July 17, 2018 1:00:00 PM
Location: BC Hydro Offices, 3333 - 22nd Avenue, Prince George (Auditorium #1)

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Macdonald, Michelle
Sent: 2018, June 15 3:00 PM
To: Macdonald, Michelle; Clarke, Sue; s.19,s.22 'Katherine.Styba@gov.bc.ca'
Cc: Thompson, Lindsay
Subject: Site C Hwy 29 Realignment Options and BCH Project Update Meeting with s.16
When: 2018, July 17 10:00 AM-1:00 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
Where: BC Hydro Offices, 3333 - 22nd Avenue, Prince George (Auditorium #1)
Agenda:

Site C

Discuss the 3 Hwy 29 Realignment Options (Option 1 – Environmental Impact Statement option; Option 2 – Northern Route Option; and Option 3 – Landowner's Proposed Option) and s.16 input from ground truthing visit on June 20;
Preliminary results on the feasibility analysis and evaluation (Structured Decision Making process)
Schedule and next steps

This email and its attachments are intended solely for the personal use of the individual or entity named above. Any use of this communication by an unintended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, any publication, use, reproduction, disclosure or dissemination of its contents is strictly prohibited. Please immediately delete this message and its attachments from your computer and servers. We would also appreciate if you would contact us by a collect call or return email to notify us of this error. Thank you for your cooperation.
-BCHydroDisclaimerID5.2.8.1541

From: [Maxwell, Scott D TRAN:EX](#)
To: [Crosby, Bryan TRAN:EX](#); [Davies, Brent M TRAN:EX](#); [Marsland, Maggie TRAN:EX](#)
Subject: FW: Site C: schedule mtg (#6502)
Date: Wednesday, September 5, 2018 2:43:35 PM

FYI

Scott Maxwell

Executive Director – Northern Region | Ministry of Transportation & Infrastructure

From: Maxwell, Scott D TRAN:EX
Sent: Wednesday, September 5, 2018 2:43 PM
To: 'Bruce Muir'
Cc: Jason Lee; NWD Site C
Subject: RE: Site C: schedule mtg (#6502)

Hi Bruce,

Thank you for your email. I understand that BC Hydro has recently communicated a selected realignment option for the redesign of Highway 29 at Cache Creek/Bear Flat and offered to meet with you to discuss this new realignment decision.

The Ministry is available to participate in a meeting with Nun wa dee and BC Hydro. If you have specific topics for discussion at this meeting and wish to provide them in advance it would help us identify which Ministry staff would be most suited to attend to help best answer your questions. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Scott Maxwell

Executive Director – Northern Region | Ministry of Transportation & Infrastructure

Phone (250) 565-6479 Email Scott.Maxwell@gov.bc.ca

Current Road Conditions: [DriveBC.ca](#) Find Us Online: [TranBC.ca](#)

From: Bruce Muir [<mailto:BMuir@nunwadee.ca>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2018 4:16 PM
To: Maxwell, Scott D TRAN:EX
Cc: Jason Lee; NWD Site C
Subject: Site C: schedule mtg (#6502)

Hi Scott,

Meeting with the MOTI is the first meeting that the First Nations would like to have. Additional meetings with other agencies/proponent will be scheduled, as appropriate.

As noted in the April 26th letter, the focus of the meeting relates to ^{s.16}

s.16

Other than the first week, our schedules are somewhat flexible. When are you and other representatives of the MOTI available to meet in September?

Please let me know at your earliest opportunity.

Wuujo aasana laa,

Bruce Muir

Senior Environmental Planner

Nun wa dee Stewardship Society

9824 98A Avenue

Fort St. John, British Columbia

V1J 1S2, Canada

Office: (250) 785-8508

Fax: (250) 785-8507

This email and its enclosed attachments is intended as a private communication for the sole use of the primary addressee and those individuals listed for copies in the original message. Any use of this communication by an unintended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not an intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Please immediately delete this message and its enclosed attachments from your computer, servers, and other devices. We would also appreciate if you would contact us by a collect call or return email to notify us of this error. Thank you for your cooperation.

H29 BFCC Bi-weekly Team Lead Meeting

Attendees: Brent Davies (PM) s.19,s.22 (BCH Rep), s.19,s.22 (BCH Rep), s.22 (Owners s.19,s.22)

Location: Telephone

Date: July 10/18

Purpose: Bi-weekly update meeting to discuss on going issues and concern related to the development of the BFCC project.

Agenda:	Decision/Highlights/Action item	Action By
Introduction		
Project updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sponsor Scope, Schedule & Budget 		
Team Lead Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinating Engineer s.19,s.22 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor edits to CCW dwgs CCW SP's complete w/ minor edits from BCH Further geotech may be required at CCE bridge crossing depending on selected alignment Binnie has received updated LiDAR which will be cross checked w/ design, Sched 7 quantities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> s.19,s.22 to provide MoTI w/ CCW DWG cover sheet
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BCH Deliverables s.19,s.22 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CCE ground truthing works complete Heritage stripping continues (CCW) about 80% complete Anticipated stripping works complete Aug 4 Mtg w/ s.16 next week to discuss CCE options process, results of field investigations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BCH to circulate EMP to MoTI for review, Binnie for inclusion in contract docs BCH/MoTI will look into who signs CCW DWG cover sheet

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCW contract issuance to proponent(s) expected w/in next week or two. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OE Team S.2 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design Criteria review to be finalized and advanced to MoTI
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MoTI (BD) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BD to provide temp detour memo comments to S.
Next Steps		

From: Maxwell, Scott D TRAN:EX
To: Bruce, Greg TRAN:EX; Davies, Brent M TRAN:EX
Subject: Fwd: Hiway 29
Date: Wednesday, July 25, 2018 3:16:12 PM

Fyi

Scott Maxwell

*Executive Director - Northern Region
BC Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure*

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Maxwell, Scott D TRAN:EX" <Scott.Maxwell@gov.bc.ca>
Date: July 25, 2018 at 3:15:43 PM PDT
To: "Main, Grant TRAN:EX" <Grant.Main@gov.bc.ca>
Cc: "Miska, Ed TRAN:EX" <Ed.Miska@gov.bc.ca>, "Lewthwaite, Jennifer TRAN:EX" <Jennifer.Lewthwaite@gov.bc.ca>, "Verwoord, Cindy TRAN:EX" <Cindy.Verwoord@gov.bc.ca>
Subject: Re: Hiway 29

Hi Grant,

Yes, we can follow up with both EMPR and the MO.

Ultimately, we are in a similar position as EMPR. All options meet out engineering standards. There are cost differences^{s.16} and local stakeholder positions that BC Hydro is trying to resolve.

We are a regular part of the discussions, and have been advising BC Hydro through the process, and ultimately it is there decision balancing the feedback of the First Nations and stakeholders.

Here is the current status:

- Property owner consultation on alignment options completed today
- FN consultation on alignment options started last week; will be completed by week's end
- FN and Property owner final inputs expected to be submitted to BCH by Aug 3rd
- Preferred alignment will be advanced by BCH working group to their board for review and decision at board mtg Aug 17th
- BCH will advise all affected ministries of decision once made.

We will follow up with the MO and EMPR,

Scott Maxwell
Executive Director - Northern Region
BC Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure

On Jul 25, 2018, at 9:43 AM, Main, Grant TRAN:EX <Grant.Main@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

Hi Ed, Scott – this email is a bit dated now so events may have overtaken it, but would you mind following up with both EMPR and the MO re Dave's question below around briefings. Thanks
gm

From: Nikolejsin, Dave EMPR:EX

Sent: Wednesday, July 4, 2018 9:39 PM

To: Wright, Don J. PREM:EX; MacLaren, Les EMPR:EX; McCann, Meghan EMPR:EX; Sanderson, Melissa EMPR:EX; Haslam, David GCPE:EX; Cochrane, Marlene EMPR:EX; Main, Grant TRAN:EX; Caul, Doug D IRR:EX

Cc: Wanamaker, Lori FIN:EX; Mihlar, Fazil JTT:EX

Subject: Hiway 29

Folks, we need to set up some briefings re the Highway 29 realignment plan for Site C.

Hydro has several viable options. All have pros and cons and will be supported differently by different stakeholder groups. Hydro is agnostic re which option is selected as all are in the same ballpark re cost and schedule implications. That said they do need to make a final decision by mid August.

The process that hydro will use to inform their final recommended plan is to take the various options directly to the affected stakeholders (communities, land owners, FN's, etc). They will do this starting now and take till end of July to complete. They will finalize their choice based on that feedback and then they want to brief Government before taking the final decision package to their Board in mid August. The decision would be made public before the end of August.

Melissa/Marlene, as this will be ^{s.22} we will need to get MBR up to speed. I will leave with you to organize a briefing time for him late July/early Aug.

Grant, if you want your minister either to join that meeting, or have a separate briefing please let me know.

Doug, same wrt your Minister as ^{s.16}

^{s.16}

Don, I will ensure you get a briefing on this as well, but I think Les and/or I can handle that unless you tell me you want to be briefed direct from hydro on this. I am also assuming that no broader political briefings are required on this.

Haslam, please note timing and sync with hydro comm's on this as required.

Les, if I've missed anything please chip in.

Thanks all.

Dave Nikolejsin

Deputy Minister

Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources

H29 BFCC Bi-weekly Team Lead Meeting

Attendees: Brent Davies (PM), s.19,s.22 (BCH Rep), s.19,s.22 (BCH Rep), s.22 (Owners s.19,s.22)

Location: Telephone

Date: July 19/18

Purpose: Bi-weekly update meeting to discuss on going issues and concern related to the development of the BFCC project.

Agenda:	Decision/Highlights/Action item	Action By
Introduction		
Project updates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sponsor• Scope, Schedule & Budget		
Team Lead Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Coordinating Engineer s.19,s.22	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Binnie has received CCW signed coversheet from MoTI• CCW tender package submitted to BCH	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Binnie to provide property r/w requirements for 3 alignment options at CCE for utility relocation consideration
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• BCH Deliverables s.19,s.22	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Revised H29 EMP submitted to BCH• BCH evaluating procurement timeline to issue CCW docs to proponent(s)• Heritage stripping ongoing, onschedule• Silver Springs, Watson Springs boat launch sites being assessed by BCH designer	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• BCH to circulate EMP to MoTI for review, Binnie for inclusion in contract docs

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meetings w/ stakeholders on CCE alignment options underway 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OE Team s.2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working on temp pole relocation (BCH) for s.22 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design Criteria review to be finalized and advanced to MoTI (no issues just awaiting updates for bridge section due to code updates) S. BD to meet re: MoTI temp detour memo comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MoTI (BD) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MoTI completed RFQ document for CCW Construction Supervision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mtg w/ BCH to review CCW Construction Supervision Est
Next Steps		

From: s.19,s.22
To: [Davies, Brent M TRAN:EX](#)
Cc: [Bruce, Greg TRAN:EX](#)
Subject: RE: CCE Alignment Options Briefing
Date: Wednesday, July 25, 2018 4:01:36 PM

Good afternoon Brent,

I will provide a copy of SDM table including detail criteria and results once the input from property owners and indigenous are incorporated (hopefully on August 3rd). The table from Briefing Note that was submitted to the Government on July 13th demonstrates the approval process.

Date	Milestone or requirement
July 6	Completion of investigations.
July 6 to July 13	BC Hydro Internal review of results and structured decision making criterial assessment.
Week of July 16	Issue structured decision making process initial criteria results to government prior to sharing results with landowners and Indigenous groups.
July 17 to August 3	Engagement and consultations with identified Indigenous groups and landowners based on the decision making process results and investigations approach and methodology.
July 30 to August 16	Review results of decision making process and determine BC Hydro's preferred route.
August 17	Provide BC Hydro's preferred route for review and approval to Project Assurance Board.
August 24	Provide results to Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure, Ministry of Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation and Ministry of Energy Mines and Petroleum Resources.
Late August	Announce decision on preferred alignment to the public.
September 2018	Start of property acquisition.
March 2019	BC Hydro files EAC amendment.
April 2020	Start of construction contract procurement process.
July 2020	Start of construction.

Thanks,

s.19,s.22 | Project Manager, Project Management and Operations

s.19,s.22

From: Davies, Brent M TRAN:EX [mailto:Brent.Davies@gov.bc.ca]

Sent: Wednesday, July 25, 2018 1:15 PM

To: s.19,s.22

Cc: Bruce, Greg TRAN:EX

Subject: CCE Alignment Options Briefing

s.19,s.2

You mentioned last Tuesday prior to our meeting w, s.16 that you would be providing MoTI (Greg)

w/ a briefing document regarding the CCE realignment options, evaluation and approvals process.
Has this document being developed as we would like to circulate it to Executive.

Thank you,

Brent D.

This email and its attachments are intended solely for the personal use of the individual or entity named above. Any use of this communication by an unintended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, any publication, use, reproduction, disclosure or dissemination of its contents is strictly prohibited. Please immediately delete this message and its attachments from your computer and servers. We would also appreciate if you would contact us by a collect call or return email to notify us of this error. Thank you for your cooperation.

Cadwallader, Carla TRAN:EX

From: Ostropolski, Melissa TRAN:EX
Sent: Friday, August 17, 2018 4:28 PM
To: Miska, Ed TRAN:EX
Subject: 279249 - H29 Cache Ck Alignment Decision IBN
Attachments: 279249 - IBN_HWY 29 Cache Creek Crossing Alignment Decision.docx

FYI – please see attached with Cliff #.

Melissa Ostropolski
A/Manager of Divisional Operations | Highways Department
Ministry of Transportation & Infrastructure
Ph: 250-387-3260 | Cell: 250-208-9336

This e-mail is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any review, dissemination, copying, printing or other use of this e-mail by persons or entities other than the addressee is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please contact the sender immediately and delete the material from any computer.



BRIEFING NOTE FOR INFORMATION

DATE: August 15, 2018
PREPARED FOR: Ed Miska, A/Assistant Deputy Minister, Highways Department
ISSUE: Highway 29 – Cache Creek East Alignment Decision (Site C)

SUMMARY:

- BCH has prepared three alternative alignments for consideration at Highway 29 Cache Creek East segment (Attachment A) in response to Government request.
- BCH has completed their decision making process for preferred Cache Creek East alignment selection. Option 4.
- The previously tendered alignment (Option 1, teal) was cancelled due to concerns over proximity to sensitive indigenous sites.
- Following consultation with affected First Nations and landowners, (Option 4, red) has been selected by BC Hydro as the preferred alignment.
- This alignment meets the Ministry's specifications and is supportive of this decision.

BACKGROUND:

In a December 11, 2017 Government News Release it was announced "BC Hydro and the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure will work with Treaty 8 First Nations and others to redesign the Highway 29 realignment at Cache Creek to reduce the effects on potential burial sites and sacred places."

BC Hydro has since prepared three alternative alignments from the previously tendered route in Summer 2017 for assessment, consultation, and selection. Following consultation with affected First Nations and landowners, Option 4 (red) has been selected by BC Hydro as the preferred alignment.

The Ministry has had an opportunity to review the alignment options from a safety and technical perspective; all of which meet Ministry standards. The Ministry is supportive of BCH's preferred alignment.

STATUS:

- BCH has completed consultation with impacted First Nations and property owners on alignment options
- BCH has finished statutory decision making process review of alignment options
- Ministry was informed on August 15, 2018 of BCH's preferred route as Option 4 (**Attachment A- in red**)
 - Option 4 meets Ministry standards and is acceptable based on safety and technical requirements
- BCH anticipates an announcement decision to public in late August 2018

Attachments: Appendix A: Highway 29 Realignment Sections Map

PREPARED BY:

Brent Davies
 Sr Project Manager
 Ministry of Transportation & Infrastructure
 (250) 565-4373



Appendix A: Highway 29 Cache Creek East Alignment Options

Copyright

Cadwallader, Carla TRAN:EX

From: Maxwell, Scott D TRAN:EX
Sent: Wednesday, July 25, 2018 3:16 PM
To: Main, Grant TRAN:EX
Cc: Miska, Ed TRAN:EX; Lewthwaite, Jennifer TRAN:EX; Verwoord, Cindy TRAN:EX
Subject: Re: Hiway 29

Hi Grant,

Yes, we can follow up with both EMPR and the MO.

Ultimately, we are in a similar position as EMPR. All options meet out engineering standards. There are cost differences and ^{s.16} and local stakeholder positions that BC Hydro is trying to resolve.

We are a regular part of the discussions, and have been advising BC Hydro through the process, and ultimately it is there decision balancing the feedback of the First Nations and stakeholders.

Here is the current status:

-Property owner consultation on alignment options completed today

-FN consultation on alignment options started last week; will be completed by week's end

-FN and Property owner final inputs expected to be submitted to BCH by Aug 3rd

-Preferred alignment will be advanced by BCH working group to their board for review and decision at board mtg Aug 17th

-BCH will advise all affected ministries of decision once made.

We will follow up with the MO and EMPR,

Scott Maxwell

Executive Director - Northern Region

BC Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure

On Jul 25, 2018, at 9:43 AM, Main, Grant TRAN:EX <Grant.Main@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

Hi Ed, Scott – this email is a bit dated now so events may have overtaken it, but would you mind following up with both EMPR and the MO re Dave's question below around breifings. Thanks
gm

From: Nikolejsin, Dave EMPR:EX

Sent: Wednesday, July 4, 2018 9:39 PM

To: Wright, Don J. PREM:EX; MacLaren, Les EMPR:EX; McCann, Meghan EMPR:EX; Sanderson, Melissa EMPR:EX; Haslam, David GCPE:EX; Cochrane, Marlene EMPR:EX; Main, Grant TRAN:EX; Caul, Doug D

IRR:EX

Cc: Wanamaker, Lori FIN:EX; Mihlar, Fazil JTT:EX

Subject: Hiway 29

Folks, we need to set up some briefings re the Highway 29 realignment plan for Site C.

Hydro has several viable options. All have pros and cons and will be supported differently by different stakeholder groups. Hydro is agnostic re which option is selected as all are in the same ballpark re cost and schedule implications. That said they do need to make a final decision by mid August.

The process that hydro will use to inform their final recommended plan is to take the various options directly to the affected stakeholders (communities, land owners, FN's, etc). They will do this starting now and take till end of July to complete. They will finalize their choice based on that feedback and then they want to brief Government before taking the final decision package to their Board in mid August. The decision would be made public before the end of August.

Melissa/Marlene, as this will be after s.22

we will need to get MBR up to

speed. I will leave with you to organize a briefing time for him late July/early Aug.

Grant, if you want your minister either to join that meeting, or have a separate briefing please let me know.

Doug, same wrt your Minister s.16

s.16

Don, I will ensure you get a briefing on this as well, but I think Les and/or I can handle that unless you tell me you want to be briefed direct from hydro on this. I am also assuming that no broader political briefings are required on this.

Haslam, please note timing and sync with hydro comm's on this as required.

Les, if I've missed anything please chip in.

Thanks all.

Dave Nikolejsin

Deputy Minister

Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources