

**EAST-WEST TIE TRANSMISSION PROJECT
AMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT**

Revision Log

Company	Client Contact	Version	Date Issued	Method of Delivery	Revisions
NextBridge Infrastructure	Corinne Miller	Rev01	September 2018	Email	Section 24.1 (Advantages and Disadvantages) was added to the document.

24. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

NextBridge Infrastructure LP (NextBridge) is proposing to construct, own, and maintain the East-West Tie Transmission Project (the Project or undertaking). Engineering requirements, environmental considerations, input from consultation and engagement, and safety considerations have all been incorporated into the Project. An assessment of alternative route segments was carried out to identify the preferred route, which represents the preferred balance of advantages and disadvantages. The proposed construction and operation of the Project, which includes the preferred route and associated infrastructure, has undergone an Individual Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the Terms of Reference and Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change guidance, including the *Code of Practice: Preparing and Reviewing Environmental Assessments in Ontario* (MOECC 2014).

Proceeding with the Project will have environmental effects. Based on knowledge of the Project and the existing environment (baseline characterization) as described in this amended EA Report, and taking into account the implementation of the mitigation described in the amended EA Report, Construction Environmental Protection Plan (Appendix 4-II), and the Operations Environmental Management Plan (Appendix 4-III), the incremental effects associated with the Project can be effectively mitigated by standard and specific environmental protection measures.

Net adverse effects associated with the Project, in combination with past, existing, certain/planned and reasonably foreseeable developments, have been determined to be significant for two wildlife and wildlife habitat criterion: woodland caribou (*Rangifer tarandus caribou*) and little brown myotis (*Myotis lucifugus*) and northern myotis (*Myotis septentrionalis*). Caribou in the caribou regional study area are considered as not likely to be self-sustaining in the baseline characterization; therefore, combined effects from the Project and previous and existing developments are predicted to be significant despite the small incremental changes caused by the Project. White-Nose Syndrome has resulted in dramatic declines of little brown myotis and northern myotis across the eastern portions of its range, including the Myotis regional study area. The little brown myotis and northern myotis are predicted to be functionally extirpated (i.e., less than 1% of existing population remaining) in Canada and the United States of America within 16 years (COSEWIC 2012), or possibly sooner based on the recent confirmation of White-Nose Syndrome in Washington (USGS 2016). After mitigation, the Project is predicted to have a small negative effect on little brown myotis and northern myotis. These populations are expected to continue to decline in the baseline characterization due to White-Nose Syndrome, and cumulative effects in the net effects assessment are predicted to be significant. Other net adverse environmental effects associated with the Project are predicted to be not significant.

The Project has been identified as a priority project by the Province of Ontario, and a needed project by the Independent Electricity System Operator to meet future electricity demand in northwestern Ontario. Development of the Project has the potential to have a notable effect on the local economies of communities in northwestern Ontario and the province as a whole. Moreover, the Project is expected to provide an economic boost to northwestern Ontario, which is currently experiencing a downturn in the forestry sector and reductions in mining sector opportunities. Development of the Project is expected to result in economic benefits in the form of potential job creation, contracts, business opportunities, and the purchase of goods and services.

24.1 Advantages and Disadvantages

As per the *Code of Practice: Preparing and Reviewing Environmental Assessments in Ontario* (MOECC 2014), an environmental assessment should describe the process for evaluating alternatives and then choosing a preferred alternative, which will become the undertaking for which approval is sought. The evaluation is a trade-off process in which the advantages and disadvantages to the environment of the alternative courses of action are weighed in terms of their effects, both positive and negative, on the environment. This follows from the determination of net effects (MOECC 2014).

In the case of this Project, the approved Terms of Reference (refer to Appendix 1-II) indicates that the EA will not include an assessment of “alternatives to” with the exception of the “do nothing” alternative. The rationale for proceeding in this manner was that a previous planning process has already been undertaken by the OPA which led to the identification and justification for the Project. In accordance with the *Environmental Assessment Act*, the amended EA includes an assessment and evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages of proceeding with undertaking (the Project) against the “do nothing” or null alternatives.

The *Environmental Assessment Act* does not differentiate between the importance of the different environments (that is, natural, social, economic, cultural, built); however, the Code of Practice acknowledges that the effects to one environment may be greater than the effects to another (MOECC 2014). In the case of the Project, there are disadvantages to the natural environment as a result of construction of the project, but the need for the project and the socio-economic benefits outweigh the advantages of not undertaking the Project.

Given the purpose of the Project to meet Ontario’s current and future electricity delivery needs, the relative socio-economic advantages (e.g., to maintain a reliable and cost-effective long-term electricity supply to the northwest Ontario) offset the relative, primarily short-term, disadvantages. The selection of the Project as the preferred alternative is supported by the identification of the new East-West Tie transmission line as a priority project for the province.

The following tables summarize the relative advantages and disadvantages of the Project based on whether there was a net effect identified (no net effect = neutral), and the direction (i.e., negative or positive) of the net effects identified throughout the environmental assessment process and detailed in Section 22 of the EA. The criteria assessed have been organized by natural, social, economic, cultural, and built environments, recognizing that some indicators and criteria could fit into more than one of these categories.

EAST-WEST TIE TRANSMISSION PROJECT

AMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Table 24-1: Advantages and Disadvantages to Natural Environment

Criteria	Advantages	Neutral	Disadvantages
Geology, Terrain and Soils (Section 6.7.5, Table 6-6)	Preferred Alternative (The Project)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No net effects in the reduction in soil quality from chemical hazardous materials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decrease in terrain distribution: from clearing, preparation and blasting (not significant) ▪ Decrease in soil quality from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – compaction rutting, and mixing, – blasting residuals, and – dust and air emissions. (not significant) ▪ Decrease in soil distribution from changes to hydrology and blasting (not significant)
	Do Nothing		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No potential alternation to terrain and soils. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No positive or negative net effects identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified
Surface Water (Section 7.7.4, Table 7-15)	Preferred Alternative (The Project)		
	None identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No net effect from the increase to the chemical concentrations of chemical constituents and suspended solids in receiving water bodies from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the transport and delivery of airborne particulate matter, – washoff of trash and leachate at waste handling and storage yards, and – washoff or organic debris and chemical constituents from maintenance activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduction / increase to streamflows and / or water levels at nearby water bodies (not significant) ▪ Increase in runoff rates and runoff volumes, and, in turn, increase in streamflows, water levels, and erosion sedimentation processes at nearby water bodies (not significant) ▪ Increase or reduction in streamflows, water levels and erosion-sedimentation processes (not significant) ▪ Increase or reduction to flow velocities, shear stresses, water levels, and erosion sedimentation at water bodies (not significant) ▪ Increase to concentrations of suspended solids and chemical constituents in receiving water bodies. ▪ Increase in the concentrations of chemical constituents in receiving waters (not significant) ▪ Increase to the concentrations of suspended solids and / or chemical constituents in water bodies (not significant) ▪ Increased opportunities for sediment erosion and transport at water bodies with associated increases to the concentrations of suspended solids (not significant)
	Do Nothing		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No predicted changes to surface water quality and quantity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No positive or negative net effects identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified

EAST-WEST TIE TRANSMISSION PROJECT

AMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Table 24-1: Advantages and Disadvantages to Natural Environment

Criteria	Advantages	Neutral	Disadvantages
Groundwater (Section 8.7.4, Table 8-7)	Preferred Alternative (The Project)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No net effect from the reduction from reduction in groundwater quality from chemical or hazardous material spills on the project footprint ▪ No net effect from dewatering excavations. ▪ No net effect from disturbing pre-shallow contaminated soils during construction ▪ No net effect from the operation of the construction camp wells. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lowering levels of groundwater levels from dewatering of foundation excavations (not significant) ▪ Increased groundwater levels due to vegetation clearing (not significant) ▪ Reduced groundwater recharge from hardening of surfaces (not significant) ▪ Lowering of groundwater levels from blasting (not significant) ▪ Lowering of groundwater levels from operation of construction camp water supply wells (not significant) ▪ Reduced groundwater quality from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – foundation pouring, – herbicide leaching into soil, and – blasting (not significant)
	Do Nothing		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No potential alternation to groundwater quality and quantity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No positive or negative net effects identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified
Air Quality (Section 9.7.2, Table 9-19)	Preferred Alternative (The Project)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No positive effects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in ambient concentrations from CAC and fugitive dust emissions (not significant) ▪ Increase in federal and provincial greenhouse gas emissions (not significant)
	Do Nothing		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No predicted alteration to ambient concentrations of SO₂, NO₂, CO and SPM. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No positive or negative net effects identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified

EAST-WEST TIE TRANSMISSION PROJECT

AMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Table 24-1: Advantages and Disadvantages to Natural Environment

Criteria	Advantages	Neutral	Disadvantages
Greenhouse Gases (Section 10.8.2, Table 10-10)	Preferred Alternative (The Project)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No positive effects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in federal and provincial annual greenhouse gases emissions (not significant)
	Do Nothing		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No potential alternation to greenhouse gas emissions of CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No positive or negative net effects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified
Acoustic Environment (Noise) (Section 11.7.4, Table 11.8)	Preferred Alternative (The Project)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No net effect from noise emissions derived from operation and maintenance activities that could increase the existing noise levels at point of receptors (POR). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise emissions from construction activities could increase existing noise levels at POR that results in a change that is greater than 3 dB (not significant)
	Do Nothing		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No potential changes to the relevant one hour and daytime equivalent noise level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No positive or negative net effects identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified

EAST-WEST TIE TRANSMISSION PROJECT AMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Table 24-1: Advantages and Disadvantages to Natural Environment

Criteria	Advantages	Neutral	Disadvantages
Vegetation and Wetlands <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Upland Ecosystem ▪ Wetland Ecosystem ▪ Riparian Ecosystems (Section 12.4.3.8, Table 12-18)	Preferred Alternative (The Project)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No net effect from chemical hazardous material spills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Loss or alteration of ecosystem availability and distribution from physical footprint (not significant) ▪ Decrease in ecosystem availability and distribution from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – dust and air emissions, – introduction and spread of noxious and invasive plant species, – distribution of herbicides, – changes in hydrology, and – revegetation success. (not significant) ▪ Decrease in ecosystem composition from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – reduction in revegetation success, – changes in hydrology, – from herbicides – dust and air emissions, and – introduction and spread of noxious and invasive plant species(not significant)
	Do Nothing		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No potential alternation to vegetation and wetlands, ecosystem composition, availability and distribution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No positive or negative net effects identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified 	

EAST-WEST TIE TRANSMISSION PROJECT

AMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Table 24-1: Advantages and Disadvantages to Natural Environment

Criteria	Advantages	Neutral	Disadvantages
Fish and Fish Habitat <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brook Trout ▪ Northern Pike ▪ Walleye ▪ Aquatic ecosystems ▪ Lake Sturgeon (Section 13.7.5, Table 13-21)	Preferred Alternative (The Project)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No net effects as a result of alteration to habitat availability from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – change to dust and air emissions, – herbicide use, and – placement of crossing structures effecting channel morphology – where proposed work is above the high-water mark. ▪ No net effects as a result of alteration to abundance and distribution of fish from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – injury or mortality of fish from construction activities – injury or mortality from blasting – spills of fuels or other materials. ▪ No net effects as a result of alteration to aquatic ecosystem community composition from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – injury or mortality of aquatic organisms from construction activities, and – spills of fuel or other materials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Alternation to habitat availability from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – physical alteration of water bodies (not significant) – changes in riparian vegetation (not significant) – change to hydrology or ground water (not significant) – the release of sediment into a water body (not significant) – placement of crossing structures effecting channel morphology – where proposed work is below the high-water mark (not significant) ▪ Alternation to abundance or distribution of from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – changes to habitat availability – placement of crossing structures affecting access to habitat – changes to public access to recreational angling area (not significant) ▪ Alteration to aquatic ecosystem community composition from changes to habitat availability(not significant)
Do Nothing			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No potential alternation to fish habitat availability, abundance or distribution, or aquatic ecosystem community composition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No positive or negative net effects identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified

EAST-WEST TIE TRANSMISSION PROJECT

AMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Table 24-1: Advantages and Disadvantages to Natural Environment

Criteria	Advantages	Neutral	Disadvantages
Wildlife and Habitat <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Woodland caribou (Section 14.7, Table 14-21, 14-22) ▪ Little brown myotis and Northern myotis (Section 14.7, Table 14-30, 14-31) 	Preferred Alternative (The Project)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No net effect from the induction and spread of noxious and invasive plant species that can affect plant community composition, and reduce or degrade caribou habitat ▪ No net effect from fly rock from blasting resulting in injury or mortality to caribou. ▪ No net effect from chemical or hazardous material stored on the Project footprint, or spills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduced or degraded habitat from loss or alteration of vegetation and topography (significant) ▪ Reduced survival and / or reproduction from; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – loss or alteration of vegetation and topography (significant),, – use of linear corridors and converted habitat by prey and predators (probable), – collisions with Project vehicles, – attraction of wildlife to the project (possible), – increase in public access. (significant) ▪ Reduced or degraded habitat from; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – sensory disturbance – Reduced survival and / or reproduction from sensory disturbance, (significant) – changes to hydrology (significant), – air emissions (significant), and – herbicide application.(significant)
	Do Nothing		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No potential alternation to survival, reproduction and habitat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No positive or negative net effects identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Moose (Section 14.7, Table 14-23) Table 14-45) ▪ American martin (Section 14.7, Table 14-26) ▪ Bald eagle (Section 14.7, Table 14-33) ▪ Bobolink (Section 14.7, Table 14-36) 	Preferred Alternative (The Project)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No net effect from the induction and spread of noxious and invasive plant species that can affect plant community composition, and reduce or degrade caribou habitat ▪ No net effect from fly rock from blasting resulting in injury or mortality to caribou. ▪ No net effect from chemical or hazardous material stored on the Project footprint, or spills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduced or degraded habitat from loss or alteration of vegetation and topography (not significant) ▪ Reduced survival and / or reproduction from; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – loss or alteration of vegetation and topography – use of linear corridors and converted habitat by prey and predators, – collisions with Project vehicles (unlikely), – attraction of wildlife to the project and, – increase in public access. (not significant) ▪ Reduced or degraded habitat from; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – sensory disturbance – Reduced survival and / or reproduction from sensory disturbance, – changes to hydrology, – air emissions and – herbicide application. (not significant)

EAST-WEST TIE TRANSMISSION PROJECT AMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Table 24-1: Advantages and Disadvantages to Natural Environment

Criteria	Advantages	Neutral	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Canada warbler (Section 14.7, Table 14-39) ▪ Eastern whip-poor-will (Section 14.7, Table 14-42) ▪ Olive-sided flycatcher (Section 14.7, Table 14-23) 	Do Nothing		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No potential alternation to survival, reproduction and habitat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No positive or negative net effects identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified

n/a = not applicable;

Refer to Section 5 for a description of the effects assessment method.

CAC = Criteria Air Contaminants; CH₄ = methane; CO = carbon monoxide; CO₂ = carbon dioxide; GHG = greenhouse gas; LSA = local study area; LSCR = Lake Superior Coast Range; N₂O = nitrous oxide; PM_{2.5} = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns; PM₁₀ = particulate matter less than 10 microns; POR = point of reception; ROW = right-of-way; RSA = regional study area; SPM = suspended particulate matter.

**EAST-WEST TIE TRANSMISSION PROJECT
AMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT**

Table 24-2: Advantages and Disadvantages to Cultural Environments

Criteria	Advantages	Neutral	Disadvantages
Archaeological Resources (Sec 15.0, Table 15-5)	Preferred Alternative (The Project)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No net effect loss of, or damage to, an archaeological resource from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – construction activities, – erosion as a result of increased stream flows, and – increase in public access to archaeological resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified
	Do Nothing		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No potential effect to known or potential archaeological resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified
Cultural Heritage Resources (Section 16-7, Table 16-6)	Preferred Alternative (The Project)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No net effects due to alteration, relocation, or demolition of a heritage resource from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – construction activities, – increase in public access to cultural heritage resources, and – erosion resulting from increased streamflows. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified
	Do Nothing		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No potential effect to known or potential heritage resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified

EAST-WEST TIE TRANSMISSION PROJECT

AMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Table 24-3: Advantages and Disadvantages to Economic and Built Environments

Criteria	Advantages	Neutral	Disadvantages
Socio-economics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Labour Market ▪ Economic Development ▪ Government Finances ▪ Temporary Accommodation ▪ Services and Infrastructure ▪ Community Well-being (Section 18.7, Table 18-32)	Preferred Alternative (The Project)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Generation of employment and incomes ▪ Generation of business opportunities and revenues ▪ Increase in government revenues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No net effect of temporary migration causing increase demand from some local services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in demand for; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – temporary accommodations, – emergency and protective services, – transportation infrastructure, – water, waste and energy infrastructure (not significant) ▪ Increase in use of transportation infrastructure (not significant) ▪ Nuisance effects from changes in ambient noise levels (not significant) ▪ Risk to worker and public safety(not significant)
	Do Nothing		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No potential alternation to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Road traffic volumes and operating capacity – Capacity of water, waste and energy – Air quality and ambient noise levels – Exposure of workers and the public to physical hazards and accidents – Government expenditures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No positive or negative net effects identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No potential generation of; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Employment and incomes – Contracting and procurement – Capacity of emergency and protective services. – Taxes, rents and other revenue stream. (not significant)

EAST-WEST TIE TRANSMISSION PROJECT AMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Table 24-4: Advantages and Disadvantages to Social Environments

Criteria	Advantages	Neutral	Disadvantages
Indigenous Current Use of Lands and Resources for Traditional Purposes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ First Nation Traditional Wildlife Harvesting ▪ First Nation Traditional Fish Harvesting ▪ First Nation Traditional Plant and Material Harvesting ▪ First Nation Use of Culturally Important Sites and Areas (Section 17.7, Table 17-40)	Preferred Alternative (The Project)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduction of availability of plants, fish and wildlife for harvesting ▪ Loss or alteration of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – harvesting and fishing sites, – land access routes, – water access routes, ▪ Changes in air quality and visual environment.
Indigenous Current Use of Lands and Resources for Traditional Purposes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Metis Way of Life ▪ Metis Harvesting (Section 17.7, Table 17-40)	Preferred Alternative (The Project)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Loss or alteration of; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – harvesting and fishing sites, – water access routes, – culturally important sites and areas – available plants for harvesting, – land access routes, and – currently available plant or materials for harvesting sites. (not significant) ▪ Changes to the visual and acoustic environment (not significant) ▪ Reduction in the availability of fish and wildlife for harvesting (not significant)
	Do Nothing		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No potential alteration to resource availability, disturbance to sites and areas of use and access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No positive or negative net effects identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified
	Do Nothing		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No potential alteration to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – known harvesting conditions required for harvest, – key cultural species harvested, reduced access to preferred locations of harvest, damage, and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No positive or negative net effects identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified

EAST-WEST TIE TRANSMISSION PROJECT AMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Table 24-4: Advantages and Disadvantages to Social Environments

Criteria	Advantages	Neutral	Disadvantages
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – loss of key spiritual areas to Metis way of life. 		
Non-Traditional Land and Resource Use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Federal, provincial and local land use policies and designations ▪ Parks and protected areas ▪ Linear infrastructure ▪ Non-commercial recreational land and resource use ▪ Commercial land and resource use (Section 19.7, Table 19-45)	Preferred Alternative (The Project) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No net effect of project compatibility with land use designations and bylaws. ▪ No net effect from the increase or decrease in access to linear infrastructure projects. ▪ Reduction and increase to access to non-commercial recreation areas. ▪ Reduction and increase to access to commercial recreation areas ▪ No net effect from change to area and spatial orientation of planned harvests due to required clearing for the project. ▪ Not net effect from change in of silviculture treatment areas due to required clearing for the project. ▪ No net effect - Change to road access due to Project overlap with existing or planned forestry access roads. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduction and increase to access to parks and protected areas (not significant) ▪ Change to environmental setting due to changing environmental conditions (not significant) ▪ Change to natural, cultural and recreational features which could affect natural, cultural and recreational values within parks and protected areas (not significant) ▪ Change to environmental setting due changing environmental conditions ▪ Reduction or increase to harvest levels due to changes in wildlife and fish abundance and distribution (not significant) ▪ Reduction and alteration to access to commercial industry areas (not significant) ▪ Change to commercial recreational environmental setting due changing environmental conditions (not significant) ▪ Loss or alteration of wildlife and fish resource harvest due to changes in wildlife and fish abundance and distribution (not significant) ▪ Reduction in production forest area due to area being unavailable for timber production (not significant)
	Do Nothing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No potential alternation to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Compatibility to land use designations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No positive or negative net effects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified

**EAST-WEST TIE TRANSMISSION PROJECT
AMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT**

Table 24-4: Advantages and Disadvantages to Social Environments

Criteria	Advantages	Neutral	Disadvantages
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parks and protected areas access and use. - Linear infrastructure access and use - Natural, cultural and recreational features affecting natural, cultural and recreational values. - Non-commercial recreational environmental setting - Commercial land and resource use 		
Visual Environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visual Quality ▪ Visual Quantity (Section 20.7, Table 20-12)	Preferred Alternative (The Project) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visibility of disturbance to existing visual quality (not significant) ▪ Contrast with existing visual quality (not significant)
	Do Nothing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No potential alternation to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Visibility of the Project - Visual contrast of the Project relative to existing landscape 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No positive or negative net effects identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified

**EAST-WEST TIE TRANSMISSION PROJECT
AMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT**

Table 24-4: Advantages and Disadvantages to Social Environments

Criteria	Advantages	Neutral	Disadvantages
Human Health (Section 21.7.3, Table 21-5)	Preferred Alternative (The Project)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No net effect – changes to soil, surface water, groundwater and food quality from use of herbicides may affect human health 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduced air quality that may affect human health (not significant)
	Do Nothing		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No potential alternation to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Changes in environmental quality, including surface water, groundwater, and air quality, and specifically contaminant concentrations in these media that could affect human health ▪ Changes in environmental quality, including surface water, groundwater, and air quality, and specifically contaminant concentrations in these media that could affect human health 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No positive or negative net effects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified