ALTERNATIVE ALTERNATIVES ASSESSMENT

East Arm Route was initial proposal from Deze. It could be argued that the alternatives assessment was designed to support a foregone conclusion.

It is unclear why some potential sub-criteria were eliminated from the alternatives assessment. For example:

It is likely that some alternatives will have more impact on barren-land caribou than others. It is also likely that some alternatives will have more impacts on furbearers than others, as predators/ungulates employ cut-lines for travel, longer lines should have more impact.

The tables below present an alternative alternatives assessment that, with little modification from Deze's, favours another of the line routing alternatives. This is but one of many different alternative assessment scenarios that could be devised using Deze's methodology.

NOTE: Sub-criteria in **BLUE** were modified from Deze. **YELLOW** denotes sub-criteria that could arguably be modified, but were not.

| ENVIRONMENT | | | East | West | Subn | narine Simps | on Is. |
|-------------|---------|------------------|------|------|------|--------------|--------|
| Air Quality | | Dust | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | Score | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | Ranking | | | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Wildlife | | Habitat | | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| | | Woodland Caribou | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | | Waterfowl | | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| | | Moose | | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| | | Passerines | | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| | Score | | | 11 | 14 | 8 | 10 |
| | Ranking | | | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Vegetation | | Rare Plants | | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| | | Forestry | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | Score | | | 4 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| | Ranking | | | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| | | SUM OF RANKINGS | | 9 | 12 | 5 | 7 |
| | | OVERALL RANKING | | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |

| SOCIO-ECONOMIC | | East | West | Submarine | Simpson Is. | |
|----------------------|------------------|------|------|-----------|-------------|---|
| Traditional Land Use | Trapping | | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| | Country Food | | | | | |
| | Consumption Rate | | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Sc | ore | | 3 | 5 | 6 | 6 |

| Ranking | | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|--------|---|--------|
| Contemporary Land Use | Renewable Resource Uses | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| | Non-Renewable Resource | | | | |
| | Uses | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| Score | | 4 | 8 | 4 | 7 |
| Ranking | | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| | Aboriginal/South Slave | | | | |
| Employment and Income | Employment ¹ | | 3 | | 2 |
| | Distribution of Project | | | | |
| | Income | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Score | | 4 | 7 | 3 | 3 |
| Ranking | | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| | | | | | |
| | Traditional Land-use | | | | |
| Socio-Cultural Well-Being | Patterns | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| | Valued Cultural and | | | | |
| | Spiritual Places | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Score | | 5 | 7 | 4 | 4 |
| Ranking | | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| | | | | | |
| Nuisances | Vicinity to Receptors | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| | Visibility | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Score | | 4 | 7 | 4 | 6 |
| Ranking | | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| Built Heritage Features and | Vicinity to existing cabins, | | | | |
| Cultural Landscapes | trails, etc. | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| | Change in the character of | | | | |
| | areas | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| Score | | 5 | 8 | 4 | 7 |
| Ranking | | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| | | | | | |
| Economic Development | Future Customers ² | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | Line Frontage ³ | 2 | | | 2 |
| Score | | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Ranking | | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Nainking | | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Access | Public Desirability | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| | Change in the character of | 2 | | 2 | 2 |
| | areas | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Score | | 2 4 | 5 7 | 3 | 4 6 |
| | | | | | |
| Ranking | | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| | | | | | |

| SUM OF RANKINGS | 16 | 29 | 15 | 21 |
|-----------------|----|----|----|----|
| OVERALL RANKING | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 |

| LAND ACCESS | | East | West | Submarine | Simpson Is. | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|------|------|-----------|-------------|---|
| Crown Land Withdrawals | Crown Land Withdrawals ⁴ | | | | | |
| Score Ranking | | l | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Areas of Recognized | Areas of Recognized | | | | | |
| Importance | Importance | | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Score | | : | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Ranking | | : | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| Land Tenure | Land Tenure ⁵ | | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Score | | : | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Ranking | | : | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| | SUM OF RANKINGS | | 5 | 8 | 4 | 6 |
| | OVERALL RANKING | : | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 |

| ENGINEERING/COST | | East | West | Submarine | Simpson Is. |
|------------------------|---------------------------|------|------|-----------|-------------|
| Capital Cost | Design Cost | 1 | 1 4 | . 3 | 2 |
| | Substation and Equipment | 1 | 1 4 | 3 | 2 |
| | Line and Construction | 1 | 1 4 | 3 | 2 |
| Sc | ore | 3 | 3 12 | . 9 | 6 |
| Rank | ing | 1 | L 4 | 3 | 2 |
| Line Loss Cost | Annual GWh Loss | 1 | 1 4 | 3 | 2 |
| Sc | ore | 1 | L 4 | 3 | 2 |
| Rank | ling | 1 | L 4 | 3 | 2 |
| Outage/Maintenance Cos | st Annual Outage Cost | 1 | 1 4 | - 2 | 3 |
| | Annual Maintenance Cost | 3 | 3 4 | - 1 | 2 |
| Sc | ore | 4 | 4 8 | 3 | 5 |
| Rank | ling | 2 | 2 4 | 1 | 3 |
| | | | | | |
| Schedule Cost | Incremental Duration Cost | 1 | 1 4 | 3 | 2 |
| Sc | ore | 1 | L 4 | 3 | 2 |
| Rank | ing | 1 | L 4 | 3 | 2 |
| | SUM OF RANKINGS | ţ | 5 16 | 10 | 9 |

| OVERALL RANKIN | G |
|-----------------------|---|
|-----------------------|---|

| CONSTRUCTION AND OPE | RATIONS RISK | East | West | Sub | omarine Simps | on ls. |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|------|------|-----|---------------|--------|
| Terrain Risk | Percentage Rock | | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| | Percentage Wetland | | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| | Percentage Disturbed | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Sco | ore | | 7 | 10 | 4 | e |
| Ranki | ng | | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Logistics/Schedule Risk | Water Crossings | | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| | Materials Delivery ⁶ | | | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| | Construction Access | | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | Construction Methods | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Sco | ore | | 10 | 9 | 13 | 11 |
| Ranki | ng | | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| Outage/Reliability Risk | Length of Line | | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| | High Towers | | 2 | 3 | 1 | Z |
| | Materials Technology | | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| | Lightning Exposure | | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| | Fire Exposure (Relative | | | | | |
| | Distance) | | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| | Fire Exposure (Ease of | | | | | |
| | Access)7 | | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Sco | ore | | 13 | 18 | 13 | 16 |
| Ranki | ng | | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| | SUM OF RANKINGS | | 7 | 9 | 7 | 8 |
| | OVERALL RANKING | | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 |

| Categories | Weight | East | West | Submarine | Simpson Is |
|--------------------|--------|------|------|-----------|------------|
| Environment | 20% | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Socio-Economics | 20% | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| Land Access | 20% | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| Engineering/Cost | 20% | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| Con. And Ops. Risk | 20% | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| TOTAL | 100% | 2 | 4 | 1.6 | 2.6 |

1. Aboriginal / South Slave Employment

It is very likely that the aboriginal employment opportunities with the East, Submarine, and Simpson

Is. alternatives would be identical, since the same amount of aboriginal groups are affected.

2. Future Customers

The Submarine and Simpson Is. Routes should be ranked higher, as they can not only potentially supply the diamond mines, but also future mining/milling at both Pine Point and Thor Lake.

3. Line Frontage

The Submarine and Simpson Is. Routes provide line frontage around Pine Point and Thor Lake, while the other alternatives do not. They should have higher ratings.

4. Crown Land Withdrawals

Interaction with Crown Land Withdrawals is irrelevant, as transmission lines do not require a disposition of land. Transmission lines can cross land withdrawals.

5. Land Tenure

While the West Route has tenure issues with the Deh Cho and Tli Cho, the other alternatives have similar tenure issues with unsettled claims and treaty processes and Parks Canada.

6. Materials Delivery

East Arm route has by far the most new winter road construction of all the alternatives, and is the most remote. This alternative should not be rated favourable for this sub-criteria.

7. Fire Exposure (Ease of Access)

The East Arm route has a long, isolated overland portion of line. Should fire damage the line, it will be much more difficult to service than the other three options.

Only modified seven (7) sub-criteria to achieve this - many more sub-criteria could be modified

Basically, based upon subjective value judgements and the different interpretations of evidence, this alternatives assessment methodology could be used to support almost any conclusion.