Identifier	Topic	Reference to EIS/EA Report	Summary of Previous Comment	Proponent's Response to Previous Comment	Follow-up comment/ Request for Information	New Proponent Response	Subsequent Comment
			Date: August 2015 *MNR-2*	*Date: 2017*	*Date: April 2017*	*Date: June 2017*	
MNRF 2B	Transmission lines		The preferred alternative for the transmission line crossing Sawmill Bay is included in the LSA, however the concern is that very little research on terrestrial ecology was conducted in this area upon reviewing the plot locations as shown on the maps supplied in the Terrestrial TSD (i.e. on the islands where towers/infrastructure will likely be installed). For this reason, there may be further information requirements for this area in particular at the time of permitting. The transmission line will be constructed on Crown land and will require land tenure from MNRF. We appreciate that CMC has provided further specifics to the alternatives, such as road length. However, this should be reflected with other comparables, (as referenced above) in a revised Table 3-10. EA coverage for MNRF permits and approvals is only as good as the EA that is submitted. Which is why MNRF has identified areas where there is inadequate EA coverage and pointed out the risk to the proponent. There has not been extensive evaluation of alternatives for the transmission line and substation. MNRF's comment on Fig 1-3 was intended to identify that it will be more practical to identify a wider corridor, the road will be constructed within. The line on the map shows little room for flexibility during implementation. _____ The response for additional information regarding plans to cross Sawbill Bay has prompted more questions. Information provided at the face to face meeting of July 8, 2014 showed proposed locations of the towers, as well as drawings of the tower designs. The steel tower structures in those drawings are shown to be 52-63m tall. In discussions with Hydro One, structures to span these distances will need to be very tall (i.e. likely >100m) and will likely require additional requirements such as aviation	Additional information provided in: Supplemental Assessment of Access Road and Transmission Line Routing Alternatives in Part 4 of the Version 3 Alternatives Assessment TSD	Section 1.2 Page 5 (final paragraph): MNRF requests that references related to Individual EA vs Class EA be clarified. Suggested wording is as follows : "This document provides the required additional information to support the Individual EA stage, recognizing that some of the detail referenced in the May 25, 2016 letter to the MOECC relates more to the environmental permits and approvals stage for the transmission line construction, rather than to providing the information necessary to select preferred alignments at the EA stage of investigation. It is important to distinguish between the level of detail considered at the Individual EA stage, and level of detail to be provided at the permitting and approvals stage. Further engineering and other details will be provided at the environmental permitting and approvals stage once final alignments for the access road and the transmission line have been defined through the Individual EA Stage." Section 4.3 Page 18 - Please clarify in text what type of water crossings will be constructed in order to provide access to the locations for the construction of the tower sites, acknowledging that permitting and approvals stage may require further data and review/approva l of other permitting authorities, such as DFO. Sec. 7.3.1 Reference to the FMP Guide for Biodiversity is not applicable to this project, therefore reference to it requires removal. Decommissioning plan for the Transmission Line is to be included in the Closure Plan. MNRF's concern here is about post-closure liability.	The revisions requested had been made in final report: Supplemental Assessment of Access Road and Transmission Line Routing Alternatives, submitted as Part 4 of the Version 3 Alternatives Assessment TSD. Decommissioning of the Transmission Line will be a component of the Certified Closure Plan to be submitted to the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines.	

Identifier	Topic	Reference to EIS/EA Report	Summary of Previous Comment	Proponent's Response to Previous Comment	Follow-up comment/ Request for Information	New Proponent Response	Subsequent Comment
			Date: August 2015 *MNR-2*	*Date: 2017*	*Date: April 2017*	*Date: June 2017*	
			lighting. Since power will not be able to be supplied from the 230kv line, plans for an auxiliary source for power will be needed. The proponent has responded that the site power distribution system design detail has not been undertaken. This is concerning, as the transmission line is not a small component of the project and the selected alternative is complex. Changes could involve new corridors, additional steel towers, a submarine auxiliary line, etc. which are major additions/changes and would not have EA coverage. The statement that other alternatives such as a submarine crossing was ruled out based on economic and environmental considerations is not acceptable. The alternative selected is also costly. The EA needs to provide more detail on what is being proposed and a better delivery of the alternatives assessment.				