

#	Summary of Comment Received	Questions to Transportation and Economic Corridors (TEC)	TEC Response
1	Concerns were presented regarding TEC negotiating right of ways instead of purchasing the private parcels, and that such lands were supposed to be accessible to Indigenous groups and the public. This has in turn shrunk the available lands over which Indigenous groups have priority to exercise their rights.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please provide a response to these concerns.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amendment is specific to wildlife friendly fencing and changes to the reporting period and report submission date (Project Change).</li> <li>In the Draft IAAC Report, IAAC noted that the revisions to the wildlife friendly fencing would not result in adverse impacts on the exercise of Indigenous rights.</li> <li>Purchase agreement discussions and agreements with each landowner advanced following Project approvals in July 2021 (IAAC) and October 2021 (NRCB) and in some instances, landowners did not want to sell their full parcels which led to partial parcel purchases and utility right of ways at certain locations. Details surrounding the landowner agreement discussions and agreements themselves will not be disclosed.</li> </ul>
2	Concerns were presented regarding consultation by TEC on the proposed staging areas, and impacts from the Project change on accessing and protecting cultural sites in this area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were the effects from the Project change on the staging areas and accessibility and protection of cultural sites assessed?</li> <li>How has TEC addressed concerns related to staging areas, and accessibility and protection of cultural sites, as part of the Project change?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amendment is specific to wildlife friendly fencing and changes to the reporting period and report submission date (Project Change).</li> <li>Staging area is not part of the amendment and is being advanced through a separate process with participating First Nations.</li> <li>Access into the Project area will be available and access points are being developed and discussed through the Land Use Planning and Land Use Advisory Committees.</li> <li>The location of the wildlife friendly fencing will not change the access to cultural sites.</li> <li>Installation of the wildlife friendly fencing is part of the construction activities, and this will be part of the worksite observed by the Indigenous Monitors</li> </ul>

			who are onsite for the duration of the construction of the SR1 project.
3	<p>Concerns were presented that the barbed wire fencing may have adverse impacts on wildlife including juveniles, grizzly bears, and migratory birds. Siksika strongly supports the mitigation measures proposed by Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• only installing wildlife-friendly fencing throughout the Project development area, and if this is not feasible, implementing additional mitigation measures in areas proposed for barbed wire fencing that include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ installing an adjustable wire fencing with staple lock or fence clips, and clipping wires together when cattle are not on site;</li> <li>○ leaving gates open when cattle are not present; and</li> <li>○ any other method that allows wildlife to cross safely according to the Alberta Landholder’s Guide to Wildlife Friendly Fencing.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there measures TEC is committed to taking, including those proposed by ECCC, to address concerns related to the barbed wire fencing? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Examples to consider: TEC leaving gates open when cattle are not present and TEC is accessing the land for Project related activities; TEC modifying the design of the fencing by having adjustable wire fencing that can be clipped or installing additional gates, drop-downs, or other passages where wildlife concentrate and cross.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TEC sent the ECCC recommendations to the landowners with fencing within privately held lands. With these recommendations in hand the landowners will determine which, if any, of the recommendations will be implemented.</li> <li>• TEC is not installing barbed wire fencing except at a short section at the north end of Highway 22, which has historically had the 5-strand barbed wire fence that was originally installed by the landowner.</li> <li>• Cattle will not be present inside the reservoir unless a grazing permit has been issued by the Government of Alberta to manage vegetation in the reservoir.</li> <li>• Monitoring of wildlife movement at wildlife-friendly fence locations will be completed as part of the Wildlife Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (WMMP). Any potential modifications to fence design will be assessed based on the results of the remote camera monitoring program (i.e., wildlife crossing success).</li> </ul>
4	<p>Comments indicated that monitoring is needed on the effectiveness of wildlife-friendly fencing, including monitoring of non-wildlife-friendly fencing, by gathering data and identifying benchmarks and indicators for monitoring programs. If monitors report barriers to wildlife movement because of the additional fencing, TEC should commit to adequate accommodation measures.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there additional follow-up measures TEC is committed to taking, including monitoring the effectiveness of the wildlife friendly fencing in supporting safe wildlife movement, to address concerns related to monitoring any Project fencing?</li> <li>• If monitors report barriers to wildlife movement because of Project fencing, is TEC committed to implementing additional measures?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Government of Alberta will monitor the effectiveness of the wildlife friendly fencing that is within their care and control; any fencing within the privately owned lands is the responsibility of the landowner.</li> <li>• As per the WMMP, wildlife habitat use/movement in the Local Assessment Area (LAA) has been monitored using remote cameras during the construction phase and will continue to be monitored for 3 years post-construction during the dry operations phase.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No additional follow-up measures are being considered at this time; monitoring of fencing will be done via the remote camera program (as detailed in the WMMP).</li><li>• Performance indicators (e.g., crossing success) and targets have been developed to evaluate mitigation effectiveness including wildlife-friendly fencing and are described in the WMMP (see Section 7.3, Table 7.1)</li><li>• Wildlife crossing success at wildlife-friendly fence locations will be monitored and adaptive management action taken if crossing success falls below 60% for focal wildlife species (e.g., elk).</li></ul>
--	--	--	---