

# Appendix C5

## Feedback and Response Log - Indigenous Communities - Kashechewan First Nation



**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Kashechewan First Nation	1	<p>“The decision regarding ownership of the Community Access Road has yet to be made. It is currently unknown who will own, maintain and operate the Community Access Road.”</p> <p>Kashechewan First Nation (Kashechewan or KFN) is concerned with the lack of defined path forward for the road.</p> <p>How can Marten Falls guarantee that principles and commitments made through the EA/IS process will be upheld by future owners of the road? Additional discussion is required.</p>	<p>Kashechewan First Nation's request for shared ownership in the Community Access Road is noted. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding ownership and operations of the Community Access Road. These conversations are ongoing, and consultation with Indigenous communities will continue in 2026 under the coordination of the regulator.</p> <p>While the ownership of the Community Access Road has not yet been determined, the commitments made through the Environmental Assessment/Impact Assessment process are documented and form part of the Community Access Road's approval conditions. These commitments are intended to carry forward regardless of future ownership. Commitments are documented in Appendix AA and will be shared with future owned/operator of the Community Access Road</p> <p>Making sure accountability over time is a key consideration, and mechanisms such as legal agreements, regulatory oversight, and permitting conditions will play a role in upholding these commitments.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	428

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Kashechewan First Nation	2	<p>“Indigenous land and resource use refers to specific areas and resources used for traditional purposes when Indigenous peoples learn and practice their Indigenous Knowledge.”</p> <p>Indigenous land and resource use includes more than traditional practices and purposes and can include modern practices that include socio-cultural, environmental, and economic activities. Please update this section to reflect this.</p>	<p>Section 6.1 of the Final EA/IS Report and Section 3.1 of the Technical Support Documents has been updated with the following text:</p> <p>"Indigenous Land and Resource Use refers to specific areas and resources used for traditional purposes when Indigenous peoples learn and practice their Indigenous Knowledge (Garvin &amp; Northern Forestry Centre (Canada), 2001). This includes the areas and sites used for hunting, trapping, fishing, and gathering and the resources harvested, as well as cultural sites, features and practices—sometimes referred to as Traditional Land Use."</p>	<p>Technical Support Documents Section 3.1 (all - template update) Final EA/IS Section 6.1</p>	429
Kashechewan First Nation	3	<p>“...were identified for the consultation and engagement program To date, Marten Falls...”</p> <p>There is punctuation missing between “program” and “To date”.</p>	<p>A period has been added in between the sentences in Section 6.1.2 of the Final EA/IS.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 6.1.2</p>	430
Kashechewan First Nation	4	<p>“Gender-Based Analysis Plus data collection for the Community Access Road included demographics, human health, engagement opportunities, and secondary research.”</p> <p>Please indicate how impact inequity for</p>	<p>The impact of inequity on Indigenous Peoples was assessed through a multi-source approach. Demographic data was analyzed to identify population distribution, including: biophysical determinants to human health were reviewed; engagement findings provided</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	431

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>effects on Indigenous Peoples can be completed using the identified data. There appears to be limited source data used for this analysis outside of engagement opportunities.</p>	<p>qualitative insights into lived experiences; and secondary research was used to supplement data.</p> <p>While disaggregated datasets specific to Indigenous communities—particularly those reflecting intersections of gender, age, and Indigeneity—are limited, these combined methods allowed for both quantitative and qualitative assessment of inequity.</p> <p>We recognize that disaggregated datasets specific to Indigenous communities, particularly those that reflect intersections of gender, age, Indigeneity, and other identity factors, are often limited in availability and scope. This is a well-documented barrier to applying GBA+ in many infrastructure projects involving Indigenous communities, and those limitations are described in the report. Refer to Section 4.5 of Appendix T Community Well-Being Technical Support Document for more information on the GBA+ methodology.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	5	<p>“We recognize that there may be limited data available for Marten Falls First Nation.”</p> <p>Please confirm whether other Nations</p>	<p>The analysis was developed with consideration for all stakeholders and rights-holders, including the 23 Indigenous communities identified in Section 11.3.2 of the Final EA/IS. This</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	432

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>were considered for GBA+ analysis or if this consideration only focused on Marten Falls.</p> <p>If other Nations were not considered, this must be remedied in the Final EA/EIS.</p>	<p>inclusive approach aligns with guidance from the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada, which emphasizes the importance of applying GBA+ to baseline conditions for diverse subgroups and integrating it into all aspects of data collection and interpretation.</p> <p>GBA+ often relies on self-identification and community-led input. The analysis incorporated both primary and secondary data sources, including Indigenous Knowledge where provided, and was designed to be responsive to the unique social, cultural, and economic contexts of each group. Engagement activities were developed to reflect these differences, and the methodology was structured to allow for the integration of additional information as it became available.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	6	Please note, the Webequie Supply Road is listed twice within the Project Inclusion List.	The Final EA/IS has been updated to remove the duplication of the Webequie Supply Road in the Project Inclusion List.	Final EA/IS Table 10.1-1	443
Kashechewan First Nation	8	Kashechewan requires engagement on potential locations of road maintenance facilities, rest stops, and pull-out areas which are to be confirmed during detailed design.	<p>Kashechewan First Nation request for engagement during detail design is noted.</p> <p>However, providing input on placement for road maintenance facilities, rest stops and pull-out areas will be undertaken solely by Marten Falls First Nation.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	444

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>Marten Falls First Nation appreciates the feedback received from Kashechewan First Nation throughout the Environmental Assessment / Impact Assessment process. Your insights have helped shape the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement (EA / IS). After the release consultation and engagement activities will be led by the provincial and federal government agencies with the Community Access Road Project Team providing support, where needed. In addition, should the Community Access Road EA / IS be approved to proceed, a consultation and engagement program will be established to guide discussions through detail design.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	8	<p>“Early investigations on permafrost have shown the Community Access Road is located within the isolated patches of the permafrost zone (Heginbottom et al., 1995), with some possible locations identified in test holes and helicopter reconnaissance by KGS Group (2019a, 2019b). Excavation within identified permafrost areas will be avoided whenever possible, as cutting into surface vegetation can disturb the permafrost regime resulting in thaw and unstable ground. As a precaution, the</p>	<p>The permafrost management plan will be shared with Kashechewan First Nation. The development and implementation of the permafrost management plan will be the responsibility of the owner/operator of the Community Access Road. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	445

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>design will primarily use fill along access roads to minimize permafrost degradation and will follow the recommendations outlined in a permafrost management plan.”</p> <p>KFN requires review of the permafrost management plan, when developed, to ensure disturbance of the permafrost regime is limited.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	9	<p>Temporary infrastructure will be decommissioned/removed and areas will be allowed to revegetate naturally.</p> <p>Kashechewan is concerned that areas where temporary infrastructure are decommissioned or removed may not revegetate in a timely manner and that revegetation may not support plants of traditional importance. KFN requires the proponent to develop a revegetation plan for temporary infrastructure that incorporates species of interest to Kashechewan.</p>	A Vegetation Restoration Plan will be developed and finalized during the next phase of the Community Access Road and will include seeding and/or planting of Traditional Use Plants.	Comment noted; see response for details	446
Kashechewan First Nation	10	“Vegetation clearing and grubbing will also occur at construction laydown and staging areas, as well as temporary construction camps. Trees will mainly be removed using heavy machinery, although hand-clearing (for example	Should the Community Access Road EA/IS be approved to proceed, a consultation and engagement program will be established to guide discussions regarding opportunity to salvage medicinal plants or other plants species	Comment noted; see response for details	448

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>chainsaws) may be used for small-scale efforts, such as those around sensitive features (Figure 7-4).”</p> <p>Please identify whether involved Nations, such as KFN, will be afforded the opportunity to salvage medicinal plants or other plant species of importance from the construction development area prior to the removal of woody vegetation and hazard trees.</p>	<p>of importance in the construction disturbance area during the detail design stage.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	11	<p>“Explosives will be transported, handled, and stored in compliance with federal and provincial regulations and will only be used by trained professionals. The storage of explosives will be in specially designed and secured containers and set back and isolated from all other activities.”</p> <p>Please specify whether Marten Falls will implement a blasting plan and potentially include blasting offset measures, where required, in proximity to waterbodies. Please update the EA/IS main document to include these details for the final.</p> <p>Further, KFN requires review of any blasting plan and requests this be implemented as part of construction activities.</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS already includes a commitments to prepare a Blasting and Communication Management Plan that is in accordance with Ontario Provincial Standard Specification (OPSS.PROV 120) General Specifications for the Use of Explosives (Ontario Provincial Standard Specifications, 2014). It will describe specific measures that will be implemented when blasting is required in proximity of watercourses.</p> <p>The Blasting and Communication Management Plan can be shared with Kashechewan First Nation. The development, review and implementation of the Blasting and Communication Management Plan will, however, be undertaken solely by Marten Falls First Nation.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	451

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Kashechewan First Nation	12	<p>“Domestic wastewater will be discharged to onsite leaching beds at the temporary construction camps.”</p> <p>Domestic wastewater includes waste from toilets and other household discharges that could include materials and chemicals that are not safe for the natural environment. Additionally, leaching beds are typically placed underground – Please specify whether these will be constructed underground and whether they will be removed/ decommissioned following conclusion of construction activities?</p>	<p>Specifics on the type of domestic wastewater systems to be used will be determined during detail design. Options may include holding tank systems with off-site disposal or on-site leaching beds designed in accordance with applicable codes and approvals. Management of domestic wastewater will be governed by established Provincial legislation, Best Practices and Guidelines and will be subject to applicable regulatory applications and permits. Construction camps and associated domestic wastewater systems will be decommissioned following the conclusion of construction activities.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	453
Kashechewan First Nation	13	<p>No Indigenous knowledge from the Kashechewan First Nation Existing Conditions Report was included in this table and, therefore, integrated into the assessment.</p> <p>This must be updated in the final EA/EIS with data from the Kashechewan report; particularly as Kashechewan respondents had specific concerns related to water, experience water as an aspect of ongoing governance, and travel various waterways in the region.</p>	<p>Table 8.1-1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to reflect input from Kashechewan First Nation.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Table 8.1-1</p>	454
Kashechewan	14	<p>This table refers to Technical Support</p>	<p>Table 8.1-2 of the Final EA/IS has been</p>	<p>Final EA/IS</p>	455

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
First Nation		<p>Documents (Appendix I) for Valued Component information related to Peatlands.</p> <p>Information must be carried over for the final EA/EIS to ensure readability.</p>	updated to include the peatlands information.	Table 8.1-2	
Kashechewan First Nation	15	<p>This table refers to Technical Support Documents (Appendix I) for Spatial Boundaries related to Peatlands.</p> <p>Information must be carried over from appendices to the EA document for the final EA/EIS to ensure readability.</p>	Table 8.1-3 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include the peatlands information.	Final EA/IS Table 8.1-3	456
Kashechewan First Nation	16	<p>In place of this Figure, there is a placeholder that refers to Technical Support Documents (Appendix I) for visualization of Spatial Boundaries related to Peatlands.</p> <p>Information must be carried over from appendices to the EA document for the final EA/EIS to ensure readability.</p>	Figure 8.1-3 has been added to Final EA/IS	Final EA/IS Figure 8.1-3	457
Kashechewan First Nation	17	<p>“These watersheds generally drain either east towards the Albany River or northeast towards Hudson Bay. They are under the jurisdiction area of the Ministry of Natural Resources.”</p> <p>Please confirm that the Ministry of</p>	The watershed areas crossed by project components are located outside of Ontario's 36 Conservation Authority jurisdictions. As a results, the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), and to a similar extent the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks	Final EA/IS Section 8.1.4.1 Appendix F	458

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Natural Resources is the conservation authority for the specified watersheds.</p> <p>If so, please adjust language from jurisdiction to “an area managed” by the Ministry of Natural Resources.</p>	<p>(MECP) and local municipalities, are responsible for managing water resources, stormwater, and land-use planning within the project area. As suggested, language will be adjusted and "jurisdiction" will be replaced with "the area managed" by MNR and other respective agencies.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	18	<p>“Field investigations included flying over the area and conducting ground surveys at selected water crossings from 2019 to 2022.”</p> <p>Please specify how water crossings were selected for field investigation.</p> <p>Additionally, why were field investigations discontinued in 2022.</p>	<p>1) Water crossings for field investigations were identified based on proposed route alignments, including alternative route options. Access to the locations accessed during the field program were further determined based on availability of suitable spot for helicopter landing, safe water level and flow conditions in order to complete an assessment, and the density of vegetation surrounding the proposed crossing locations. For details regarding the existing conditions study design and methodology, refer to Section 4.3 of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document.</p> <p>2) Field investigations during the Aquatics field program were coordinated and completed to collect data on surface water quantity and quality during different seasonal conditions and varying flow conditions. Upon collection of baseline field data to characterize existing</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	459

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>conditions, field investigations were discontinued because survey intensity was completed to meet the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines. For additional details, refer to Section 4.3 of Appendix F.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	19	<p>“Based on a review of publicly available hydropower mapping (Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, 2001), Ontario Power Generation (2019) reports, and Water Survey of Canada Hydrometric datasets (Environment Canada, 2022), there are no known hydropower generating stations or active dams in the Local and Regional Study Areas.”</p> <p>While there are no active hydropower generating sites in the RSA currently, there are Ontario Power Generation potential development sites along the Albany River with a 250 MW generating potential. This must be considered and evaluated in the Cumulative Effects assessment portion. Please refer to OPG’s Northern Hydroelectric Opportunities Report for details.</p>	<p>OPG hydroelectric projects for which location and timing information was publicly available when the Project Inclusions List was prepared were included. For example, the Little Jackfish River Hydroelectric Project and the water control structures along the Albany River Watershed are listed in Table 10.1-1 of the Final EA/IS.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	460
Kashechewan First Nation	20	<p>“Ogoki River at Crossing RA-1-WC-05: ... Fish sampling was not conducted at this crossing but the fish community in the Ogoki River is well documented.</p>	<p>For the EA/IS, fish sampling was conducted to document fish presence in the vicinity of the waterbody crossings. Limited fish sampling was conducted in</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	461

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>It is noted that field investigations were conducted between 2019 and 2022; this crossing was not included in these investigations.</p> <p>Additionally, the species listed for this crossing come from outdated sources (Government of Ontario, 2015; and Golder 2013).</p> <p>Additional field investigations should be conducted to confirm the presence of the listed species to ensure those species are present with similar population sizes and seasonal usage.</p>	<p>the Ogoki River as the fish community is well documented. Instead fish sampling efforts focused on waterbodies where the fish community was not as well described. For the purposes of the EA/IS, all fish species previously recorded through historical information for the Ogoki River as well from Indigenous Knowledge were considered to be present at the Ogoki River crossing. A conservative approach was taken to determine species presence within individual waterbodies; if there were any uncertainties about the ability of a waterbody to support a species of fish, it was assumed the species may be present in the waterbody.</p> <p>A fish habitat survey was conducted at crossing RA1-WC-05 on the Ogoki River on September 8, 2019. Although fish sampling was not specifically conducted at RA1-WC-05, fish sampling was conducted in the Ogoki River at another crossing location (RA1-WC-11) in June and August 2022 (Section 3.3.15 of Attachment C of Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document).</p> <p>Due to the historical fish presence information and Indigenous Knowledge</p>		

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			regarding the Ogoki River, no additional fish sampling is required to support the EA/IS or Fisheries and Oceans Canada and the Ministry of Natural Resources permit applications for this crossing.		
Kashechewan First Nation	21	<p>Ogoki River at Crossing RA1-WC-11: In-text reference: Government of Ontario 2015, Golder 2013; and “Fish sampling done in 2022...”</p> <p>The fish listed to be found at this crossing by the sources Government of Ontario, 2015, and Golder, 2013 were not verified through fish sampling done between 2019-2022. These sources are out of date.</p> <p>Additional field investigations should be conducted to confirm the presence of the listed species to ensure those species are present with similar population sizes and seasonal usage.</p>	<p>For the purposes of the EA/IS, all fish species previously recorded through historical information for the Ogoki River as well from Indigenous Knowledge were considered to be present at the Ogoki River crossings, as well as the fish species captured through sampling.</p> <p>Due to the historical fish presence information and Indigenous Knowledge regarding the Ogoki River, no additional fish sampling is required to support the EA/IS or Fisheries and Oceans Canada and the Ministry of Natural Resources permit applications for this crossing.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	462
Kashechewan First Nation	22	<p>Albany River at Crossing RA1-WC-27: “An unknown mussel species was found at the crossing.”</p> <p>Please provide detail on whether these unknown mussels will be investigated to ensure they are not invasive (i.e., Zebra Mussels or Quagga Mussels).</p>	After review of field photos, the mussel species observed in the Albany River at crossing RA1-WC-27 has been identified as a Giant Floater ( <i>Pyganodon grandis</i> ), which is a native freshwater mussel commonly found in Ontario rivers, with a wide distribution across Canada.	Final EA/IS Section 8.1.6.1.1 Appendix G	463

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			Section 8.1.6.1.1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include information on this mussel species.		
Kashechewan First Nation	23	<p>Albany River at Crossing RA1: In-text reference: Government of Ontario 2015, Golder 2013; and MFFN 2021</p> <p>The fish listed to be found at this crossing by the sources Government of Ontario, 2015, and Golder, 2013 were not verified through fish sampling done in 2021. (The 2021 investigation found other fish species.) These sources are out of date.</p> <p>Additional field investigations should be conducted to confirm the presence of the listed species to ensure those species are present with similar population sizes and seasonal usage.</p>	<p>For the purposes of the EA/IS, all fish species previously recorded through historical information for the Albany River as well from Indigenous Knowledge were considered to be present at the Albany River crossing. Large-bodied fish including Brook Trout, Northern Pike, Walleye, Lake Sturgeon, and Lake Whitefish have all been documented in the Albany River as well as several small-bodied forage fish species (e.g., Lake Chub, Brook Stickleback).</p> <p>Due to the historical fish presence information and Indigenous Knowledge regarding the Albany River, no additional fish sampling is required to support the Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement or Fisheries and Oceans Canada and the Ministry of Natural Resources permit applications for this crossing.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	464
Kashechewan First Nation	24	Ogoki River at Crossing RA4B-WC-01: In-text references: Government of Ontario 2015, Golder 2013; "Fish sampling was not conducted at this crossing because it would have fallen	A fish habitat assessment was completed on October 15, 2020 at crossing RA4B-WC-01 on the Ogoki River. During the time of the assessment in mid-October, fish sampling was not completed due to	Comment noted; see response for details	465

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>during a restricted activity window, however it is assumed that the populations are similar to those found at Ogoki River at Crossing RA1-WC-11 (above).”</p> <p>The investigation period is stated as taking place between 2019-2022. Please clarify if the entire investigation period was under a restricted activity window.</p> <p>If not, why was investigation of this crossing not completed at another window throughout the 2-year investigation period? Additionally, the sources (Government of Ontario, 2015, and Golder, 2013) are out of date.</p> <p>Additional field investigations should be conducted for fish presence and seasonality.</p>	<p>the field program being scheduled during the fall restricted activity timing window (September 1 to June 15).</p> <p>The overall schedule for the field programs is outlined in Section 2.2. of Attachment B of Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document. As described in this section, field programs were subsequently conducted in 2021 and 2022; however, fish sampling was not completed at the large watercourses (i.e., Albany and Ogoki rivers) where historical records exist on the fish community.</p> <p>As described in the responses to #162, #163, and #165, historical information and Indigenous Knowledge was available regarding the fish species present in the Ogoki River, In addition, fish sampling was conducted in the Ogoki River at another crossing location (RA1-WC-11) in June and August 2022 (Section 3.3.15 of Attachment C of Appendix G). As a result of the information available, a subsequent field survey of this crossing was not considered warranted.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	25	Albany River at Crossing RA4-WC-34: In-text references: Government of	As described in Section 3.3.48 of Attachment B of the Fish Habitat	Comment noted; see	466

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Ontario 2015, Golder 2013; “Fish sampling involved setting minnow traps; no fish were captured.”</p> <p>The fish listed to be found at this crossing by the sources Government of Ontario, 2015, and Golder, 2013 were not verified through fish sampling done in 2021 as the 2021 investigation using minnow traps resulted in no fish capture.</p> <p>However, spawning and rearing habitat was deemed moderate to high for large-bodied fish species including Lake Sturgeon.</p> <p>Minnow traps are commonly used to catch small-bodied freshwater fish species. Why were no methods for large-bodied fish completed during the 2021 fish investigation? Will additional investigations at this water crossing be completed to verify the older data used to report on species presence?</p>	<p>Technical Support Document: Existing Conditions &amp; Effects Assessment (Appendix G), the fish community in the Albany River is well documented; therefore, fishing effort for the Project was minimal. Minnow traps were set at crossing RA4-WC-34 on the Albany River while the field crew conducted the fish habitat assessment on September 15, 2021.</p> <p>For the purposes of the EA/IS, all fish species previously recorded through historical information for the Albany River as well from Indigenous Knowledge were considered to be present at the Albany River crossing. Large-bodied fish including Brook Trout, Northern Pike, Walleye, Lake Sturgeon, and Lake Whitefish have all been documented in the Albany River as well as several small-bodied forage fish species (e.g., Lake Chub, Brook Stickleback).</p> <p>Due to the historical fish presence information and Indigenous Knowledge regarding the Albany River, no additional fish sampling is required to support the EA/IS or Fisheries and Oceans Canada and the Ministry of Natural Resources permit applications for this crossing.</p>	<p>response for details</p>	

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Kashechewan First Nation	26	<p>(g) Valued Component fish species</p> <p>Four fish were chosen as Valued Components (VCs) to represent the 37 fish species found in the Local Study Area. However, there was no representative VC selected for baitfish such as the fathead minnow.</p> <p>Brook trout, which as assumed to be representative of small-bodied fish such as the fat head minnow are larger carnivorous fish whereas minnows are smaller omnivorous fish; therefore, a representative VC should have been selected.</p>	<p>The approach for selecting the fish Valued Components is described in Section 4.2.2 of Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document. All of the fish species recorded during baseline studies have a role in the ecosystem; however, the purpose for limiting the assessment on Valued Components is to focus on those species that were identified as most valuable based on the presence in the study area, importance to Indigenous users, government priorities (e.g., provincial or federal listed species), and life history requirements and role in the food web. This approach for selecting Valued Components is a common practice in environmental assessments (e.g., Impact Assessment Agency of Canada, 2024).</p> <p>The Valued Components in the fish and fish habitat EA/IS are the fish species in the May 2021 Final Fish and Fish Habitat Study Plan. The Study Plan process also incorporated feedback from regulators and Indigenous Groups on the Valued Components. Engagement was also conducted with Indigenous Groups on the preliminary Valued Components (Section 3.2 of Appendix G).</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	467

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Kashechewan First Nation	27	<p>“A number of fish species have been identified as culturally important to Indigenous communities including Aroland First Nation and Marten Falls First Nation. Both Aroland First Nation and Marten Falls First Nation have highlighted the importance of species including Brook Trout, Lake Sturgeon, Northern Pike, Sucker, Walleye, and Lake Whitefish (Dillon, 2024; MFFN, 2023a).”</p> <p>No details from the Kashechewan First Nation Existing Conditions Report are reflected in this Section. Kashechewan identified over 100 fishing sites for Northern Pike, over 69 fishing sites for walleye, over 22 fishing sites for Lake Sturgeon, and over 20 sites for Lake Whitefish, among others.</p> <p>Please update this in the final version to reflect Kashechewan input.</p>	Section 8.1.6.3 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to incorporate input provided by Kashechewan First Nation.	Final EA/IS Section 8.1.6.3 Appendix G	468
Kashechewan First Nation	28	“Although Blackfin Cisco...were found in 2006 downstream from the Waboose Dam on the Ogoki Reservoir...they were not considered likely to be present in the existing conditions Construction Disturbance Area, Local Study Area, or Regional Study Area.”	As described in Section 5.4.1.2 of Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document, Blackfin Cisco were reported to have been incidentally captured in 2006 during a non-forestry netting exercise, downstream from the Waboose Dam at the Ogoki Reservoir. The Ogoki	Comment noted; see response for details	469

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Additional detail is required to support the assumption of Blackfin Cisco not likely to be present in the listed areas. The in-text references (Long Lake, 2008; Golder, 2013) are out of date. The presence/absence of Blackfin Cisco should be verified with up-to-date information.</p> <p>Additional field investigations should be conducted to confirm the presence (or absence) of the Blackfin Cisco.</p>	<p>Reservoir is outside of the existing conditions Regional Study Area and is located over 100 km upstream from the crossing on the Ogoki River / Patience Lake (RA4-WC-15).</p> <p>Blackfin Cisco prefer cold, deep water of 55 to 165 m and the water depth at Patience Lake along Alternative 4 (RA4-WC-15) was recorded as being 3.4 m. Therefore, Blackfin Cisco were not considered as a potential fish species that could be present in the existing conditions Construction Disturbance Area, Local Study Area, or Regional Study Area.</p> <p>Historically, the Blackfin Cisco was reported as an endemic species to each of the Great Lakes, except Lake Erie and Lake Nipigon. However, the occurrence of Blackfin Cisco in lakes Superior and Ontario was never confirmed. Recent sampling suggests that the stocks from the Great Lakes are extirpated. According to Eshenroder et al. (2016), Blackfin Cisco was historically reported in Lakes Michigan, Huron, and Nipigon, and the species remains present in Lake Nipigon. Historical records of Blackfin Cisco for inland lakes in Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta are</p>		

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>now considered to be invalid due to taxonomic uncertainty (COSEWIC 2007).</p> <p>Due to the habitat preference for this species (i.e., at depths greater than 50 m) and taxonomic uncertainty of previous identifications, sampling specifically for this species is not warranted.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	29	<p>“At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement, the peatland existing conditions information was not available to summarize. The full Peatlands Technical Support Document can be found in Appendix I. A summary will be provided in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.”</p> <p>Information must be carried over from appendices to the EA document for the final EA/EIS to ensure readability.</p>	Section 8.1.8 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include the peatlands information.	Final EA/IS Section 8.1.8	470
Kashechewan First Nation	30	<p>No Indigenous knowledge from the Kashechewan First Nation Existing Conditions Report was included in this table and, therefore, integrated into the assessment.</p> <p>This must be updated in the final EA/EIS with data from the Kashechewan report as Kashechewan respondents had</p>	Table 8.2-1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to incorporate input provided by Kashechewan First Nation.	Final EA/IS Table 8.2-1	471

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		specific concerns related to habitat, migration, accidents, additional development, and contaminants/pollutants.			
Kashechewan First Nation	31	<p>Vegetation &gt; Traditional Use Plants and Species at Risk Plant Populations</p> <p>Indicators for this Valued Component (VC) do not include plant quality. Traditional use plants may be available to harvest but may be poor quality and not preferred for harvest. Please provide additional details on how plant quality was considered in the final EA/IS.</p>	<p>Plant quality was considered in relation to indicators of changes in traditional plant availability and distribution. Because 'quality' can vary by context and is difficult to define consistently, the assessment focused on observable factors such as plant health and vigor as proxies for quality. If components of the Community Access Road were determined to affect these factors, this was understood to influence the availability and distribution of traditional plants.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	472
Kashechewan First Nation	32	<p>Wildlife &gt; Bats</p> <p>“Changes in mortality (due to increased anthropogenic [human-caused] stresses [for example, harvest, vehicle travel]).</p> <p>KFN respects the environment holistically and has particular care and concern for species that are threatened or endangered. KFN has not historically harvested bats, nor would; due to their status. Please indicate whether other indigenous groups harvest bats. If not, remove harvesting an example of</p>	<p>The bullet point referencing harvest was included in the list of Measures of Change for bats in Table 8-14 in error. This measure of change was only considered in the assessment of effects on the furbearer valued components. The Final EA/IS has been updated to remove this from the bat row of Table 8.2-2 of the Final EA/IS (formerly Table 8-14 of the Draft EA/IS).</p>	Final EA/IS Table 8.2-2	473

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		anthropomorphic stresses for bats.			
Kashechewan First Nation	33	<p>This map specifies that the Local and Regional Study Areas are for “Existing Conditions” however, there is no differentiation on other figures within this section, nor an additional figure displaying the impact assessment LSA and RSA.</p> <p>Please advise whether the displayed LSA and RSAs are for both existing conditions and assessment of potential effects. If yes, please remove “existing conditions” from the legend, title, etc.</p>	<p>The Ungulates Effects Assessment Local Study Area and Regional Study Areas are displayed on Figure 9.4-4 of the Final EA/IS. Please note that the existing conditions and effects assessment study areas are the same to provide consistent and transparent calculations for changes in habitat quantity, other numerical comparisons, and ecological context for the assessment. The titles are different to align with the different sections of the EA/IS.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	474
Kashechewan First Nation	34	<p>Traditional use plants were selected and studied using both oral and written knowledge from Marten Falls First Nation, the Eabametoong First Nation’s Biodiversity Atlas (Eabametoong First Nation et al., no date), and the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines.</p> <p>While the Kashechewan First Nation Existing Conditions Report does not indicate any berry or plant gathering within the LSA or RSA, there was knowledge shared about plants, activities and valued medicinal plants. Please update this section to include details from the Kashechewan Report.</p>	<p>Table 8.2-1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to incorporate input provided by Kashechewan First Nation.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 8.2.4</p>	475

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Kashechewan First Nation	35	<p>A list of 43 traditional use plant species was created by reviewing desktop resources and Indigenous Knowledge provided within the Eabametoong First Nation Biodiversity Atlas (no date).</p> <p>There are details within the Kashechewan First Nation Existing Conditions Report which can enhance this section including species of berry, seasonality of harvest and typical locations the berries can be found. In addition, there are details about medicinal plants including species and usage. This section must be updated to incorporate details from Kashechewan.</p>	Table 8.2-1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to incorporate input provided by Kashechewan First Nation.	Final EA/IS Section 8.2.4.7	476
Kashechewan First Nation	36	<p>“Gray wolf was recoded on 23 or 30 cameras...”</p> <p>This sentence has both a misspelling (“recoded” and not “recorded”) and requires adjustment of the word “or” to be “of”.</p>	The sentence has been updated as follows: “Gray wolf was recorded on 23 of 30 cameras (occurrence rate of 40 percent)”.	Final EA/IS Section 8.2.5.3.2	477
Kashechewan First Nation	37	<p>“Habitat suitability for ospreys is summarized in Table 8-32 and shown on Figure 8-26.”</p> <p>There is an error – “ospreys” in this sentence should be replaced with “boreal owls” as Table 8-32 and Figure 8-26</p>	The title of Table 8.2-20 has been corrected to Habitat Suitability for Ospreys.	Final EA/IS Table 8.2-20	478

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		reference boreal owls.			
Kashechewan First Nation	38	<p>“Caribou and moose are culturally and traditionally important for Marten Falls First Nation. Moose meat is commonly shared with family, Elders, and community members, and almost all parts of the moose are used for different purposes (Marten Falls First Nation, 2023).”</p> <p>Both moose and caribou were noted as key species within the Kashechewan First Nation Existing Conditions Report.</p> <p>This section and the EA/IS in general must be updated to include information from the Kashechewan Report</p>	<p>The Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement and the Technical Support Documents were prepared to meet the requirements outlined in the Terms of Reference, the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines and the technical discipline-specific study plans. The development of a caribou monitoring program is not a regulatory requirement and as such was not developed as part of the Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.</p> <p>However, Table 8.2-1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to reflect Kashechewan First Nation's request for a caribou monitoring program.</p>	Final EA/IS Table 8.2-1	479
Kashechewan First Nation	39	<p>“No such habitats have been recorded in the moose Local Study Area, but they likely exist and just haven’t been documented yet.”</p> <p>What processes will Marten Falls undertake to ensure documentation of these moose habitat sites? What are the plans to verify the presence of these habitats? Documentation and verification of moose habitat sites must be included in the final EA/IS.</p>	Section 8.2.7.2 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to summarize Section 5.2.2 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document which outlines the Moose Habitat Distribution within the Local Study Area.	Final EA/IS Section 8.2.7.2	480

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Kashechewan First Nation	40	<p>Several of the potential pit areas have not been verified for their properties.</p> <p>What processes will Marten Falls undertake to ensure fulsome documentation of these the potential pit areas? How will engagement be undertaken on these sites? Information on potential pit areas must be included in the final EA/IS.</p>	<p>Material sampling and ground water monitoring at all potential aggregate sites are being undertaken as part of an ongoing permitting and preliminary design processes to verify their properties.</p> <p>Application for proposed pits will be completed during the next phase of the Community Access Road and will follow the Aggregate Resources of Ontario: Provincial Standards, Version 1.0, including notifications and consultation.</p> <p>All available information regarding potential aggregate sites has been incorporated into Section 7.1.2.3 of the Final EA/IS.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	481
Kashechewan First Nation	41	<p>“Water erosion risk wasn’t calculated for open water, rock, human-made materials, or organic soils, which make up 66.2 percent of the Local Study Area.”</p> <p>Considering open water, rock, human-made materials, and organic soils make up such a large portion of the Local Study Area, why was water erosion risk not calculated?</p>	<p>The water erosion equation is designed to predict the amount of mineral soil that is likely to be detached and transported by water from a specific area and is designed only for mineral soil. An erosion risk rating was assigned to all mineral soils in the LSA. If a risk rating were to be assigned to organic areas, it would be "very low" as organic materials are typically effective at preventing water erosion. Areas of Organic soil are also associated with level topography which are not prone to water erosion. Bedrock</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	482

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>is not susceptible to water erosion, so if a rating were to be assigned to that, it would be "very low". Water itself can not have an erosion risk rating, and in anthropogenic (human-made) areas, it is not possible to infer the soil texture or topography to calculate a reliable risk rating.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	42	<p>“Since there are few bogs or poor fens in the Local Study Area...”</p> <p>Page 190 indicates that fens make up 37% of the Local Study Area (LSA) and bogs make up 1%. Fens also make up 50% of wetlands in the LSA. As previously indicated, there are not few fens in the LSA. If the fens are determined to be poor in quality, please explain how this determination was made.</p>	<p>The term "poor fen" does not refer to the quality of the wetland community, but rather the nutrient availability of the fen community. It is a classification of peatland as outlined in the Ontario Wetlands Evaluation System Northern Manual. Poor fens are defined as mesotrophic peatlands, are intermediate between mineral-nourished (minerotrophic) and precipitation-dominated (ombrotrophic) peatlands.</p> <p>The summary of the availability of fen ecosites in Section 8.2.8.7.5 of the Final EA/IS includes all fen ecosites from poor fen to extremely rich fen ecosites.</p>	Final EA/IS Section 8.2.8.7.5	483
Kashechewan First Nation	43	<p>“The information, some of which is confidential, that has been used to inform this Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement related to the people disciplines is summarized in Table 8-52.” This table does not reflect shared</p>	<p>Table 8.3-1 of the Final EA/IS (formerly Table 8-52 of the Draft EA/IS) has been updated to reflect information from Kashechewan First Nation, where applicable.</p>	Final EA/IS Table 8.3-1	484

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>information from the Kashechewan First Nation Existing Conditions Report. This means that information was not used to inform the draft EA/IS.</p> <p>Please update this table and the final EA/IS to include information provided by Kashechewan.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	44	<p>This table includes a placeholder for valued components for Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests.</p> <p>Please note that Kashechewan First Nation identified three VCs within the Kashechewan First Nation Existing Conditions Report: Way of Life, Harvesting, and Governance. These can be used to update the final EA/IS.</p>	<p>The six Valued Components (VCs) identified in the Kashechewan First Nation Existing Conditions Report have been incorporated into the Draft Kashechewan First Nation: Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests (ATRI) Assessment Report. Specifically, Section 5: Existing Conditions incorporates the VCs and Table 5-2: Relation of Kashechewan First Nation’s and the Project’s Valued Components, Indicators, and Measurable Parameters demonstrates the correlation between Kashechewan First Nation’s VCs and the Project VCs.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	485
Kashechewan First Nation	45	<p>Valued Component: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>Indicators for this VC should include access to culturally significant landscapes. Measures of Change should include changes to access of culturally significant landscapes.</p>	<p>Changes in access to Cultural Heritage Valued Components (VCs) are documented in the Preliminary Impact Assessment, which is included in Section 8 of Appendix Q Cultural Heritage Technical Support Document.</p>	Appendix Q	486

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Kashechewan First Nation	46	Information must be carried over from appendices to the EA document for the final EA/IS to ensure readability.	Table 8.3-2 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include the information on Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests, Community Well-Being and Visual information.	Final EA/IS Table 8.3-2	487
Kashechewan First Nation	47	Information must be carried over from appendices to the EA document for the final EA/IS to ensure readability.	Table 8.3-2 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include the information on Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests, Community Well-Being and Visual information.	Final EA/IS Table 8.3-2	488
Kashechewan First Nation	48	<p>“[Placeholder: Refer to the detailed Technical Support Document in Appendix O]”</p> <p>Information must be carried over from appendices to the EA document for the final EA/IS to ensure readability.</p>	Figure 8.3-1 has been added to Final EA/IS	Final EA/IS Figure 8.3-1	489
Kashechewan First Nation	49	<p>“[Placeholder: Refer to the detailed Technical Support Document in Appendix T]”</p> <p>Information must be carried over from appendices to the EA document for the final EA/IS to ensure readability.</p>	Figure 8.3-5 has been added to Final EA/IS	Final EA/IS Figure 8.3-5	490
Kashechewan First Nation	50	“[Placeholder: Refer to the detailed Technical Support Document in Appendix V]”	Figure 8.3-7 has been added to Final EA/IS	Final EA/IS Figure 8.3-7	491

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		Information must be carried over from appendices to the EA document for the final EA/IS to ensure readability.			
Kashechewan First Nation	51	<p>“This assessment includes several steps, which will be detailed in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.”</p> <p>By the release date of this Environmental Assessment/Impact Statement, all sections should be completed. Proper feedback cannot be provided if sections are not complete in the draft.</p>	Section 8.3.4 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include the Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests information.	Final EA/IS Section 8.3.4	492
Kashechewan First Nation	52	<p>“The initial data collection for Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights was obtained by assessing the current state of valued components such as Indigenous Current Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes, Cultural Continuity, and Well-Being. Efforts to incorporate insights from engaged Indigenous communities, included organizing two forums for discussion.”</p> <p>Details from the Kashechewan First Nation Existing Conditions Report were not included in the EA/IS and were not considered in the current state. Please update the EA/IS to include details from the Kashechewan First Nation Existing</p>	The Final EA/IS has been updated to include information from the Kashechewan First Nation Existing Conditions Report, where applicable.	Section 3.1 of the Technical Support Documents	493

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		Condition Report.			
Kashechewan First Nation	53	<p>“At a later date, each of the 23 Indigenous communities will be issued a Preliminary Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests Existing Conditions and Impact Assessment Report. Our intention is for Indigenous communities to first review this Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.”</p> <p>While the intention to review the draft is noted, the draft has many aspects that are incomplete. This means review is difficult, requires cross reference, or the necessary details are not present at all.</p> <p>The final EA/IS must have all relevant details present to allow for fulsome consideration and evaluation.</p>	All placeholders in the Draft EA/IS have been replaced with finalized content in the Final EA/IS.	Final EA/IS all placeholder sections from the Draft EA/IS	494
Kashechewan First Nation	54	<p>Short term measurements of 20 minutes are shorter than is typical for assessment of noise levels which, in most cases, require samples of 1 hour.</p> <p>Please indicate how 20 minutes can effectively characterize noise sources or events.</p>	In addition to the short-term noise measurements, long-term noise monitoring was carried out at two locations: one representative of more populated areas of Marten Falls First Nation and one removed from human activities. Noise monitoring was carried out at these locations for approximately 48 hours. The short-term measurements were intended to supplement the long-term monitoring; however, were not used	Comment noted; see response for details	495

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>further in the assessment. As described in Section 7.1 of Appendix P Acoustic and Vibration Environment Technical Support Document, when establishing existing conditions for use in the effects assessment, the results of the long-term noise monitoring were used.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	55	<p>“The Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessment reports for the Community Access Road have been shared with neighbouring Indigenous communities, and feedback has been received from some communities.”</p> <p>Section 8.3 mentions feedback received by Indigenous communities, but does not list this feedback, or the Nations that provided it.</p> <p>Please provide details on the feedback provided and how it was addressed in the EA/IS.</p>	<p>Section 8.3.6 of the Final EA/IS makes reference to the Stage 1 and 2 archaeological reports, which include a “Statement of Indigenous Engagement.” This statement is contained within the Supplementary Documentation that accompanies the archaeological reports but is not made publicly available. The Supplementary Documentation is submitted to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism solely to fulfill archaeological licensing requirements. It provides a brief summary of who has provided archaeological feedback; however, it is not an official consultation document for the EA/IS.</p> <p>Due to the inclusion of confidential Indigenous Knowledge (IK), the feedback summarized in this documentation is not shared with other Indigenous communities. The purpose of the Supplementary Documentation is limited to meeting licensing obligations rather</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	496

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			than informing EA/IS decisions.		
Kashechewan First Nation	56	<p>“Therefore, only two of the nine river crossings were assessed in the fall of 2019...”</p> <p>Please clarify if the additional seven river crossings will be assessed in the future during the field investigation and whether this information will be included in the final EA/IS.</p>	<p>Further archaeological investigations (Stage 2 Archaeological Assessments) will be required for the seven additional river crossings along the preferred route. These assessments will not be included in the Final EA/IS due to timing constraints. Once the Stage 2 assessments are completed, the resulting reports will be shared with Indigenous communities, consistent with the approach taken for previous Stage 2 assessments for the Community Access Road.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	497
Kashechewan First Nation	57	<p>“The Proponent team will continue to work with members of Marten Falls First Nation to determine culturally important areas rather than relying on the standard procedures to document existing conditions as prescribed by the Province.”</p> <p>Kashechewan requires additional engagement on culturally significant areas, as capacity allows. Kashechewan also requests immediate notification if any human remains are discovered during Project construction.</p>	<p>We appreciate Kashechewan First Nation’s interest in further involvement in identifying culturally significant areas. Should the Community Access Road EA/IS be approved to proceed, a consultation and engagement program will be established to address requests such as this in the next phase of the Community Access Road.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	498
Kashechewan	58	“Table 8-62 and Figure 8-61 to Figure 8-	Table 8.3-11 of the Final EA/IS (formerly	Final EA/IS	499

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
First Nation		<p>65 provide a summary of Indigenous Knowledge data points relevant to built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes within and adjacent to the Local Study Area.”</p> <p>As currently written, it appears that only information and data points provided by Marten Falls were considered. It is unclear whether information provided by Kashechewan was included in the data points in Table 8-62.</p> <p>Please clarify whether information from Kashechewan’s Existing Conditions Report was included in Table 8-62, so that Kashechewan can confirm whether the cultural heritage information Kashechewan provided was assessed.</p>	Table 8-62 of the Draft EA/IS) has been updated to incorporate information provided by Kashechewan First Nation.	Section 8.3.6.7, Table 8.3-11 Appendix Q	
Kashechewan First Nation	59	<p>“At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement Report, Community Well-Being information was not available to summarize.”</p> <p>By the release date of this Environmental Assessment/Impact Statement, all sections should be completed in their entirety. The final EA/IS must have all relevant details present to allow for fulsome consideration and evaluation.</p>	Section 8.3.8 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include a summary of the Community Well-Being report.	Final EA/IS Section 8.3.8 and Section 9.5.6	500

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		Please ensure this is completed for the final EA/IS.			
Kashechewan First Nation	60	<p>“Highway 11 is being realigned to support the Community Access Road development and operation.”</p> <p>Currently, the realignment of highway 11 is not included on the cumulative effects project inclusion list (page 71 and 72). Please update the Project Inclusion List to include this project.</p>	The Project Inclusion List has been updated in the Final EA / IS to include the realignment of Highway 11.	Final EA/IS Table 10.1-1 Appendix E	501
Kashechewan First Nation	61	<p>“A the time of the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement, the visual existing conditions information was not available to summarize.</p> <p>By the release date of this Environmental Assessment/Impact Statement, all the sections should be completed in their entirety. The final EA/IS must have all relevant details present to allow for fulsome consideration and evaluation. Please ensure this is completed for the final EA/IS.</p>	Section 8.3.10 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include the visual environment information.	Final EA/IS Section 8.3.10	502
Kashechewan First Nation	62	<p>[Placeholder: Refer to the detailed Technical Support Document in Appendix I]</p> <p>Information must be carried over from</p>	The Final EA/IS has been updated to include Figure 9.3-3.	Final EA/IS Figure 9.3-3	503

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>appendices to the EA document for the final EA/EIS to ensure readability.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	63	<p>There are insufficient details within the EA/IS for the predicted residual effects to Surface Water and Sediment Quality to be identified. The EA/IS jumps from project interactions straight to the Summary of Residual Effects where residual effects criteria is described with no details on the potential effect beyond the limited description of the change (i.e., one sentence or less).</p> <p>Referring readers to Appendices is not appropriate.</p> <p>At minimum, the EA/IS must set out the adverse effects to valued components in a detailed way so that applied mitigation can be evaluated against the impacts; and those mitigations can then be considered for sufficiency. This has not occurred.</p> <p>Please see the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines Page 86 - 88 for full requirements of information required to assess effects to the Surface Water and Sediment VC.</p> <p>The Practitioners Guide developed by</p>	<p>Section 9 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to meet the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Code of Practice and includes additional information on predicted residual effects. However, it should be noted that the main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth.</p>	Final EA/IS Section 9	504

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>the IAAC specifies that “In their Impact Statement, proponents must describe all likely potential effects in a manner that is sufficient to enable impact assessment participants to understand ... the changes that are likely to be caused by the project and the positive and negative consequences of these changes...”</p> <p>This has not been completed. Please update the final EA/IS main document to include sufficient details on the project effects to Surface Water and Sediment Quality to allow for fulsome consideration.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	64	<p>There is insufficient detail within this section to evaluate the significance rating. Please see cover letter for detailed comments. Please amend this for the final EA/IS.</p> <p>Table 9-6: Summary of Residual Effects for Surface Water Page 387 (PDF 435) Valued Component: Surface Water Quantity Description of Potential Effect: Changes to surface water quantity from short-term water taking “Potable water for work sites, temporary construction camps, and temporary laydown areas will be obtained from surface water sources....”</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS has been updated to include further detail on significance.</p> <p>A conclusion on significance was made using the following characteristics: context, direction (i.e. positive, neutral, negative), magnitude (i.e. negligible, low, medium, high), geographic extent, duration (i.e. short term, medium term, long term), frequency (i.e. infrequent, frequent, continuous), reversibility (i.e. reversible, irreversible), likelihood (i.e. unlikely, possible, probably, certain) and uncertainty, as well as taking into consideration professional judgement.</p>	Final EA/IS Section 8.1.5	505

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Likelihood for this Predicted Residual Effect is listed as “Probable”; Uncertainty is listed as “Moderate”. As described in this table (see reference details) and Section 7.2.3.6 Temporary Construction Camps indicates that “water will be required to support both camp and construction activities.” (Page 91). As such, the likelihood for the Predicted Residual Effect should be updated to “Certain” and the Uncertainty to “Low”.</p>	<p>The assessment of significance of residual effects of the Community Access Road was informed by the interaction between the residual effects characteristics, with magnitude, duration, and geographic extent being the most important factors, along with consideration of context.</p> <p>Consideration was also given to the concerns of Indigenous communities, interested agencies, groups and individuals raised during engagement.</p> <p>A graded scale (i.e. negligible, low, medium, high) was applied to magnitude, which refers to the amount of change in a parameter relative to the baseline condition of a Valued Component with and without the Community Access Road in place or to other standards or guidelines.</p> <p>Although a graded scale was not used for the determination of significance in the Draft EA/IS, it was applied throughout the assessment process to inform the determination.</p> <p>The appended Technical Support Documents (Appendices F to V) contain detail information on how each valued</p>		

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>component completed their assessment. The purpose of the Final EA/IS was to provide a summary of the technical information. Please refer to the Technical Support Documents for additional information.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	66	<p>Mitigation measures are meant to be actions taken to reduce the severity of impact. Compliance with established regulations is required and part of standard project design. These standard aspects of project design should not be listed as a mitigation measure. It is suggested that any of these measures, where listed, be identified as a project design component and not a mitigation measure.</p>	<p>As standard road design primarily focuses on safety and functionality, how the Community Access Road is designed can serve as mitigation when it incorporates environmental design features. Inclusion of environmental design features in mitigation is a standard practice in environmental assessments. The design of the Community Access Road will be refined as it progresses to the next phase.</p> <p>Table 9.3-4 in the Final EA/IS (formerly Table 9-6 of the Draft EA/IS) is a high-level summary of the surface water assessment. Refer to Appendix F (Surface Water) for detailed surface water assessment. It follows the identification of potential effects, and explores technically and economically feasible mitigation and enhancement measures to avoid or minimize the identified negative effects. These measures consisted of industry-standard practices, federal and provincial standard</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	506

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>specifications, regulator-mandated measures, best management practices, Indigenous and community recommendations, and recommendations from environmental professionals based on expertise, scientific publications, experience, and professional judgement.</p> <p>The Final EA/IS distinguishes project design components (Section 7) from mitigation measures (Section 9).</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	67	<p>An Adaptive Management Plan will be developed in the event of an unexpected change to water quantity or quality (in other words, increase in turbidity in accordance with Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment standards).</p> <p>Kashechewan requires review of the adaptive management plan, once developed.</p>	An Adaptive Management Plan will be developed in the next phase of the Community Access Road. It will be shared with Kashechewan First Nation.	Comment noted; see response for details	507
Kashechewan First Nation	68	<p>Valued Component: Surface Water Quantity, Surface Water Quality, Sediment Quality                      Project Phase: Construction                      Description of Potential Effect: Changes to surface water quantity, surface water quality, and sediment quality due to changes in channel hydraulics at</p>	<p>Likelihood:</p> <p>Detailed discussion on characterization of predicted residual effect (Changes to surface water quantity, surface water quality, and sediment quality due to changes in channel hydraulics at waterbody crossings) is presented in</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	508

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>waterbody crossings</p> <p>Likelihood for this Predicted Residual Effect is listed as “Possible”, and Uncertainty is listed as “Moderate”. There is a high interaction with project activities and operations as much of the Project crosses through wetlands and over waterbodies. As such, there will be instances in which the road crosses wetlands and alters otherwise unrestricted surface water. Likelihood and Uncertainty should be updated to reflect this. Likelihood: Certain; Uncertainty: Low.</p>	<p>Section 7.3.2.4 of Appendix F (Surface Water). The likelihood is assessed as “Possible” because, while the construction and presence of waterbody crossing structures could cause localized changes to channel hydraulics and suspended sediment levels, these effects are not expected to occur under typical flow conditions. The design of the crossings is intended to minimize hydraulic disruption, meaning the predicted effect is not likely to manifest regularly or consistently. However, the effect may still occur under certain circumstances, especially:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- During infrequent high-flow or runoff events (e.g., minor to major floods), when natural stream conditions could interact with the crossing structures to alter flow velocities, erosion–sedimentation patterns, or suspended solids.</li> <li>- As the structures are permanent, the potential for occasional hydraulic changes persists over the long term, even if rare.</li> </ul> <p>In short, the likelihood is “Possible” because the conditions that would trigger the effect can happen, but they are infrequent and not expected during typical flows, making the effect neither</p>		

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>likely nor unlikely—just possible.</p> <p>Uncertainty:</p> <p>A discussion on prediction confidence and uncertainty is presented in Section 7.3.4 of Appendix F (Surface Water). Although the assessment has strong baseline data and a good understanding of project effects and mitigation measures, several irreducible scientific uncertainties remain. These include natural variability in surface water systems, incomplete knowledge of all baseline conditions, complex ecosystem interactions across time and space, and reliance on qualitative assessment for parts of the large project area. As these factors cannot be fully eliminated, the confidence level cannot reasonably be rated as low uncertainty. Therefore, “moderate” is the appropriate rating, reflecting both the strength of available information and the inherent complexity that prevents achieving a “low” uncertainty classification.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	69	Valued Component: Surface Water Quantity, Surface Water Quality, Sediment Quality Project Phase: Operation and Maintenance	The residual effect is predicted to be irreversible due to permanent waterbody crossing structures as the localized changes to surface water quantity, surface water and sediment quality are	Comment noted; see response for details	509

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Description of Potential Effect: Changes to surface water quantity, surface water quality, and sediment quality due to changes in channel hydraulics at waterbody crossings</p> <p>Reversibility is listed as “Reversible”. The Project is expected to be permanent and not decommissioned, as such, permanent waterbody crossings would be a predicted effects for this VC. Reversibility should be updated to reflect this; Reversibility: Irreversible</p>	<p>likely to persist through the Operation and Maintenance Phase and it is uncertain when the waterbody crossing structures would be decommissioned.</p> <p>During Operations and Maintenance Phase, the residual effect is predicted to be reversible because maintenance activities are expected to restore the crossings to the design conditions. Refer to Section 7.3.2.4 of Appendix F (Surface Water) for more details.</p> <p>Reversibility due to construction of waterbody crossings is noted as "irreversible", however the changes due to activities during Operation and Maintenance Phase are noted "reversible" (i.e., return to design conditions, not the pre-development conditions).</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	70	<p>Valued Component: Surface Water Quantity, Surface Water Quality, Sediment Quality</p> <p>Project Phase: Construction</p> <p>Description of Potential Effect: Changes to surface water quantity, surface water quality, and sediment quality due to changes in land cover</p> <p>Project activities during construction such</p>	<p>Potential effects due to dust are discussed under "Changes to surface water quality from the transport and delivery of airborne particulate matter to nearby waterbodies" and potential effects due to debris/trash are discussed under "Changes to surface water quality from the wash-off of trash, domestic waste, and leachate at waste handling and storage facilities to nearby waterbodies"</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	510

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>as gathering/quarrying materials and rock will release dust and debris. Likelihood, and Uncertainty should be updated to reflect this. Likelihood: Certain; Uncertainty: Low.</p>	<p>in Appendix F (Surface Water).  Detailed discussion on characterization of predicted residual effect (Changes to surface water quantity, surface water quality, and sediment quality due to changes in land cover) is presented in section 7.3.2.5 of Appendix F (Surface Water). During the Construction Phase, land cover disturbance from the project—particularly exposed soils associated with both permanent and temporary construction areas—may increase runoff, erosion, and suspended sediment (dust-related) inputs to nearby waterbodies; however, because most watershed catchments have less than 5% disturbance, these effects are expected to be negligible, localized to within about 120 metres downstream of crossings, and primarily triggered during large precipitation events. In small watersheds where disturbance percentages are higher, the effect remains limited due to the temporary nature of most disturbed areas, the prevalence of ephemeral or intermittent streams, and the planned reclamation and revegetation. Overall, although increases in sediment and suspended solids are probable during construction, the magnitude is low to negligible, spatial</p>		

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>extent is small, and impacts diminish substantially once reclamation progresses.</p> <p>A discussion on prediction confidence and uncertainty is presented in section 7.3.4 of Appendix F (Surface Water). Overall, uncertainty in predicting surface-water effects—including those influenced by dust deposition—is rated moderate based on the quality of baseline data, the understood pathways by which project activities and dust may affect water and sediment quality, and the reliability of proposed mitigation measures. Uncertainty was reduced through comprehensive baseline data review, conservative assumptions for dust-generating activities, comparison with scientific literature, and planned mitigation, monitoring, and adaptive management. With generally robust baseline information and well-understood project interactions, confidence in the predictions is considered moderate.</p> <p>Drawing on the rationale and findings outlined in these sections, it is our assessment that the likelihood of occurrence of residual effect due to land cover changes during Construction phase is "probable" and the level of</p>		

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			uncertainty is considered "moderate."		
Kashechewan First Nation	71	<p>“Chemical vegetation maintenance, including the use of pesticides and herbicides, will be in accordance with the Ministry of Transportation requirements and / or Pesticide Act and Regulations (Government of Ontario, 1990j), as applicable, noting that the use will be reserved for situation that cannot be managed by other methods and the use of herbicide will be restricted around sensitive area (for example, wetlands).”</p> <p>Within the Kashechewan First Nation Existing Conditions Report, it was noted that 96% of Respondents would not harvest in areas where pesticide or herbicide was applied.</p> <p>Kashechewan requires notification in the event of pesticide or herbicide usage to ensure Kashechewan land users are aware. This notification must include locational and timing details.</p>	The Final EA/IS has been updated for clarity around use of herbicides. Herbicide use is not planned.	Comment noted; see response for details	511
Kashechewan First Nation	72	<p>Valued Component: Surface Water Quality, Sediment Quality                      Project Phase: Construction                      Description of Potential Effect: Changes to surface water quality and sediment quality from the wash-off of organic</p>	This section is a continuation of the table on the previous page. The Final EA/IS has been updated so that all rows include the necessary information, and any blank cells are clearly labeled to avoid confusion.	Final EA/IS Section 9	512

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>debris to nearby waterbodies and/or increased rates of erosion in disturbed and exposed areas with sediment transport and delivery to adjacent waterbodies</p> <p>There is no “Predicted Residual Effect” details listed for this potential effect. Please update or indicate that this is a continuation of the table on the previous page - as all other table cells have repeated details except this one.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	73	<p>There are insufficient details within the EA/IS for the predicted residual effects to Fish and Fish Habitat to be identified. The EA/IS jumps from project interactions straight to the Summary of Residual Effects where residual effects criteria is described with no details on the potential effect beyond the limited description of the change (i.e., one sentence or less). Information missing includes: geomorphological changes and their effects to hydrodynamic conditions and fish habitats; potential effects to riparian areas that could affect aquatic biological resources and productivity; changes to water quality at discharge point and receiving environment; changes to water quality due to runoff from any temporary or permanent project</p>	<p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Section 9.3.3 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the fish and fish habitat assessment in Appendix G (Fish and Fish Habitat). Refer to Appendix G for detailed fish habitat assessment completed for the Community Access Road.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	513

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>component; effects to fish biodiversity; direct effects of contamination downstream; direct and incidental effects on fish behaviors, distribution, abundance and migration patterns; etc.</p> <p>Please see the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines Page 90 – 92 for full requirements of information required in the main EA/IS document to assess effects to the Fish and Fish habitat VC.</p> <p>Referring readers to Appendices is not appropriate. At minimum, the EA/IS must set out the adverse effects to valued components in a detailed way so that applied mitigation can be evaluated against the impacts; and those mitigations can then be considered for sufficiency. This has not occurred.</p> <p>The Practitioners Guide developed by the IAAC specifies that “In their Impact Statement, proponents must describe all likely potential effects in a manner that is sufficient to enable impact assessment participants to understand ... the changes that are likely to be caused by the project and the positive and negative consequences of these changes...”</p> <p>This has not been completed. Please</p>			

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		update the final EA/IS to include sufficient details on the project effects to fish and fish habitat to allow for fulsome consideration.			
Kashechewan First Nation	74	There is insufficient detail within this section to evaluate the significance rating. Please see cover letter for detailed comments. Please amend this for the final EA/IS.	The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Section 9.3.3 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the fish and fish habitat assessment in Appendix G (Fish and Fish Habitat). Refer to Appendix G for detailed fish habitat assessment completed for the Community Access Road.	Comment noted; see response for details	514
Kashechewan First Nation	75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direction: Neutral where proposed work is above the high water mark</li> <li>• Magnitude: Not Applicable</li> <li>• Geographic Extent: Not Applicable</li> <li>• Duration: Not Applicable</li> <li>• Frequency: Not Applicable</li> <li>• Reversibility: Not Applicable</li> <li>• Probability: Not Applicable</li> <li>• Significance: Not Applicable</li> <li>• Uncertainty: Not Applicable</li> </ul> <p>The first row of Table 9-10 has Predicted Residual Effect listed as “Not Applicable”.</p>	The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Table 9.3-7 (formerly Table 9-10) in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the fish and fish habitat assessment in Appendix G (Fish and Fish Habitat). Refer to Appendix G for detailed fish habitat assessment completed for the Community Access Road.	Comment noted; see response for details	515

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>There is limited explanation on why this is the case. Secondly, there are mitigations proposed, and therefore, the residual effects should be characterized based on the mitigation applicability.</p> <p>Physical alterations to waterbodies above the high-water mark can still impact the waterbody via dust and debris, introduction of sediment into the water, etc.</p> <p>Additional details are required, and residual effects criteria must be evaluated and included for Magnitude, Geographic Extent, Duration, Frequency, Reversibility, Probability, Significance, Uncertainty.</p>	<p>Changes to fish habitat quantity and quality through physical alterations of waterbodies is assessed in Section 7.3.1.1 of the Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document: Existing Conditions &amp; Effects Assessment (Appendix G), with residual effects in Section 7.3.2.1. Please see these sections for the rationale related to the residual effects characterization.</p> <p>Note that changes to fish habitat quality from release of sediment at waterbody crossings and from the deposition of air contaminants and fugitive dust emissions are addressed under separate effects pathways (Sections 7.3.1.4 and 7.3.1.9 of Appendix G [Fish and Fish Habitat], respectively).</p> <p>Please also see Table 7-6 in Appendix G (Fish and Fish Habitat) for a summary of the residual effects characterization for fish and fish habitat.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	76	Mitigation measures are meant to be actions taken to reduce the severity of impact. Compliance with established regulations is required and part of standard project design. These standard aspects of project design should not be	It should be noted that Table 9.3-7 (formerly Table 9-10) in the main body of the Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement is a high-level summary of the fish and fish habitat assessment in the Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support	Comment noted; see response for details	516

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>listed as a mitigation measure.</p> <p>It is suggested that any of these measures, where listed, be identified as a project design component and not a mitigation measure.</p>	<p>Document: Existing Conditions &amp; Effects Assessment (Appendix G).</p> <p>As described in Section 4.2.2 of the Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document: Existing Conditions &amp; Effects Assessment (Appendix G), following the identification of potential effects, the effects assessment explored technically and economically feasible mitigation and enhancement measures to avoid or minimize the identified negative effects. These measures consisted of industry-standard practices, federal and provincial standard specifications, regulator-mandated measures, best management practices, Indigenous and community recommendations, and recommendations from environmental professionals based on expertise, scientific publications, experience, and judgement.</p> <p>It should be noted that inclusion of environmental design features in mitigation is a standard practice in environmental assessment. As per IAAC (2025) guidance, mitigation measures are technically and economically feasible and would mitigate any adverse effects of a project. Further, mitigation measures eliminate, reduce, control or offset the</p>		

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>adverse effects of a project. "Technically feasible" means that the engineering, design, materials, and techniques used to implement the measure are available and known to work. "Economically feasible" means that they must not be prohibitively costly (IAAC 2025).</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	77	<p>Complete work as quickly as possible to shorten the duration of disturbance.</p> <p>The EA/IS does not include sufficient details for KFN to understand the duration of disturbance to evaluate whether this mitigation measure would be effective in addressing changes to fish habitat quantity and quality through physical alterations of waterbodies.</p>	<p>Section 6.5.1 of the Final EA/IS indicates that construction of the Community Access Road is anticipated to last between 3 and 10 years. This range reflects variability in factors such as seasonal and climatic constraints, terrain and geotechnical conditions, logistical challenges in a remote setting, regulatory and permitting timelines, and construction sequencing required to minimize environmental impacts.</p> <p>Detailed, site-specific durations for in-water works at individual crossings are not included in the Final EA/IS, as these will be refined during the next phase of the Community Access Road.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	517
Kashechewan First Nation	78	<p>“Avoid constructing in sensitive habitats (for example, spawning areas, groundwater upwellings) where feasible.”</p> <p>Please identify how sensitive habitats will be pinpointed prior to construction as</p>	<p>Sensitive fish habitats were identified through Indigenous Knowledge (Table 3-1 in Section 3.1 of Appendix G [Fish and Fish Habitat]), and during fish and fish habitat field surveys for the EA/IS.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	518

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>sufficient detail is not included in the EA/IS document.</p>	<p>To support Fisheries and Oceans Canada and the Ministry of Natural Resources permitting, site-specific ground-based surveys will be required at all waterbody crossings where work is anticipated to occur below the high-water mark during Construction. Additional field surveys will be conducted in the next phase of the Community Access Road to support permitting. Similar to the surveys conducted to support the E/IS, these surveys will identify sensitive habitat features (e.g., spawning areas, groundwater upwellings). The results will be used to inform the siting of final crossing locations and the design of structures, applying an avoidance-first approach where feasible. This process will occur prior to construction in accordance with regulatory standards.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	79	<p>Project Phase: Construction Description of Potential Effect: Changes to fish habitat quantity and quality through changes to riparian vegetation</p> <p>Riparian zones act as filters and buffers for waterbodies. Removing or altering riparian zones have the potential to increase the level of sediment and debris in the waterbody, causing changes to water and habitat quality for fish.</p>	<p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Table 9.3-7 (formerly Table 9-10) in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the fish and fish habitat assessment in Appendix G (Fish and Fish Habitat). Refer to Appendix G for detailed fish habitat assessment</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	519

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Magnitude and Frequency should be updated to reflect this. Magnitude: Medium; Frequency: Continuous (for waterbodies in which the riparian zone remains altered from its initial state).</p>	<p>completed for the Community Access Road.</p> <p>Changes to fish habitat quantity and quality through changes to riparian vegetation is assessed in Section 7.3.1.2 of Appendix G (Fish and Fish Habitat), with residual effects in Section 7.3.2.2. Please see these sections for the rationale related to the residual effects characterization.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	80	<p>“Do not use herbicides during future maintenance.”</p> <p>This is contradictory to the mitigation listed for Surface Water and Sediment Quality which indicated that “Chemical vegetation maintenance, including the use of pesticides and herbicides, will be in accordance with the Ministry of Transportation requirements and / or Pesticide Act and Regulations (Government of Ontario, 1990j), as applicable, noting that the use will be reserved for situation that cannot be managed by other methods and the use of herbicide will be restricted around sensitive area (for example, wetlands).”</p> <p>Please specify what the approach will be in relation to herbicide and adjust the</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS has been updated for clarity around use of herbicides. Herbicide use is not planned. Vegetation will be largely removed by mechanical means, except within 10 m of a watercourse or wetland. In these areas, vegetation will be removed manually, using chain saws and other hand-held equipment, while leaving the undergrowth and duff layer undisturbed to prevent erosion.</p>	Final EA/IS Table 9.3-7	520

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		mitigation affected in the final EA/IS, as appropriate.			
Kashechewan First Nation	81	<p>“Obtain a Licence to Collect Fish for Scientific Purposes from the Ministry of Natural Resources and have Aquatics Specialists rescue and relocate fish within the isolated workspace prior to construction in the isolated workspace.”</p> <p>Kashechewan requires ongoing engagement in relation to any fish relocation undertaken as part of this project. This will ensure that any locations selected are within areas that Indigenous harvesters frequent and will increase those harvesters’ knowledge of any ecosystem level changes that may impact their overall harvesting rights.</p>	Should the Community Access Road EA/IS be approved to proceed, a consultation and engagement program will be established to guide discussions regarding fish relocation during the detail design stage.	Comment noted; see response for details	521
Kashechewan First Nation	82	<p>“Develop and follow a Sediment and Erosion Control Plan in accordance with Ontario Provincial Standard Specifications Construction Specification for Temporary Erosion Control (Ontario Provincial Standard Specifications, 2021a) and Construction Specification for Temporary Sediment Control (Ontario Provincial Standard Specifications, 2020).”</p> <p>Kashechewan First Nation requires</p>	A Sediment and Erosion Control Plan will be developed in the next phase of the Community Access Road. It will be shared with Kashechewan First Nation.	Comment noted; see response for details	557

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		review of any developed Sediment and Erosion Control Plan for the Project.			
Kashechewan First Nation	83	<p>Project Phase: Construction Description of Potential Effect: Changes to fish habitat quantity and quality from the placement of waterbody crossing structures and changes in channel morphology</p> <p>The third row of Table 9-10 on this page has Predicted Residual Effect listed as “Not Applicable” for multiple criteria.</p> <p>There is limited explanation on why this is the case. Secondly, there are mitigations proposed and therefore the residual effects should be characterized based on the mitigation applicability.</p> <p>Changes to fish habitat quantity and quality from the placement of waterbody crossing structures and changes in channel morphology above the high-water mark can still impact the waterbody via dust and debris, introduction of sediment into the water, etc.</p> <p>Additional details are required, and residual effects criteria must be evaluated and included for Magnitude, Geographic Extent, Duration, Frequency,</p>	<p>Table 9.3-7 (formerly Table 9-10) in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the fish and fish habitat assessment in Appendix G (Fish and Fish Habitat). Changes to fish habitat quantity and quality from placement of waterbody crossing structures and changes in channel morphology is assessed in Section 7.3.1.5 of Appendix G (Fish and Fish Habitat), with residual effects in Section 7.3.2.5. Refer to these sections in Appendix G (Fish and Fish Habitat) for the rationale related to the residual effects characterization.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	558

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		Reversibility, Probability, Significance, and Uncertainty.			
Kashechewan First Nation	84	<p>Blasting-related injuries or mortality to fish.</p> <p>It is indicated here that there will be no residual effect to fish from blasting related injuries. The finding of no residual effect is not substantiated through documentation to be deemed sufficient. Please update this section to adequately substantiate this finding.</p>	<p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Table 9.3-7 (formerly Table 9-10) in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the fish and fish habitat assessment in Appendix G (Fish and Fish Habitat). The assessment related to blasting effects on fish is provided in Section 7.3.1.8 of Appendix G (Fish and Fish Habitat). This section describes the potential effects and the mitigation measures that will be employed. As guidelines to protect fish will be followed, blasting is predicted to result in no residual effect on fish habitat quantity and quality or fish survival, reproduction, and distribution in waterbodies crossed by the Community Access Road.</p>	Final EA/IS Table 9.3-7	559
Kashechewan First Nation	85	<p>Project Phase: Construction</p> <p>Description of Potential Effect: Changes to fish habitat quality from the deposition of air contaminants and fugitive dust emissions</p>	<p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Table 9.3-7</p>	Final EA/IS Table 9.3-7	560

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>It is indicated here that there will be no residual effect. Much of the project construction and operation occurs around or within the boundaries of waterbodies. This contrasts with the finding of residual effects to peatlands due to fugitive dust emissions. Waterbodies do include less specialized ecosystems than Peatlands, but the finding of no residual effect is not substantiated through documentation to be deemed sufficient. Please update this section to adequately substantiate this finding.</p>	<p>(formerly Table 9-10) in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the fish and fish habitat assessment in Appendix G (Fish and Fish Habitat)</p> <p>The assessment related to Changes to Fish Habitat Quality from the Deposition of Air Contaminants and Fugitive Dust Emissions is provided in Section 7.3.1.9 of Appendix G (Fish and Fish Habitat). This section describes the potential effects and mitigation measures that will be employed. The surface water quality assessment, available in Appendix F (Surface Water) used the results from the screening level assessment of air emissions to predict effects from air contaminants and fugitive dust emissions to water quality criteria; no residual effect on surface water quality is predicted. As a result, no residual effect on fish habitat quantity and quality would be expected.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	86	<p>Changes to fish survival and reproduction from improved public access to recreational angling areas</p> <p>The residual effects criteria noted are conducive to a consideration of low to moderate significance. However, the predicted residual effect has ratings of “Not significant”.</p>	<p>Based on the impact assessment completed for fish and fish habitat, fish populations within the regional study area are predicted to remain self-sustaining and ecologically functional after the Community Access Road is in operations. Therefore, residual effects on fish and fish habitat are considered not significant.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	561

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Please see cover letter for commentary on lack of detail regarding the significance rating and requirement for a scale.</p> <p>Please provide additional detail and rationale why, for this specific potential effect the rating was applied as such with the higher criteria ratings overall.</p>	<p>Changes to Fish Survival and Reproduction from Improved Public Access to Recreational Angling Areas is assessed in Section 7.3.1.10 of Appendix G (Fish and Fish Habitat), with residual effects in Section 7.3.2.8. Refer to these sections for the rationale related to the residual effects characterization, and the associated significance determination (Section 7.3.3 of Appendix G).</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	87	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Wash, refuel, and service machinery to prevent any deleterious substances from entering a waterbody (DFO, 2023).</li> <li>• Store fuel and other materials for the machinery in to prevent any deleterious substances from entering a waterbody (DFO, 2023).”</li> </ul> <p>Please identify how the proposed mitigation measures will be monitored to ensure compliance as no details are listed within this section or within the follow-up monitoring section.</p>	<p>Typically, the Proponent would be responsible for monitoring the implementation of mitigation measures. As Marten Falls First Nation continues to engage in discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and future operations and maintenance of the Community Access Road, an approach to monitoring of construction and compliance with the proposed mitigation measures is yet to be defined.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	562
Kashechewan First Nation	88	<p>There are insufficient details within the EA/IS for the predicted residual effects to Groundwater and Geochemistry to be identified. The EA/IS jumps from project interactions straight to the Summary of Residual Effects where residual effects</p>	<p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Section</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	563

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>criteria is described with no details on the potential effect beyond the limited description of the change (i.e., one sentence or less).</p> <p>Please see the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines Page 86 - 88 for full requirements of information required to assess effects to the Groundwater Quantity and Quality/Geochemistry VC.</p> <p>Referring readers to Appendices is not appropriate. At minimum, the EA/IS must set out the adverse effects to valued components in a detailed way so that applied mitigation can be evaluated against the impacts; and those mitigations can then be considered for sufficiency. This has not occurred.</p> <p>The Practitioners Guide developed by the IAAC specifies that “In their Impact Statement, proponents must describe all likely potential effects in a manner that is sufficient to enable impact assessment participants to understand ... the changes that are likely to be caused by the project and the positive and negative consequences of these changes...”</p> <p>This has not been completed. Please update the final EA/IS to include</p>	<p>9.3.4 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the groundwater assessment in Appendix H (Groundwater and Geochemistry). Refer to Appendix H (Groundwater and Geochemistry) for detailed assessment of groundwater completed for the Community Access Road.</p>		

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		sufficient details on the project effects to groundwater and geochemistry to allow for fulsome consideration.			
Kashechewan First Nation	89	<p>“Predicted Residual Effect: No predicted residual effect”</p> <p>Several rows in Table 9-14 are indicated as having no predicted residual effect. Short-term water takings and the ability of ground water to recharge could result in residual effects; referral to other locations such as Appendices for this information is inappropriate and should be contained in the body of the EA/IS.</p> <p>Currently, there is no information on whether extraction of aggregate material will include quarrying below the water table; there is no information on whether a site balance model was completed that incorporates groundwater fluxes for construction, operations, etc.; there is no discussion of spatial or temporal changes to groundwater quality at potential receptor locations – or indeed – discussion of receptors outside of baseline information. Overall, the EA/IS has insufficient information for KFN to review and provide critique of the conclusions.</p>	<p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Section 9.3.4 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the groundwater assessment in Appendix H (Groundwater). Refer to Appendix H (Groundwater) for detailed assessment of groundwater completed for the Community Access Road. The predicted residual effects include potential changes to groundwater quantity due to pit or quarry dewatering and potential changes to groundwater quality due to blasting or exposure of aggregate materials.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	564

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Kashechewan First Nation	90	<p>Permit or register water takings of more than 50,000 litres per day with the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks Permit to Take Water or Environmental Activity and Sector Registry programs.</p> <p>As it is a requirement for water takings over 50,000 litres to access a permit or register the water taking, this cannot be included as a mitigation. Please adjust this measure to be part of project design.</p> <p>This comment must also be applied to other project design features noted in the mitigation and enhancement measures such as the aggregate permits being permitted by the Ministry of Natural Resources, and the aggregate pit dewatering in excess of 50,000 litres being permitted.</p>	<p>Mitigation measures are best management practices that reduce potential environmental effects, and securing the necessary permits is an accepted and standard practice by both industry and regulators to support environmental protection.</p> <p>For this reason, obtaining a Permit to Take Water will remain listed as a mitigation measure in the Final EA/IS.</p>	Final EA/IS Table 9.3-11	565
Kashechewan First Nation	91	<p>“A Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan should be developed and implemented for the Project operations and maintenance.”</p> <p>Kashechewan First Nation requires review of the Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan, once developed, and subject to capacity.</p>	A Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan will be developed in the next phase of the Community Access Road. It will be shared with Kashechewan First Nation.	Comment noted; see response for details	566

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Kashechewan First Nation	92	<p>“A Waste Management Plan will be developed for the Project and include details for how wastes should be stored, handled, and disposed of.”</p> <p>Kashechewan First Nation requires review of the Waste Management Plan, once developed, and subject to capacity.</p>	<p>A Waste Management Plan will be developed in the next phase of the Community Access Road. It will be shared with Kashechewan First Nation.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	567
Kashechewan First Nation	93	<p>“A Blasting and Communication Management Plan will be developed for the Project and include guidelines for explosives handling, storage, and loading to minimize explosives exposure to the environment and minimize explosives residue after blasting.”</p> <p>Kashechewan First Nation requires review of the Blasting and Communication Plan, once developed, and subject to capacity.</p>	<p>A Blasting and Communication Management Plan will be developed in the next phase of the Community Access Road. It will be shared with Kashechewan First Nation.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	568
Kashechewan First Nation	94	<p>“Road maintenance should be carried out according to best management practices such as those outlined by Best Practices for the Use and Storage of Chloride-Based Dust Suppressant (Environment Canada, 2007) to reduce the use of chemicals for dust control and minimize runoff of chemicals to the environment.”</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS includes the development of a fugitive dust management plan prior to construction as a mitigation and enhancement measure. The plan is expected to include the use of environmentally friendly dust suppressants approved by the Ontario Ministry of Transportation. Please refer to Section 9 of the Final EA/IS for more information.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 9</p>	569

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>KFN is concerned with the usage of chloride-based dust suppressants as there is potential for this to impact both vegetation and wildlife. Further engagement is required to explore potential dust control alternatives and/or to mitigate the impacts that the use of chloride-based dust suppressants may have on KFN'S rights and interests.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	37	<p>Alternative chemicals or methods of dust control that pose less risk of runoff and infiltration should be considered for use.</p> <p>Further engagement is required to explore potential dust control alternatives and/or to mitigate the impacts that the use of chloride-based dust suppressants may have on KFN's rights and interests.</p>	<p>Marten Falls is committed to minimizing potential environmental impacts and will review best management practices recommended by Environment Canada as part of planning for dust control measures during the next phase of the Community Access Road, including the use of environmentally friendly suppressants approved by the Ontario Ministry of Transport.</p> <p>Should the Community Access Road EA/IS be approved to proceed, a consultation and engagement program will be established to guide discussions through detail design.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	570
Kashechewan First Nation	96	<p>“At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement, the peatland effects assessment information was not available to summarize. The full</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS has been updated to include a summary of peatlands.</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS has been updated to include a</p>	571

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Peatlands Technical Support Document can be found in Appendix I. A summary will be provided in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.”</p> <p>Information must be carried over from appendices to the EA document for the final EA/IS to ensure readability.</p>		summary of peatlands.	
Kashechewan First Nation	97	<p>The Impact Assessment Agency of Canada has suggested that significance be applied with a scalable extent (e.g., negligible, low, moderate, high). Please provide rationale for not identifying an extent of significance and instead applying a binary scale.</p> <p>This method likely does not allow for a reasonable weighting of all evidence and rationales of effect.</p> <p>Further, due to the lack of narrative related to effects within the EA/IS means it is difficult for KFN to evaluate the determination in a meaningful way.</p> <p>The EA/IS must be updated to include additional detail and a rationale for binary significance determinations is required.</p>	<p>A conclusion on significance was made using the following characteristics: context, direction (i.e. positive, neutral, negative), magnitude (i.e. negligible, low, medium, high), geographic extent, duration (i.e. short term, medium term, long term), frequency (i.e. infrequent, frequent, continuous), reversibility (i.e. reversible, irreversible), likelihood (i.e. unlikely, possible, probably, certain) and uncertainty, as well as taking into consideration professional judgement.</p> <p>The assessment of significance of residual effects of the Community Access Road was informed by the interaction between the residual effects characteristics, with magnitude, duration, and geographic extent being the most important factors, along with consideration of context.</p> <p>Consideration was also given to the concerns of Indigenous communities,</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	572

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>interested agencies, groups and individuals raised during engagement. A graded scale (i.e. negligible, low, medium, high) was applied to magnitude, which refers to the amount of change in a parameter relative to the baseline condition of a Valued Component with and without the Community Access Road in place or to other standards or guidelines.</p> <p>Although a graded scale was not used for the determination of significance in the Draft EA/IS, it was applied throughout the assessment process to inform the determination.</p> <p>The appended Technical Support Documents (Appendices F to V) contain detail information on how each valued component completed their assessment. The purpose of the Final EA/IS was to provide a summary of the technical information. Please refer to the Technical Support Documents for additional information.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	98	<p>“The magnitude of the predicted residual effects on surface water and sediment features are negligible in magnitude.”</p> <p>A negligible rating for surface water magnitude means there is little to no variation predicted and hydrology will</p>	<p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Section 9.3.6.2 is a summary of the detailed</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	573

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>remain within the natural variation.</p> <p>There are limited details within the effects assessment to substantiate this magnitude rating; particularly as there are only 47 bridges and 21 culverts proposed for the road. If road construction and operation results in even a small adjustment to hydrology and surface flow patterns this would mean that the magnitude should be rated as low (5% variation).</p> <p>The Project Area is relatively untouched land and water; project development of any kind will create impacts in the Project Area higher than a negligible degree and this should be described in the main EA/IS document and the criteria applied should be reconsidered.</p>	<p>assessment completed for surface water (Appendix F Surface Water).</p> <p>The residual effects assessment completed for surface water indicated that potential effects from the Community Access Road–environment interactions are negligible in magnitude, localized, and largely indiscernible beyond a short distance from the point of impact in the waterbody. With proper implementation of mitigation and enhancement measures, along with the proposed monitoring programs, there will be no residual adverse effects on surface water quantity or on surface water and sediment quality.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	99	<p>“Residual effects on the surface water and sediment valued component were considered not significant as the residual effects were assessed negligible in magnitude, and they do not represent a substantial management concern.”</p> <p>See ID #573</p>	<p>Water and sediment have been identified as management concerns for the Community Access Road. The assessment was conducted with appropriate mitigation measures in place, and as a result, the residual effect after applying these measures is considered negligible.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	574
Kashechewan First Nation	100	<p>“Residual effects on the fish valued component were considered not</p>	<p>A conclusion on significance was made using the following characteristics:</p>	<p>Comment noted; see</p>	575

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>significant as the residual effects were assessed negligible to medium in magnitude and they do not represent a substantial management concern.”</p> <p>The significance rating for fish and fish habitat must be reevaluated using a non-binary scale. Further, additional evaluation is required for species of importance to Indigenous Nations in relation to their social and ecological contexts.</p> <p>As detailed in previous comments, there is limited effects assessment details and without this, the sufficiency of mitigation is unclear. Mitigation should prevent the diminishment or loss of key components fish and not merely reduce the management concern.</p>	<p>context, direction (i.e. positive, neutral, negative), magnitude (i.e. negligible, low, medium, high), geographic extent, duration (i.e. short term, medium term, long term), frequency (i.e. infrequent, frequent, continuous), reversibility (i.e. reversible, irreversible), likelihood (i.e. unlikely, possible, probably, certain) and uncertainty, as well as taking into consideration professional judgement.</p> <p>The assessment of significance of residual effects of the Community Access Road was informed by the interaction between the residual effects characteristics, with magnitude, duration, and geographic extent being the most important factors, along with consideration of context.</p> <p>Consideration was also given to the concerns of Indigenous communities, interested agencies, groups and individuals raised during engagement.</p> <p>A graded scale (i.e. negligible, low, medium, high) was applied to magnitude, which refers to the amount of change in a parameter relative to the baseline condition of a Valued Component with and without the Community Access Road in place or to other standards or</p>	<p>response for details</p>	

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>guidelines.</p> <p>Although a graded scale was not used for the determination of significance in the Draft EA/IS, it was applied throughout the assessment process to inform the determination.</p> <p>The appended Technical Support Documents (Appendices F to V) contain detail information on how each valued component completed their assessment. The purpose of the Final EA/IS was to provide a summary of the technical information. Please refer to Appendix G (Fish and Fish Habitat) for additional information.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	101	<p>“Residual effects on the groundwater valued component were considered not significant as the residual effects were not assessed as high in magnitude, long-term or permanent duration, irreversible...”</p> <p>Effects are likely to be medium significance if they are medium to high in magnitude, have a moderate duration, are irreversible and generate impacts in a social or ecological context.</p> <p>It is unreasonable that all residual effects</p>	<p>A conclusion on significance was made using the following characteristics: context, direction (i.e. positive, neutral, negative), magnitude (i.e. negligible, low, medium, high), geographic extent, duration (i.e. short term, medium term, long term), frequency (i.e. infrequent, frequent, continuous), reversibility (i.e. reversible, irreversible), likelihood (i.e. unlikely, possible, probably, certain) and uncertainty, as well as taking into consideration professional judgement.</p> <p>The assessment of significance of</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	576

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>criteria must be high or irreversible to allow for significance considerations which is why the binary rating is problematic.</p> <p>This requires further consideration by the proponent, direction from the regulator, and updated engagement with KFN once a direction has been chosen to inform KFN of direction for the final.</p>	<p>residual effects of the Community Access Road was informed by the interaction between the residual effects characteristics, with magnitude, duration, and geographic extent being the most important factors, along with consideration of context.</p> <p>Consideration was also given to the concerns of Indigenous communities, interested agencies, groups and individuals raised during engagement.</p> <p>A graded scale (i.e. negligible, low, medium, high) was applied to magnitude, which refers to the amount of change in a parameter relative to the baseline condition of a Valued Component with and without the Community Access Road in place or to other standards or guidelines.</p> <p>Although a graded scale was not used for the determination of significance in the Draft EA/IS, it was applied throughout the assessment process to inform the determination.</p> <p>The appended Technical Support Documents (Appendices F to V) contain detail information on how each valued component completed their assessment.</p>		

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			The purpose of the Final EA/IS was to provide a summary of the technical information. Please refer to Appendix H (Groundwater) for additional information.		
Kashechewan First Nation	102	<p>“At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement, the peatland effects assessment information was not available to summarize. The full Peatlands Technical Support Document can be found in Appendix I. A summary will be provided in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.”</p> <p>Information must be carried over from appendices to the EA document for the final EA/IS to ensure readability.</p>	The Final EA/IS has been updated to include a summary of peatlands.	Final EA/IS Section 9.3.6.5	577
Kashechewan First Nation	103	<p>There are insufficient details within the EA/IS for the predicted residual effects to Vegetation to be identified. The EA/IS jumps from project interactions straight to the Summary of Residual Effects where residual effects criteria is described with no details on the potential effect beyond the limited description of the change (i.e., one sentence or less).</p> <p>Information missing includes: details on dust deposition on vegetation; a</p>	The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Section 9.4.2 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the vegetation assessment in Appendix J (Vegetation). Adverse effects on vegetation were assessed and mitigation measures are provided in Appendix J (Vegetation).	Comment noted; see response for details	578

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>summary of information from the Far North Biodiversity Project; details on invasive species, descriptions of vegetation control methods contemplated; a lack of characterization of vegetation elements and details on habitat fragmentation; discussion of how hydrological or drainage changes may affect vegetation, and no description of any revegetation procedures to be implemented as part of the project; etc.</p> <p>Please see the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (multiple sections) for full requirements of information required to assess effects to the Vegetation VC.</p> <p>Referring readers to Appendices is not appropriate. At minimum, the EA/IS must set out the adverse effects to valued components in a detailed way so that applied mitigation can be evaluated against the impacts; and those mitigations can then be considered for sufficiency. This has not occurred.</p> <p>The Practitioners Guide developed by the IAAC specifies that “In their Impact Statement, proponents must describe all likely potential effects in a manner that is sufficient to enable impact assessment</p>			

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>participants to understand ... the changes that are likely to be caused by the project and the positive and negative consequences of these changes...”</p> <p>This has not been completed. Please update the final EA/IS to include sufficient details on the project effects to vegetation to allow for fulsome consideration.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	104	<p>Project Phase: Construction Indicator: Availability, Distribution</p> <p>Description of Potential Effects should be updated to include changes to the biodiversity, relative abundance and distribution of vegetation areas per the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (Page 46). This should be assessed in conjunction with increased human activity to allow a fulsome consideration of potential impacts.</p>	<p>The indicators in the Final EA/IS Table 9.4-1 (formerly Table 9-15) row in question (i.e., availability and distribution of all vegetation valued components) is relating to direct vegetation loss on the availability and distribution of vegetation VCs only. The following row relates to the ‘composition and function’ of vegetation VCs which addresses changes to biodiversity. This also incorporates effects from increased public access / human activity. The approach taken is consistent with the Vegetation Study Plan and Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	579
Kashechewan First Nation	105	<p>Magnitude: Low - 2,309.3 hectares or 2 percent of the upland ecosystems within the effects assessment Regional Study Area will be directly affected. Loss of</p>	<p>The total amount of upland ecosystem within the local study area as well as the percent directly affected is provided in Table 7-1 of Appendix J (Vegetation). The</p>	Final EA/IS Table 9.4-7	580

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>functional area might reduce the ability of remaining areas to carry out ecosystem functions.</p> <p>The local study area is noted as the area representing the expected limit of direct effects from the community access road. Therefore, direct effects to vegetation must be described in the context of the local study area.</p> <p>Please provide the total amount of upland ecosystem within the local study area. Please further identify the percent of upland ecosystems that will be directly affected.</p> <p>Finally, please update the predicted residual effects using local study area parameters.</p> <p>This must be applied in all instances where the regional study area has been used within Table 9-17.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS has been updated to include this information.</p> <p>The predicted residual effects are summarized based on the effects within the regional study area to put the effects of the road into context. The regional study area was used to provide context and characterize the residual effects that occur mainly in the local study area.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	106	<p>Valued Component(s): Upland Ecosystem                      Project Phase: Construction                      Description of Potential Effect: Changes to Upland Ecosystems as a result of direct vegetation loss</p>	<p>The changes to Upland Ecosystems, while discernable, are not anticipated to be of a higher magnitude than assessed due to the implementation of mitigation measures and best management practices to limit the vegetation loss. No update to the magnitude assessment is</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	581

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Magnitude is identified as being 'low' with the disclaimer "Loss of function area might reduce the ability of remaining areas to carry out ecosystem functions." Please update the magnitude to reflect a moderate to high-level magnitude, that appropriately fits descriptions and rationale as expressed in Table 9-16. Additionally, please update significance to a non-binary scale as per Impact Assessment Agency guidance documents.</p>	<p>warranted.</p> <p>A conclusion on significance was made using the following characteristics: context, direction (i.e. positive, neutral, negative), magnitude (i.e. negligible, low, medium, high), geographic extent, duration (i.e. short term, medium term, long term), frequency (i.e. infrequent, frequent, continuous), reversibility (i.e. reversible, irreversible), likelihood (i.e. unlikely, possible, probably, certain) and uncertainty, as well as taking into consideration professional judgement.</p> <p>The assessment of significance of residual effects of the Community Access Road was informed by the interaction between the residual effects characteristics, with magnitude, duration, and geographic extent being the most important factors, along with consideration of context.</p> <p>Consideration was also given to the concerns of Indigenous communities, interested agencies, groups and individuals raised during engagement.</p> <p>A graded scale (i.e. negligible, low, medium, high) was applied to magnitude, which refers to the amount of change in a</p>		

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>parameter relative to the baseline condition of a Valued Component with and without the Community Access Road in place or to other standards or guidelines.</p> <p>Although a graded scale was not used for the determination of significance in the Draft EA/IS, it was applied throughout the assessment process to inform the determination.</p> <p>The appended Technical Support Documents (Appendices F to V) contain detail information on how each valued component completed their assessment. The purpose of the Final EA/IS was to provide a summary of the technical information. Please refer to the Technical Support Documents for additional information.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	107	<p>Develop and implement a Project-specific Environmental Protection Plan.</p> <p>Kashechewan First Nation requires review of the Environment Protection Plan, once developed, and subject to capacity</p>	A Project-specific Environmental Protection Plan will be developed in the next phase of the Community Access Road. It will be shared with Kashechewan First Nation.	Comment noted; see response for details	582
Kashechewan First Nation	108	Prepare and Implement a Vegetation Restoration Plan. Include the seeding	A Vegetation Restoration Plan will be developed in the next phase of the	Comment noted; see	583

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>and / or planting of Traditional Use Plants in the Vegetation Restoration Plan.</p> <p>KFN requires involvement in the development of the Vegetation Restoration Plan and requires input into seeding and/or planting of Traditional Use Plants to ensure revegetation is conducive to supporting Indigenous rights in the future.</p>	<p>Community Access Road. It will be shared with Kashechewan First Nation. The development and implementation of the Vegetation Restoration Plan will be the responsibility of the owner/operator of the Community Access Road. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road.</p>	<p>response for details</p>	
Kashechewan First Nation	109	<p>Valued Component(s): Riparian Ecosystems Project Phase: Construction Description of Potential Effect: Changes to Riparian Ecosystems as a result of direct vegetation loss</p> <p>Please update the magnitude to reflect an increased magnitude, that appropriately fits descriptions and rationale as expressed in Table 9-16. Additionally, please update significance to align in a non-binary scale as per Impact Assessment Agency guidance documents.</p>	<p>The changes to Riparian Ecosystems, while discernable, are not anticipated to be of a higher magnitude than assessed due to the implementation of mitigation measures and best management practices to limit the vegetation loss. No update to the magnitude assessment is warranted.</p> <p>Regarding your request to update significance, refer to our response to your comment #97.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	584
Kashechewan First Nation	110	<p>Valued Component(s): Designated Areas Project Phase: Construction Description of Potential Effect: Changes to Designated Areas as a result of direct vegetation loss</p>	<p>The changes to Designated Areas, while discernable, are not anticipated to be of a higher magnitude than assessed due to the implementation of mitigation measures and best management</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	585

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		See ID #584	<p>practices to limit the vegetation loss.</p> <p>Regarding the request to update significance, refer to our response to your comment #67.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	111	<p>Valued Component(s): Wetland Ecosystem                      Project Phase: Construction                      Description of Potential Effect: Changes to Wetland Ecosystems as a result of direct vegetation loss</p> <p>See ID #584</p>	<p>The changes to Wetland Ecosystems, while discernable, are not anticipated to be of a higher magnitude than assessed due to the implementation of mitigation measures and best management practices to limit the vegetation loss. No update to the magnitude assessment is warranted.</p> <p>Regarding your request to update significance, refer to our response to your comment #97.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	586
Kashechewan First Nation	112	<p>Valued Component(s): Traditional Use Plant Species                      Project Phase: Construction                      Description of Potential Effect: Changes to Traditional Use Plant Species as a result of direct vegetation loss</p> <p>Geographic Extent is listed as “Construction Disturbance Area”. This does not recognize the potential for displacement of Indigenous harvesters. Often harvesters dislike harvesting in disturbed areas Please update the</p>	<p>The Geographic Extent for this effect remains defined as the Construction Disturbance Area for the Vegetation discipline, as this reflects the spatial boundary within which direct vegetation removal is anticipated to occur.</p> <p>Indigenous Use of Lands and Resources for Traditional Purposes has been thoroughly considered and documented as part of the Kashechewan First Nation Draft Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests: Impact Assessment</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	587

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Geographic Extent to Regional and update language in the final EA/IS to reflect this change.</p>	<p>Report, which was shared with Kashechewan First Nation on July 10, 2025. This report provides detailed information regarding traditional land use, harvesting practices, and associated rights and interests.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	113	<p>Valued Component(s): All Valued Components                      Project Phase: Construction                      Description of Potential Effects: Changes all vegetation valued components as a result of the introduction and spread of invasive plant species                      “Context: Limited existing human disturbance has resulted in limited potential for invasive species to be present in the Construction Disturbance Area. No invasive plant species were documented during field surveys.”</p> <p>The language of “limited existing human disturbance has resulted in limited potential for invasive species” does not mean that invasive plants will not be introduced during project construction and operation. Once project activities commence, the area will no longer have ‘limited existing human disturbance’, and the rate of potential invasive species may increase. Invasive species and their seeds (such as grasses) can be carried</p>	<p>The statement about limited potential for invasive species is reflective of the current conditions, not future conditions. It is agreed that project activities will introduce disturbance and will have potential to introduce invasive plant species. The effects assessment considered the construction and operation effects (see Section 7.3.1.5 of Appendix J [Vegetation]), with the expectation that a robust Environmental Protection Plan will be developed and implemented to minimize the potential for the introduction and spread of invasive plant species during Construction. Additional measures are recommended during Operation and Maintenance. While residual effects are predicted to occur, they were determined to be not significant.</p> <p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	588

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>in vehicle tires, on vehicle bodies and via vehicle waste. Please adjust this language and the overall consideration of effects to include more in-depth consideration of invasive species. This will ensure the assessment is conservative in its findings.</p>	<p>provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Table 9-17 in the Draft EA/IS (Table 9.4-7 in the Final EA/IS) is a high-level summary of the vegetation assessment in Appendix J (Vegetation). Refer to Appendix J for detailed vegetation assessment completed for the Community Access Road.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	114	<p>Valued Component(s): All Valued Components                      Project Phase: Operation and Maintenance                      Description of Potential Effects: Changes all vegetation valued components as a result of the introduction and spread of invasive plant species                      “Context: Limited existing human disturbance has resulted in limited potential for invasive species to be present in the Construction Disturbance Area. No invasive plant species were documented during field surveys.”</p> <p>See ID #588</p>	<p>Refer to our response to comment #78.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	589
Kashechewan First Nation	115	<p>Valued Component(s): All Valued Components                      Project Phase: Construction                      Description of Potential Effects: Changes all vegetation valued components as a</p>	<p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	590

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>result of fragmentation and edge effects                      "...given that boreal forests are generally adapted to large-scale natural disturbances and are less influenced by fragmentation and edge effects than temperate and tropical forests.</p> <p>While boreal forests typically experience wildfire and other natural disturbances which can limit effects of anthropogenic disturbances, the resilience of the forest type and impacts on biodiversity must still be considered. Please update the EA/IS to include assessment details which describe edge effects and how this will be managed moving forward.</p>	<p>wish to review them in depth. Table 9.4-7 (formerly Table 9-17) in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the vegetation assessment in Appendix J (Vegetation).</p> <p>A detailed assessment was completed for edge effects and mitigation measures are provided in Appendix J (Vegetation).</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	116	<p>"As per the Ministry of Transportation Ontario's Weed Control Maintenance Best Practice (MBP-320), weeds in the Construction Disturbance Area will be controlled using a combination of biological, chemical, cultural, manual, and mechanical control methods during Operation and Maintenance (Ministry of Transportation, Ontario 2003).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note that mechanical removal is the preferred approach, with chemical herbicides being reserved for situations that cannot be managed any other way.</li> <li>• Herbicide use will be restricted around sensitive areas (for example, wetlands)"</li> </ul>	<p>The Final EA/IS has been updated for clarity around use of herbicides. Herbicide use is not planned. Vegetation will be largely removed by mechanical means, except within 10 m of a watercourse or wetland. In these areas, vegetation will be removed manually, using chain saws and other hand-held equipment, while leaving the undergrowth and duff layer undisturbed to prevent erosion.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	591

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Herbicide application can impact vegetation, in particular, plants that Indigenous harvesters and wildlife consume – in turn impacting the health of those harvesters and/or wildlife. Continued engagement is required with KFN regarding the use of chemical herbicide and the identified restrictions around sensitive areas.</p> <p>Further, the of impact herbicide use must be explored in an expanded EA/IS section in the final EA/IS.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	117	<p>Valued Component(s): All Valued Components            Project Phase: Construction            Description of Potential Effects: Changes all vegetation valued components from the release of sediment during construction</p> <p>No predicted residual effects are listed. Through project activities, operation and maintenance, there will be increased exposure through sediment release and dust deposition which can collect on vegetation and impact the harvest of traditional plant use species. Please update the Predicted Residual Effects to reflect this consideration or alternatively</p>	<p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Table 9.4-7 (formerly Table 9-17) in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the vegetation assessment in Appendix J (Vegetation). Refer to Appendix J for detailed vegetation assessment completed for the Community Access Road.</p> <p>Refer to Section 7.3.1.7 in Appendix J (Vegetation). With the implementation of the mitigation measures, residual effects from the release of sediment during</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	592

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>include a separate Valued Component for this table that reflects the impact of dust and sediment on traditional use plants species.</p>	<p>construction were not anticipated to have a measurable effect on the availability, distribution, composition, and function of Vegetation Valued Components (including Traditional Use Plants), therefore this interaction was not carried forward to residual effects characterization.</p> <p>Refer to Section 7.3.1.10 in Appendix J (Vegetation) for the changes to vegetation from fugitive dust emissions. Residual effects from dust emissions were carried forward into the residual effects characterization (See Section 7.3.2.7 of Appendix J [Vegetation]).</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	118	<p>Valued Component(s): All Valued Components                      Project Phase: Operation and Maintenance                      Description of Potential Effects: Changes all vegetation valued components from the release of sediment during construction</p> <p>See ID #592</p>	<p>Refer to Section 7.3.1.7 in Appendix J (Vegetation). With the implementation of the mitigation measures, residual effects from the release of sediment during construction were not anticipated to have a measurable effect on the availability, distribution, composition, and function of Vegetation Valued Components (including Traditional Use Plants), therefore this interaction was not carried forward to residual effects characterization.</p> <p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	593

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Table 9-17 in the Draft EA/IS (Table 9.4-7 of the Final EA/IS) is a high-level summary of the vegetation assessment in Appendix J (Vegetation). Refer to Appendix J for detailed vegetation assessment completed for the Community Access Road.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	119	<p>Valued Component(s): All Valued Components                      Project Phase: Operation and Maintenance                      Description of Potential Effects: Changes all vegetation valued components from the release of sediment during construction</p> <p>The Description of Potential Effect has an error and should be updated to be "during operation and maintenance"</p>	<p>The entry has been edited in Table 9.4-7 to "Changes to all vegetation valued components from the release of sediment during operations".</p>	Final EA/IS Table 9.4-7	594
Kashechewan First Nation	120	<p>"Adherence to federal and provincial regulations and guidelines regarding fuel and residue, chemical product, petroleum product, and hazardous substance collection and storage, use and handling, and disposal and treatment, such as the federal Transportation of Dangerous</p>	<p>Best management practices, as well as meeting standard guidelines and regulations are all part of the project design. Implementing project-specific mitigation measures, best management practices, and meeting standards and regulations have all influenced the</p>	Final EA/IS Table 9.4-7	595

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Goods Act, Ontario Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act and the Ontario Environment Act.”</p> <p>Mitigation measures are meant to be actions taken to reduce the severity of impact. Adherence to federal and provincial regulations is required and part of standard project design. These standard aspects of project design should not be listed as a mitigation measure.</p> <p>It is suggested that any of these measures, where listed, be identified as a project design component and not a mitigation measure. Please apply this throughout Table 9-17 and the EA/IS broadly.</p>	<p>assessment of residual effects.</p> <p>As standard road design primarily focuses on safety and functionality, how the Community Access Road is designed can serve as mitigation when it incorporates environmental design features. Inclusion of environmental design features in mitigation is a standard practice in environmental assessments. The design of the Community Access Road will be refined as it progresses to the next phase.</p> <p>Table 9.4-7 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the vegetation assessment. Refer to Appendix J (Vegetation) for detailed vegetation assessment. It follows the identification of potential effects, and explores technically and economically feasible mitigation and enhancement measures to avoid or minimize the identified negative effects. These measures consisted of industry-standard practices, federal and provincial standard specifications, regulator-mandated measures, best management practices, Indigenous and community recommendations, and recommendations from environmental professionals based on expertise, scientific publications, experience, and</p>		

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>professional judgement.</p> <p>The Final EA/IS distinguishes project design components (Section 7) from mitigation measures (Section 9). No changes were required in response to this comment.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	121	<p>Valued Component(s): All Valued Components</p> <p>Description of Potential Effect: Changes to all vegetation valued components as a result of increased access</p> <p>As there are no effects assessment details within this Section, it is impossible to evaluate whether there will be an impact to vegetation availability for traditional purposes due to increased accessibility to the area. Please include details related to this consideration in analysis completed for the final EA/IS.</p>	<p>The construction of the Community Access Road will expand access to a broader range of individuals and groups. However, the region will remain relatively remote with the nearest urban centre (Thunder Bay) being over 430 km from Marten Falls. Therefore, a large influx of individuals or groups harvesting plants for traditional use is not expected. Furthermore, the plant species typically harvested for traditional uses (by both Indigenous and non-Indigenous individuals) are common and abundant in the Project area. Given that impacts to the availability and distribution of Traditional Use Plant Species is unlikely affected to a measurable degree, this change may be viewed as a positive by increased access to these resources for local Indigenous communities. Increased public access is not predicted to result in a measurable negative effect on vegetation. Rather, increased access may result in a positive effect on local</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	596

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>Indigenous communities with respect to increased access to harvest Traditional Use Plants.</p> <p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Table 9.4-7 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the vegetation assessment in Appendix J (Vegetation). Refer to Appendix J for detailed vegetation assessment completed for the Community Access Road.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	122	<p>“Install access controls (for example, gates and boulders) to control public vehicle travel on some temporary access routes and trails.”</p> <p>Access controls can influence Indigenous harvester behavior and result in increased avoidance of areas surrounding the gates on routes and trails typically used.</p> <p>Within the Kashechewan First Nation Existing Conditions Report it was noted that 87% of Respondents would not harvest in areas where gates are</p>	<p>Marten Falls First Nation continues to engage in discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and future operations and maintenance of the Community Access Road. Access and ownership are not within the scope of the Final EA/IS, however it is a matter that will require further dialogue between the communities and the Province.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	597

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>present.</p> <p>Additional detail is required on how the proponent has considered this unintended impact because of implementing a gate.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	123	<p>There are insufficient details within the EA/IS for the predicted residual effects to Wildlife to be identified. The EA/IS jumps from refined existing conditions information, to project interactions, straight to the Summary of Residual Effects where residual effects criteria is described with no details on the potential effect beyond the limited description of the change (i.e., one sentence or less).</p> <p>Information missing includes: a lack of description of population level effects such as noise, sensory disturbance, habitat alteration, air emissions, and dust; a lack of detail on increased predation, potential for spread of disease, poaching opportunities, etc. There is no discussion of how new road access may impact wildlife mortality.</p> <p>Please see the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (page 94) for full requirements of information required to assess effects to the Wildlife VC.</p>	<p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Section 9.4.3 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the wildlife assessment in Appendix K (Wildlife). Refer to Appendix K for detailed wildlife assessment including mitigation measures for the Community Access Road.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	598

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Referring readers to Appendices is not appropriate. At minimum, the EA/IS must set out the adverse effects to valued components in a detailed way so that applied mitigation can be evaluated against the impacts; and those mitigations can then be considered for sufficiency. This has not occurred.</p> <p>The Practitioners Guide developed by the IAAC specifies that “In their Impact Statement, proponents must describe all likely potential effects in a manner that is sufficient to enable impact assessment participants to understand ... the changes that are likely to be caused by the project and the positive and negative consequences of these changes...”</p> <p>This has not been completed. Please update the final EA/IS to include sufficient details on the project effects to vegetation to allow for fulsome consideration.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	124	<p>“A comprehensive list of mitigation measures ... is provided in the [name] Technical Support Document.”</p> <p>By the release date of this Environmental Assessment/Impact Statement, all the</p>	The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Table 9.4-9	Comment noted; see response for details	599

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>sections should be completed in their entirety. Proper feedback cannot be provided if the sections are not complete in their draft forms. Please update the Mitigation and Enhancement Measures column of this table where detail is provided in an Appendix only.</p>	<p>in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the wildlife assessment in Appendix K (Wildlife). Refer to Appendix K for detailed wildlife assessment including mitigation measures for the Community Access Road.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	125	<p>Project Phase: Construction; Operation and Maintenance                      Description of Potential Effect: Fugitive dust emissions-Fugitive dust emissions and deposition may cause changes in soils and vegetation, which can adversely affect wildlife habitat availability and distribution</p> <p>As stated in the Predicted Residual Effect, due to low levels of human disturbance there is little dust and emission recorded for the existing conditions of the Project Area and Project Study Area. All phases of the project will increase dust and emissions relative to existing conditions. Additional assessment details are required to understand how dust and emissions will be managed.</p>	<p>Additional assessment details on the effects of fugitive dust emissions on wildlife are provided in Sections 7.3.1.1.3 and 7.3.3.1.2 of Appendix K (Wildlife). Additional assessment details on the effects of fugitive dust emissions on vegetation are provided in Section 8.2.5 of Appendix J (Vegetation).</p> <p>A Project-specific environmental monitoring program will be developed in the next phase of the Community Access Road and will contain mitigation measures to control dust and air emissions during Operation and Maintenance. A comprehensive list of mitigation measures that will be implemented to limit dust deposition during Construction and Operation and Maintenance is provided in Appendices S1 and S2 (Atmospheric Report and Air Quality Attachment C) of the Final ES/IS.</p> <p>Mitigation measures will include the</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	600

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development of a Best Management Plan for fugitive dust. Examples of best management practices that may be implemented include, watering or application of environmentally friendly dust suppressants, and keeping vegetation (grasses, shrubs, and trees) along the road to enhance gravitational deposition of particles and natural windbreaks.</li> <li>• Limiting construction vehicle speed, where feasible.</li> <li>• Strategic haul planning to reduce the overall number of trips required for aggregate material.</li> </ul>		
Kashechewan First Nation	126	<p>Project Phase: Construction; Operation and Maintenance</p> <p>Description of Potential Effect: Increase in wildlife attractants-Attraction of wildlife to the Project site (for example, corvids to food waste or raptors to roadkill) may increase human-wildlife interactions and change predator-prey relationships, which can affect wildlife survival and reproduction</p> <p>The long-term duration, continuous frequency, and irreversibility of these potential effects do not align with a “not significant” rating and negligible</p>	<p>The effects of an increase in wildlife attractants on all wildlife Valued Components and the expected mitigation measures are described in detail Section 7.3.1.1.8 of Appendix K (Wildlife). The implementation of the mitigation measures, including effective waste management practices are expected to limit the attraction of wildlife and their predators to the Construction Disturbance Area. Mitigations to limit wildlife attractants are well understood and the methods have been demonstrated to be effective. Although, the predicted effects are continuous and</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	601

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>magnitude. Instead, the proponent must consider using a scale of significance that can better reflect conditions.</p>	<p>irreversible, these effects were characterized as negligible in magnitude (after the implementation of mitigation) and confined to the Construction Disturbance Area (i.e., limited in geographic extent). Effects from wildlife attractants and changes to predator-prey relationships on the ability of wildlife populations within the effects assessment Regional Study Area to remain self-sustaining and ecologically functional are anticipated to be negative but negligible in magnitude. A comprehensive description of the methods for characterizing residual effects, and the determination of significance is provided in Section 4.4.2 of Appendix K (Wildlife).</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	127	<p>“Blasting will be suspended within 4 kilometres of known or potential wolverine denning areas during the denning period to minimize sensory disturbances (January 15 to May 31). If timing windows cannot be adhered to, follow environmental approval conditions, permits, or authorizations issued for the Project, including those issued from Environment and Climate Change Canada, Ontario Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks, and Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources.”</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that blasting and other disturbances within 4 kilometres of wolverine dens poses a threat to the species through sensory disturbance and potential degradation of air quality. Wolverine den surveys will be conducted ahead of all construction activities that may impact wolverines during the denning period. A detailed summary of wolverine den survey methods can be found in Section 7.3.1.3.4.2 of Appendix K (Wildlife). All survey methods for wolverine dens will be developed in</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	602

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Wolverines are sensitive to anthropomorphic disturbances and can have natal and maternal denning periods from January to April. Blasting can impact denning, natal and maternal periods through noise and alteration of air quality. Please indicate how wolverine denning areas will be identified to apply the specified four-kilometre buffer. Is the proponent considering using radio collars to track wolverine movement?</p> <p>Additionally, KFN requires notification in the event that a timing window will not be adhered to.</p>	<p>consultation with the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation, and Parks.</p> <p>Potential wolverine denning areas will be identified by reviewing plant communities and physical characteristics (i.e. any forested or partially forested communities). Targeted surveys will be undertaken in potential denning areas to look for features that may be indicative of maternal denning habitat (i.e. snow-covered fallen trees, snow caves, boulders, and snow-covered slash piles. All treed communities, eskers, watercourse banks, forestry cut blocks, and prominent terrain features have the potential to support maternal denning.</p> <p>If clearing, grubbing, or blasting is required during the denning period, surveys for the presence of wolverine dens will be conducted prior to work. Survey methods will be determined in consultation with the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation, and Parks. Surveys will be conducted from helicopters or drones and will cover all potentially suitable denning habitat within 4 km of the disturbance.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	128	Valued Component: Bats (little brown myotis and northern myotis)	It is acknowledged that both little brown myotis and northern myotis have a low	Comment noted; see	603

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Description of Potential Effect: Sensory disturbance – Sensory disturbance (for example, lights, smells, noise, human activity) can alter bat habitat availability, use and connectivity (movement and behaviour), which can lead to changes in habitat availability and distribution and adversely affect survival and reproduction</p> <p>“Context: Generally tolerant to human disturbance such as noise associated with construction activities.”</p> <p>Little Brown Myotis are not tolerant to human disturbance. This is especially true during hibernation periods. Additionally, Northern Myotis are not highly tolerant of human disturbance and are more associated with natural, undisturbed habitats. Please update the context within this entry and the associate predicted residual effect as a result.</p>	<p>tolerance to sensory disturbance during hibernation. No hibernacula were identified in the construction disturbance footprint, nor the LSA. Therefore, there is no predicted residual effect from sensory disturbance on hibernating bats. Both little brown myotis and northern myotis are known to roost in buildings and urban forests, which indicates some level of tolerance to anthropogenic sensory disturbance during the active season.</p>	<p>response for details.</p>	
Kashechewan First Nation	129	<p>Valued Component: Furbearers (wolverine)</p> <p>Project Phase: Operation and Maintenance</p> <p>Description of Potential Effect: Increase in predator access – Increased access for predators (for example, coyote, wolf and black bear) may increase</p>	<p>Considering that the Community Access Road will result in a very small increase in linear feature density in the wolverine effects assessment Regional Study Area, and linear corridors will remain absent or limited in most of the wolverine effects assessment Regional Study Area, effects from increased predator access on the</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	604

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>competition for prey and may increase predation risk and decrease survival and reproduction for wolverine</p> <p>The permanent duration, continuous frequency, irreversibility of these potential effects does not align with the rating of “not significant” and negligible magnitude. The impact to wildlife species from increased predator/competitive interactions can compound over time. Please further consider magnitude and significance and apply a range of significance extents to better reflect variability of parameters.</p>	<p>ability of the wolverine population to remain self-sustaining and ecologically functional are anticipated to be negative and negligible in magnitude.</p> <p>Although the analysis determined that the predicted residual effect of an increase in predator access on wolverine is negligible and not significant, an overall determination of significance of the combined interactions (including an increase in predator access) was assessed as significant.</p> <p>Refer to Sections 7.3.1.3.3 and 7.3.3.3.3 of Appendix K (Wildlife) for additional analysis of the predicted effects of an increase in predator access on wolverine habitat availability, distribution, and survival and reproduction.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	130	<p>“Herbicides will not be used during Operation and Maintenance.”</p> <p>This mitigation and enhancement measure specifies that herbicides will not be used during operation and maintenance however, in the fish and fish habitat effects assessment it specifies that “As per the Ministry of Transportation Ontario’s Weed Control Maintenance Best Practice (MBP-320),</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS has been updated for clarity around use of herbicides. Herbicide use is not planned.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	605

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>weeds in the Construction Disturbance Area will be controlled using a combination of biological, chemical, cultural, manual, and mechanical control methods during Operation and Maintenance”.</p> <p>Please clarify which approach will be employed and adjust the appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures. This is required for the entirety of Table 9-22 where herbicide is repeatedly identified as not being used during operations and maintenance.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	131	<p>Valued Component: Furbearers (wolverine)                      Project Phase: Construction; Operation and Maintenance                      Description of Potential Effect: Increase in public access – Could affect wolverine survival and reproduction through increased trapping efforts</p> <p>As stated in the Predicted Residual Effect for this Valued Component, increase access to areas in the Project Area can lead to increased trapping efforts. As this area currently experiences limited traffic and limited hunting/trapping/etc., the change in harvest of furbearers could have serious</p>	<p>The potential increase in trapping and corresponding increase in wolverine mortality resulting from increased public access is uncertain because fluctuating fur market prices influence trapping effort. However, any potential effects are likely to be limited in geographic extent to the area within 10 km of the Community Access Road. After mitigation the effects from increase in public access on the ability of the wolverine population in the wolverine effects assessment Regional Study Area to remain self-sustaining and ecologically functional are anticipated to be negative and low in magnitude.</p> <p>The significance of adverse residual</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	606

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>implications to wolverine populations which are threatened under the Endangered Species Act. Additional consideration must be given to the predicted residual effect for this valued component.</p>	<p>effects on wildlife Valued Components was evaluated using the assessment endpoints self-sustaining and ecologically effective populations as significance thresholds. The significance of effects was predicted as a binary response, with effects classified as significant or not significant. Adverse residual effects were determined to be significant if the wildlife Valued Component is not expected to be self-sustaining or ecologically effective at the scale of the effects assessment Regional Study Area. Self-sustaining and ecologically effective populations are populations that would be maintained into the future without the need for immigration of individuals from other populations.</p> <p>Significant effects are measurable at the population level and are likely to decrease resilience and increase the risk to the maintenance of a self sustaining and ecologically effective population. Not significant residual effects are measurable at the individual level, and strong enough to be detectable at the population level but are not likely to decrease resilience and increase the risk to a self sustaining and ecologically effective population.</p>		

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>Although the analysis determined that the predicted residual effect of an increase in public access on wolverine is low and not significant, an overall determination of significance of the combined interactions (including an increase in public access) was assessed as significant.</p> <p>Additional analysis of the predicted effects of an increase in public access on wolverine survival and reproduction is provided in Sections 7.3.1.3.6 and 7.3.3.3.6 of Appendix K (Wildlife).</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	132	<p>Valued Component: Furbearers (American marten)            Project Phase: Construction; Operation and Maintenance            Description of Potential Effect: Increase in predator access – Increased access for predators (for example, coyote, wolf and black bear) may increase competition for prey and may increase predation risk and decrease survival and reproduction for American marten</p> <p>The permanent duration, continuous frequency, and irreversibility of these potential effects do not align with a rating of “not significant” and negligible</p>	<p>The significance of adverse residual effects on wildlife Valued Components was evaluated using the assessment endpoints self-sustaining and ecologically effective populations as significance thresholds. The significance of effects was predicted as a binary response, with effects classified as significant or not significant. Adverse residual effects were determined to be significant if the wildlife Valued Component is not expected to be self-sustaining or ecologically effective at the scale of the effects assessment Regional Study Area. Self-sustaining and ecologically effective populations are</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	607

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>magnitude. Additional consideration must be given to the predicted residual effect for this valued component.</p>	<p>populations that would be maintained into the future without the need for immigration of individuals from other populations.</p> <p>Significant effects are measurable at the population level and are likely to decrease resilience and increase the risk to the maintenance of a self sustaining and ecologically effective population. Not significant residual effects are measurable at the individual level, and strong enough to be detectable at the population level but are not likely to decrease resilience and increase the risk to a self sustaining and ecologically effective population.</p> <p>Effects from increased predator access on the ability of the American marten population to remain self-sustaining and ecologically functional are anticipated to be negative and negligible in magnitude.</p> <p>Additional analysis of the predicted effects of an increase in predator access on American marten habitat availability, distribution, and survival and reproduction is provided in Sections 7.3.1.4.3 and 7.3.3.4.3 of Appendix K (Wildlife).</p>		

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Kashechewan First Nation	133	<p>Valued Component: Furbearers (American marten)                      Project Phase: Construction; Operation and Maintenance                      Description of Potential Effect: Increase in public access – Could affect American marten survival and reproduction through increased trapping efforts</p> <p>As stated in the Predicted Residual Effect for this Valued Component, increase access to areas in the Project Area can lead to increased trapping efforts. As this area currently experiences limited human traffic and limited hunting/trapping/etc., the change in harvest of furbearers could negatively impact furbearers. Additional consideration must be given to the predicted residual effect for this valued component.</p>	<p>The potential increase in trapping and corresponding increase in American marten mortality resulting from increased public access is uncertain because fluctuating fur market prices influence trapping effort. However, any potential effects are likely to be limited in geographic extent to the area within 10 km of the Community Access Road. After mitigation the effects from increase in public access on the ability of the American marten population in the wildlife effects assessment Regional Study Area to remain self-sustaining and ecologically functional are anticipated to be negative and low in magnitude.</p> <p>Additional analysis of the predicted effects of an increase in public access on American marten survival and reproduction is provided in Sections 7.3.1.4.6 and 7.3.3.4.6 of Appendix K (Wildlife).</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	608
Kashechewan First Nation	134	<p>Valued Component: Furbearers (beaver)                      Project Phase: Construction; Operation and Maintenance                      Description of Potential Effect: Increase in public access – Could affect beaver survival and reproduction through increased trapping efforts</p>	<p>The potential increase in trapping and corresponding increase in beaver mortality resulting from increased public access is uncertain because fluctuating fur market prices influence trapping effort. However, any potential effects are likely to be limited in geographic extent to the area within 10 km of the Community</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	609

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>As stated in the Predicted Residual Effect for this Valued Component, increase access to areas in the Project Area can lead to increased trapping efforts. As this area currently experiences limited human traffic and limited hunting/trapping/etc., the change in harvest of furbearers could negatively impact furbearers. Additional consideration must be given to the predicted residual effect for this valued component.</p>	<p>Access Road. After mitigation the effects from increase in public access on the ability of the Beaver population in the wildlife effects assessment Regional Study Area to remain self-sustaining and ecologically functional are anticipated to be negative and low in magnitude.</p> <p>Additional analysis of the predicted effects of an increase in public access on beaver survival and reproduction is provided in Sections 7.3.1.5.6 and 7.3.3.5.6 of Appendix K (Wildlife).</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	135	<p>There are insufficient details within the EA/IS for the predicted residual effects to Birds to be identified. The EA/IS jumps from refined existing conditions information, to project interactions, straight to the Summary of Residual Effects where residual effects criteria is described with no details on the potential effect beyond the limited description of the change (i.e., one sentence or less).</p> <p>Information missing includes increased predation opportunities disruption to movement corridors, increased poaching opportunities; there is no analysis of bird conservation region priority species.</p> <p>Please see the Tailored Impact</p>	<p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Table 9.4-12 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the birds assessment in Appendix L (Birds). Refer to Appendix L for detailed birds assessment including mitigation measures for the Community Access Road.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	610

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Statement Guidelines (page 92-94) for full requirements of information required to assess effects to the Birds VC.</p> <p>Referring readers to Appendices is not appropriate. At minimum, the EA/IS must set out the adverse effects to valued components in a detailed way so that applied mitigation can be evaluated against the impacts; and those mitigations can then be considered for sufficiency. This has not occurred.</p> <p>The Practitioners Guide developed by the IAAC specifies that “In their Impact Statement, proponents must describe all likely potential effects in a manner that is sufficient to enable impact assessment participants to understand ... the changes that are likely to be caused by the project and the positive and negative consequences of these changes...”</p> <p>This has not been completed. Please update the final EA/IS to include sufficient details on the project effects to Birds to allow for fulsome consideration.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	136	Mitigation and Enhancement Measures: “See [Section Name] mitigation measures for [Potential Effect]...”	The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are	Comment noted; see response for details	611

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>The majority of this table references various sections of the EA/IS for Mitigation and Enhancement Measures. For proper and fulsome review, the mitigation measures for each Valued Component, Project Activity, Project Phase, etc. should be listed. Please update the table to reflect this information.</p>	<p>provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Table 9.4-12 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the birds assessment in Appendix L (Birds). Refer to Appendix L for detailed birds assessment including mitigation measures for the Community Access Road.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	137	<p>Magnitude Levels</p> <p>For each Valued Component, Project Activity, Project Phase, etc. in this table, magnitude is provided as a descriptor/rationale. No magnitude levels are given. Please give provide magnitude levels for each row in Table 9-25 that align with Table 9-24: Bird Magnitude Definition.</p>	<p>Magnitude under “All Bird VC” categories were assessed to have negligible magnitude designations, given that there are standard mitigations for these impacts and the effect is not anticipated to have a measurable change on the bird population in the effects assessment RSA.</p> <p>Table 9.4-12 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include this information.</p>	Final EA/IS Table 9.4-12	612
Kashechewan First Nation	138	<p>“No predicted residual effect.”</p> <p>For many Valued Components, Project Activity, Project Phase, etc. in this table, no predicted residual effects are listed. Please update to include the predicted residual effects criteria used to reach this conclusion for evaluation.</p>	<p>The criteria used to assess the predicted residual effects for caribou are described in Section 6.7.3 (Assessing Residual Effects) of the Final EA/IS and in Section 4.4. (Effects Assessment) of Appendix M (Ungulates).</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	613
Kashechewan	139	There are insufficient details within the	The main body of the Final EA/IS is	Comment	614

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
First Nation		<p>EA/IS for the predicted residual effects to Ungulates to be identified. The EA/IS jumps from refined existing conditions information, to project interactions, straight to the Summary of Residual Effects where residual effects criteria is described with no details on the potential effect beyond the limited description of the change (i.e., one sentence or less).</p> <p>Information missing includes: a description of an assessment of the potential adverse effects on boreal caribou habitat; discussion of how linear disturbance may impact caribou seasonal habitats and result in functional habitat loss, etc.</p> <p>Please see the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines for full requirements of information required to assess effects to the Ungulates VC.</p> <p>Referring readers to Appendices is not appropriate. At minimum, the EA/IS must set out the adverse effects to valued components in a detailed way so that applied mitigation can be evaluated against the impacts; and those mitigations can then be considered for sufficiency. This has not occurred.</p>	<p>intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Section 9.4.5 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the ungulates assessment in Appendix M (Ungulates). Refer to Appendix M for detailed ungulates assessment completed for the Community Access Road.</p>	<p>noted; see response for details</p>	

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>The Practitioners Guide developed by the IAAC specifies that “In their Impact Statement, proponents must describe all likely potential effects in a manner that is sufficient to enable impact assessment participants to understand ... the changes that are likely to be caused by the project and the positive and negative consequences of these changes...”</p> <p>This has not been completed. Please update the final EA/IS to include sufficient details on the project effects on ungulates to allow for fulsome consideration.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	37	<p>Mitigation and Enhancement Measures: “See [Section Name] mitigation measures for [Potential Effect]...”</p> <p>The majority of this table references various sections of the EA/IS for Mitigation and Enhancement Measures. For proper and fulsome review, the mitigation measures for each Valued Component, Project Activity, Project Phase, etc. should be listed. Please update the table to reflect this information.</p>	Appendix AA-1 consists of a compilation of all mitigation measures included in the technical support documents.	Appendix AA-1	615
Kashechewan First Nation	37	Magnitude Levels	Table 9.4-12 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include magnitude.	Final EA/IS Table 9.4-12	616

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>For each Valued Component, Project Activity, Project Phase, etc. in this table, magnitude is provided as a descriptor/rationale. No magnitude levels are given. Please give provide magnitude levels for each row in Table 9-25 that align with Table 9-24: Bird Magnitude Definition.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	37	<p>There are insufficient details within the EA/IS for the predicted residual effects to Ungulates to be identified. The EA/IS jumps from refined existing conditions information, to project interactions, straight to the Summary of Residual Effects where residual effects criteria is described with no details on the potential effect beyond the limited description of the change (i.e., one sentence or less).</p> <p>Information missing includes: a description of an assessment of the potential adverse effects on boreal caribou habitat; discussion of how linear disturbance may impact caribou seasonal habitats and result in functional habitat loss, etc.</p> <p>Please see the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines for full requirements of information required to assess effects to the Ungulates VC.</p>	<p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Section 9.4.5 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the ungulates assessment in Appendix M (Ungulates). Refer to Appendix M for detailed ungulate assessment completed for the Community Access Road.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	618

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Referring readers to Appendices is not appropriate. At minimum, the EA/IS must set out the adverse effects to valued components in a detailed way so that applied mitigation can be evaluated against the impacts; and those mitigations can then be considered for sufficiency. This has not occurred.</p> <p>The Practitioners Guide developed by the IAAC specifies that “In their Impact Statement, proponents must describe all likely potential effects in a manner that is sufficient to enable impact assessment participants to understand ... the changes that are likely to be caused by the project and the positive and negative consequences of these changes...”</p> <p>This has not been completed. Please update the final EA/IS to include sufficient details on the project effects on ungulates to allow for fulsome consideration.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	140	Valued Component: Woodland Caribou Project Phase: Construction, Operation and Maintenance Description of Potential Effect: Sensory disturbance – (for example, lights, smells, noise, human activity) can later ungulate habitat	Significance for caribou effects is determined using a binary approach (significant or not significant), as described in Section 4.4.2.6 of Appendix M (Ungulates). This framework does not apply ordinal categories such as low,	Comment noted; see response for details	619

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>availability, use and connectivity (movement and behaviour), which can lead to changes in abundance and distribution and adversely affect survival and reproduction Significance: Not Significant</p> <p>As previously stated in the Construction Phase for the same Valued Component and within the Description of Potential Effect, “The Nipigon range already exceeds the disturbance threshold established by Environment and Climate Change Canada, so any additional habitat loss is considered significant.”</p> <p>The description of this Predicted Residual Effect indicates the extent of the Construction Disturbance Area that will no longer be considered functional Habitat. KFN understands non-functional habitat to be areas that are unsuitable or no longer provide the necessary resources and conditions for caribou to thrive.</p> <p>Due to the addition of non-functional habitat (e.g., 27,020 hectares from ambient noise, smells and light spill) to the already noted Construction Disturbance Area, the significance for this Predicted Residual Effect should be</p>	<p>moderate, or high significance. Refer to response to comment #97 for information on significance.</p>		

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		reevaluated and have a low to moderate significance applied.			
Kashechewan First Nation	141	<p>“Increased predator access—increased access for predators (for example, wolf and black bear) and prey may increase predation risk and decrease survival and reproduction for moose and caribou.”</p> <p>This is not a mitigation measure, rather a statement of an indirect project effect which may occur. Please provide a relevant mitigation measure to address increased predator access.</p>	The statement was not intended for that row and is an error. Mitigations for predator access are described in the following row. Table 9.4-14 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to correct this.	Final EA/IS Table 9.4-14	620
Kashechewan First Nation	142	<p>The Impact Assessment Agency of Canada suggests that significance be applied with a scale (e.g., negligible, low, moderate, high). Please provide rationale for not identifying a scale of significance and instead applying a binary significant/not significant rating.</p> <p>This method likely does not allow for a reasonable weighing of all evidence and rationales of effect.</p> <p>Further, due to the lack of narrative within the EA/IS it is hard for KFN to evaluate the determination in a meaningful way.</p> <p>The EA/IS must be updated to include</p>	<p>A conclusion on significance was made using the following characteristics: context, direction (i.e. positive, neutral, negative), magnitude (i.e. negligible, low, medium, high), geographic extent, duration (i.e. short term, medium term, long term), frequency (i.e. infrequent, frequent, continuous), reversibility (i.e. reversible, irreversible), likelihood (i.e. unlikely, possible, probably, certain) and uncertainty, as well as taking into consideration professional judgement.</p> <p>The assessment of significance of residual effects of the Community Access Road was informed by the interaction between the residual effects</p>	Final EA/IS Section 9.4.7	621

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>additional detail and a rationale for binary significance determinations is required.</p>	<p>characteristics, with magnitude, duration, and geographic extent being the most important factors, along with consideration of context.</p> <p>Consideration was also given to the concerns of Indigenous communities, interested agencies, groups and individuals raised during engagement.</p> <p>A graded scale (i.e. negligible, low, medium, high) was applied to magnitude, which refers to the amount of change in a parameter relative to the baseline condition of a Valued Component with and without the Community Access Road in place or to other standards or guidelines.</p> <p>Although a graded scale was not used for the determination of significance in the Draft EA/IS, it was applied throughout the assessment process to inform the determination.</p> <p>The appended Technical Support Documents (Appendices F to V) contain detail information on how each valued component completed their assessment. The purpose of the Final EA/IS was to provide a summary of the technical information. Please refer to the Technical</p>		

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			Support Documents for additional information.		
Kashechewan First Nation	143	<p>Due to the high level of uncertainty (in other words, low prediction confidence) about how wolverines will respond to the Community Access Road once constructed and in the ability to avoid or mitigate the magnitude of these effects on the regional wolverine population, a precautionary approach was applied, and it is anticipated that the Project effects may be significant to the sustainability of the population in the effect assessment Regional Study Area.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proponent implement a collaring program and robust monitoring of wolverines to ensure any population effects are tracked and can be managed adaptively.</p>	Monitoring is described in Section 9 of Appendix K (Wildlife) of the Final EA/IS. The final monitoring programs will be developed through engagement and consultation with Indigenous communities and federal and provincial regulators.	Comment noted; see response for details	622
Kashechewan First Nation	144	Please ensure the Study Areas for Aboriginal and Treaty Rights and Interests is available and included in the final EA/IS to allow for fulsome consideration.	The Final EA/IS does not include each Indigenous community's Area of Interest (study area) due to the confidential nature of the data provided by Indigenous communities. Areas of Interest (study area) are where traditional practices, land use, or cultural activities occur. This approach protects sensitive information provided by Indigenous communities and respects the privacy	Comment noted; see response for details	623

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			and protocols of each Indigenous community involved.		
Kashechewan First Nation	145	<p>“As described in Section 8.3.4, each of the 23 Indigenous communities listed in Section 11.2 will be issued a Preliminary Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests Existing Conditions and Impact Assessment Report. Marten Falls First Nation’s intention is for Indigenous communities to first review this Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement. The feedback will be included as a summary in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement while keeping information confidential and will be developed based on dialogue with Indigenous communities and a literature review of publicly available documents.”</p> <p>While the intention to review the draft is noted, the draft EA/IS, therefore, has many aspects that are incomplete. This means review is difficult, requires cross reference, or the necessary details are not present.</p> <p>The final EA/IS must have all relevant details present to allow for fulsome consideration and evaluation.</p>	Section 9.5.2 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include the Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests information.	Final EA/IS Section 9.5.2	624
Kashechewan	146	There are insufficient details within the	The main body of the Final EA/IS is	Comment	625

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
First Nation		<p>EA/IS for the predicted residual effects to the Acoustic Environment to be identified. The EA/IS jumps from refined existing conditions information, to project interactions, straight to the Summary of Residual Effects where residual effects criteria is described with no details on the potential effect beyond the limited description of the change (i.e., one sentence or less).</p> <p>Information missing includes: a lack of detail of ambient vibration and other sound levels resulting from the project including changes to the perception of non-anthropogenic sounds, etc.</p> <p>Please see the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (Page 85) for full requirements of information required to assess effects to the Acoustic Environment VC.</p> <p>Referring readers to Appendices is not appropriate. At minimum, the EA/IS must set out the adverse effects to valued components in a detailed way so that applied mitigation can be evaluated against the impacts; and those mitigations can then be considered for sufficiency. This has not occurred.</p>	<p>intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Section 9.5.3 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the acoustic and vibration assessment in Appendix P (Acoustic and Vibration). Refer to Appendix P for detailed acoustic and vibration assessment completed for the Community Access Road.</p>	<p>noted; see response for details</p>	

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>The Practitioners Guide developed by the IAAC specifies that “In their Impact Statement, proponents must describe all likely potential effects in a manner that is sufficient to enable impact assessment participants to understand ... the changes that are likely to be caused by the project and the positive and negative consequences of these changes...”</p> <p>This has not been completed. Please update the final EA/IS to include sufficient details on the project effects on the acoustic environment to allow for fulsome consideration.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	147	<p>Valued Component: Noise Significance: Not significant</p> <p>As previously stated in the EA/IS, there is relatively little human disturbance in the Project Area; existing day and night noise levels are lower than that of populated areas (Table 9-33) for the majority of the Project Area. As such, any alteration to existing conditions (with a high magnitude, as depicted), could have a residual effect on the area. Additional consideration and discussion of the significance rating must be undertaken.</p>	<p>As described in Section 7.3.2.1 of Appendix P (Acoustic and Vibration), taking into account the implementation of the mitigation measures, the magnitude of the net effects from the increased noise during Construction has the potential to range from low to high, depending on the distance between the points of reception and the construction activities. Therefore, for a conservative assessment, the net effects were assessed to be high. The net effects were assessed to be local in geographic extent, short term and reversible. Due to the expected intermittent use of specific point of reception locations and the</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	626

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>infrequent nature of construction activities in the proximity of a given point of reception, the frequency was assessed to be infrequent.</p> <p>As the net effects from the increased noise during Construction are not predicted to be long-term in duration or frequent, the net effects during Construction are assessed as not significant.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	148	<p>Valued Component: Noise Reversibility: Reversible</p> <p>Considering the length of construction and the lifespan of the project, noise will be ongoing (even if intermittent). It is not possible to reverse the long-term effects of sound with a permanent project lifespan. Please provide additional rationale for this residual effect rating.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 6.7.3 of the Final EA/IS for definitions of residual effects characteristics. The project-wide definition of reversible is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reversible: the effect is not permanent</li> <li>- Irreversible: the effect is permanent</li> </ul> <p>Noise is considered to be reversible as if the noise source stops, the effects of the noise will cease.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	627
Kashechewan First Nation	149	<p>“If impacts will be proposed to Caviar (Eilp-1), a Stage 3 AA is required. The Stage 3 AA for Caviar (Eilp-1) must include the hand excavation test unit methodology as outlined in Section 3.2 and Table 3.1 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Ontario Government 2011), to further test the nature and density of the site.</p>	<p>We acknowledge Kashechewan First Nation’s request for input on mitigation measures and interest in reviewing future archaeological assessments.</p> <p>Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment will be shared with Kashechewan First Nation. The development and implementation of future archaeological</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	628

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Given that Caviar (Eilp-1) is primarily located on exposed bedrock, hand excavation covering the entire site may not be possible. Therefore, the Stage 3 AA would consist of site documentation and recording.”</p> <p>In KFN’s Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment review, KFN stated that “If there is a chance that any site identified by Indigenous groups may be impacted by the Project, they require additional assessment.” The Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment found that Study Area WA-15 Location 2 intersects with a site reported by Indigenous groups. KFN reported a fishing site polygon in KFN’s Existing Conditions Report that intersects this find. Therefore, the finding may have cultural heritage value or interest to KFN, and either avoidance and protection or Stage 4 mitigation is warranted. KFN requires input on Stage 4 mitigation if it is not possible to avoid and protect this site.</p> <p>KFN is interested in reviewing the Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment, contingent upon KFN capacity.</p>	<p>assessments will be the responsibility of the owner/operator of the Community Access Road. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	150	“If impacts will be proposed to Caviar (Eilp-1), a Stage 3 AA is required. The	Refer to response to ID149	Comment noted; see	629

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Stage 3 AA for Caviar (Eilp-1) must include the hand excavation test unit methodology as outlined in Section 3.2 and Table 3.1 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Ontario Government 2011), to further test the nature and density of the site. Given that Caviar (Eilp-1) is primarily located on exposed bedrock, hand excavation covering the entire site may not be possible. Therefore, the Stage 3 AA would consist of site documentation and recording.”</p> <p>Being that there was an archaeological site of potential Indigenous cultural heritage value or interest, avoidance and protection or Stage 4 mitigation is warranted.</p> <p>KFN seeks input on Stage 4 mitigation if the site cannot be avoided or protected, and requests to review the Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment, subject to our capacity.</p>		response for details	
Kashechewan First Nation	151	<p>“At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement, Community Well-Being was not available to summarize.”</p> <p>By the release date of this Environmental</p>	The Final EA/IS has been updated to include a summary of community well-being.	Final EA/IS Section 9.5.6	630

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Assessment/Impact Statement, all sections should be completed in their entirety. Proper feedback cannot be provided if the sections are not complete in their draft forms.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	152	<p>“At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement, information from visual was not available to summarize.”</p> <p>By the release date of this Environmental Assessment/Impact Statement, all sections should be completed in their entirety. Proper feedback cannot be provided if the sections are not complete in their draft forms.</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS has been updated to include a summary of visual.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 9.5.8</p>	631
Kashechewan First Nation	37	<p>“The Impact Assessment Act (Government of Canada, 2024a) requires that each environmental assessment of a project consider any cumulative environmental effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with the environmental effects of other physical activities that have been or will be carried out in the region.”</p> <p>“The Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012 (Government of Canada, 2017b) requires that each Environmental Assessment of a project take into account any cumulative</p>	<p>The Impact Assessment Act (Government of Canada, 2017a) was used in the development of the cumulative effects assessment of the Marten Falls Community Access Road for it to meet their requirements. Additionally, the cumulative effects assessment was prepared in accordance with the Terms of Reference Approval and Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines, that include requirements specific for the Community Access Road.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	632

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>environmental effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with the environmental effects of other physical activities that have been or will be carried out.”</p> <p>Please clarify whether the Impact Assessment Act or the Canada Environmental Assessment Act was used as a standard to guide the assessment of cumulative effects.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	154	<p>This section describes three components of a cumulative effects assessment. One of these components is “temporal overlap”, described as: “When one activity happens at the same time as another activity...”</p> <p>Note, cumulative effects assessments must also include the interactions between the residual effects of this Project with the residual effects of past projects. It is not sufficient to assume the residual effects of past projects are encapsulated in the existing conditions as this contributes to a sliding baseline effect and leads to an inaccurate prediction of impacts and cumulative effects.</p>	<p>The cumulative effects assessment was prepared in accordance with the Impact Assessment Act,(Government of Canada, 2017a) and the approved Terms of Reference for the Community Access Road. Activities were included on the Project Inclusions List where spatial and temporal overlap with local and regional study areas were identified for each of the valued components carried forward from the regional effects assessment; and where information was publicly available from online sources at the time the cumulative effects assessment was completed.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	634
Kashechewan	155	<p>Temporal boundaries are defined by</p>	<p>As outlined in Section 10 of the Draft</p>	<p>Comment</p>	635

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
First Nation		<p>Project phase and used to determine temporal boundary overlap with other projects.</p> <p>While scoping the three factors for cumulative effects assessments is helpful for assessing Project interactions with other projects in the area; limiting temporal boundaries to Project phases can create inaccuracies in predictions for temporal overlap between project residual effects.</p> <p>For example, impacts from Project construction may persist into the operation and maintenance phases and overlap temporally with other projects. Without applying this approach, some projects and physical activities may have been excluded from the assessment for various VCs where residual impacts were identified only for the construction phase.</p>	<p>EA/IS and the Final EA/IS, “The Impact Assessment Act (Government of Canada, 2017a) requires that each Environmental Assessment of a project take into account any cumulative environmental effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with the environmental effects of other physical activities that have been or will be carried out.” In alignment with this requirement, the cumulative effects assessment was prepared in accordance with the approved Terms of Reference for the Community Access Road. Notably, Table 10.1-1 of the draft EA/IS identifies infrastructure projects with spatial or temporal overlap with the Community Access Road, based on publicly available sources. This demonstrates that the project was not assessed in isolation, but rather within a broader regional context— confirming that cumulative impacts were thoroughly considered.</p>	<p>noted; see response for details.</p>	
Kashechewan First Nation	156	<p>“Two residual effects were carried forward to the cumulative effects assessment... Overall, the Valued Component fish populations are expected to remain self-sustaining and ecologically effective.”</p> <p>“Overall, the Valued Component fish</p>	<p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Section 10.2.3 of the Final EA/IS is a high-level</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	638

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>populations are expected to remain to be self-sustaining and ecologically effective; therefore, the predicted cumulative effects on fish and fish habitat are assessed as not significant.”</p> <p>Significance determinations throughout the cumulative effects section are made with little to no assessment present for consideration. There must be a description or demonstration of how the residual effects from this Project on fish and fish habitat will interact from the residual effects of other projects on fish and fish habitat in the area. It is not sufficient to only state no significant changes will occur and that fish populations will remain self-sustaining; nor to refer readers to multiple volumes and appendices for these relevant details. Complete information and justifications must be provided for Nations to provide informed feedback and make informed decisions about the Project in an easy to navigate way.</p>	<p>summary of the cumulative effects assessment for fish and fish habitat. Refer to Section 8 of Appendix G (Fish and Fish Habitat) for more information on the cumulative effects for fish and fish habitat.</p> <p>The cumulative effects of the Northern Road Link, Anaconda and Painter Lake forestry access road upgrades, and Rapid Lynx Broadband projects along with the Project to cumulative effects on fish and fish habitat is not expected to change the determination of significance (Section 7.3.3 of Appendix G [Fish and Fish Habitat]). Based on the cumulative effects assessment (Section 8.2 of Appendix G [Fish and Fish Habitat]), the characterization of cumulative effects was considered to be the same as the residual effects characterization for both interactions carried forward; the magnitude of the predicted cumulative effects remained low for changes to fish habitat quantity and quality through physical alteration from work below the high-water mark and medium for changes to fish survival and reproduction from improved public access to recreational angling areas.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on the fish Valued</p>		

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>Component were considered not significant as the residual effects were assessed low to medium in magnitude and they do not represent a substantial management concern. Similar to Section 7.3.3 of Appendix G (Fish and Fish Habitat), there is the potential for management concerns through an increased public access leading to changes in angler pressure and fish harvest; however, the resources are expected to continue to be managed through Ministry of Natural Resources and local communities for recreational and Indigenous harvest, respectively. Overall, the Valued Component fish populations are expected to remain to be self-sustaining and ecologically effective, and therefore, the predicted cumulative effects on fish and fish habitat are assessed as not significant.</p> <p>The cumulative effects assessment is presented in Section 8.2 of Appendix G (Fish and Fish Habitat); this section provides context for the characterization of predicted cumulative effects and the significance determination.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	157	Thank you for the information provided. This section constitutes a more comprehensive and complete cumulative	Section 10 of the Final EA/IS has been revised to maintain a consistent level of detail across all Valued Components.	Final EA/IS Section 10	639

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		effects assessment and should be carried throughout the rest of the Valued Components for Cumulative Effects.			
Kashechewan First Nation	158	<p>“At the junction between the Project and the Northern Road Link it could be possible for slightly increased cumulative effects to occur locally since three road segments would be joining however these effects would still be characterized the same as the residual effects and managed with the same monitoring and mitigation plans.”</p> <p>Please provide a justification for this finding as impacts could interact at a local level and compound to create a cumulative impact.</p>	Additional information has been provided in Section 10.2.4 of the Final EA/IS.	Final EA/IS Section 10.2.4.5	640
Kashechewan First Nation	159	<p>“Due to temporal separation of the construction phase of each project, the cumulative impacts from the two projects combined were generally assessed to have the same characteristics as the residual effects of each project.”</p> <p>As previously discussed, impacts occurring within the construction phase of a project can persist into the operations and maintenance phase. Please elaborate on the predicted duration of these effects (from both the</p>	Residual groundwater effects from the Community Access Road are expected during both construction and operations. Construction phase effects (e.g., excavation and dewatering) will be short to medium term, occurring only while work is active in the area (typically months to a few years). Operational effects (e.g., minor changes to groundwater flow from the road footprint and drainage features) will be long term, persisting for the life of the road.	Comment noted; see response for details	641

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>MFCAR Project and assumed from the Rapid Lynx Broadband project) to support this justification. The same should be carried forward for each Valued Component and residual effect.</p>	<p>For the Rapid Lynx Broadband Project, groundwater interactions are expected to be short term and limited to construction, with shallow trenching causing temporary disturbance for weeks to months at any location. The project is not expected to generate any long-term operational groundwater effects due to the passive nature of buried fibre infrastructure.</p> <p>Given these durations, the only meaningful temporal overlap between the two projects occurs during their respective construction periods. No long term cumulative operational effects are expected. Section 10 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to reflect this.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	160	<p>“Overall, the vegetation ecosystems and plant populations are expected to remain self-sustaining and ecologically effective within the effects assessment Regional Study Area.”</p> <p>As previously stated, there must be a description or demonstration of how the residual effects from this Project on vegetation will interact from the residual effects of other projects on vegetation in the area. It is not sufficient to only state no significant changes will occur and that vegetation ecosystems will remain self-</p>	<p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Section 10.3.2 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the vegetation assessment in Appendix J (Vegetation). Refer to Appendix J for the detailed vegetation assessment completed for the Community Access Road.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	642

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		sustaining.			
Kashechewan First Nation	161	As a general note, the cadence and level of detail changes between valued components in the cumulative effects assessment. Consistency in this area would better inform feedback and understanding of potential Project cumulative interactions and impacts.	We have aimed to provide similar level of detail between valued components in the Final EA/IS Section 10 Cumulative Effects Assessment.	Final EA/IS Section 10	643
Kashechewan First Nation	162	<p>“The addition of the Project and past, present and reasonably foreseeable developments is expected to result in effects on little brown myotis and northern myotis...”</p> <p>Previous sections state that cumulative effects assessments considered only present and reasonably foreseeable developments. Please clarify if past projects are included in the cumulative effects assessment or if they considered only in the effects assessment.</p>	The effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable activities on the Study Area and valued components were assessed as part of the Cumulative Effects Assessment. Section 10 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to state that past projects are included in the cumulative effects assessment.	Final EA/IS Section 10.3.3	644
Kashechewan First Nation	163	<p>“...the weight of evidence from the analysis predicts that the changes to little brown myotis and northern myotis habitat availability, distribution, and population survival and reproduction are expected to remain within the resilience and adaptability limits of the regional populations...”</p>	<p>Resilience and adaptability limits for each Valued Component were included in the assessment of significance. This has been discussed throughout Section 10 of the Final EA/IS.</p> <p>Additional details on the assessment of cumulative effects of the Community</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	646

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Were resilience and adaptability limits or other such thresholds identified for other indicator species or Valued Components? If so, please include throughout the cumulative effects assessment. If not, please describe how this may impact the level of uncertainty and prediction confidence.</p>	<p>Access Road and the other reasonably foreseeable developments on the resilience and adaptability limits for each Valued Component are provided in Section 8 of Appendix K (Wildlife).</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	164	<p>If possible, please disaggregate the information provided by Indigenous communities on these milestones.</p>	<p>A Community-specific breakdown of input received from Indigenous communities and its influence on Milestones 1 (Notice of Commencement), 2 (Effects Assessment Methods), and 3 (Identification of Preferred Alternatives) is available online at <a href="https://eais.martenfallsaccessroad.ca/progress-reports/">https://eais.martenfallsaccessroad.ca/progress-reports/</a>.</p> <p>The Final Record of Consultation and Engagement for indigenous Communities will include an additional report (Milestone 4: Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement) that summarizes all consultation activities undertaken from October 29, 2021 to September 5, 2025, and will also include a breakdown of input received from Indigenous communities from August 1, 2025 to September 5, 2025.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	647

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Kashechewan First Nation	37	<p>“These communities contributed their knowledge through climate change webinars, workshops, and surveys. Knowledge Keepers from these communities shared observations of environmental changes, such as shifts in animal migration patterns, changes in fish populations, and variations in vegetation health. For instance, they reported that certain bird species, including waterfowl, are migrating earlier in the spring and leaving later in the fall. These shifts have direct impacts on hunting practices, which are vital for food security and cultural heritage.”</p> <p>While it is positive that Indigenous perspectives are included in the Climate Change section, because the data is aggregated, it is unclear which Nation’s feedback is used throughout. It is recommended that Marten Falls disaggregate this information and specifically identify the Nation or Nations’ whose report specific climate change observations.</p>	<p>Indigenous Knowledge and perspectives are included throughout the Final EA/IS and in many cases feedback is submitted confidentially. We have therefore summarized some of the information shared in Section 12.1.4 of the Final EA/IS. Information that has been shared outside of the confidential process can be found in the Record of Consultation and Engagement and can be sorted by individual Indigenous community.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	648
Kashechewan First Nation	166	<p>Table 12-3: Construction Adaptation Measures and Expected Outcomes, Page 927 (PDF Page 975) Wildfire Adaptation Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Implement early warning systems</li> </ul>	<p>Marten Falls First Nation appreciates the feedback received from Kashechewan First Nation throughout the Environmental Assessment / Impact Assessment process. Your insights have</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	649

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Develop evacuation plans...”</p> <p>Please indicate whether KFN will be included in any early warning systems related to wildfires developed for the Marten Falls Community Access Road.</p>	<p>helped shape the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement (EA / IS), which MFFN plans to release to Indigenous communities, the public and the regulators in the spring of 2026. After the release consultation and engagement activities will be led by the provincial and federal government agencies with the Community Access Road Project Team providing support, where needed.</p> <p>In addition, should the Community Access Road EA / IS be approved to proceed, a consultation and engagement program will be established to guide discussions through detail design.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	167	<p>Illumination Challenges During Storms Adaptation Measures: “Utilize high-intensity or LED lighting systems”</p> <p>Please indicate how Marten Falls will balance the need for high-intensity or LED lighting systems during storms with potential impacts to harvesters from increased light shed in proximity to the road. Increased light can negatively impact harvesters and land users and their experience while using the land. Safety must be adequately balanced with the rights of harvesters.</p>	<p>The statement pertained to illumination challenges during storms specifically for construction related project components. During the construction phase illumination will be restricted to construction sites as it will be needed for safety reasons. Illumination throughout the Community Access Road once operations commence will be further examined during detail design. It should be clarified that there are currently no plans to provide lighting along the Community Access Road when it commences operations. Illumination</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	650

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			during the operations phase will be present at aggregate sites needed for maintenance work.		
Kashechewan First Nation	168	<p>Various Adaptation Measures</p> <p>Multiple climate events include developing emergency plans as their adaptation measures. Kashechewan First Nation requires involvement in and identification through these emergency plans as climate events are typically regional in nature and can impact Kashechewan First Nation both directly and indirectly.</p> <p>Please confirm that Kashechewan First Nation will be included in the development and execution of any relevant emergency plans.</p>	The development and implementation of any emergency plans during operations and maintenance of the Community Access Road will be the responsibility of the owner/operator of the Community Access Road. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road.	Comment noted; see response for details	651
Kashechewan First Nation	169	“One of the requirements that the contractor selected for the Community Access Road will have to fulfill is the preparation and implementation of the plans related to accidents and malfunctions. The prime contract will be responsible for drafting plans, while subcontractors will be responsible for reviewing and implementing these. A list of potential plans is provided below for consideration. The final list will be	<p>The commitments made through the Final EA/IS form part of the project’s approval conditions. These commitments, as outlined in the Final EA/IS, will be confirmed and refined at the next phase of the Community Access Road.</p> <p>A spill contingency plan, an emergency response plan, a wildlife management plan, and a traffic management plan will</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	653

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>confirmed once the ownership of the Community Access Road is determined.”</p> <p>Please provide detail on how Marten Falls will guarantee that the contractor will prepare and implement plans and that Marten Falls commitments to interested Indigenous communities for involvement in plans will be upheld.</p> <p>This is particularly relevant for the spill contingency plan, the emergency response plan, the wildlife management plan, and the traffic management plan, as KFN requires involvement in the development and execution of those plans.</p>	<p>be developed in the next phase of the Community Access Road. It will be shared with Kashechewan First Nation.</p> <p>The development and implementation of the spill contingency plan, the emergency response plan, the wildlife management plan, and the traffic management plan will be the responsibility of the owner/operator of the Community Access Road. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	170	<p>“The Community Access Road will require consideration of the following safety and traffic management protocols: ...”</p> <p>Please provide details on how Marten Falls will ensure the road owner will implement the identified safety and traffic management protocols as the ownership of the Community Access Road has not yet been determined.</p>	<p>The Community Access Road will be designed and signed in accordance with Provincial Highway Standards. Road users will follow protocols similar to other provincial road networks. These requirements will be incorporated into design, construction, and operations of the Community Access Road, making them binding regardless of final ownership.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	654
Kashechewan First Nation	171	<p>“Table 13-2 presents the feedback obtained on traffic, community safety,</p>	<p>Table 13.1-2 has been updated to include feedback provided by</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Table 13.1-2</p>	655

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>and impacts to humans, traditional subsistence and cultural resources. It lists feedback directly sent to Marten Falls First Nation. At the time of writing this Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement no feedback relating to accidents or malfunctions was listed on the Agency’s registry.”</p> <p>Table 13-2 does not include feedback provided by Kashechewan First Nation in the Kashechewan First Nation Existing Conditions Report. Within this report Kashechewan respondents shared their perspectives on how the project could result in impacts on Kashechewan. One such impact was, with the increase in vehicle traffic (Section 5.3.5), respondents were concerned about an increase in accidents or vehicle strikes with wildlife. Additionally, respondents also noted that fuel spillage should be watched carefully as contaminants/pollutants could travel upriver or through water more generally (Section 5.3.2)</p> <p>Please update the table to include this information.</p>	Kashechewan First Nation in the Final EA/IS.		
Kashechewan First Nation	172	“Culturally Appropriate Reporting System: consider establishing an easy-	During construction the contractor will be encouraged to consider a culturally	Comment noted; see	656

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>to-use and culturally sensitive reporting system. This system should be developed in collaboration with Indigenous communities to ensure it respects traditional protocols and communication methods;”</p> <p>Kashechewan First Nation requires involvement in the development of culturally appropriate reporting systems to ensure Kashechewan protocols and communication methods are respected.</p>	<p>appropriate reporting system.</p> <p>The development and implementation of a culturally appropriate reporting system will be the responsibility of the owner/operator of the Community Access Road. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road.</p>	<p>response for details</p>	
Kashechewan First Nation	173	<p>“There are sections of the road that will be on peatlands. Leaving these in place to avoid releasing carbon stored in the peatlands will be considered;”</p> <p>This section includes permissive language for peatlands removal. Kashechewan First Nation requires engagement from Marten Falls in the event that peatlands will be removed or altered rather than left in place.</p>	<p>We acknowledge Kashechewan First Nation's request to be engaged in the event that peatlands will be removed or altered. Should the Community Access Road EA / IS be approved to proceed, a consultation and engagement program will be established to guide discussions through the next phase of the Community Access Road.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	657
Kashechewan First Nation	174	<p>“The Assessment Process is a tool to ensure the sustainability of projects. The three principles of sustainability are environmental sustainability, social sustainability and economic sustainability. As part of the analysis, potential mitigation measures are used to</p>	<p>The Impact Assessment Agency of Canada (the Agency) issued the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines for the Marten Falls First Nation Community Access Road on February 24, 2020. On June 20, 2024, the Budget Implementation Act, 2024, No. 1,</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	658

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>attempt to balance environmental impacts against development / social gains.”</p> <p>There is no discussion within this section of how the roads could open the region to more development and no exploration of how this could impact environmental sustainability or social sustainability.</p> <p>While it is acknowledged that this project would make the Marten Falls community more sustainable, consideration must be given to the implications of the road to the broader regional environmental context.</p>	<p>received Royal Assent and brought into force amendments to the Impact Assessment Act.</p> <p>The Agency sent a letter to Marten Falls First Nation on June 11, 2025 outlining the next steps in the Community Access Road Impact Statement Phase due to the amendments made to the Impact Assessment Act. As stated in the letter, the Agency will focus their technical review of the Community Access Road Impact Statement on key issues under federal jurisdiction, which are relevant for decision making, specifically federal effects and the positive benefits of the Community Access Road. The Agency will also concentrate on leveraging federal mechanisms outside of the Impact Assessment Act as well as provincial legislative frameworks and instruments, to address the key issues. Key issues the Agency will focus on are with respect to fish and fish habitat, migratory birds, potential impacts to Indigenous Peoples and public interest factors.</p> <p>The Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement was prepared to meet the requirements outlined in the Terms of Reference and the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines. Considering the Community Access Road's effects on the</p>		

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			broader regional environmental context is not a regulatory requirement and as such was not developed as part of the Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.		
Kashechewan First Nation	175	<p>“If new waterbodies are identified prior to construction, an Aquatics Specialist will be contracted to assess the waterbody. Depending on the nature of the waterbody, recommendations for construction methods, appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures, and permitting requirements will be made by the Aquatics Specialist and, if necessary, local First Nation communities and appropriate regulatory agencies including Fisheries and Oceans Canada and the Ministry of Natural Resources will be engaged.”</p> <p>Kashechewan First Nation requires notification in the event that a new waterbody is identified and will be impacted by construction activities.</p>	<p>We acknowledge Kashechewan First Nation's request to be notified in the event that a new waterbody is identified and will be impacted by construction activities.</p> <p>Should the Community Access Road EA / IS be approved to proceed, a consultation and engagement program will be established to guide discussions through the next phase of the Community Access Road.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	659
Kashechewan First Nation	176	“Marten Falls First Nation has also noted interest in highlighting the importance of combining western science hydrology and Indigenous Knowledge (Marten Falls First Nation, 2023). The community noted that relevant Indigenous	Groundwater monitoring results will be provided to the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks and/or other relevant regulators. Kashechewan First Nation will have the opportunity to request the results through	Final EA/IS Section 14.1.1.2	660

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Knowledge provided by Marten Falls First Nation may be integrated into the groundwater monitoring program to provide a holistic approach to the Project’s monitoring activities.”</p> <p>Kashechewan First Nation identified concern with changes to the muskeg, water levels and river systems as a whole in the Kashechewan First Nation Existing Conditions Report. Additionally, Kashechewan has requested to be informed of groundwater monitoring results (Section 5.4).</p> <p>Please update this section to include the specific information and requirements provided by Kashechewan First Nation.</p>	<p>environmental advisory committees.</p> <p>As outlined in Kashechewan First Nation Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests: Draft Impact Assessment Report, proposed mitigation measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Collaboration with local environmental advisory committees to support the development and implementation of environmental monitoring programs; and</li> <li>- Promoting the inclusion of Indigenous interests and perspectives, particularly with respect to resources utilized for rights-based purposes.</li> </ul> <p>In the absence of an existing advisory committee with an aligned mandate to Marten Falls First Nation, work with relevant agencies and Indigenous Peoples to establish a Terms of Reference for one.</p> <p>Section 14 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include feedback shared by Kashechewan First Nation.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	177	“Locations of groundwater monitoring instruments (for example, piezometers) will be determined in consultation with vegetation ecologists so that effects on vegetation valued components are	The Final EA/IS has been updated to say, "Locations of groundwater monitoring instruments (for example, piezometers) will be determined in consultation with vegetation ecologists	Final EA/IS Section 14.1.1.2	661

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>considered when determining their placement.”</p> <p>Locations of groundwater monitoring instruments should also be determined in consultation with Marten Falls First Nation and other Nations where berry, plant, or medicine gathering was identified within the Project Development Area. This will ensure that instruments do not interfere with species of cultural importance.</p>	<p>and Indigenous communities so that effects on vegetation valued components are considered when determining their placement.”</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	178	<p>“At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement this information was not available to summarize. The full Peatlands Technical Support Document can be found in Appendix I. A summary will be provided in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.”</p> <p>KFN will provide comments on this summary section, once provided in the final Environmental Assessment/Impact Statement.</p>	<p>Sections 14.1.1, 14.2.1, 14.3.1 and 14.4.1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include the information relating to peatlands.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Sections 14.1.1.4, 14.2.1.4, 14.3.1.4 and 14.4.1.4</p>	662
Kashechewan First Nation	179	<p>“Refine vegetation community mapping and field-verify the locations of sensitive or difficult to restore vegetation communities ((for example, organic</p>	<p>We acknowledge Kashechewan First Nation's request to be informed of the results.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	663

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>wetlands) to inform the micro-siting of temporary access roads, staging areas, camps, debris and / or timber stockpiles, as well as the centreline of the Community Access Road within the 100-metre cleared right-of-way”</p> <p>Kashechewan First Nation must be informed of the results of vegetation community mapping and field verification of difficult to restore vegetation communities to inform micro-siting.</p>	<p>Should the Community Access Road EA/IS be approved to proceed, a consultation and engagement program will be established to guide discussions through detail design.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	180	<p>“Monitoring programs for the pre-construction, Construction, and Operation and Maintenance Phases of the Project will be determined based on requirements outlined in provincial and federal permits, and through engagement and consultation with Indigenous communities and federal and provincial regulators.”</p> <p>At minimum, there must be a wildlife monitoring program established for operation and maintenance phases to ensure wildlife-vehicle collisions are reduced. This could be accomplished through animal detection systems, managing roadside vegetation, and installing salt licks to deter wildlife from approaching the road.</p>	<p>The development and implementation of a wildlife monitoring program will be the responsibility of the owner/operator of the Community Access Road. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	664

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Please confirm that a wildlife monitoring program will be implemented and that Kashechewan will have input/oversight of this program through ongoing review of results.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	181	<p>“At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement this information was not available to summarize. Please refer to Section 8.3.4 for further information. A summary will be provided in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.”</p> <p>KFN will provide comments on this summary section, once provided in the final Environmental Assessment/Impact Statement.</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS has been updated to include a summary of Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 14.1.3.1</p>	665
Kashechewan First Nation	182	<p>“If the Ogoki and / or Albany River cultural heritage landscapes are determined to meet the criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06 or Ontario Regulation 10/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act, it is recommended that Heritage Impact Assessments be prepared to fully assess impacts and propose design alternatives and mitigation measures to conserve the Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of the cultural heritage landscapes.”</p>	<p>It is anticipated that future reports will be circulated to interested Indigenous communities for information and feedback.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	667

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Kashechewan requires continued notification and review of information related to cultural heritage assessments undertaken.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	183	<p>“At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement this information was not available to summarize. Please refer to Section 8.3.8 for further information. A summary will be provided in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.”</p> <p>KFN will provide comments on this summary section, once provided in the final Environmental Assessment/Impact Statement.</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS has been updated to include a summary of Community Well-Being.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 14.1.3.6</p>	668
Kashechewan First Nation	184	<p>“At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement this information was not available to summarize. The full Visual Environment Technical Support Document can be found in Appendix V. A summary will be provided in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.”</p> <p>KFN will provide comments on this summary section, once provided in the</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS has been updated to include a summary of visual.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 14.1.3.8</p>	669

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		final Environmental Assessment/Impact Statement.			
Kashechewan First Nation	185	Kashechewan First Nation requires review of all surface water monitoring results undertaken in the construction phase.	<p>Surface water monitoring results will be provided to the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks and/or other relevant regulators. Kashechewan First Nation will have the opportunity to request the results through environmental advisory committees.</p> <p>As outlined in Kashechewan First Nation Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests: Draft Impact Assessment Report, proposed mitigation measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Collaboration with local environmental advisory committees to support the development and implementation of environmental monitoring programs; and</li> <li>- Promoting the inclusion of Indigenous interests and perspectives, particularly with respect to resources utilized for rights-based purposes.</li> </ul> <p>In the absence of an existing advisory committee with an aligned mandate to Marten Falls First Nation, work with relevant agencies and Indigenous Peoples to establish a Terms of Reference for one.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	670

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Kashechewan First Nation	186	<p>“Environmental Monitors and Indigenous Environmental Monitors will be onsite during construction to confirm that all waterbodies crossed by the Community Access Road right-of-way and access roads have been identified and documented in the waterbody crossing list.”</p> <p>Please confirm whether Kashechewan First Nation can participate in the ongoing monitoring of waterbodies in relation to crossing structures. If yes, Kashechewan First Nation requires continued engagement to understand this opportunity.</p>	<p>We acknowledge Kashechewan First Nation's request to have an Indigenous monitor for monitoring of waterbodies.</p> <p>The development and implementation of waterbody monitoring programs will be the responsibility of the owner/operator of the Community Access Road. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	685
Kashechewan First Nation	187	<p>“As construction proceeds, the monitoring program may need to be modified or updated based on changing conditions or work plans. The monitoring program should be overseen by and directed by a qualified person retained for environmental monitoring of the Project.”</p> <p>Kashechewan First Nation identified concern with changes to the muskeg, water levels and river systems as a whole in the Kashechewan First Nation Existing Conditions Report. Additionally, Kashechewan has requested to be</p>	<p>Groundwater monitoring results will be provided to the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks and/or other relevant regulators. Kashechewan First Nation will have the opportunity to request the results through environmental advisory committees.</p> <p>As outlined in Kashechewan First Nation Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests: Draft Impact Assessment Report, proposed mitigation measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Collaboration with local environmental advisory committees to support the</li> </ul>	Comment noted; see response for details	686

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>informed of groundwater monitoring results (Section 5.4).</p> <p>Please update this section to include the specific information and requirements provided by Kashechewan First Nation.</p> <p>Additionally, the monitoring program should also be directed and overseen by an Indigenous monitor to ensure culturally appropriate methods. Please identify whether an Indigenous monitor will be appointed.</p>	<p>development and implementation of environmental monitoring programs; and - Promoting the inclusion of Indigenous interests and perspectives, particularly with respect to resources utilized for rights-based purposes.</p> <p>In the absence of an existing advisory committee with an aligned mandate to Marten Falls First Nation, work with relevant agencies and Indigenous Peoples to establish a Terms of Reference for one.</p> <p>Section 14 of The Final EA/IS has been updated to include feedback shared by Kashechewan First Nation.</p> <p>The development and implementation of the groundwater monitoring program will be the responsibility of the owner/operator of the Community Access Road. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	188	“At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement this information was not available to summarize. The full	The Final EA/IS has been updated to include a summary of peatlands.	Final EA/IS Section 14.2.1.4	687

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Peatlands Technical Support Document can be found in Appendix I. A summary will be provided in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.”</p> <p>KFN will provide comments on this summary section, once provided in the final Environmental Assessment/Impact Statement.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	189	<p>“During construction, the following monitoring programs will be required. These programs will be further developed during the preparation of the Environmental Protection Plan: ...”</p> <p>Please identify whether the vegetation monitoring programs will be directed and overseen by an Indigenous monitor to ensure culturally appropriate methods.</p>	<p>We acknowledge Kashechewan First Nation's request to have an Indigenous monitor for the vegetation monitoring programs.</p> <p>The development and implementation of vegetation monitoring programs will be the responsibility of the owner/operator of the Community Access Road. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	688
Kashechewan First Nation	190	<p>“A reporting protocol and system to report incidental wildlife observations and wildlife-vehicle collisions (bats, furbearers and other large mammals, and reptiles and amphibians) during Construction and Operation and Maintenance will be developed. The</p>	<p>The development and implementation of the Environmental Protection Plan will be the responsibility of the owner/operator of the Community Access Road. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	689

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>details of the incidental wildlife and wildlife-vehicle collision reporting system will be described in the Environmental Protection Plan”</p> <p>KFN requires involvement in the development and execution of the Environmental Protection Plan to ensure KFN is identified for ongoing reporting and included in the reporting protocol and system.</p>	Community Access Road.		
Kashechewan First Nation	191	<p>“Ground-based pre-clearing surveys (“wildlife sweeps”) will be completed along the Construction Disturbance Area under the direction of the Environmental Monitor, prior to any clearing or grubbing. The wildlife sweeps will entail surveying for sensitive wildlife features, including mammal dens, beaver lodges, amphibian and reptile habitats, and bat maternity roost habitat”</p> <p>Please update this section to include an Indigenous monitor for the ground-based pre-clearing surveys (“wildlife sweeps”) as critical Indigenous knowledge can contribute to the success of this work, particularly in relation to crucial species such as beaver.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that Indigenous knowledge can contribute to the success of the pre-clearing surveys (wildlife sweeps). This section in the Final EA/IS has been updated as follows:</p> <p>“Ground-based pre-clearing surveys (“wildlife sweeps”) will be completed along the Construction Disturbance Area under the direction of the Environmental Monitor and Indigenous Environmental Monitor, prior to any clearing or grubbing. The wildlife sweeps will entail surveying for sensitive wildlife features, including mammal dens, beaver lodges, amphibian and reptile habitats, and bat maternity roost habitat.”</p>	Final EA/IS Section 14.2.2.2	690
Kashechewan	192	“If activity restrictions cannot be followed	Section 14.2.2 of the Final EA/IS has	Final EA/IS	691

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
First Nation		<p>for construction activities, the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks will be engaged to determine alternative approaches. This may include daily monitoring of caribou locations with collars and only commencing construction activities if collar data indicates that there are no caribou within pre-defined “cautionary zones” (pre-defined spatial buffer areas)”</p> <p>If activity restrictions cannot be followed for construction activities, KFN should be engaged in the determination of alternate approaches and informed of any alternate approaches considered by Marten Falls.</p>	<p>been updated to include Indigenous communities, in addition to the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, if activity restrictions cannot be followed for construction activities.</p>	<p>Section 14.2.2.4</p>	
Kashechewan First Nation	193	<p>“In addition to the intensive monitoring during sensitive seasons described above, ground-based pre-clearing surveys (“wildlife sweeps”) will be completed outside of the sensitive timing windows to detect and document presence of large mammals, migratory bird nests and raptor stick nests ahead of clearing and blasting activities. Trained staff will survey the areas to be cleared or blasted, plus a 500-metre buffer, by foot, all-terrain vehicles, snow machine, or trucks. Wildlife observations and signs will be documented and reported to the</p>	<p>This section in the Final EA/IS as well as Section 9 in Appendix M (Ungulates) have been updated to include an Indigenous monitor for ground-based pre-clearing surveys.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 14.2.2.4 Appendix M</p>	692

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>contractor’s Environmental Manager”</p> <p>Please update this section to include an Indigenous monitor for the ground-based pre-clearing surveys (“wildlife sweeps”) as critical Indigenous knowledge can contribute to the success of this work, particularly in relation to crucial species such caribou.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	194	<p>“During Construction, Operation and Monitoring, the following Before-After Control-Impact monitoring programs are potential approaches that could be discussed and evaluated during engagement and consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deploying and maintaining Global Positioning System collars on adult female caribou...”</li> </ul> <p>KFN requests Marten Falls to commit to the deployment of GPS collars on adult female caribou as this will ensure sufficient information is collected on residences, seasonal movements, movement corridors, habitat requirements, and key habitat areas.</p>	Final decisions about ongoing monitoring programs for caribou during construction and operations of the Community Access Road will be determined during the permitting phase, through engagement with Indigenous communities (including Kashechewan First Nation) and regulators.	Comment noted; see response for details	693
Kashechewan First Nation	195	“During Construction, Operation and Monitoring, the following Before-After Control-Impact monitoring programs are potential approaches that could be	During Construction, Operation and Monitoring, the following Before-After Control-Impact monitoring programs are potential approaches that could be	Comment noted; see response for details	694

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>discussed and evaluated during engagement and consultation:            • Remote camera monitoring at selected reference sites...”</p> <p>KFN requires Marten Falls to commit to the deployment and ongoing monitoring of remote cameras at selected reference sites as this can provide crucial data on predation risk and changes to movement over time. Additionally, please confirm how selected reference sites will be identified and how KFN information provided in the Kashechewan First Nation Existing Conditions Report will be considered.</p>	<p>discussed and evaluated during engagement and consultation. As such, if remote camera monitoring is confirmed as a mitigation measure during the next phase of the Community Access Road, it will be the responsibility of the owner/operator of the Community Access Road. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	196	<p>“During detailed design, a Project-specific Soil Management Plan will be developed...”</p> <p>KFN requires review and input of the Soil Management Plan.</p>	<p>The soil management plan will be shared with Kashechewan First Nation. The development and implementation of the soil management plan will, however, be undertaken solely by the future owner/operator.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	695
Kashechewan First Nation	197	<p>“At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement this information was not available to summarize. Please refer to Section 8.3.4 for further information. A summary will be provided in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement”</p>	<p>Section 14.2.3 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include a summary of Aboriginal and/or Treat Rights and Interests.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 14.2.3.1</p>	696

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>KFN will provide comments on this summary section, once provided in the final Environmental Assessment/Impact Statement.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	198	<p>“A noise monitoring program is not recommended for the Project.”</p> <p>The road will take an area that is entirely remote/rural and introduce road traffic to the area that will displace wildlife and land users. Please indicate and provide specifics on why a noise monitoring program was not warranted to ensure noise levels are not in exceedance of predicted.</p>	<p>The result of the noise residual effects assessment is that there are no significant residual effects and the uncertainty is not considered to be high. Therefore, regular noise monitoring is not recommended.</p> <p>However, as stated in Table 9.5-13 (formerly Table 9-36) of the Final EA/IS, during construction of the Community Access Road "a complaint resolution mechanism will be developed by the contractor whereby persons can contact the Project team if there are perceived noise issues." Noise monitoring of perceived noise issues may be carried out as needed as part of the investigation.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	697
Kashechewan First Nation	199	<p>“Construction monitoring for this discipline will be further determined based on the results of the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports described in Section 14.2.3.3.”</p> <p>KFN requires review and consideration of</p>	<p>It is anticipated that future reports for Cultural Heritage, including recommendations for monitoring, will be circulated to interested Indigenous communities for information and feedback.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	698

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		the Cultural Heritage construction monitoring as determined following the results of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment.			
Kashechewan First Nation	200	<p>“At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement, Community Well-Being information was not available to summarize. This discipline includes information related to social, economics and human health. The full Community Well Being Technical Support Document can be found in Appendix T. A summary will be provided in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.”</p> <p>KFN will provide comments on this summary section, once provided in the final Environmental Assessment/Impact Statement.</p>	Section 14.2.3 has been updated in the Final EA/IS to include a summary of Community Well-Being.	Final EA/IS Section 14.2.3.6	699
Kashechewan First Nation	201	<p>“At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement this information was not available to summarize. The full Visual Environment Technical Support Document can be found in Appendix V. A summary will be provided in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.”</p>	Section 14.2.3 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include a summary of visual.	Final EA/IS Section 14.2.3.8	700

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		KFN will provide comments on this summary section, once provided in the final Environmental Assessment/Impact Statement.			
Kashechewan First Nation	202	Kashechewan First Nation requires review of all surface water monitoring results undertaken in the operations phase.	<p>Surface water monitoring results will be provided to the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks and/or other relevant regulators. Kashechewan First Nation will have the opportunity to request these results through environmental advisory committees.</p> <p>As outlined in Kashechewan First Nation Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests: Draft Impact Assessment Report, proposed mitigation measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Collaboration with local environmental advisory committees to support the development and implementation of environmental monitoring programs; and</li> <li>- Promoting the inclusion of Indigenous interests and perspectives, particularly with respect to resources utilized for rights-based purposes.</li> </ul> <p>In the absence of an existing advisory committee with an aligned mandate to Marten Falls First Nation, work with</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	701

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			relevant agencies and Indigenous Peoples to establish a Terms of Reference for one.		
Kashechewan First Nation	203	<p>“Culverts and bridges will be regularly inspected and maintained to prevent blockages from forming and causing ponding or backwater effects.”</p> <p>Please confirm whether Kashechewan First Nation can participate in the ongoing monitoring of waterbodies in relation to crossing structures. If yes, Kashechewan First Nation requires continued engagement to understand this opportunity.</p>	As noted in Kashechewan First Nation Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests: Draft Impact Assessment Report, proposed mitigation measures include the collaboration with local existing environmental advisory committees to support the development and implementation of all environmental monitoring programs. The objective is to include Indigenous interests and perspectives, particularly concerning resources utilized for rights-based purposes. In the absence of an existing advisory committee with an aligned mandate to Marten Falls First Nation, a Terms of Reference between relevant agencies and Kashechewan First Nation will be established.	Comment noted; see response for details	702
Kashechewan First Nation	204	“At sites where impacts to groundwater levels or quality have been identified, the groundwater monitoring programs should continue, as per the construction monitoring program until a return to baseline equivalent conditions is observed, or a site-specific remediation monitoring plan is implemented;”	Groundwater monitoring results will be provided to the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks and/or other relevant regulators. Kashechewan First Nation will have the opportunity to request these results through environmental advisory committees.	Comment noted; see response for details	703

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Kashechewan First Nation identified concern with changes to the muskeg, water levels and river systems as a whole in the Kashechewan First Nation Existing Conditions Report. Additionally, Kashechewan has requested to be informed of groundwater monitoring results (Section 5.4).</p> <p>Please confirm continued notification of ongoing operations and maintenance monitoring results.</p> <p>Additionally, please provide detail on the criteria to be used to identified 'continued impacts to groundwater levels' during operations and maintenance and who will be responsible for this ongoing determination.</p>	<p>As outlined in Kashechewan First Nation Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests: Draft Impact Assessment Report, proposed mitigation measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Collaboration with local environmental advisory committees to support the development and implementation of environmental monitoring programs; and</li> <li>- Promoting the inclusion of Indigenous interests and perspectives, particularly with respect to resources utilized for rights-based purposes.</li> </ul> <p>In the absence of an existing advisory committee with an aligned mandate to Marten Falls First Nation, work with relevant agencies and Indigenous Peoples to establish a Terms of Reference for one.</p> <p>The development and implementation of any monitoring programs during operations and maintenance will be the responsibility of the owner/operator of the Community Access Road. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road.</p>		
Kashechewan	205	"At the time of writing the Draft	Section 14.3.1 of the Final EA/IS has	Final EA/IS	704

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
First Nation		<p>Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement this information was not available to summarize. The full Peatlands Technical Support Document can be found in Appendix I. A summary will be provided in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.”</p> <p>KFN will provide comments on this summary section, once provided in the final Environmental Assessment/Impact Statement.</p>	<p>been updated to include a summary of peatlands.</p>	<p>Section 14.3.1.4</p>	
Kashechewan First Nation	206	<p>“During operations, the following monitoring programs will be required. These programs will be further detailed during subsequent project phases, when restoration and Terrestrial Biodiversity Offsetting Plans have been developed”</p> <p>KFN requires involvement in the review of the Terrestrial Biodiversity Offsetting Plan referenced within this section to ensure rehabilitated/restored vegetation communities and wetland offset areas meet the requirements of the community.</p>	<p>The Preliminary Biodiversity Offset Plan is provided in Appendix AB of the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement. The development the Preliminary Biodiversity Offset Plan will, however, be undertaken solely by the future owner/operator of the Community Access Road.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	705
Kashechewan First Nation	207	<p>“Engagement and consultation with Indigenous communities and federal and provincial regulators, as well as requirements outlined in federal and</p>	<p>As noted in Kashechewan First Nation's Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests: Draft Impact Assessment Report proposed mitigation measures</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	706

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>provincial permits, will determine the monitoring programs during the Operation and Maintenance Phase of the Project. As required by the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (Impact Assessment Agency of Canada, 2020), opportunities to participate in the development and implementation of the operation and maintenance monitoring program will be provided for representatives from Indigenous groups.”</p> <p>KFN requires confirmation from Marten Falls that they will be engaged in the determination of monitoring programs during the operation and maintenance phase of the project.</p>	<p>include the collaboration with local existing environmental advisory committees to support the development and implementation of all environmental monitoring programs. The objective is to include Indigenous interests and perspectives, particularly concerning resources utilized for rights-based purposes. In the absence of an existing advisory committee with an aligned mandate to Marten Falls First Nation, work with relevant agencies and Indigenous Peoples to establish a Terms of Reference for one.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	208	<p>“The purpose of the Before-After Control-Impact Study monitoring program will be to determine the efficacy of mitigation measures, verify the predictions in the assessment, to guide any future measures that could be implemented during the Operation and Maintenance Phase, and to fulfill Species at Risk permitting requirements. The Before-After Control-Impact Study will be based on the methods implemented for the existing conditions study.”</p> <p>KFN requires review of the Before-After</p>	<p>As noted in Kashechewan First Nation Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests: Draft Impact Assessment Report, proposed mitigation measures include the collaboration with local existing environmental advisory committees to support the development and implementation of all environmental monitoring programs. The objective is to include Indigenous interests and perspectives, particularly concerning resources utilized for rights-based purposes. In the absence of an existing advisory committee with an aligned</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	707

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		Control-Impact Study monitoring program results, upon availability.	<p>mandate to Marten Falls First Nation, a Terms of Reference between relevant agencies and Kashechewan First Nation will be established.</p> <p>Monitoring results will be provided to MECP and the environmental advisory committees can request the results from MECP.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	209	<p>“The following monitoring is anticipated to be required as part of permitting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wolverine hair snag/camera trap surveys: monitoring of wolverine population that interacts with the Project Local Study Area to allow for modelling of the wolverine population density in the Operation and Maintenance Phase;” <p>Wolverines are species of importance to KFN. As denning sites are critical to this species, Marten Falls should include a collaring survey for ongoing monitoring which would help in identification of critical habitat areas and denning sites.</p> </li></ul>	As noted in Kashechewan First Nation Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests: Draft Impact Assessment Report, proposed mitigation measures include the collaboration with local existing environmental advisory committees to support the development and implementation of all environmental monitoring programs. The objective is to include Indigenous interests and perspectives, particularly concerning resources utilized for rights-based purposes. In the absence of an existing advisory committee with an aligned mandate to Marten Falls First Nation, a Terms of Reference between relevant agencies and Kashechewan First Nation will be established.	Comment noted; see response for details	708
Kashechewan First Nation	210	“The following monitoring is recommended to satisfy the requirements of the Tailored Impact	As noted in Kashechewan First Nation Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests: Draft Impact Assessment	Comment noted; see response for	709

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Statement Guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Winter snow tracking – to monitor the abundance and distribution of furbearers during Construction and Operation and Maintenance;</li> <li>• Beaver lodge survey – to monitor the abundance and distribution of beavers during Construction and Operation and Maintenance;</li> <li>• Remote camera program - to monitor the occurrence and distribution of wildlife during construction, and operation and maintenance. Additional details on the recommended remote camera program are provided in the Ungulates Technical Support Document (Appendix M); and</li> <li>• Autonomous recording unit surveys for anurans – to monitor species presence and distribution during Construction and Operation and Maintenance.”</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the proposed monitoring, KFN requires Marten Falls to commit to the deployment of GPS collars on adult female caribou as this will ensure sufficient information is collected on residences, seasonal movements, movement corridors, habitat requirements, and key habitat areas.</p>	<p>Report, proposed mitigation measures include the collaboration with local existing environmental advisory committees to support the development and implementation of all environmental monitoring programs. The objective is to include Indigenous interests and perspectives, particularly concerning resources utilized for rights-based purposes. In the absence of an existing advisory committee with an aligned mandate to Marten Falls First Nation, a Terms of Reference between relevant agencies and Kashechewan First Nation will be established.</p>	<p>details</p>	
Kashechewan	211	“The post-construction monitoring will	Post-construction monitoring results for	Comment	710

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
First Nation		<p>occur within one full growing season after the completion of construction, but timing may be extended if needed.”</p> <p>KFN requires review of any post-construction monitoring results for Physiography, Terrain and Soils as erosion and sediment control may impact surface water which is of concern to KFN.</p>	<p>these disciplines will be provided to the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks and/or other relevant regulators. Kashechewan First Nation will have the opportunity to review these results through environmental advisory committees.</p> <p>As outlined in Kashechewan First Nation Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests: Draft Impact Assessment Report, proposed mitigation measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Collaboration with local environmental advisory committees to support the development and implementation of environmental monitoring programs; and</li> <li>- Promoting the inclusion of Indigenous interests and perspectives, particularly with respect to resources utilized for rights-based purposes.</li> </ul> <p>In the absence of an existing advisory committee with an aligned mandate to Marten Falls First Nation, work with relevant agencies and Indigenous Peoples to establish a Terms of Reference for one.</p>	noted; see response for details	
Kashechewan First Nation	212	“At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement this information was not	Section 14.3.3 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include a summary of Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and	Final EA/IS Section 14.3.3.1	711

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>available to summarize. Please refer to Section 8.3.4 for further information. A summary will be provided in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.”</p> <p>KFN will provide comments on this summary section, once provided in the final Environmental Assessment/Impact Statement.</p>	Interests.		
Kashechewan First Nation	213	<p>“No operational monitoring for acoustic is recommended at this time.”</p> <p>The road will take an area that is entirely remote/rural and introduce road traffic to the area that will displace wildlife and land users. Please indicate and provide specifics on why a noise monitoring program is not warranted to ensure noise levels are not in exceedance of predicted.</p>	<p>The result of the noise residual effects assessment is that there are no significant residual effects and the uncertainty is not considered to be high. Therefore, noise monitoring is not recommended. The magnitude of the net effects from the increased noise from the operation of the road was assessed to be low.</p> <p>However, as stated in Table 9.5-13 (formerly Table 9-36) of the Final EA/IS, during construction of the Community Access Road "a complaint resolution mechanism will be developed by the contractor whereby persons can contact the Project team if there are perceived noise issues." Noise monitoring of perceived noise issues may be carried out as needed as part of the investigation</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	712

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Kashechewan First Nation	214	<p>“At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement this information was not available to summarize. Please refer to Section 8.3.8 for further information. A summary will be provided in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.”</p> <p>KFN will provide comments on this summary section, once provided in the final Environmental Assessment/Impact Statement.</p>	Section 14.3.3 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include a summary of Community Well-Being.	Final EA/IS Section 14.3.3.6	713
Kashechewan First Nation	215	<p>Kashechewan First Nation requests to be informed of ongoing monitoring results (Section 5.4) within their existing conditions report.</p> <p>Please confirm continued notification of ongoing operations and maintenance monitoring results and add to the other commitments section.</p>	As noted in Kashechewan First Nation Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests: Draft Impact Assessment Report, proposed mitigation measures include the collaboration with local existing environmental advisory committees to support the development and implementation of all environmental monitoring programs. The objective is to include Indigenous interests and perspectives, particularly concerning resources utilized for rights-based purposes. In the absence of an existing advisory committee with an aligned mandate to Marten Falls First Nation, a Terms of Reference between relevant agencies and Kashechewan First Nation will be established.	Comment noted; see response for details	714

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Kashechewan First Nation	216	As there is reliance future identification of sites for short-term water discharges, Kashechewan First Nation requires notification of locations, when available, and reporting on ongoing monitoring to ensure surface water quality is not impacted by short-term water discharges.	As noted in Kashechewan First Nation Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests: Draft Impact Assessment Report, proposed mitigation measures include the collaboration with local existing environmental advisory committees to support the development and implementation of all environmental monitoring programs. The objective is to include Indigenous interests and perspectives, particularly concerning resources utilized for rights-based purposes. In the absence of an existing advisory committee with an aligned mandate to Marten Falls First Nation, a Terms of Reference between relevant agencies and Kashechewan First Nation will be established.	Comment noted; see response for details	715
Kashechewan First Nation	217	<p>Draft Surface Water Technical Support Document: Existing Conditions and Effects Assessment, because deposition of fugitive dust could result in changes to surface water quality due to increased concentrations of chemical constituents and suspended solids in the receiving waterbodies.</p> <p>Additional details are required on how the proponent will minimize dust generating activities as these activities have the potential to alter water pH,</p>	Marten Falls will review best management practices recommended by Environment Canada as part of planning for dust control measures during the next phase of the Community Access Road. This will include applying dust suppressants, scheduling activities to reduce exposure during dry or windy conditions, etc. Specific measures will be finalized during detail design.	Comment noted; see response for details	716

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>affecting fish mortality and long-term health.</p> <p>Following provincial guides and regulations are a minimum standard and do not constitute additional mitigation to alleviate the level of effect.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	218	<p>“Chemical vegetation maintenance, including the use of pesticides and herbicides during construction of the Project will be in accordance with the Ministry of Transportation requirements...”</p> <p>Chemical vegetation maintenance is noted within the Kashechewan First Nation Existing Conditions Report as a key concern with 96% of respondents indicating they would not harvest in areas where this has been undertaken. Additional engagement is required in the event of chemical vegetation maintenance usage.</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS has been updated for clarity around use of herbicides. Herbicide use is not planned.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	717
Kashechewan First Nation	219	<p>Predicted Residual Effects</p> <p>When predicted residual effects are identified, descriptions of Direction, Magnitude, Geographic Extent, Duration, Frequency, Reversibility, Probability, Significance and Uncertainty are not</p>	<p>Table 7-5 of Appendix I (Peatlands) provides a summary of the characterization of predicted residual effects and the determination of significance for peatland ecosystems.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	718

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>listed. This makes it difficult to fully understand and assess residual effects. Please update.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	220	<p>Valued Component(s): Peatland Ecosystems                      Project Phase: Construction                      Description of Potential Effect: Changes to peatland ecosystems from the release of sediment                      Predicted Residual Effect: No predicted residual effect</p> <p>As previously described in the EA/IS comments, the Project Area has very little human disturbance. The characteristics of peatlands increase the potential to retain contaminants such as sediment which can impact peatland function. KFN has concerns that there will be residual effects from construction and operation phases due to sediment. Please update accordingly.</p>	<p>As outlined in Section 7.3.1.7.3 of Appendix I Peatlands Technical Support Document, any potential residual effects related to sediment in peatlands are predicted to be localized. Table 7-4 and Section 7.3.1.7.2 of Appendix I list the mitigation measures that will be designed and implemented to address the potential for sediment release during construction. These include a Project-specific Environmental Protection Plan which will be developed by the Owner/Operator during detail design and will recommend adaptive management measures to be implemented, as needed, resulting from monitoring results.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	719
Kashechewan First Nation	221	<p>Valued Component(s): Peatland Ecosystems                      Project Phase: Construction                      Description of Potential Effect: Changes to peatland ecosystems from their spills of fuel or other contaminants                      Predicted Residual Effect: No predicted residual effect</p>	<p>Mitigation measures to address the potential effects from spills of fuel or other contaminants are provided in several technical support documents and sections of the Final EA/IS. Mitigation measures specifically related to spills or releases to peatlands are provided in Tables 7-4 and 10-1 of Appendix I</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	720

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>As previously described in the EA/IS, the Project Area has very little human disturbance. The characteristics of peatlands increase their potential to retain contaminants such as fuel/spills which can impact peatland function. KFN has concerns that there will be residual effects from construction and operation phases due to potential fuel spills.</p>	<p>Peatlands Technical Support Document.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	222	<p>“Prepare and Implement a Vegetation Restoration Plan that includes measures specific to peatland communities and peatland, restoration, including peat stockpile management.”</p> <p>For peatland restoration to be effective, long-term monitoring is required to ensure understanding of restoration outcomes and guide future efforts.</p> <p>How will Marten Falls ensure the future operator of the road will be committed to the necessary monitoring?</p> <p>Additionally, in restoration of peatland, often vascular plants recover quickly while others, such as bryophytes may not recover or recover more slowly. How will Marten Falls ensure recovery to pre-disturbance conditions?</p>	<p>A Vegetation Restoration Plan will be developed by the Owner/Operator during detail design. The Vegetation Restoration Plan will include long-term monitoring and reporting on restoration success measures that will be included as part of the plan. Marten Falls First Nation has made the commitment to develop the Vegetation Restoration Plan and conduct subsequent monitoring.</p> <p>We acknowledge the Northern Road Link and Webequie Supply Road would benefit from a coordinated approach for peatland recovery. Coordination for peatland recovery will be at the direction of the Province.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	721

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Further, there are two other road segments proposed: the Northern Road Link and Webequie Supply Road. Will efforts be coordinated for peatland recover to ensure a whole-system approach is taken as this is essential for conservation and recovery.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	223	<p>“After implementation of the mitigation measures, the effects of direct peatland ecosystem loss on the availability and distribution of peatland ecosystems will be permanent (irreversible) and long term in duration. The effects are certain to occur, and the changes are negative; however, because the loss will be relatively small in extent, the magnitude if considered low. As a result, the residual effects of direct peatland loss on the availability and distribution of peatland ecosystems are determined to be not significant.”</p> <p>KFN disagrees with the characterization of the residual effect to peatland as not significant based solely on a low magnitude. Instead, significance should be characterized using multiple criteria and benchmarks as per the IAAC Practitioner’s Guide. In the case of Peatlands, the minimum rating of</p>	<p>The approach for the assessment of significance is described in Section 4.4.2.6 of Appendix I Peatlands Technical Support Document, and the assessment of significance was informed by magnitude, duration, and geographic extent as the most important factors, along with consideration of context. The amplification of the potential effects with other physical activities was considered in the cumulative effects assessment section, Section 8 of Appendix I.</p> <p>The Northern Road Link and Webequie Supply Road were considered as part of the cumulative effects assessment in Section 8 of Appendix I which acknowledges that residual effects from the three road projects may overlap temporally and spatially within the Local and Regional Study Areas.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	722

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>significance should be of low significance as magnitude is low, but the relative importance and regional context is high. While the effect to Peatlands may be negligible on its own, of which KFN does not agree, it could be amplified with other physical activities impacting the same valued component (i.e., the Northern Road Link and Webequie Supply Road).</p> <p>This must be further explored between Marten Falls First nation and Webequie First Nation to allow for consideration regionally and reassessed within the final EA/IS to identify significance along a scale that allows for consideration of environmental and social conditions.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	224	See ID #722	<p>The approach for the assessment of significance is described in Section 4.4.2.6 of Appendix I Peatlands Technical Support Document, and the assessment of significance was informed by magnitude, duration, and geographic extent as the most important factors, along with consideration of context. The amplification of the potential effects with other physical activities was considered in the cumulative effects assessment section, Section 8 of Appendix I.</p> <p>The Northern Road Link and Webequie</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	723

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>Supply Road were considered as part of the cumulative effects assessment in Section 8 of Appendix I which acknowledges that residual effects from the three road projects may overlap temporally and spatially within the Local and Regional Study Areas.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	225	<p>Construction of the Community Access Road through peatlands also has the potential to alter groundwater quantity and flow, altering the availability of peatlands. Mitigation measures, namely construction of the road using the “floating road” construction methodology and implementation of a monitoring program, are expected to limit residual changes. However, there is uncertainty about the effectiveness of this mitigation and measurable changes to groundwater levels near the road are possible. Changes to peatland ecosystems resulting from changes in groundwater that may alter drainage patterns and increase or decrease groundwater levels are expected to be negative in direction, medium in magnitude, local in geographic extent, long term, continuous, irreversible, and probable. As a result, the residual effects as a result of changes to groundwater on peatland ecosystems are determined to be not</p>	<p>We have reconsidered the significance of changes to peatland ecosystems resulting from changes to groundwater and agree with the comment that the effect should be characterized as ‘significant’, particularly given the high uncertainty in the magnitude of effect on peatlands from this pathway and the primary mitigation approach (i.e. the floating road). Appendix I Peatlands Technical Support Document and the Final EA/IS have been updated with the revised significance rating.</p>	<p>Appendix I Sections 7.3.4 and 8.2.7 Final EA/IS Section 9.3.6</p>	724

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>significant..”</p> <p>The IAAC Practitioner’s Guide includes suggested criteria for characterizing significance along quantitative or qualitative (descriptive) scales. Moderate significance are effects that are moderate in magnitude (this effect includes this rating); moderate duration (this effect is long term and continuous); partially reversible (this effect is irreversible and probable); and has high levels of impact in a social and ecological context.</p> <p>Therefore, this effect should not be categorized as “not significant” rather, of moderate significance with the requirement for additional robust monitoring, coordination with other project partners, and ongoing engagement with KFN.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	226	<p>“As the Project’s Terrestrial Biodiversity Offsetting Plan is developed, it is anticipated that restoration and offsetting measures will contribute to minimizing the long-term residual effects of direct peatland loss on peatland ecosystems. It is assumed that the Northern Road Link project will implement a Terrestrial Biodiversity Offsetting Plan similar to the</p>	<p>1: As stated in Kashechewan First Nation's Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests: Impact Assessment Report, Marten Falls First Nation (MFFN) has proposed to collaborate with local existing environmental advisory committees to support the development and implementation of all environmental monitoring programs. The objective is to</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	725

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>one that will be developed for the Project, as offsetting is a required of the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines for the Northern Road Link project...”</p> <p>First, KFN requires involvement in the development of the Terrestrial Biodiversity Offsetting Plan as peatlands are of particular importance to KFN.</p> <p>Second, Marten Falls should confirm and connect the Offsetting Plans between itself and Webequie First Nation and identify that a coordinated approach will be taken to ensure a regional approach to restoration and management of peatlands. Please confirm this coordinated approach within the final EA/IS or through engagement with KFN.</p>	<p>ensure the inclusion of Indigenous interests and perspectives, particularly concerning resources utilized for rights-based purposes. In the absence of an existing advisory committee with an aligned mandate to MFFN, work with relevant agencies and Indigenous Peoples to establish a Terms of Reference for one.</p> <p>2: MFFN Nation will aim to work with Webequie First Nation to identify areas in which their respective road projects can collaborate on. However, it should be noted that the Community Access Road, the Northern Road Link and the Webequie Supply Road projects are being coordinated and permitted separately; and that MFFN cannot make a commitment on behalf of Webequie First Nation.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	227	<p>Pre-Construction Monitoring Program, Page 433 (PDF Page 457)            “Due to the importance of beavers to Indigenous Communities and the uncertainty with respect to the effect of the Project on populations of furbearers and the fact that there are gaps in the existing conditions data, an additional aerial survey for active beaver lodges will be completed throughout the effects</p>	<p>The wildlife assessment completed for the Community Access Road is adequate for the characterization of Project effects on beaver. A description of how the habitat suitability model was developed is provided in Attachment C (Wildlife Modelling Report) of Appendix K (Wildlife). The incidental observations of beaver lodges were used in the validation of the model. The assessment</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	726

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>assessment Local Study Area to complement existing conditions data and refine the baseline characterization of beaver distribution.”</p> <p>The referenced additional aerial surveys must be completed, assessed, and included in the final EA/IS to allow KFN to adequately consider potential project effects.</p>	<p>of Project impacts on beaver would not be influenced by additional observations from the aerial beaver lodge surveys as there are no gaps in the assessment and the uncertainty for the effects of habitat loss and alteration is low.</p> <p>The intent of the additional beaver aerial survey data is not to update the effects assessment, but to inform monitoring requirements required by the TISG.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the results of the additional aerial survey for beaver lodges will be circulated to Indigenous Communities, government agencies, and stakeholders for review.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	228	<p>“Prepare a Blasting and Communication Management Plan that is in accordance with Ontario Provincial Standard Specifications...”</p> <p>Blasting can disturb and impact wildlife and also has the potential to impact the ability of KFN land users and harvesters to exercise their rights and interests.</p> <p>KFN harvesters and land users have preferred harvesting times and conditions that must be considered in relation to blasting. Further, blasting poses a safety</p>	<p>A Blasting and Communication Management Plan will be shared with Kashechewan First Nation. The development and implementation of the Blasting and Communication Management Plan will, however, be undertaken solely by the future operator/owner of the Community Access Road. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	727

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>concern for KFN members who may be out on the land.</p> <p>Therefore, KFN requires engagement on the development of the Blasting and Communication Management Plan referenced. KFN must also be notified before blasting occurs, with sufficient time to notify members.</p>			
Kashechewan First Nation	229	<p>“The amount of disturbance in the Nipigon range in the existing conditions exceeds the 35% threshold, and the addition of the Project is predicted to increase the level of total disturbance (natural and anthropogenic combined) from 42.9% to 43%.”</p> <p>Given that the current disturbance level already exceeds the identified threshold, KFN requires additional involvement in ongoing management of caribou to ensure mitigation measures prevent increased mortality or habitat loss.</p>	<p>As stated in Kashechewan First Nation's Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests: Impact Assessment Report, Marten Falls First Nation has proposed to collaborate with local existing environmental advisory committees to support the development and implementation of all environmental monitoring programs. The objective is to ensure the inclusion of Indigenous interests and perspectives, particularly concerning resources utilized for rights-based purposes. In the absence of an existing advisory committee with an aligned mandate to Marten Falls First Nation, work with relevant agencies and Indigenous Peoples to establish a Terms of Reference for one.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	728
Kashechewan First Nation	230	Valued Component: Cultural Continuity and Wellbeing (ability to practice and transmit cultural traditions)	Cultural Continuity and Wellbeing is assessed in Appendix O (Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests),	Comment noted; see response for	729

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Changes in access to sites and areas used for traditional activities should be included as an indicator for this Valued Component.</p>	<p>where the indicator for this Valued Component is 'Changes in the experience of being on the land.</p> <p>Changes in access to sites and areas used for traditional purposes is also addressed within the ATRI assessment; this is evaluated under the Valued Component 'Indigenous Current Use of Lands and Resources for Traditional Purposes which uses 'access to culturally important sites and areas as an indicator.</p>	<p>details</p>	
Kashechewan First Nation	231	<p>No residual effects assessment has been completed for Aboriginal and Treaty rights and interests – this prevents a fulsome assessment. Please update with a detailed residual effects assessment in the final EA/IS.</p>	<p>A residual effects assessment for Aboriginal and Treaty Rights and Interests (ATRI) was completed and included in the draft ATRI report, which was shared with Kashechewan First Nation on July 10, 2025. The Final EA/IS and Appendix O (ATRI) have been updated to include a summary of the ATRI assessment.</p> <p>Due to the need to protect Indigenous Knowledge and maintain confidentiality, the summary included in the Final EA/IS and Appendix O (ATRI) provides an overview of the assessment without disclosing community-specific information.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS all ATRI sections Appendix O</p>	730

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Kashechewan First Nation	232	<p>“At the Albany River crossing WA-15, two locations containing archaeological material were identified;...Temporary non-diagnostic artifacts do not help to place the archaeological location within a specific time period or to a particular cultural group.</p> <p>Given the isolated nature of the find, and the lack of temporal or cultural information it provides, Location 1 is concluded to have no further cultural heritage value or interest as the site does meet the criterion identified in Section 2.2, Standard 1a of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011). Therefore, no further work is recommended for Location 1.”</p> <p>The Stage 2 Study Area WA-15 intersects a fishing site identified in KFN’s Existing Conditions Report. As no further work is recommended in the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, KFN requests immediate notification of any new discoveries so that appropriate protocols can be conducted.</p>	Kashechewan First Nation will be notified of any new archaeological discoveries in a timely manner.	Comment noted; see response for details	731
Kashechewan First Nation	233	“Location 2 is a campsite on exposed bedrock adjacent to a fishing location...the campsite retains cultural	Marten Falls First Nation acknowledges Kashechewan First Nation's request to review the Stage 3 Archaeological	Comment noted; see response for	732

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>heritage value or interest. Location 2 has been registered with the MHSTCI as the Caviar (Elip-1) site...it is not yet evident that the level of cultural heritage value or interest may result in a recommendation to proceed to Stage 4 mitigation.”</p> <p>In KFN’s Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment review, KFN stated that “If there is a chance that any site identified by Indigenous groups may be impacted by the Project, they require additional assessment.” The Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment found that Study Area WA-15 Location 2 intersects with a site reported by Indigenous groups. KFN reported a fishing site polygon in KFN’s Existing Conditions Report that intersects this find. Therefore, the finding may have cultural heritage value or interest to KFN, and either avoidance and protection or Stage 4 mitigation is warranted. KFN requires input on Stage 4 mitigation if it is not possible to avoid and protect this site.</p> <p>KFN is interested in reviewing the Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment, contingent upon our capacity.</p>	<p>Assessment. However, currently a Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment is not planned for the Community Access Road.</p>	<p>details.</p>	
Kashechewan First Nation	37	“Implement watering or application of Ontario Ministry of Transportation	Marten Falls will review best management practices recommended by	Comment noted; see	733

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>approved dust suppressants that are environmentally friendly.”</p> <p>Dust suppressants are of concern to Nation as they can potentially impact subsistence vegetation and displace potential land users or harvesters who would otherwise use the area in the exercise of their rights should awareness or evidence of dust suppressants be identified.</p> <p>Additional engagement with KFN is required to ensure proper protocols/situations for usage/deployment.</p>	<p>Environment Canada as part of planning for dust control measures during the next phase of the Community Access Road, including the use approved Ontario Ministry of Transport dust suppressants.</p> <p>Should the Community Access Road EA/IS be approved to proceed, a consultation and engagement program will be established to guide discussions through detail design.</p>	<p>response for details</p>	
Kashechewan First Nation	235	<p>“Enhancement measures focused on improving the regional economy include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contractor should prioritize hiring Marten Falls First Nation and Aroland First Nation members, as well as other Indigenous community members...”</li> </ul> <p>Prioritized hiring methodologies is not mitigation in which there can be measurement of achievement. A target should be set for hiring Nation members in and around the Project Area. Additionally, are there goals or targets as to how neighbouring Nations will be</p>	<p>Neighbouring Nations will be involved in the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Project through targeted hiring, training partnerships, and workforce development initiatives.</p> <p>Specific hiring targets will be established during the next phase of the Community Access Road, once labour needs and workforce availability are better understood.</p> <p>The Final EA/IS outlines foundational measures that are needed to determine targets. These include prioritized hiring</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	734

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		included in the Project construction, operation and maintenance? If yes, please provide detail.	approaches, capacity-building programs, and exploration of funding opportunities to enable meaningful participation by Indigenous communities throughout the project lifecycle.		
Kashechewan First Nation	236	When predicted residual effects are identified, descriptions of Direction, Magnitude, Geographic Extent, Duration, Frequency, Reversibility, Probability, Significance and Uncertainty are not listed. This makes it difficult to fully understand and assess residual effects. Please update.	Appendix T (Community Well-Being) has been updated to include consistent descriptions of Direction, Magnitude, Geographic Extent, Duration, Frequency, Reversibility, Probability, Significance, and Uncertainty.	Appendix T	735
Kashechewan First Nation	237	<p>There is no valued component related to Indigenous rights and/or traditional land use meaning the project’s potential to result in alterations to the visual environment to those experiences / activities were not considered.</p> <p>The connection to land, elements of locationality, and ‘Sense of Place’ are all contributing factors to KFN use and enjoyment while exercising rights on the land.</p> <p>Aesthetics contribute to the perceptions KFN members have on the places where KFN member exercise those rights.</p>	<p>Section 3 (Table 3-1) of Appendix V (Visual) has been revised to incorporate Kashechewan First Nation’s identified cultural heritage values related to the visual environment, as documented through Kashechewan’s First Nation Existing Conditions Report (July 2024). This includes the numerous traditional use areas and the broader sense of place tied to the remote wilderness character of the Study Area.</p> <p>These values have been fully integrated into Section 7 of Appendix V (Visual). Furthermore, a new Valued Component— Cultural Heritage Resources and Indigenous Experience</p>	Final EA/IS Visual sections Appendix V	736

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>The draft EA/IS does not articulate how the perceptions of Indigenous Peoples could change during the construction and operational project phases, or how the rights and interests KFN could be impacted. This must be explored for the Final EA/IS.</p>	<p>and Sense of Place—has been added to ensure that these perspectives are explicitly assessed in relation to visual change (Section 4.2.3 of Appendix V [Visual]). The existing conditions for this Valued Component are described in Section 5.2 of Appendix V (Visual), and the corresponding effects assessment is presented in Section 7 of Appendix V (Visual).</p> <p>Sections 8, 9 and 10 of the Final EA/IS have been updated to incorporate these changes, where applicable.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	238	<p>“Scenic viewpoints are locations that would be more affected by changes in both scenic quality and visibility.”</p> <p>Information from KFN was not included in the effects assessment for this VC.</p> <p>KFN specific scenic quality is different from that of the public and may diverge from conditions required by Marten Falls as connection to land, elements of locationality, and ‘Sense of Place’ are all contributing factors to KFN’s cultural identity.</p> <p>This distinct perspective must be discussed through additional</p>	<p>Section 3 (Table 3-1) of Appendix V (Visual) has been revised to incorporate Kashechewan First Nation’s identified cultural heritage values related to the visual environment, as documented through Kashechewan’s First Nation Existing Conditions Report (July 2024). This includes the numerous traditional use areas and the broader sense of place tied to the remote wilderness character of the Study Area.</p> <p>These values have been fully integrated into the Effects Assessment (Section 7 of Appendix V [Visual]). Furthermore, a new Valued Component— Cultural Heritage Resources and Indigenous Experience</p>	Final EA/IS Visual sections Appendix V	737

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>engagement and incorporated into the Final EA/IS.</p>	<p>and Sense of Place—has been added to ensure that these perspectives are explicitly assessed in relation to visual change (Section 4.2.3 of Appendix V [Visual]). The existing conditions for this Valued Component are described in Section 5.2 of Appendix V (Visual), and the corresponding effects assessment is presented in Section 7.3 of Appendix V (Visual).</p> <p>Sections 8, 9 and 10 of the Final EA/IS have been updated to incorporate these changes, where applicable.</p>		
Kashechewan First Nation	239	<p>“Progressive restoration and revegetation will be implemented as non-permanent features will be decommissioned and restored or left to revegetate naturally.”</p> <p>Additional detail is required on the timescale anticipated for restoration activities as a delay in restoration may result in caribou species habituating to different habitats and areas.</p>	<p>Additional information about the expected timeline for restoration activities has been provided in Section 9.4.7 of the Final EA/IS.</p> <p>The time interval between commencement and completion of any work that disturbs earth surfaces shall be a maximum of 20 calendar days. Commencement of such work shall be considered to have occurred when the original stabilizing ground cover has been removed, including grubbing, or has been covered with fill material. Completion of such work shall be considered to have occurred when the cover material (seed and mulch, seed</p>	Final EA/IS Section 9.4.7.4	738

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Kashechewan First Nation**

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>and erosion control blanket, sod, rip-rap, etc.) has been applied.</p> <p>Where the timing of the operation results in a conflict with the application requirements of the specified cover, the Contractor shall determine appropriate interim measures that afford temporary protection until such a time as final cover can be applied.</p>		