

Appendix C6

Feedback and Response Log - Government Review Team - MECP Environmental Assessment Branch



Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	1	<p>The draft EA does not include a number of sections and appendices as noted below. The draft EA indicates that these will be in the final EA. As such, government reviewers were unable to review and provide comments on these sections/appendices during the draft EA phase that could have been addressed prior to final EA submission. Comments will be provided during the final EA review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sections on existing conditions (s. 8), potential effects and mitigation (s. 9), cumulative effects (s. 10) and commitments & monitoring (s. 14) for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Peatlands o Aboriginal and Treaty Rights and Interests o Community Wellbeing o Visual Environment - Appendix O – ATRI Report - Record of Consultation for Indigenous Communities - Record of Consultation for Government Review Team <p>The approved Terms of Reference for the MFCAR requires that the EA assess effects of the project on the components of the environment listed in the EAA, including natural, social, economic and</p>	<p>Sections 8.1.8, 9.3.5, 10.2.5, 14.1.1.3, 14.2.1.4, 14.3.1.4 and 14.4.1.3 of the Final EA/IS have been updated with the peatlands information. The detailed peatlands assessment is available in Appendix I Peatlands Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Sections 8.3.4, 9.5.2, 10.4.2, 14.1.3.1, 14.2.3.1, 14.3.3.1 and 14.4.3.1 of the Final EA/IS have been updated with the Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests (ATRI) information. A description of the detailed ATRI assessment is available in Appendix O Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Sections 8.3.8, 9.5.6, 10.4.7, 14.1.3.6, 14.2.3.6, 14.3.3.6 and 14.4.3.6 of the Final EA/IS have been updated with the community well-being information. The detailed community well-being assessment is available in Appendix T Community Well-Being Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Section 8.3.10, 9.5.8, 10.4.9, 14.1.3.8, 14.2.3.8, 14.3.3.8 and 14.4.3.8 of the Final EA/IS have been updated with the visual information. The detailed visual assessment is available in Appendix V</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Sections 8.1.8, 9.3.5, 10.2.5, 14.1.1.3, 14.2.1.4, 14.3.1.4 and 14.4.1.3</p> <p>Final EA/IS Sections 8.3.4, 9.5.2, 10.4.2, 14.1.3.1, 14.2.3.1, 14.3.3.1 and 14.4.3.1</p> <p>Final EA/IS Sections 8.3.8, 9.5.6, 10.4.7, 14.1.3.6, 14.2.3.6, 14.3.3.6 and 14.4.3.6</p> <p>Final EA/IS Section 8.3.10, 9.5.8, 10.4.9, 14.1.3.8, 14.2.3.8, 14.3.3.8 and 14.4.3.8</p>	1307

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>cultural environments; for example, Aboriginal and treaty rights and interests, wetlands, community well-being and visual aesthetics (ToR page 73 and Appendix A). The ToR also requires the EA Record of Consultation to “describe engagement and consultation activities undertaken with neighbouring Indigenous communities, government agencies and interested persons” (ToR page 110).</p> <p>For awareness.</p> <p>A. Required for EA as per approved ToR</p>	<p>Visual Environment Technical Support Document.</p> <p>A detailed record of consultation is available in Appendix X Record of Consultation.</p>	<p>Appendix O Appendix X</p>	
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	2	<p>The draft EA does not include a table of the commitments made during the ToR process and how they were addressed in the EA. Rather, the commitments in section 14 and Appendix AA are forward-looking for project implementation and the ToR concordance table in Appendix C provides a high level cross-reference between sections of the ToR and the general section where they are found in the draft EA. Both of these are appropriate and may be able to contribute relevant information for the table, however the separate table of commitments from the ToR phase is also required.</p>	<p>A concordance table of the Terms of Reference for the Community Access Road and the location of the information within the Final EA/IS is provided in Table C2 of Appendix C Concordance Tables.</p>	<p>Appendix C</p>	1318

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>The approved ToR for the MFCAR states: “The EA will include a comprehensive list of environmental commitments made by MFFN during preparation of the ToR and EA process” (p. 76 of ToR; see also pages 77 and 101). Section 9.1.1 of the ToR lists commitments identified during the ToR. As well, any additional commitments the proponent made in its response tables to GRT, public and Indigenous comments should also be included in the ‘commitments from the ToR phase’ table in the EA.</p> <p>The proponent’s response to MECP EA Branch’s comments on the ToR states: “The EA will include a commitments table that will document commitments made during the ToR review” (final ToR response to MECP-5, February 8, 2021).</p> <p>MECP’s Code of Practice: Preparing and Reviewing Terms of Reference for EAs in Ontario (2022), states that “the proponent will include in the terms of reference a statement that the environmental assessment will include a comprehensive list of commitments made by the proponent during the terms of reference process, and where or how they have been dealt with in the</p>			

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>environmental assessment” (section 5.2.8).</p> <p>In the final EA, please include the complete table of commitments made during the ToR process and where they have been addressed in the EA. Please include both:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the commitments in section 9.1.1 of the ToR and - all other commitments made during the ToR process, which are likely mostly found in the proponent’s response tables to comments received on the ToR (e.g. the proponent’s Feb 8, 2021 ToR response table for MECP indicated “Commitment for EA” where applicable). <p>Please include a statement in the EA where to find the table of ToR commitments.</p> <p>Please also include the commitments made during the EA phase that will be carried out during project implementation, should the project receive EAA approval. This is a separate table from the ToR commitments table noted above.</p> <p>A. Required for EA as per approved ToR, response to ToR comment and EA Code</p>			

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		of Practice			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	3	<p>The draft EA does not contain a list of potential permits and approvals that may be required following the EA process. The approved ToR includes the preliminary list of permits and approvals and states that “This list is based on a conceptual level of design, and the final determination of permits and approvals that will be required will occur as the design is defined through the EA process” (ToR page 112).</p> <p>The EA Code of Practice states, “At minimum, the environmental assessment should identify the other approvals required and address how they will be coordinated where possible” (section 3.2.4 of Code).</p> <p>Please include the list of anticipated permits and approvals that will be required for the project following completion of the EA process.</p> <p>A. Required for EA as per approved ToR and EA Code of Practice</p>	A table, similar to Table 13-1 of the Terms of Reference, has been inserted into Appendix AA Summary and Recommendation Tables. The table lists the potential permits and approvals which may be required following the EA process.	Appendix AA	1325
MECP Environmental Assessment	4	The draft EA does not include any flexibility provisions (e.g. amendment procedure/change process) that would	A new section (Section 5.1.6) on the amendment procedure / process has been prepared to be incorporated into	Final EA/IS Section 5.1.6	1329

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Branch		<p>set out a process to follow if changes are required to implement the project post-EA, should the project receive EAA approval.</p> <p>The EA Code of Practice states: “Including an amendment procedure in the environmental assessment may allow a proponent to make minor modifications to the approved undertaking without having to fulfil the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act all over again. Before developing an amendment procedure, the proponent should discuss its merits and requirements with the Project Officer” (section 4.2.5 of Code).</p> <p>The proponent should prepare a process to be followed in respect of any changes to the project, and any changes to how the project is to be carried out that the proponent may wish to make after the EA, should the project receive EAA approval.</p> <p>The proponent is requested to share a draft version of the amendment procedure/change process with MECP EAB for EAB’s review and comment prior to inclusion in the final EA.</p>	<p>the Final EA/IS. The draft version was shared with MECP on December 19, 2025.</p>		

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		A. Required for EA as per approved ToR and EA Code of Practice			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	5	<p>At the end of each of the effects assessment sections for Water, Land and People, there is a determination of significance to each of the valued components (significant or not significant). It appears that these are all based on the significance of potential adverse effects. However, if any potential effects are positive and significant, this should be identified too and specifically noted as a potential positive effect.</p> <p>The approved ToR (page 7) and the EAA (section 17.6) require an evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages to the environment of the project.</p> <p>Please identify potential positive effects in the assessments of significance throughout section 9.</p> <p>A. Required for EA as per the EAA</p>	Section 9.5.6 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to identify the only discipline with potential positive effects which is the community well-being.	Final EA/IS Section 9.5.6	1336
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	6	1. Why isn't the alternative solution of a road listed among the options? The road alternative was introduced in the ToR in the discussion of alternatives alongside the do nothing. It is typical when introducing alternatives to, to list all	<p>1. Section 4.1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include the four alternatives.</p> <p>2. The EA/IS for the Community Access Road was not completed on a final</p>	Final EA/IS Section 4.1	1337

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>alternatives, including the one that ends up being preferred.</p> <p>2. This section of the EA should include a discussion of how alternatives were assessed for gravel pits, construction camps, side roads etc.</p> <p>[We suggest]</p> <p>1. Recommend listing the four options first, then describing why the three other options were rejected.</p> <p>2. The EA should contain a description of other alternatives assessment; for example, location of aggregates, construction camps, potential rest areas etc.</p> <p>1. B. Recommended for EA 2. A. Required for EA as per EA Code of Practice (Jan 2014) Section 3.1 “consider a reasonable range of alternatives”. Discussed in MECP comments on the ToR and proponent responses.</p>	<p>footprint but on two alternative routes. The Terms of Reference require the preliminary study area and description of the existing environment to include each alternative route. Section 4 of the Final EA/IS describes the route selection process, however the resulting selection is not named the final route, but the Preferred Route as it has not been approved by the regulators. The preliminary design of the Community Access Road has not been finalized and feedback received on the Draft EA/IS is informing the preliminary design and has resulted in additional changes, some of which will affect temporary infrastructure. As such, Marten Falls First Nations cannot at this time identify all permanent and temporary infrastructure locations or include a description of range of alternatives considered as these will be identified during detail design phase.</p>		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	7	<p>“The main reasons why Alternative 1 is the least preferred alternative from an engineering point of view include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Constructability of roadway and cost; and - Access to aggregate.” 	<p>The sentence in Section 4.4.3 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to “The main reasons why Alternative 4 is the least preferred alternative from an engineering point of view include [...]”</p>	Final EA/IS Section 4.4.3	1338

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>This sentence says Alternative 1 is least preferred for engineering and cost, however Table 4-7 shows Alternative 1 as most preferred for engineering and costs.</p> <p>Please fix typo as required.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	8	<p>It is assumed that the list in section 4.4.4 is outlining, in plain language, some of the key provincial requirements in the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) for selecting the preferred route. As such, the list should also identify the following requirements as set out in section 17.6(2) of the EAA and section 3.4 of the approved ToR to confirm that these key elements were completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a description of and rationale for the project and alternatives, and - a description of the environment that will be affected or that might reasonably be expected to be affected, directly or indirectly. <p>Please add the bullets below to the list in section 4.4.4. The proponent can change the wording to be more plain language as long as the meaning is the same.</p>	<p>The bullet list of regulatory requirements in Section 4.4.4 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include the two following requirements outlined in The Impact Assessment Act (Government of Canada, 2017a) and Section 3.4 of the Terms of Reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a description of and rationale for the project and alternatives - a description of the environment that will be affected or that might reasonably be expected to be affected, directly or indirectly. 	Section 4.4.4 of the Final EA/IS	1339

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>- a description of and rationale for the project and alternatives, and - a description of the environment that will be affected or that might reasonably be expected to be affected, directly or indirectly.</p> <p>A. Required for EA as per the EAA and approved ToR</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	9	<p>1. Provincial comment period- it would be useful to add “of the EA” to differentiate this from the comment period on the ministry review.</p> <p>2. For the line after “MECP prepares the Ministry Review” its is recommended this is changes to “provincial comment period on Ministry Review” to differentiate it from the EA comment period.</p> <p>3. Federal impact assessment stage (row 3 of the table) shows a submission timeline of March/April 2025- is that still accurate?</p> <p>[We suggest]</p> <p>1. Use language to differentiate the comment periods. 2. Use language to differentiate the comment periods.</p>	<p>1. Table 5-15.1-1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to add "of the EA."</p> <p>2. Table 5-15.1-1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to "provincial comment period on Ministry Review."</p> <p>3. The table timelines in Table 5-15.1-1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to reflect the revised schedule.</p>	Final EA/IS Table 5-15.1-1	1340

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>3. Please check to see whether this submission date is still applicable.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	10	<p>“Marten Falls First Nation strove to... Measures to support this included, but were limited to:”</p> <p>Unclear if there is a typo in “but were limited to.”</p> <p>Please fix typo as required.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>The sentence in Section 6.1.1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated as follows: "Measures to support this included, but were not limited to"</p>	Final EA/IS Section 6.1.1	1341
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	11	<p>Typo: “the that provides”</p> <p>Correct typo</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>The sentence in Section 6.1.1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated as follows: "In support of this, Marten Falls First Nation created an internal Indigenous Knowledge program guide which provides:"</p>	Final EA/IS Section 6.1.1	1342
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	12	<p>The EA states “All temporary infrastructure will either be decommissioned or closed, depending on the infrastructure type.” Is this true? Will all the access roads be closed after the road is operational?</p> <p>Please confirm whether all temporary roads and/or other temporary</p>	<p>Section 6.5.1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated as follows: "All temporary infrastructure will either be decommissioned or closed, depending on the infrastructure type. For example, it is not possible to return a temporary aggregate site to its original condition before construction began. As a result, these locations will be closed in</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	1343

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>infrastructure will be decommissioned and if not, revise the statement to clarify what may remain.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA as per EA Code of Practice S. 3.2</p>	<p>accordance with the requirements of the Aggregate Resources Act (Government of Ontario, 1990b). All other temporary infrastructure, such as construction camps, and temporary roads, will be decommissioned, which includes for example removing all the components of the camp and allowing the area to revegetate naturally".</p>		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	13	<p>Webequie Supply Road is listed twice in the federal project list.</p> <p>Consider removing duplication.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>The duplicated Webequie Supply Road entry has been removed from the list of projects under the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines.</p>	Final EA/IS Section 6.8.2	1344
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	14	<p>The map is missing the Wataynikaneyap Power Phase 1 project. It has the Wataynikaneyap Phase 2 project in the blue lines but the Phase 1 project from Dinorwic to Pickle Lake is missing. The legend incorrectly labels the blue line as both Phase 1 and Phase 2, but only Phase 2 is showing.</p> <p>Also, something in the legend is called "Alienation" and shown in pale yellow on the map. It is not clear what this means as the word "alienation" does not appear elsewhere in the Draft EA or Appendix E (inclusions list).</p>	<p>The legend in Figure 6-1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to "Alienation (lands dedicated to protection) and to include the Wataynikaneyap Phase 1 project.</p> <p>The notes have also been updated to include "Alienation" to refer to lands identified in the Community Based Land Use Plan as areas dedicated to protection and withdrawn from development or disposition. These lands cannot be developed for industrial purposes such as mining, forestry, or infrastructure.</p>	Final EA/IS Figure 6-1	1345

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Please add Wataynikaneyap Phase 1 project to Figure 6 1.</p> <p>Please clarify in the EA or in response to this comment what “Alienation” means on the map.</p> <p>Both of the above also apply to Figure 10-1 on page 776.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	15	<p>“Hammon Reef” in the list of projects should say “Hammond Reef” on page 75.</p> <p>Please fix typo as required.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	The bullet point in Section 6.8.3 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to Hammond Reef Project.	Final EA/IS Section 6.8.3	1346
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	16	<p>In the first row “All-season gravel road,” it would be helpful to identify how many kilometres will be on the Marten Falls First Nation reserve. This information would be helpful for general project understanding and to potentially identify applicable permitting.</p> <p>The draft EA elsewhere identifies how much of the WSR will be on the Webequie First Nation reserve but does not seem to do so for the MFCAR in</p>	<p>Table 7-17.1-1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to "Total length: approximately 184 kilometre, of which 8 kilometre will be within the Marten Falls First Nation reserve".</p> <p>The bullet point on Section 15.1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated as follows: "Approximately 184 kilometre of all-season gravel road, of which 8 kilometre will be within the Marten Falls First Nation reserve."</p>	Final EA/IS Table 7-17.1-1 and Section 15.1	1347

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>terms of the Marten Falls reserve.</p> <p>Please add to Table 7-1 how many kilometres of the road out of the total 184 km will fall within the MFFN reserve boundary. Consider adding same info to section 15.1 (summary of the MFCAR) on page 979.</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	17	<p>Sections 7.2.2 and 7.2.3 should explain that, after EAA approval is granted, the detailed design, construction and operation will proceed in accordance with the EA approval and any conditions of approval (e.g. the approved project design, mitigation measures and all other commitments made during the EA process will be adhered to).</p> <p>It is recommended to add this information to help the reader understand the continuation from the EA to construction/operation and that the proponent is responsible for fulfilling commitments/conditions of the EA.</p> <p>For sections 7.2.2 and 7.2.3, recommend adding something to the effect of: If approval for the Community Access Road is granted under the provincial EAA, the project must be carried out in</p>	<p>The first paragraph of Section 7.2.2 (Detail Design) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to "The design process also known as detail design, typically begins after the conclusion of the planning process. However, it can begin while the project is awaiting a decision from the regulators. It should be noted that if approval for the Community Access Road is granted under the provincial Environmental Assessment Act, the Community Access Road must follow the approval conditions within. This can, for example include the approved project design, mitigation measures and commitments made during the Environmental Assessment process".</p> <p>The first paragraph of Section 7.2.3 (Construction) has been updated to "Construction of a project typically begins</p>	Final EA/IS Sections 7.2.2 and 7.2.3	1348

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>accordance with that approval.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>	<p>after approval has been obtained and the detail design phase is complete. However, in some cases, detail design and construction may overlap and occur simultaneously. The construction approach will be determined early in the detail design phase. It should be noted that if approval for the Community Access Road is granted under the provincial Environmental Assessment Act, the Community Access Road must follow the approval conditions within. This can, for example include mitigation measures to be implemented during construction and commitments made during the Environmental Assessment process”.</p>		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	18	<p>1. Construction is expected to take between 3 and 10 years, with a partial overlap with the planning and design phase. What construction would occur during the planning phase exactly?</p> <p>2. “If a combined detail design and construction model is chosen, construction could start as early as 1 year after the Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement is approved.”- This would be subject to any conditions of approval.</p>	<p>Recommendation 1 Section 7.2.3 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include types of construction that may occur during the planning phase.</p> <p>Recommendation 2 It is noted that construction activities will follow conditions of the approval.</p>	Final EA/IS Section 7.2.3	1351

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>1. Please state examples of what kind of construction could occur during the planning phase (or alternatively, what could not occur).</p> <p>2. Please note that any activities after approval may be subject to conditions of approval first being met.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	19	<p>• “Construct temporary access roads to reach notable locations such as aggregate sites, camps, and road and bridge construction sites”</p> <p>Are the temporary access roads to reach road and bridge construction sites included in the count of temporary access roads for aggregate sites and camps in Table 7-1? Do they represent a separate cleared area of the project footprint or will they be within the 60 m cleared right-of-way? The approved ToR for the MFCAR states that “The description [of the project components] will be sufficiently detailed to identify and assess potential effects of the Project during the Project phases” (p. 15). This information is required so that the full project footprint is described in the EA.</p> <p>Please clarify how many temporary</p>	<p>Temporary access roads to road and bridge construction sites will be determined during detail design, will be restricted to the right-of-way described in Table 7-17.1-1 of the Final EA/IS and are separate from the temporary access roads for aggregate sites and camps. An additional bullet point has been added to Table 7-17.1-1 of the Final EA/IS under All-season gravel road to clarify that temporary access roads related to road and bridge construction sites are included within the right-of-way.</p>	Table 7-17.1-1 of the Final EA/IS	1354

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>access roads will be required to access road and bridge construction sites, and include this figure in Table 7-1 unless already accounted for.</p>			
<p>MECP Environmental Assessment Branch</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>This section refers to permanent aggregate quarries, which could include permanent access roads to these quarries, that would remain after construction. It is not clear from this section or Table 7-1 how much of the project infrastructure will become permanent, aside from the road itself.</p> <p>The proponent’s response to MNR’s comment on the final ToR includes the commitment: “The EA will clearly indicate if access roads associated with the Project will be temporary or permanent and provide associated appropriate water course crossing information” (final ToR response to MNRF-2, February 8, 2021).</p> <p>Please identify in the EA which project components will be temporary and which will be permanent, with appropriate details as necessary.</p> <p>A. Required for EA as per response to ToR comment</p>	<p>A Band Council Resolution for the Community Access Road Preferred Route was issued in August 2024 and geotechnical work could not commence until the winter of 2025. These are key inputs required to be able to advance the design of the Community Access Road, including the location and number of access roads; as well as identifying which aggregate sites will support construction and which will support the maintenance of the Community Access Road.</p> <p>The Final EA / IS was conducted on the Project Study Area as shown on Figure ES 4-1 of the Final EA/IS and which is the most up to date footprint. As stated in Section 6.5.2 of the Final EA/IS, the Project Study Area consists of a corridor area 2.5 km from the centreline. Minor adjustments within the area are generally permissible during detail design. However, any significant deviation beyond it may require additional assessment and regulatory review. It should be noted that there are currently</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	<p>1357</p>

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			no plans for the Preferred Route to be outside the Project Study Area.		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	21	<p>The draft EA states: “It is expected that the existing winter road will no longer be maintained once the Community Access Road is operational and will be left to naturally revegetate.”</p> <p>Would the fate of the existing winter road be in the scope of the MFCAR project? If not, perhaps it is better not to speculate on what the fate of the existing road will be. If it is part of the project, this should be clarified and any potential effects of decommissioning included in the assessment.</p> <p>Please consider removing this statement if it is not confirmed or part of the project. If winter road decommissioning is part of the project, please make it clear and include in the description and assessment.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>	Section 7.2.6 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to remove the fate of the existing winter access road.	Final EA/IS Section 7.2.6	1358
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	22	“As described in Section 6.6, the existing condition in this Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement is described for both route alternatives (Alternative 1 and Alternative 4 as	The statement in Section 6.6 of the Final EA/IS describes the existing conditions for both route alternatives, Alternative 1 and Alternative 4, as outlined in Section 4 of the Final EA/IS. This includes the	Final EA/IS Sections 6.6 and 8	1359

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>discussed in Section 4), and this information was used to inform the selection of a Preferred Route Alternative.”</p> <p>Does the statement above include the ancillary infrastructure alternatives as well as the route alternatives? The ToR requires that the EA describe the existing environment for the undertaking and alternative methods, which includes the ancillary infrastructure (p. 7 of ToR).</p> <p>Please clarify in the EA whether the ToR requirements were met for all alternatives.</p> <p>A. Required for EA as per the EAA and approved ToR</p>	<p>associated supporting infrastructure such as aggregate sites, camps, and laydown areas, which are shown on the maps and accommodated within the wider right-of-way.</p> <p>In accordance with the Terms of Reference (p. 7), the Environmental Assessment (EA) describes the existing environment for the undertaking and for the alternative methods, which includes ancillary infrastructure.</p> <p>The sentence in Section 6.6 in the Final EA/IS has been updated to "The existing conditions in this Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement are described for Alternative 1, Alternative 4 and the ancillary infrastructure associated with each alternative (as discussed in Section 4)".</p> <p>The first paragraph in Section 8 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to "As mentioned in Section 6, environmental studies have been completed to document and assess existing natural, socio-economic and cultural environmental features for both route alternatives and their associated ancillary infrastructure".</p>		

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	23	<p>Marten Falls First Nation (Oji-Cree translation, Wegwajihwana) emphasizes the importance of water, as water is life-giving to the land and all species of life.” Is Wegwajihwana the translation for Marten Falls FN, or is it for water?</p> <p>Please confirm placement of translation is correct.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>The placement of translation is correct. Wegwajihwana is the translation for Marten Falls.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1360
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	24	<p>Some of the “Measures of Change” in the Valued Components of People table (Table 8-53) include not only the measure but also what type of measure is preferred. For example, “road segments that pass through the least amount of mineral claim lands are preferred” for the mining-related indicators. This information on knowing what is considered preferred is very helpful for understanding how the effects assessment was done and how certain decisions were made in the EA.</p> <p>However not all the measures in this table and none of the measures in Tables 8-3 and 8-14 indicate what is a preferred change. Rather they just say the measure is a “change in” habitat availability etc.</p>	<p>The addition of what type of change is preferable has not been added to the tables as this comment is considered recommended.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1361

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>If possible, the VC tables could be enhanced by adding what type of change of the measures was considered preferable for this particular EA. The MECP Code of Practice for Preparing and Reviewing EAs in Ontario (2023) includes principles for clear and transparent documentation that allows the reader to understand the decision-making process with explanations of the rationale for making certain choices (s. 3.1.5 and 3.2.3 of Code).</p> <p>Please consider adding what type of change is preferable for the “Measures of Change” columns in Tables 8-3, 8-14 and 8-53.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	25	<p>Muswbik Tertiary watershed: check spelling of Muswabik.</p> <p>Correct typo.</p>	<p>The third bullet point in Section 8.1.4.1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated as follows: "4GF – Upper Albany – Muswabik Tertiary watershed drains into the main part of the Albany River, which then flows into James Bay".</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 8.1.4.1</p>	1362
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	26	<p>Says “where it applicable”</p> <p>Correct typo.</p>	<p>The editorial error "where applicable" has been updated in Sections 8.1.1, 8.2.1 and 8.3.1 of the Final EA/IS.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Sections 8.1.1, 8.2.1 and 8.3.1</p>	1363

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		C. Editorial			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	27	Says “lage mammals” Correct Typo. C. Editorial	There were three instances in Table 8-13 of the Draft EA/IS were this editorial error was made. The topics column of Table 8.2-1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to "Large Mammals".	Final EA/IS Table 8.2-1	1364
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	28	Says “Indigenous Knowledge shared by Mushkegowuk Council and Kingfisher Lake First Nation included concerns that increased vehicle emissions would to ingestion of contaminants by bird Species at Risk.” Is there a word missing here? Check if text is missing. C. Editorial	The bullet point under the Details column of Table 8.2-1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to "Indigenous Knowledge shared by Mushkegowuk Council and Kingfisher Lake First Nation included concerns ranging from increased vehicle emissions to ingestion of contaminants by bird Species at Risk".	Final EA/IS Table 8.2-1	1365
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	29	Says “The Community also shared Indigenous Knowledge related to the distribution and habitat preferences of other bird species was shared by Marten Falls First Nation for species including Canada jay”. Consider correcting this redundant sentence. C. Editorial	The bullet point under the Details column of Table 8.2-1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to "The Community also shared Indigenous Knowledge related to the distribution and habitat preferences of other bird species for species including Canada jay [...]".	Final EA/IS Table 8.2-1	1366

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	30	<p>Draft EA states “Marten Falls First Nation identified concerns including: Alteration of areas caribou mating areas.”</p> <p>Consider correcting redundancy.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>The bullet point under the Details column of Table 8.2-1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to "Marten Falls First Nation identified concerns including: Alteration of caribou mating areas."</p>	Final EA/IS Table 8.2-1	1367
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	31	<p>The map of the wolverine study area only shows the preferred route, whereas the other study area maps show both route alternatives.</p> <p>Please add the route alternatives to Figure 8-9.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>Figure 8.2-3 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include both Alternative 1 and Alternative 4.</p>	Final EA/IS Figure 8.2-3	1368
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	32	<p>The map of the Birds Study Area is missing the project (i.e. the road alternatives, camps, aggregate etc.) that is found on the other study area maps in this section.</p> <p>Please add the project (roads etc.) to Figure 8-10.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>Figure 8.2-4 (formerly Figure 8-10) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include Alternative 1, Alternative 4 and their associated ancillary infrastructure.</p>	Final EA/IS Figure 8.2-4	1369
MECP Environmental	33	<p>This section does not note the provincial species at risk status of little brown</p>	<p>Section 8.2.5.1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include the federal and</p>	Final EA/IS Section	1370

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Assessment Branch		<p>myotis and northern myotis, which are both listed as endangered. Adding this information would provide important context to the description of these species.</p> <p>Please add the SAR status of endangered to the descriptions of little brown myotis and northern myotis in section 8.2.5.1</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>	provincial Species at Risk designations.	8.2.5.1	
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	34	<p>This section does not note the provincial species at risk status of wolverine, which is listed as threatened. Adding this information would provide important context to the description of this species.</p> <p>The federal status of “special concern” is indicated but not the provincial status.</p> <p>Please add the SAR status of threatened to the description of wolverine in section 8.2.5.2.1</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>	Section 8.2.5.2.1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include the federal and provincial Species at Risk designations.	Final EA/IS Section 8.2.5.2.1	1371
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	35	<p>This section on Grey wolf states “recoded” instead of recorded.</p> <p>Consider correcting typo.</p>	The sentence in Section 8.2.5.3.2 of the Final EA/IS has been updated as follows: "Gray wolf was recorded on 23 of 30 cameras (occurrence rate of 40	Final EA/IS Section 8.2.5.3.2	1372

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		C. Editorial	percent)".		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	36	<p>This section states that Caribou collars are still active as of March 2023. Does this describe the current collaring situation? Why are all collars not yet removed- are they still required for monitoring, or is there another reason?</p> <p>Consider updating this section for the final EA.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA, for reader clarity.</p>	<p>Caribou collars were deployed for three years (2021 to 2024). The Draft EA/IS was written prior to the completion of the three-year baseline caribou monitoring program, and at the time Caribou collars were still active. All Caribou collar data has been used to update the Final EA/IS and the collars are no longer active. The requested edit has not been completed as this comment is considered recommended.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1374
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	37	<p>What was process used to determine alternative locations for aggregate pits? Can a summary be provided, and appendix mentioned if contained in an appendix? Or a reference to a past completed assessment provided?</p> <p>Recommend describing/summarizing the alternatives assessment process for aggregate pits and quarries as well as other infrastructure associated with the project in the Final EA.</p> <p>A. Required for EA. EA Code of Practice and ToR: consider a reasonable range of alternatives. S 6.1 of ToR states:</p>	<p>Potential locations for aggregate pits and quarries, including alternative locations, were identified and assessed through a multi-step investigation to find suitable materials for construction of the Community Access Road. Section 8.2.8.6.1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to detail the location selection process.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 8.2.8.6.1</p>	1375

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>“Alternative methods are the different ways of performing the same activity, which for this Project would be a range of different alignment options of a CAR (i.e., alternative routes) and associated temporary infrastructure for construction.”</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	38	<p>Last sentence says “where it applicable”.</p> <p>Correct typo.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>The editorial error "where applicable" has been updated in Sections 8.1.1, 8.2.1 and 8.3.1 of the Final EA/IS.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Sections 8.1.1, 8.2.1 and 8.3.1</p>	1376
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	39	<p>The bullet for Extractive Resource Industry under the Rationale for Selection column repeats itself:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The Community Access Road has the potential to physically remove land areas with the potential for extraction activities. In addition, changes to land use near the Community Access Road may alter access to existing extractive features.” <p>Remove duplication/typo.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>The repeated bullet point under the Rationale for Selection column of Table 8.3-2 (formerly Table 8-53) of the Final EA/IS has been removed.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Table 8.3-2</p>	1377
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	40	<p>The study areas for the Atmospheric and Community Well-Being environments do not include both alternative road corridors. These maps are in the section describing the existing environment for</p>	<p>The Air Quality Local Study Area on Figure 8.3-4 (formerly Figure 8-54) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include both alternative road corridors.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Figures 8-54 and 8-56</p>	1378

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>all alternatives, before all of the study areas were refined in the later effects assessment of the Preferred Route.</p> <p>Section 6.5.2 of the draft EA defines the Construction Development Areas as inclusive of both alternative road corridors and section 6.6 says existing conditions are described for both Alternative 1 and Alternative 4 to inform the preferred route (pages 61-62 of draft EA).</p> <p>The approved ToR says the preliminary study area and description of the existing environment includes each alternative route (page 27 of ToR).</p> <p>Please include both alternative road corridors in the study area maps on Figures 8-54 and 8-56.</p> <p>A. Required for EA as per approved ToR</p>	<p>The Community Well-Being Local Study Areas (Extraction Industry LSA, Energy and Linear Infrastructure LSA, Recreation and Tourism LSA) shown in Figure 8.3-6 (formerly Figure 8-56) of the Final EA/IS have been updated to include both alternative road corridors.</p>		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	41	<p>Visual Environment Project Study Area and Regional Study Area- this figure is missing and a placeholder has been applied.</p> <p>It is understood that this figure, and other areas where placeholders have been applied, will be included in the final EA.</p>	<p>We appreciate and acknowledge your comment. Figure 8.3-7 are now included.</p>	Final EA/IS Figure 8.3-7	1396

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		A. Required for EA as per approved ToR			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	42	<p>This section states: “Despite some negative impressions, turnips, hay, and potatoes were grown at Marten Falls, and cattle thrived there.” Could a little more detail be provided here about what or who the negative impressions were from? For ex: negative impressions about ability to grow crops on the land?</p> <p>Consider elaborating on this statement for clarity.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>The mention of negative impressions resulted from the following information: A Hudson’s Bay Company clerk at Marten Falls, wrote in 1878-1879 that “M. [Marten] Falls is the poorest place for Country produce that I’ve been stationed at since I entered the Service now almost 20 years.” Despite the individual’s negative impression of Marten Falls’ agricultural yields, turnips, hay, and potatoes were all cultivated at Marten Falls Hudson’s Bay Company post, and cattle thrived in the location. Additional information is provided in in Section 5.4.4 of Appendix Q Cultural Heritage Technical Support Document.</p> <p>As this was the impression of one individual, the sentence in Section 8.3.6.4.4 of the Final EA/IS has been simplified as follow: “Turnips, hay, and potatoes were grown at Marten Falls, and cattle thrived there.”</p>	Final EA/IS Section 8.3.6.4.4	1397
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	43	<p>Is the first bullet about 13 provincial parks accurate?</p> <p>“... there are provincially regulated parks and protected areas within the</p>	Section 8.3.9.3 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to reflect the preferred route will intersect 5.7 ha of the Albany Provincial Park to accommodate a water crossing. No other parks or protected	Final EA/IS Section 8.3.9.3	1399

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Construction Disturbance Area, as noted below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thirteen provincial parks, three Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest, and other areas such as significant ecological areas and designated old-growth forests. • Two provincial parks (Ogoki River and Albany River provincial parks).” <p>Please confirm/correct number of parks in the Construction Disturbance Area as needed.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>areas, as regulated under the Ontario Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves Act, are within the Construction Disturbance Area.</p>		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	44	<p>The maps that show existing conditions for traplines and mining projects do not include both alternative road corridors. These maps are in the section describing the existing environment for all alternatives, before all of the study areas were refined in the later effects assessment of the Preferred Route.</p> <p>The approved ToR says the preliminary study area and description of the existing environment includes each alternative route (page 27 of ToR).</p> <p>Please include both alternative road corridors in the study area maps on Figures 8-66 and 8-67.</p>	<p>Figures 8.3-17 and 8.3-18 (formerly Figures 8-66 and 8-67) of the Final EA/IS have been updated to include both alternative road corridors.</p>	Final EA/IS Figures 8.3-17 and 8.3-18	1400

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		A. Required for EA as per approved ToR			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	45	<p>It would be helpful to indicate that Ontario Regulation 387/04 is made under the Ontario Water Resources Act and that the regulation is called Water Taking and Transfer, for reader understanding, rather than just citing the regulation number alone.</p> <p>Same for Ontario Regulation 63/16 (made under the Environmental Protection Act) and any other references to provincial regulations.</p> <p>Throughout the EA, when citing provincial regulation numbers, please consider adding the regulation name and the legislation that the regulation is made under.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>The bullet point under the "Mitigation and Enhancement Measures" column of Table 9.3-4 (formerly Table 9-6) of the Final EA/IS have been updated as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Water taking will be in compliance with Water Taking and Transfer Ontario Regulation 387/04 under the Ontario Water Resources Act as amended by Ontario Regulation 64/16 (Government of Ontario, 1990c) (pertaining to permits, data and reporting, and water transfers), where applicable, and best industry practices. - Construction water will be discharged in compliance with Water Taking and Transfer Ontario Regulation 387/04 under the Ontario Water Resources Act as amended by Ontario Regulation 64/16 (Government of Ontario, 1990c) or Ontario Regulation 63/16 made under the Environmental Protection Act (Government of Ontario, 1990d), where applicable, and good industry practice. - Short-term water diversions (active or passive) will be carried out in accordance with Water Taking and Transfer Ontario Regulation 387/04 under the Ontario Water Resources Act as amended by 	Final EA/IS Table 9.3-4	1401

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			Ontario Regulation 301/21 (Government of Ontario, 1990c).		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	46	<p>The column Predicted Residual Effect includes “Direct/Indirect” as one of the characteristics for significance in the Surface Water and Atmospheric Residual Effects tables. However, the residual effects tables for other VCs, including fish, groundwater, vegetation, wildlife, birds etc. do not include “Direct/Indirect.”</p> <p>It is noted that Table 6-1 of residual effects characteristics does not include “direct/indirect” among the 9 characteristics (context, direction, magnitude, geographic extent, duration, frequency, reversibility, likelihood, uncertainty).</p> <p>Please revise the residual effects tables to consistently use the same set of residual effects characteristics.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	The technical support documents have been updated to include direct/indirect effects in Table 6.8-1 (formerly Table 6-2) of the Final EA/IS.	Final EA/IS Table 6.8-1	1402
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	47	<p>Statements on whether herbicides will be used appear contradictory throughout the EA.</p> <p>Page 394: “Chemical vegetation maintenance, including the use of</p>	As outlined in Section 7.3.1.2.2 and Table 10-1 of Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document herbicides are not planned for use in riparian areas during construction, operation and maintenance. As outlined	Comment noted; see response for details.	1407

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>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>However, pages 413, 421, 486, 487, 493, 499, 500, 505, 508, 509: “Herbicides will not be used during Construction, Operation and Maintenance”; “Do not use herbicides during future maintenance”; “Use mechanical or manual methods to clear vegetation; herbicide use is not permitted.”</p> <p>Page 456: “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). Note that mechanical removal is the preferred approach, with chemical herbicides being reserved for</p>	<p>in Section 7.3.1.8.2 and Table 77 of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document vegetation management within riparian areas will be completed by mechanical means, except within 10 m of watercourses where vegetation will be removed manually using hand-held equipment (e.g., chain saws) while leaving the undergrowth and duff layer undisturbed to prevent erosion.</p>		

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>situations that cannot be managed any other way. Herbicide use will be restricted around sensitive areas (for example, wetlands).”</p> <p>Please confirm whether herbicides will be used or not during construction and operation/maintenance, and ensure the language in the EA is consistent. Please ensure similar reference to chemicals and pesticides is also consistent.</p> <p>Please also ensure Appendix AA is consistent as there are references to herbicide.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	48	<p>Page 395 says: “The new Community Access Road and waterbody crossings will be designed and constructed in accordance with the Ministry of Natural Resources’ Environmental Guidelines for Access Roads and Water Crossings (Ministry of Natural Resources, 1990).”</p> <p>However, pages xiv, 935 and 937 say: “The Community Access Road will be designed in accordance with the Ontario Ministry of Transportation Roadside Design Manual. In addition, the geometric design criteria used for the</p>	<p>While the Environmental Guidelines for Access Roads and Water Crossings (Ministry of Natural Resources, 1990) provides direction on the construction and maintenance of access roads and water crossings in a forest environment, the Ministry of Transportation Roadside Design Manual (MTO 2020) provides policies, standards, and guidelines for the design of roadside environment (geometric design) adjacent to the road within provincial right of way. Both documents in addition to other resources (best practices from the Transportation</p>	Appendix F Section 7.3.1.9.2	1408

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>design and construction of the Community Access Road will be based on the latest and best practices from the Transportation Association of Canada and Ministry of Transportation of Ontario Design Supplement.”</p> <p>of Transportation Roadside Design Manual. In addition, the geometric design criteria used for the design and construction of the Community Access Road will be based on the latest and best practices from the Transportation Association of Canada and Ministry of Transportation of Ontario Design Supplement.”</p> <p>Please revise text to be consistent regarding what standards the MFCAR will be built to. Please also review Appendix AA for this text as well.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>	<p>Association of Canada and Ministry of Transportation of Ontario Design Supplement) are relevant and would be used for detail design and to comply with requirements of regulatory authorities.</p> <p>Section 7.3.1.9.2 of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document has been updated to clarify that the geometric design of the Community Access Road will follow Ontario Ministry of Transportation Road Design Manual (Ontario Ministry of Transportation, 2020) and best management practices from the Transportation Association of Canada and Ministry of Transportation of Ontario Design Supplement.</p>		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	49	<p>The top of page 399 says “a total of 45 waterbodies are crossed by the Preferred Route,” however in the 2nd paragraph it says “Northern Pike are present at 51 waterbody crossings.”</p> <p>If there are 45 crossings total, how are Northern Pike present at 51 of them? Is</p>	Northern Pike are present at 34 crossings. The Final EA/IS has been updated to include the correct numbers.	Final EA/IS Section 9.3.3.1. Fish and Fish Habitat, Refined Existing Conditions	1409

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>this including crossings of temporary access roads? If so this should be more clear.</p> <p>Please confirm number of crossings and/or number of Northern Pike present at crossings.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>		Information	
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	50	<p>It is not explained why the residual effects for some of the characteristics say “not applicable.”</p> <p>Also it is not clear why the two characteristics “Context” and “Direct/Indirect” are not included, since both of these were included in the surface water table under each row for the Residual Effects column (Table 9-6). Context is defined in Table 6-1 as a residual effect characteristic.</p> <p>Please clarify why some of the residual effects are “not applicable” and why Context and Direct/Indirect is not included in Table 9-10.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	Table 9.3-7 (formerly Table 9-10) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include "Context" and "Direction".	Final EA/IS Table 9.3-7 (formerly Table 9-10)	1410
MECP Environmental	51	The last two rows on page 415 are identical except for the last column on	Table 9.3-7 (formerly Table 9-10) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to remove	Final EA/IS Table 9.3-7	1411

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Assessment Branch		<p>residual effects.</p> <p>Please correct the duplicated rows and confirm which column entry for “residual effects” is correct.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>the duplicated row and the correct information under the "Residual Effects" column.</p>		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	52	<p>The first two rows on page 416 are identical except for the last column on residual effects.</p> <p>Please correct the duplicated rows and confirm which column entry for “residual effects” is correct.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>Table 9.3-7 (formerly Table 9-10) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to remove the duplicated row and the correct information under the "Residual Effects" column.</p>	Final EA/IS Table 9.3-7	1412
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	53	<p>The last row on page 416 and first row on page 417 are identical except for the last column on residual effects.</p> <p>Please correct the duplicated rows and confirm which column entry for “residual effects” is correct.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>Table 9.3-7 (formerly Table 9-10) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to remove the duplicated row and the correct information under the "Residual Effects" column.</p>	Final EA/IS Table 9.3-7	1413
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	54	<p>The last two rows on page 417 are identical except for the last column on residual effects.</p>	<p>Table 9.3-7 (formerly Table 9-10) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to remove the duplicated row and the correct information under the "Residual Effects"</p>	Final EA/IS Table 9.3-7	1414

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Please correct the duplicated rows and confirm which column entry for “residual effects” is correct.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>column.</p>		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	55	<p>It is not understood how blasting rock during construction and operation doesn't have any negative residual effects, as the description of potential effect states: “blasting related injuries or mortality to fish”. Would a residual effect not be potential injury or death of fish?</p> <p>Please consider providing more information why blasting rock is not considered to have negative residual effects.</p> <p>Recommended for EA</p>	<p>The assessment related to blasting effects on fish is provided in Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document and includes mitigation measures that will be employed including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use explosives only if alternate methods of excavation to remove materials for foundation systems and roads are not feasible; • Complete blasting near fish-bearing waterbodies outside the proposed restricted activity timing window for all blasting operations; • Prepare and implement a Blasting and Communication Management Plan that is in accordance with Ontario Provincial Standard Specification General Specifications for the Use of Explosives (OPSS, 2014) and describes specific measures that would be implemented if blasting is required; and • For blasting operations, follow the overpressure and vibration guidelines outlined in the Ontario Provincial Standard Specification General 	Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document	1415

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>Specifications for the Use of Explosives (OPSS, 2014) and Guidelines for the Use of Explosives in or Near Canadian Fisheries Waters (Wright and Hopky, 1998).</p> <p>As mitigation measures to protect fish and fish habitat will be followed by the Project, blasting is predicted to result in no residual effect on fish or fish habitat quantity and quality. The Final EA/IS includes assessment related to blasting effects on fish and fish habitat in Appendix G.</p>		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	56	<p>It is unclear why effects to groundwater and geochemistry was deemed not significant, even though the text appears to say that the definition for significant was met. These paragraphs say that the effects were both high magnitude but not high magnitude; long-term duration but not long-term duration; and extended beyond the construction area out to the LSA but did not have any geographic extent. These statements are confusing.</p> <p>“The magnitude of the predicted residual effects on groundwater are medium to high in magnitude, range from medium-term to long-term in duration, are reversible and irreversible, and are</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 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the Groundwater and Geochemistry in Appendix H Groundwater and Geochemistry Technical Support Document. Refer to Appendix H for the significance assessment completed for the Community Access Road.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	1416

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>confined to the Local Study Area in geographic extent.</p> <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, and at any geographic extent and they do not represent a substantial management concern.”</p> <p>The EA Code of Practice includes principles for clear and transparent documentation that allows the reader to understand the decision-making process with explanations of the rationale for making certain choices (s. 3.1.5 and 3.2.3 of Code).</p> <p>Please reword section 9.3.6.4 to be more clear as to how the groundwater and geochemistry valued components are not predicted to be significantly impacted, using the metrics in the preceding tables.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	57	Under Designated areas, three provincial parks are said to be located within the regional study area.	Section 8.2.4.6 of the Final EA/IS clarifies that Albany River, Ogoki River and Little Current River Provincial Parks are located within the regional study area	Comment noted; see response for details.	1417

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Please consider naming the three parks located within the Regional Study area in this section for clarity, and specify that only Albany River PP will be directly affected under the context subtitle in the predicted residual effects column.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>and only Albany River Provincial Park is located within the local study area.</p>		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	58	<p>Page 452 states: “Context: Only Species at Risk plant (Black Ash) is known to be present in the effects assessment Local Study Area.”</p> <p>However, page 449 seems to say Black Ash is not present in the area: “If Schedule 1 of Ontario Regulation 6/24 has been updated to include the area of the Project, a search for Black Ash trees shall be completed at the Ogoki River crossing.”</p> <p>Please clarify these two statements for consistency as to whether Black Ash is present in the project area and may be impacted by the project.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>As noted in Section 7.3.2.2.4 of Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document, one occurrence of Black Ash has been confirmed within the Construction Disturbance Area in the vicinity of the Ogoki River crossing.</p> <p>Potential effects to Black Ash were assess based on suitable habitat as outlined in Section 7.3.1.1.4 of Appendix J.</p> <p>A targeted search for Black Ash was not feasible given the size of the study area, however, should Ontario Regulation 6/24 be updated to include the Community Access Road, targeted searches for Black Ash will be undertaken during future phases to specifically document locations of Black Ash within the Construction Disturbance Area.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1418
MECP	59	The text on pages 457, 458, 477, 541	The Final EA/IS and appendices have	Final EA/IS:	1419

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Environmental Assessment Branch		<p>and 618 saying “Ontario Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act,” “provincial Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Act” and “Ontario Environment Act” are incorrect. They seem to potentially refer to Manitoba legislation.</p> <p>It appears they should say Ontario Dangerous Goods Transportation Act and Ontario Environmental Protection Act.</p> <p>Please correct the names of the two Ontario acts in all instances they are mentioned in the EA including appendices.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>been updated to reference the correct Ontario acts.</p>	<p>throughout the document, where applicable.</p>	
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	60	<p>The first row under the Predicted Residual Effect column only says “Net residual effect” and does not include the full list of characteristics – context, direction, magnitude etc.</p> <p>Please add any missing text in the first row, last column of page 479. This is also found on pages 481, 487, 490, 493, 503, 507, 634 and potentially others.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>Table 9.4-9 (formerly Table 9-22) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include the full list of characteristics (i.e., environmental assessment criteria).</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Table 9.4-9</p>	1420

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	61	<p>The first row on page 481 says “the Ministry of Natural Resources Species at Risk Branch.” The Species at Risk Branch is in the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks. Unclear if this should refer to both MNR and MECP’s SAR Branch.</p> <p>Please correct ministry name.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>The reference in Table 9.4-9 (formerly Table 9-22) of the Final EA/IS has been changed to "Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks Species at Risk Branch".</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Table 9.4-9</p>	<p>1421</p>
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	62	<p>The references to cumulative effects study area in the last column are out of place. This table is to describe potential effects of the MFCAR project on the valued components, using the construction disturbance, local and regional study areas as defined in the EA for the MFCAR. Discussion of potential cumulative effects should be in the cumulative effects section of the EA.</p> <p>Please move reference to cumulative effects from the effects assessment for the MFCAR to the cumulative effects assessment section or otherwise revise as needed so that the effects assessment of the project (aside from the cumulative effects assessment) is focused on the MFCAR.</p>	<p>Table 9.4.-12 (formerly Table 9-25) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to focus the information on residual effects.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Table 9.4-12</p>	<p>1423</p>

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		A. Required for EA as per approved ToR			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	63	<p>The following text from the 2nd row, last column is out of place: “Irreversible (operation of the Project, the Northern Road Link, and upgraded Anaconda and Painter Lake forestry roads)”</p> <p>As the draft EA is for the MFCAR project and this table in particular is about describing the potential effects of the MFCAR, should reference to these other proposed projects be moved to the cumulative effects assessment section?</p> <p>As per the approved ToR, the assessment methodology is to identify potential effects and residual effects of the project first, then later on to conduct the cumulative effects assessment considering other projects (page 72 of ToR).</p> <p>Please move reference to the NRL and Anaconda and Painter Lake roads from the effects assessment for the MFCAR to the cumulative effects assessment section or otherwise revise as needed so that the effects assessment of the project (aside from the cumulative effects assessment) is focused on the MFCAR.</p>	Table 9-25 of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document has been updated to remove reference to the Northern Road Link and upgraded Anaconda and Painter Lake forestry roads.	Table 9-25 of Appendix L	1424

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		A. Required for EA as per approved ToR			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	64	<p>The Wilson’s Snipe and Mallard rows in Table 9-25 do not include the potential effect “Survival and Reproduction,” which is an indicator on page 525 due to these birds being targeted species for hunting.</p> <p>Please consider the need to add survival and reproduction as potential effects in Table 9-25 for these species.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	Table 9-25 of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document has been updated to include survival and reproduction as potential effects for Wilson's Snipe and Mallard.	Appendix L Table 9-25	1426
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	65	<p>There is a typo in the following statement on pages 575 and 576:</p> <p>“Context: Chimney swift and bank swallow are Threatened under Schedule 1 of Species at Risk Act and the Endangered Species Act. Bank swallow is Special Concern under Schedule 1 of Species at Risk Act and the Endangered Species Act.”</p> <p>Please confirm whether the 2nd bank swallow should say barn swallow.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>The sentence in Table 9.4-12 (formerly Table 9-25) has been updated as follows:</p> <p>“Context: Chimney swift and bank swallow are Threatened under Schedule 1 of Species at Risk Act and the Endangered Species Act. Barn swallow is Special Concern under Schedule 1 of Species at Risk Act and the Endangered Species Act.”</p>	Final EA/IS Table 9.4-12	1430
MECP	66	For both rows on page 615, the last	The incorrect information has been	Final EA/IS	1432

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Environmental Assessment Branch		<p>column says, “Magnitude: Changes to groundwater quantity from dewatering of pits... can affect bird habitat availability and distribution.” However this table is for caribou and moose.</p> <p>Please fix typo.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>removed from Table 9.4-14 (formerly Table 9-27) of the Final EA/IS.</p>	<p>Table 9.4-14</p>	
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	67	<p>The last bullet in the Mitigation column on both pages 631 and 650 appears to be pasted in error: “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>Please fix typo</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>The incorrect bullet points regarding predator access has been removed from Table 9.4-14 (formerly Table 9-27) of the Final EA/IS.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Table 9.4-14</p>	1433
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	68	<p>In the 2nd row on page 695, the residual noise effect for operation of the road says the effect is reversible. Since the road will be continuously operated and used by cars and trucks, it is not clear how this effect is reversible.</p> <p>Also, the magnitude says “Low/High” and frequency says “Frequent/Infrequent.” Is</p>	<p>Table 9.5-13 (formerly 9-36) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to clarify that the use of two ratings for magnitude and frequency are related to "road / quarry" as outlined in the Predicted Residual Effect column.</p> <p>Reversibility of noise during Operations is described in Section 7.3.2.2 of</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Table 9.5-13 (formerly 9-36)</p>	1434

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>this intentional or is there meant to be a selection between low/high and frequent/infrequent?</p> <p>Please consider whether noise effects from the road being operational are actually reversible, and if so please provide rationale. Please also review the text for magnitude and frequency.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>Appendix P Acoustic and Vibration Environment Technical Support Document.</p>		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	69	<p>The table “Project-Environment Interactions” for the Atmospheric Environment appears to be missing. These tables have been provided for the other VCs in section 9 up to this point (appearing prior to the “Residual Effects” tables).</p> <p>Please review if the “Project-Environment Interactions” for the Atmospheric Environment is missing.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>	<p>Table 4-8 in Appendix S Atmospheric Technical Support Document contains project-environment interactions for air quality.</p>	Appendix S	1436
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	70	<p>The rows for “quarry blasting” and “blasting” on pages 708-709 say the geographic extent of residual effects is 12,250 metres (12.25 km). It is not clear if this distance is from the road centreline, outer edge of the LSA or</p>	<p>The effects of quarry blasting and road blasting were modelled using AERMOD. The distances included within Table 7-1 are from the centre of respective sources.</p>	Appendix S Table 7-1	1445

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>something else, and if this means that potential effects would go beyond the LSA. Page 698 says that air quality “effects are not expected beyond the Local Study Area.”</p> <p>The LSA is understood to be just over 10 km wide for Atmospheric (Construction Disturbance Area plus a 5 km buffer - page 104).</p> <p>Please clarify if potential atmospheric effects are expected to go beyond the LSA; if so, please revise the study areas information on page 698 as required.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>Table 7-1 has been revised in the Appendix S Atmospheric Environment Technical Support Document. In the case where defined thresholds were predicted to occur past the modelling domain, they have been indicated in Table 7-1 as EDM = Exceeds Modelling Domain.</p>		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	71	<p>The only row for project activities for the Operation phase is “Tailpipe emissions of diesel-powered equipment.” This implies construction equipment, but what about regular vehicle (car and truck) traffic that will be using the road?</p> <p>How is regular car and truck traffic accounted for as a project activity and description of effects in Table 9-39? And is Table 9-40 just for diesel-powered equipment or also for cars and trucks under expected operational conditions?</p>	<p>Section 4.4.3 in Appendix S states: “Vehicle emissions of relevant air contaminants were estimated using the United States Environmental Protection Agency’s Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator model. A county-level Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator run was conducted using the “emission rates” mode to obtain appropriate rate-per-distance emission factors of relevant contaminants. For this assessment, emission factors were developed for auto traffic, medium trucks, and heavy trucks. Table 4 12 below summarizes key Motor</p>	Appendix S	1447

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		B. Recommended for EA	<p>Vehicle Emission Simulator parameters for the “emission rates” run for the operation phase.”</p> <p>Section 4.4.3 in Appendix S also states: "Fleet data sets included within MOVES only include those of US counties. As such the Niagara County was selected as it borders Canada, and while geographically it may vary from the MFFN location it is anticipated to be representative. MOVES was run in "Emission Rate" mode, therefore the county selection only affects the default fuel input (i.e., fuel formulation). Fuel formulas in Ontario and Niagara are expected to be similar due to Clean Fuel Regulations in Canada and US. Other county-default inputs, such as VMT and average speed distribution, were not used in the emission rate run as these parameters were based on site-specific data."</p>		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	72	The section on Archaeological and Cultural Heritage is missing an introduction narrative for the valued component that is otherwise found in the other VCs. It is also missing the table “Project-Environment Interactions,” which is otherwise found in most other VC sections in section 9.	An introduction narrative for the valued component Archaeological and Cultural Heritage and table "Project-Environmental Interactions" have been added to Section 9 of the Final EA/IS.	Final EA/IS Section 9	1448

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Please review if there is an introductory narrative missing and if the “Project-Environment Interactions” table is missing for Archaeological and Cultural Heritage.</p> <p>B. Recommended EA</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	73	<p>Table 9-46 says “Not applicable” for the description of the Local Study Area, which is confusing due to a lack of rationale and the fact that the Land & Resource Use Technical Supporting Document (Appendix U) refers to the different LSAs throughout the document (e.g. Table 7-1 describes the LSAs and RSAs for the effects assessment).</p> <p>The same table as 9-46 also appears in Appendix U (as Table 6-1) but similarly does not provide rationale for why LSA is not defined, despite the LSAs then being described for each VC in the subsequent sections of the appendix.</p> <p>Please provide rationale for why LSA is “not applicable” in Table 9-46 and in Appendix U, or revise the text.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>	Section 9.5.7 of the Final EA/IS and Table 6-1 of Appendix U Land and Resource Use Technical Support Document have been updated to provide additional description on how the Local and Regional Study Areas were investigated.	Final EA/IS Section 9.5.7 Appendix U Table 6-1	1449

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	74	<p>The table “Project-Environment Interactions” for the Land and Resource Use section appears to be missing. These tables have been provided for most of the other VCs in section 9 (appearing prior to the “Residual Effects” tables).</p> <p>Please review if the “Project-Environment Interactions” for the Land and Resource Use section is missing.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>	The table has been added to Section 9.5.7 of the Final EA/IS.	Final EA/IS Section 9.5.7	1454
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	75	<p>The title of Table 9-48 says “Summary of Residual Effects for Acoustic Environment” – however this is the Land and Resource Use section.</p> <p>Please correct the title of Table 9-48.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	The title of the table has been updated to “Summary of Residual Effects for Land and Resource Use”	Final EA/IS Section 9	1451
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	76	<p>“Using the overall residual effects characteristics for each discipline, each of the potential residual effects was assigned a significance level as a means of ranking the potential effects on the surface water quantity, surface water quality, and sediment quality.”</p> <p>This is a typo and should refer to the</p>	Section 9.5.9.1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include the ranking of potential effects on land and resource use.	Final EA/IS Section 9.5.9.1	1456

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Land and Resource Use valued components.</p> <p>Please fix typo.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	77	<p>This section does not speak to the ToR Notice of Approval requirements for the cumulative effects assessment, in particular amendments 1.2 and 1.3 (consideration of cumulative effects assessments for the WSR and NRL and consideration of the federal Regional Assessment, if any of the above are available at time of EA preparation). It is acknowledged that this information was not available at the time of the MFCAR draft EA preparation, but it would be helpful to acknowledge that these requirements will be fulfilled in the final EA to the extent possible.</p> <p>The draft EA does acknowledge, in section 11, amendments 1.1 and 1.4 of the ToR Notice of Approval regarding consultation on the cumulative effects assessment and how the final EA will fulfill those requirements, as well as an interim summary of related consultation to date, which is appreciated.</p>	<p>Section 6.8.2 of the Final EA/IS outlines that Regional Assessment, where applicable would be included in the cumulative effects assessment, however, at the time of issuing of the Final EA/IS there was not sufficient publicly available information on the Regional Assessment for it to be considered in the cumulative effects assessment. The Project Inclusion List for the cumulative effects assessment is provided in Table 10.1-1 (formerly Table 10-1) and includes the Northern Road Link (NRL) and the Webequie Supply Road (WSR).</p> <p>Section 11.8.1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include information relating to how the Terms of Reference Notice of Approval requirements for cumulative effects have been addressed.</p>	Final EA/IS Section 11.8.1	1459

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>In the final EA, please add a description of how all of the ToR Notice of Approval requirements for cumulative effects have been addressed. This would include incorporating any relevant information or explaining that such information was not available, as per the Notice of Approval.</p> <p>A. Required for EA as per ToR Notice of Approval</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	78	<p>Please check for minor typos in the table, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Neskantage” (on pages 755, 778, 790) - Rapid Lynx – says Phase 1 is complete but construction of Phase 1 will overlap with MFCAR? - Noront as developer for Transload Facility – should this be Wyloo? - “Wataynikeneyap” (on pages 71, 75, 758, 879, 906) - Eagle’s Nest row – “Terms of Reference amendment for the project approved June 18, 2015” – remove “amendment” as it was the Terms of Reference that was approved (on pages 756, 790) - Gull Bay Roads rehabilitation row – “Infrastructure Ontario issued its Notice of Determination on July 15, 2021, and determined that the project is not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects” – this is incorrect as 	Table 10.1-1 (formerly Table 10-1) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to correct the editorial edits requested.	Final EA/IS Table 10.1-1	1461

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Infrastructure Ontario did not issue this notice as this is a federal notice (on pages 757, 791) - New Osnaburgh Water Treatment Plant Upgrades row – “Infrastructure Ontario issued its Notice of Determination on October 16, 2023, and determined that the project is not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects” – this is incorrect as Infrastructure Ontario did not issue this notice as this is a federal notice (on page 765)</p> <p>Please review table for typos.</p> <p>For Gull Bay road, please review the federal registry for this project and correct the wording: https://iaac-aeic.gc.ca/050/evaluations/proj/80744</p> <p>For New Osnaburgh Water Treatment Plant Upgrades, please review the federal registry for this project and correct the wording: https://iaac-aeic.gc.ca/050/evaluations/proj/82990</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>			
MECP	79	Noront transload facility- was this	The Noront transload facility is a	Comment	1462

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Environmental Assessment Branch		<p>proposed as part of the Eagle’s Nest Mine? Or is this a standalone project?</p> <p>The proponent should confirm that this is a standalone project and not part of the Eagle’s Nest Mine, and update status of the project for the final EA.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>	<p>standalone project and is not part of the Eagle's Nest Mine. As such, it is listed as a separate project in the project inclusions list.</p>	<p>noted; see response for details.</p>	
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	80	<p>The symbology and locations for the Northern Road Link, Anaconda-Painter Lake Road and Rapid Lynx Broadband Project are inconsistent between Figures 10-2 and 10-3.</p> <p>Please review symbology for consistency.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>Figure 10.2-1 (formerly Figures 10-2 and 10-3) of the Final EA/IS have been updated to correct inconsistencies.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Figure 10.2-1</p>	1465
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	81	<p>spelling error “tis” not expected.</p> <p>Correct typo</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>The sentence in Section 10.3.2.1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to "The contribution of the Community Access Road and other reasonably foreseeable developments to cumulative residual effects on vegetation valued components in the Cumulative Effects Assessment Area is not expected to change the self-sustaining and ecologically effective status of vegetation valued components".</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 10.3.2.1</p>	1467

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	82	<p>Cumulative effects on vegetation are shown on Figure 10-5 to Figure 10-7, however these maps are missing one of the four projects that are listed in Table 10-6 for inclusion in the vegetation cumulative effects assessment – Ogoki Forest Management Plans.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please review maps for missing project and revise as required.</p>	<p>Mapping of Forest Management Units (FMU) does not provide an accurate representation of forestry impacts at specific points in time, therefore, FMU areas were not included in the cumulative effects assessment. Instead, a qualitative assessment of forestry impacts was used for the cumulative effects assessment.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1468
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	83	<p>“For all wildlife valued components except wolverine, the cumulative effects assessment considered the effects of three reasonably foreseeable developments in addition to the Project in the wildlife effects assessment Regional Study Area. For wolverine, the cumulative effects assessment considered the effects of nine reasonably foreseeable developments in addition to the Project in the wolverine effects assessment Regional Study Area.”</p> <p>It is not clear why this says 3 projects were considered when Table 10-6 lists 19 projects that overlap with the MFCAR project.</p> <p>Also, what are these 3 projects and 9 projects for wildlife and wolverine, respectively?</p> <p>Similarly, why does Figure 10-8 only</p>	<p>Three reasonably foreseeable developments (RFDs) were considered in the cumulative effects assessment for all wildlife Valued Components with the exception of wolverine. Due to the large home ranges occupied by wolverine, a larger Regional Study Area was assessed for this species. The larger study area for wolverine encompasses additional reasonably foreseeable developments. Nineteen projects within the wolverine Regional Study Area were identified. However, not all of the nineteen projects were carried to the cumulative effects assessment. Table 8-3 in Section 8.1.3 of Appendix K: Wildlife Technical Support Document indicates which RFDs were included in the assessment of cumulative effects on the wildlife and wolverine VCs. The rationale</p>	<p>Table 10.3-2, Section 10.3.3 and Figure 10.3-4 of the Final EA/IS</p>	1466

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>show 5 projects from the project inclusions list for wolverine, when the text above says 9 projects were considered for the wolverine cumulative effects assessment?</p> <p>Recommendation: Please clarify and provide rationale for why this says that only 3 projects were considered for the wildlife cumulative effects assessment. Please explain which reasonably foreseeable projects were considered, if not all those listed in Table 10-6. Please explain why Figure 10-8 only shows 5 reasonably foreseeable projects, rather than 9 for wolverine.</p>	<p>for excluding certain RFDs is that they are to occur in areas that are disturbed by current activities (e.g., Gull Bay Roads Rehabilitation, Kasabonika Lake First Nation Band Representative Facility) and are not expected to result in additional impacts to wolverine compared to existing conditions.</p> <p>In addition to the Project, eleven RFDs were included in the assessment of cumulative effects for wolverine. Ten of these are shown on Figure 8-1 of Appendix K. The Ogoki Forest Management Plan was not illustrated on Figure 8-1 because no harvest footprints were available. The Ogoki Forest Management Plan was included in the cumulative effects assessment but not in quantitative calculations of habitat loss; rather, in a qualitative discussion about habitat loss.</p> <p>Table 10.3-2 (formerly Table 10-6) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to indicate which projects are included in the CEAs for wildlife and wolverine. Section 10.3.3 and Figure Figure 10.3-4 (formerly 10-8) of the Final EA/IS has also been updated to indicate the correct number of projects considered for the CEA.</p>		

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	84	<p>It is not clear from the purple colouring if the Eagle’s Nest mine is shown on Figures 10-9 to 10-14. This is one of the reasonably foreseeable projects included for the ungulates cumulative effects assessment.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please clarify if the Eagle’s Nest project is on Figures 10-9 to 10-14. If not, please add to the maps.</p>	<p>Eagle's Nest Mine has been included in the cumulative effects assessment as outlined in the Table 10.1-1 (formerly Table 10-1) Project Inclusion List and on Figure 10.1-1 (formerly Figure 10-1) of the Final EA/IS. Eagle's Nest Mine is also included an anticipated anthropogenic disturbance on Figure 10.3-6 (formerly Figure 10-9) and as a reasonably foreseeable developments on Figure 10.3-11 (formerly Figure 10-14).</p>	<p>Final EA / IS Table 10.1-1, Figures 10.1-1, 10.3-6 and 10.3-11</p>	1464
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	85	<p>The rows for caribou and moose for the summary of predicted cumulative effects for land disciplines say “placeholder,” however the sections above that describe the cumulative effects for caribou and moose (s. 10.3.5) seem to have this information.</p> <p>It is noted that Table 10-10 (summary of cumulative effects for People) also includes a number of placeholders that will be filled in for the final EA.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please fill in the placeholders in Table 10-7.</p>	<p>Table 10.3-3 (formerly Table 10-7) of the Final EA/IS has been updated with the associated moose and caribou information.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Table 10.3-3</p>	1460
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	85	<p>The rows for caribou and moose for the summary of predicted cumulative effects for land disciplines say “placeholder,” however the sections above that</p>	<p>Table 10.3-2 (formerly Table 10-7) of the Final EA/IS has been updated with the associated moose and caribou information.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Table 10-7</p>	1463

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>describe the cumulative effects for caribou and moose (s. 10.3.5) seem to have this information.</p> <p>It is noted that Table 10-10 (summary of cumulative effects for People) also includes a number of placeholders that will be filled in for the final EA.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please fill in the placeholders in Table 10-7.</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	86	<p>Placeholders are present for ATRI, Air Quality, Community Well Being, Land and Resource Use, and Visual' predicted cumulative effects.</p> <p>Recommendation: This information should be included in the final EA.</p>	The Final EA/IS has been updated to include content for Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests, Air Quality, Community Well-Being, Land and Resource Use and Visual Environment.	Final EA/IS Section 10	1458
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	87	<p>The first paragraph on this page talks about a highlight of consultation then goes on to list several achievements. The final achievement listed is "ultimately getting a Band Council Resolution for the preferred Route from Marten Falls First Nation" (MFFN). As MFFN is the proponent, I question the grouping of these highlights under the same section. While I understand that consultation with MFFN for this project is different than</p>	Section 11 of the Final EA/IS has been updated with additional details on consultation, however, the section includes all consultation for the Community Access Road and has not been broken out by group type as this comment is considered recommended.	Final EA / IS Section 11	1457

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>typical as the proponent is the FN community and is also consulting the community; I would recommend separating the consultation done with interested communities by MFFN, consultation with MFFN, and consultation supported by the province a little better in this section overview; or maybe cutting down the overview and leaving the different types of consultation to be better described in the sub-headings.</p> <p>Recommendation: Consider revising the overview of this section for clarity and brevity.</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	88	<p>“In addition, Records of Consultation and Engagement for Indigenous communities and for government agencies, detailing activities from the Notice of Commencement of Environmental Assessment up to the completion of the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement Phase will be distributed for review and comment in summer 2025, allowing an opportunity to review the records in advance of release of the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.”</p> <p>It is not clear how much time will be given to Indigenous communities and government agencies to meaningfully</p>	<p>The timeline for review and comment on the Final EA/IS will be determined by the Province. A record of consultation is included in the Final EA/IS as Appendix X Record of Consultation. Submission of the record of consultation prior to submission of the Final EA/IS was not a condition of the Terms of Reference or the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1455

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>review this Record of Consultation in advance of the final EA.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please clarify how much time will be given to Indigenous communities and government agencies to meaningfully review this Record of Consultation and provide comments to the proponent in advance of the final EA. Please also confirm that any comments received would be addressed and incorporated into the final EA before the final EA is submitted.</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	89	<p>The first paragraph on the page states “Additionally, when the Terms of Reference was approved by the Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, additional requirements for consultation with Indigenous communities with respect to the cumulative effects assessment were included. The following activities were requested:”</p> <p>As these are requirements from the minister, this statement should be written as “required” not requested.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please revise the sentence to say “...The following activities were required”</p>	The sentence in Section 11.2.2 (formerly Section 11.1.2) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to read: "The following activities were required:"	Final EA/IS Section 11.1.2	1453

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	90	<p>“As the Proponent and key rightsholder, Marten Falls First Nation is directly impacted by the outcome of the Community Access Road’s,” - is there something missing in this sentence or is this a misplaced apostrophe?</p> <p>Recommendation: Please check whether this sentence needs revision.</p>	The sentence in Section 11.3.1 (formerly 11.1.2) of the Final EA/IS has been amended.	Final EA/IS Section 11.2.1	1452
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	91	<p>“Table 11-2 lists the neighbouring Indigenous communities, as identified by the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (A. Cross, 2018, personal communication), to be consulted based on their constitutionally protected Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights that may be adversely affected by the Community Access Road, or who may be interested in the Community Access Road.”</p> <p>For accuracy and to be consistent with the approved ToR wording, this paragraph should instead reference the January 7, 2020 MOU signed by MECP, MEM (then ENDM) and Marten Falls, and as amended by MECP on April 15, 2020. The MOU provides the list of Indigenous communities that Ontario has identified to be consulted based on their constitutionally protected Aboriginal</p>	Section 11.3.2 (formerly Section 11.2.2) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to clarify that Table 11-1 (formerly Table 11-2) lists the neighbouring Indigenous communities, as identified by Ontario in the Memorandum of Understanding on Shared Consultation Responsibilities developed for the EA/IS for the Community Access Road.	Final EA/IS Section 11.2.2	1450

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>and/or Treaty Rights that may be adversely affected by the Community Access Road, or who may be interested in the Community Access Road.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please revise the first paragraph of section 11.2.2 as follows: Table 11-2 lists the neighbouring Indigenous communities, as identified by Ontario in the Memorandum of Understanding on Shared Consultation Responsibilities developed for the provincial EA for the proposed MFCAR. The MOU was signed by MECP, MEM (then ENDM) and Marten Falls on January 7, 2020, and amended by MECP on April 15, to be consulted based on their constitutionally protected Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights that may be adversely affected by the Community Access Road, or who may be interested in the Community Access Road.</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	92	<p>In this section, some spelling is erroneous and some ministry/agency names out of date.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please check spelling and update to current ministry and agency names.</p>	The spelling mistakes and ministry/agency named have been updated in Section 11 of the Final EA/IS.	Final EA/IS Section 11.3.1	1446

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	93	<p>Ministry of Energy, Northern Development and Mines is not separate from Mishkeegogamang community in the bulleted list.</p> <p>Editorial recommendation: Please separate Ministry of Energy, Northern Development and Mines from Mishkeegogamang community in the bulleted list.</p>	The entries in Section 11.6.5 of the Final EA/IS have been separated.	Final EA/IS Section 11.6.5	1444
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	94	<p>This section describes meeting with Indigenous communities. Why include the meeting with Nibinamik and Aroland if the meetings didn't happen?</p> <p>Recommendation: Suggest discussing meetings that were scheduled but not held separately from meetings that went ahead.</p>	Section 11 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to remove cancelled or postponed meetings with exception of certain engagements with MFFN members.	Final EA/IS Section 11.7.1.1	1443
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	95	<p>The planned roundtable directed at MFFN women and youth also did not occur as there was no uptake.</p> <p>Recommendation: Suggest discussing meetings that were scheduled but not held separately from meetings that went ahead.</p>	Section 11 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to remove cancelled or postponed meetings with exception of certain engagements with MFFN members.	Final EA/IS Section 11.7.1.1	1442
MECP Environmental	96	For the second row, wouldn't extreme rainfall also pose a risk to workers? For	Appendix Y Climate Change and Resiliency Technical Support Document	Appendix Y	1441

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Assessment Branch		<p>example, if there is a flood risk at the camps, it could impact safety during work hours or at camps (septic contamination, power outage, electrical hazards, slip and fall).</p> <p>Wouldn't thunderstorms potentially pose harm to workers?</p> <p>Finally, heavy snowfall- this is written as a worker accommodation hazard but not also a worker hazard.</p> <p>Recommendation: Consider whether these three climate events also pose threats to workers.</p>	has been updated to include risks posed to workers by extreme rainfall, thunderstorms and snowfall.		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	97	<p>The last sentence in adaptation measures states "train staff to be aware of climate and whether related risks"- is this supposed to say "weather"?</p> <p>Editorial recommendation: Please check if this is a typo.</p>	Section 12 of the Final EA/IS has been modified. It now includes one table listing a summary of adaptation measures. The sentence with the spelling mistake is not included in the table or in the updated section.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1440
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	98	<p>For operations, under the climate event Extreme Heat- should the effect of extreme heat on the road infrastructure be considered? Especially if the road will be paved (as per conversation with project teams on hydrology/design)?</p> <p>Recommendation: Consider adding under Extreme Heat</p>	As outlined in Section 7.1 of the Final EA/IS the Community Access Road will be an all-season gravel road. Extreme heat is not known to significantly affect the structural integrity of gravel roads, therefore assessment of extreme heat on the road was not considered.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1439

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		effects to road infrastructure.			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	99	<p>This section states that after applying these adaptation measures, “the negative effects of the climate change on the Community Access Road are significantly reduced.” Is this a factual statement? Is this more of a “could be” statement? Is there proof? Would it be better to say “are anticipated to be...reduced”?</p> <p>Recommendation: Consider revising the language to a more probable statement than a factual one.</p>	The sentence in Section 12.4 has been amended as follows: "After implementing the identified adaptation measures, the negative effects of the climate change on the Community Access Road could be significantly reduced".	Final EA/IS Section 12.4	1438
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	100	<p>It appears that in this section, the wording used is a cut and paste from the technical reports, or advice to proponent. The pre-facing paragraphs should also be adjusted to reflect that the proponent will be doing the work. I would encourage instead of saying “should be” this should say “will be” or “would be, where feasible” etc.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please revise paragraphs to acknowledge that proponent is committed to undertake the tasks in the groundwater monitoring program.</p>	Section 14.2.1.1.2 of the Final EA/IS and Section 9 of Appendix H Groundwater Technical Support Document have been update to clarify that the recommended groundwater monitoring will be conducted.	Final EA/IS Section 14.2.1.1.2 Appendix H Section 9	1437

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	101	<p>Would any of the Archaeological Assessment (AA) work already carried out for permits required during the EA process be relevant for the pre-construction monitoring programs? Would it be beneficial to mention work already done in this section?</p> <p>Recommendation: Consider the relevance of including a general discussion of AA work carried out during EA permitting.</p>	<p>The intent of Section 14 of the Final EA/IS is to highlight future work for the Community Access Road as required by both the Terms of Reference and the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines. Work already completed in support of the Community Access Road remains in the previous sections of the Final EA/IS.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1435
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	102	<p>In this discussion of groundwater and geochemistry, it is recommended that the wording is revised to demonstrate a commitment to do the monitoring (replace “should” with “would, will” etc.). This is similar to the comment made re: S 14.1.1.2.</p> <p>Recommendation: Recommend revising wording to reflect a commitment to monitoring in this section.</p>	<p>Section 14.2.1.3 of the Final EA/IS and Section 9 of Appendix H Groundwater Technical Support Document have been update to clarify that the recommended groundwater monitoring will be conducted.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 14.2.1.3 Appendix H Section 9</p>	1431
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	103	<p>This section states “Given that the site is located on the periphery of one of the route options, avoidance and protection might be possible upon choosing the preferred route.” This statement appears to have been pulled from page ii of the executive summary of appendix R, it</p>	<p>The Caviar (Eilp-1) site is located along the preferred route. Section 14.2.3.4 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to address the location of the Caviar (Eilp-1) site in relation to the preferred route.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 14.2.3.4</p>	1429

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>should be revised in the EA to reflect that a preferred route was chosen by Band Council resolution and discuss whether this site falls near or within the preferred route? In addition, if the site falls within the preferred route and avoidance is not possible- what steps will be taken then?</p> <p>Recommendation: Please revisit the second paragraph to ensure that it corresponds with the preferred route selection, and also discusses other options for the site if avoidance is not possible.</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	104	<p>Implement monitoring measures as outlined in the air quality, noise, visual, surface water, fish, wildlife, and ungulates technical reports to manage potential impacts related to remote outfitters.</p> <p>The Acoustic and Vibration Report (Appendix P) says that noise monitoring programs are not recommended. Is the statement above meant to say vibration instead of noise?</p> <p>Please review/revise statement for accuracy.</p>	Section 4.2.3.7 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to clarify that the disciplines listed are in reference to the Technical Support Documents (appendices) and do not reference specific monitoring programs.	Final EA/IS Section 4.2.3.7	1428
MECP Environmental	105	“Any permits for significant work during this period would be obtained through a	The original sentence intended to convey that permitting activities will occur during	Final EA/IS Section 14.3	1427

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Assessment Branch		<p>separate Class EA or other process and are not considered here.” It is not clear what Class EA is being referred to here.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please explain what Class EA is being referred to and why that Class EA would be used for permits for significant work.</p>	<p>the next phase of the Community Access Road. However, the details of that phase—including whether it will follow MTO’s Class Environmental Assessment and Detailed Design process—remain uncertain, as the ownership of the road has not yet been determined.</p> <p>The sentence in Section 14.3 of the Final EA/IS has been updated as follows: “Any permits required for significant work during the operation and maintenance period will be obtained through the process applicable to the next phase of the Community Access Road.”</p>		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	106	<p>“Conduct monitoring measures as outlined in the air quality, noise, visual, surface water, fish, wildlife, and ungulates technical reports...” The Acoustic and Vibration Report (Appendix P) says that noise monitoring programs are not recommended. Is the statement above meant to say vibration instead of noise?</p> <p>Editorial recommendation: Please review/revise statement for accuracy.</p>	<p>Section 4.3.3.7 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to clarify that the disciplines listed are in reference to the Technical Support Documents (appendices) and do not reference specific monitoring programs.</p>	Final EA/IS Section 4.3.3.7	1425
MECP Environmental	107	<p>The top of page 973 mentions a “Wetland Offset Plan.” Is this the same</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS and associated Appendices have been updated to</p>	Final EA/IS various	1422

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Assessment Branch		<p>as the Terrestrial Biodiversity Offset Plan or a different offsetting plan?</p> <p>Editorial recommendation: Please clarify if the Wetland Offset Plan is the same as the Terrestrial Biodiversity Offset Plan or not. Same comment for Appendix J-Vegetation Report.</p>	<p>address the discrepancy and confirm that one combined offset plan will be developed as the Preliminary Biodiversity Offset Plan.</p>	<p>Appendices</p>	
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	108	<p>The technical appendices contain comments from the provincial review team on the draft study plans (2020-2022). However there were a number of technical meetings that occurred in 2020-2022 between the proponent and provincial reviewers about these study plans, for which the proponent produced meeting minutes and shared with MECP. The meeting minutes are not included in the appendices.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please include the meeting minutes for the technical study plan meetings that occurred between 2020 and 2022. By MECP EAB's records, there are 24 meeting minute documents.</p>	<p>Meeting minutes from the technical meetings on the draft study plans are confidential between the proponent and the regulator. As such, these will not be included in the Final EA/IS.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1406
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	109	<p>See comment 108 for page 394 of the main EA report regarding conflicting statements on whether herbicide will be used.</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>	1405

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Recommendation: See comment 108 for page 394 and please revise text in Appendix AA as needed.</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	110	<p>See comment above for page 395 of the main EA report regarding whether the Community Access Road will be constructed according to MTO or MNR guidelines.</p> <p>Recommendation: See comment above (#48) for page 395 and please revise text in Appendix AA as needed.</p>	<p>The Community Access Road will be designed and constructed to meet the Ministry of Transportation guidelines and best management practices, and will follow all permit conditions from other ministries. Appendix AA Summary and Recommendations has been updated to clarify ministry guidelines to be followed.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1404
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	111	<p>In the reptile/amphibian and pollinating insect rows, one of the mitigation measures is for American marten.</p> <p>Editorial recommendation: Please check for any copy and paste errors in the table.</p>	<p>Appendix AA Summary and Recommendations has been reviewed and any editorial errors have been corrected.</p>	<p>Appendix AA</p>	1403
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	112	<p>Pollinating insects: sensory disturbance during construction speaks to reptiles and amphibian habitat, not of insects. Same with during operation and maintenance.</p> <p>Editorial recommendation:</p>	<p>Appendix AA Summary and Recommendations and Section 8.2.2.3. of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document have been updated to correctly reflect the species (e.g., reptiles and amphibians) related to sensory disturbance during construction,</p>	<p>Appendix AA Appendix K Section 8.2.2.3</p>	1398

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		Revise the sentence to correctly reflect the species.	operation and maintenance of the Project.		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	113	<p>“Ministry of Environment and Energy” appears on PDF pages 48 and 49.</p> <p>Editorial Recommendation: If this is meant to refer to the Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, please revise text.</p>	The bullet points in Appendix AA under the "Concerned Agencies" column have been updated. Specifically the wording "Ministry of Environment and Energy" has been replaced with "Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks".	Appendix AA	1395
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	114	<p>The mitigation measure for pileated woodpecker on PDF page 50 says, “any trees with pileated woodpecker nests will not be removed until they are determined to be inactive for at least 36 months after discovery.”</p> <p>The mitigation measure for pileated woodpecker on PDF page 53 says, “non-intrusive pre-clearing nest surveys will occur within 7 days of the clearing; buffers will be established around each nest, and clearing activities will be restricted near active bird nests or pileated woodpecker nest cavities.”</p> <p>It is not clear if these two mitigation measures align or if they are just worded differently but have the same effect?</p> <p>Editorial recommendation: Please review the mitigation measures</p>	The two mitigation measures provided in Appendix AA Summary and Recommendations are aligned. Appendix AA has been updated to align recommended Pileated Woodpecker mitigation measures with Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) guidance. Section 9 of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document has been updated to include additional pre-construction monitoring for Pileated Woodpecker.	Appendix AA; Section 9 of Appendix L	1394

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		for pileated woodpecker on these pages to ensure they align.			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	115	<p>This section states a cultural heritage evaluation report should be completed... would prefer more active language like “would be” or “will” be completed.</p> <p>Editorial recommendation: Consider using language that confirms/commits the proponent to doing the work.</p>	<p>The bullet points in Appendix AA Summary and Recommendations Table under the "Mitigation, Protection, Monitoring, and Study Commitments to be Carried Forward to Detail Design" column have been updated. Specifically the wording "A Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report should be completed by a Qualified Person(s) [...]" has been replaced as follows "A Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report will be completed by a Qualified Person(s) [...]".</p>	Appendix AA	1393
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	116	<p>“Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture” appears on PDF page 88.</p> <p>Recommendation: If this is meant to refer to the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism, please revise text.</p>	<p>The reference to the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture has been replaced by The Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism in Appendix AA Summary and Recommendations Table for the Final EA/IS.</p>	Appendix AA	1392
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	117	<p>Page 344 includes only MECP EAB and MECP Surface Water Specialist comments on the draft Fish and Fish Habitat study plan. The comments from MNR are missing. MECP EAB provided MNR’s comments to the proponent on January 19, 2022 and the proponent provided its responses on April 29, 2022.</p>	<p>The comments from the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) related to the draft Fish and Fish Habitat Study Plan, as well as the associated responses have been added as attachments to Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document.</p>	Appendix G	1391

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Recommendation: Please include the comments from MNR and the proponent's responses for the Fish and Fish Habitat Study Plan.</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	118	<p>Page 344 includes only the August 26, 2021 comments from the MECP Hydrogeologist on the draft Groundwater study plan. The August 5, 2020 comments from the province on the study plan are missing, along with the proponent's responses provided on April 29, 2022.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please include the additional comments from MECP and the proponent's responses for the Groundwater Study Plan.</p>	The comments received from regulators are included in Attachment A of Appendix H Groundwater and Geotechnical Technical Support Document.	Appendix H	1390
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	119	<p>Page 263 (using the PDF page numbers) of Appendix I indicates that regulator comments on the Peatlands Study Plan are included in the appendix. However, the comments from MNR and MECP Species at Risk Branch (SARB) are missing along with the proponent's responses. The MNR and SARB comments were sent to the proponent on August 17, 2021 and September 9, 2021, respectively; the proponent provided</p>	The comments received from regulators are included in Attachment A of Appendix I Peatlands Technical Support Document.	Appendix I	1389

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>responses to these comments on July 29, 2022.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please include the comments from MNR and SARB and the proponent's responses for the Peatlands Study Plan.</p>			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	120	<p>The MNR and MECP (EAB) and SARB) comments that were provided on the draft Vegetation Study Plan on July 23, 2020, and the proponent's responses, are included, however the follow up MNR comments from September 10, 2021 and the proponent's responses dated April 29, 2022 are not included.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please include the additional comments from MNR and the proponent's responses for the Vegetation Study Plan.</p>	<p>The comments from the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) and the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) related to the draft Vegetation Study Plan, as well as the associated response have been added as attachments to Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document.</p>	Appendix J	1388
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	121	<p>Please see comment 120 for page 973 of the main EA report re: the text "Wetland Offset Plan."</p> <p>Editorial Recommendation: See comment 120 for page 973 and revise text as needed. Check other appendices for consistency.</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS and associated Appendices have been updated to address the discrepancy and confirm that one combined offset plan will be developed as the Preliminary Biodiversity Offset Plan.</p>	Final EA/IS various Appendices	1387
MECP	122	Starting at PDF page 682, the SARB and	Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support	Appendix K	1386

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Environmental Assessment Branch		<p>MNR comments that were provided on the draft Wildlife Study Plan on July 23, 2020 are included, however the follow up comments provided on the final Wildlife Study Plan are not included.</p> <p>The proponent received follow up comments from MNR on September 10, 2021 and from MECP SARB on September 25 and 27, 2021. The proponent's responses to these were provided to MECP on April 29, 2022. SARB also provided comments specific to the approach to wolverine field surveys, including recommendations for updating the Wildlife Study Plan (comments came after a technical discussion on this topic). MECP provided these comments to the proponent on March 10, 2021.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please include the follow up comments from SARB and MNR and the proponent's responses for the Wildlife Study Plan. Please also consider including the SARB comments on the wolverine approach.</p>	Document has been updated to include the follow up Species at Risk Ontario (SARB) and Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) comments within the Study Plan comment response table.		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	123	The copy of provincial comments on the Birds Study Plan in this appendix is incorrect. These appear to be comments on the Wildlife Study Plan. MECP	Attachment A of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document includes the Draft and Final Bird Study Plan and federal and provincial regulator	Comment noted; see response for more details	1385

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>provided the proponent with the MNR comments on the Birds Study Plan on August 17, 2021 and the proponent provided its responses on April 29, 2022.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please remove the comments from the wrong study plan and include the comments from MNR and the proponent's responses for the Birds Study Plan.</p>	<p>comments. Province comments referred to by Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) in the comment were provided in May 2021 for the Final Wildlife Study Plan and as such were added to the Final Bird Study Plan in Appendix L. Province comments received focused on both wildlife and birds.</p>		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	124	<p>The SARB and MNR comments that were provided on the draft Ungulates Study Plan on July 23, 2020 are included, however the follow up comments provided on the final Ungulates Study Plan are not included.</p> <p>Recommendation: The proponent received follow up comments from MNR on September 10, 2021 and from MECP SARB on October 8, 2021. The proponent's responses were provided on April 29, 2022. Please include the additional comments from MNR and MECP SARB and the proponent's responses for the Ungulates Study Plan.</p>	<p>The comments received from regulators are included in Attachment A of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.</p>	Appendix M	1384
MECP Environmental	125	<p>The ATRI TSD only includes the 2021 Study Plan and does not include any of</p>	<p>The comments from the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) and the</p>	Appendix O	1383

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Assessment Branch		<p>the provincial comments and proponent responses that were provided on that study plan.</p> <p>Recommendation: Comments on the study plan were from MNR (December 9, 2021 and June 21, 2022), MECP SARB (August 17, 2021) and MECP Indigenous Advisor (September 22, 2021). The proponent's responses were provided on May 20, 2022, but appear not to include responses to the June 21 MNR comments. Please include the comments from MNR and MECP and the proponent's responses for the ATRI Study Plan.</p>	<p>Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) related to the draft Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests Study Plan, as well as the associated responses have been added as attachments to Appendix O Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests Technical Support Document.</p>		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	126	<p>The provincial comments on the Cultural Heritage study plan are missing. Comments from MNR were provided to the proponent on September 21, 2021. The proponent's responses were provided to MECP on July 29, 2022.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please include the comments from MNR and the proponent's responses for the Cultural Heritage Study Plan. Same applies to Appendix R (Archaeological Assessment) since the federal comments for the Cultural Heritage Study Plan were</p>	<p>The comments from the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) related to the draft Cultural Heritage Study Plan, as well as the associated response have been added as attachments to Appendix Q Cultural Heritage Technical Support Document.</p>	Appendix Q	1382

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		included but not provincial comments.			
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	127	<p>The provincial comments on the Economic Study Plan are missing – comments from MEDJCT that were provided to the proponent on November 8, 2021 and the proponent’s responses on April 29, 2022.</p> <p>The provincial comments on the Human Health Study Plan from MECP’s Human Toxicology and Air Standards (HTAS) section (reviewer Ganesharam Balagopal, Senior Regulatory Toxicologist) from August 24, 2021 and the proponent’s responses from July 29, 2022 are missing. (The MECP comments from August 5, 2020 and proponent responses are included in the appendix.)</p> <p>Recommendation: Please include the comments from MEDJCT and MECP HTAS and the proponent’s responses for the Economic and Human Health Study Plans.</p>	The comments from the Ministry of Economic Development, Job Creation and Trade (MEDJC) related to the draft Economic Study Plan and comments from the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) related to the draft Human Health Study Plan, as well as the associated responses have been added as attachments to Appendix T Community Well-Being Technical Support Document.	Appendix T	1381
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	128	The provincial comments from MNR (September 21, 2021), MECP SARB (September 13, 2021) and MECP Indigenous Advisor (September 22, 2021) on the Land and Resource Use Study Plan along with the proponent’s responses are missing. The responses	The comments from the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) and the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) related to the draft Land and Resource Use Study Plan, as well as the associated responses have been added as attachments to Appendix	Appendix U	1380

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – MECP Environmental Assessment Branch

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>were provided to MECP on August 12, 2022.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please include the comments from MNR and MECP and the proponent's responses for the LRU Study Plan.</p>	<p>U Land and Resource Use Technical Support Document.</p>		
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	129	<p>Please see comment 128 for page 740/table 9-46 of the main EA report regarding the text "Not applicable" for the description of the Local Study Area.</p> <p>Recommendation: See comment above for page 740 and please revise text as needed.</p>	<p>Section 9.5.7 of the Final EA/IS and Table 6-1 of Appendix U Land and Resource Use Technical Support Document have been updated to provide additional description on how the Local and Regional Study Areas were investigated.</p>	Final EA/IS Section 9.5.7 Appendix U Table 6-1	1379
MECP Environmental Assessment Branch	130	<p>The provincial comments and proponent responses on the Visual Study Plan are missing. The provincial comments from MECP EAB and MHSTCI are dated August 10, 2020. MECP does not have a record of the proponent's responses.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please include the comments from MECP EAB and MHSTCI and the proponent's responses for the Visual Study Plan.</p>	<p>The comments and responses from MECP EAB and MHSTCI dated August 10, 2020 related to the Visual Study Plan have been included in Appendix V of the Final EA/IS.</p>	Appendix V	1373