

Appendix C6

Feedback and Response Log - Government Review Team - Ministry of Transportation



Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Transportation	1	<p>The team went back to collect IK from Elders in 2023 but were unsuccessful as they could not communicate with the Elders.</p> <p>The proponent should make every reasonable effort to facilitate communications with the Elders. Any information should be incorporated to determine archaeological potential, as appropriate.</p>	Sections 11.7 and 11.8 of the Final EA/IS outline the consultation and engagement efforts carried out to obtain feedback and perspectives from Elders.	Comment noted; see response for details	1207
Ministry of Transportation	2	<p>“Posted speed limit of 80 kilometers per hour”</p> <p>Consider reviewing law enforcement options.</p>	Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding ownership and operations of the Community Access Road. The owner/operator of the road will be responsible for reviewing law enforcement options.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1208
Ministry of Transportation	3	<p>3H:1V fore slopes not ideal</p> <p>Recommend reviewing MTO Roadside Design Manual for appropriate fore slopes on new construction.</p>	Roadway fore slopes will be designed in accordance with the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) Roadside Design Manual. As outlined in Section 7.1.2.1 of the Final EA/IS the final side slopes will be determined in collaboration with MTO during detail design.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1209
Ministry of Transportation	4	<p>No field verification has taken place for any of the proposed aggregate permits.</p> <p>Groundwater monitors have to be</p>	Section 9.3.1 of the Final EA/IS discusses potential effects associated with pit or quarry dewatering. The mitigation and enhancement measures	Comment noted; see response for details	1213

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>installed and monitored for 4 seasons (1 year) and Species at Risk surveys have to be carried out at the appropriate time of year. Also, the aggregate deposit (bedrock or sand & gravel) should be delineated in the field. Acquiring aggregate permits under the Ontario Aggregate Resources Act is required prior to producing aggregate on Crown Land.</p> <p>If not completed, recommended to acquire an aggregate permit. To do this the proponent will have to perform a Summary Statement, a Maximum Predicted Water Table Report, a Natural Environment Report with associated Species at Risk Surveys, an Archaeology Report and a Survey and Site Plan as per the Aggregate Resources of Ontario Standards.</p>	<p>include "Any aggregate pits or quarries to be developed as part of Project construction will be permitted under the Ontario Aggregate Resources Act (Government of Ontario, 1990). As part of the permitting, site specific technical studies will be carried out, including hydrogeological studies for aggregate pits and quarries that will extract from below the water table. These permitting studies will further assess the risks of adverse effects due to the pit / quarry operation at each proposed pit / quarry site as well as establish the rehabilitation plans for each site.</p> <p>Section 14.1.1.3 of the Final EA/IS discusses the monitoring programs recommended prior to construction of the Project. Groundwater monitoring stations will be established at areas where large groundwater takings are expected or where potential for impacts on groundwater quality exists, such as pits and quarries. For pits and quarries which will be extracted below the water table under an Ontario Aggregate Resources Act permit, the groundwater monitoring program will be designed in accordance with the Aggregate Resources of Ontario: Technical Reports and Information Standards (Government of Ontario,</p>		

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			2023) in addition to the Project monitoring program.		
Ministry of Transportation	5	<p>The report outlines that the area of the proposed road is covered by Treaty No. 9 (James Bay Treaty) and that it is the traditional territory of Northern Anishinaabe communities and Métis people. However, for the archeological assessment of culturally significant areas the steps taken by the consultants outlined in the report include: A field visit to Marten Falls was completed to discuss cultural heritage significance with community members and to take photos and notes of the area (Stage 1).</p> <p>The Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment was conducted between September 24 and October 4, 2019, and focused on the alternatives for the major river crossings and any specific locations that Marten Falls First Nation suggested. In discussion with Marten Falls First Nation, it was agreed upon that archaeologists would survey the areas within a 1-kilometre buffer from each of the proposed river crossing locations under consideration. A total of nine river crossings were identified to be completed during 2019.</p>	The consultation record is available in Appendix X Record of Consultation.	Appendix X	1214

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		MTO looks forward to reviewing the consultation record when it becomes available.			
Ministry of Transportation	6	<p>The first Stage 1 under MCM PIF P438-0225-2020 was done prior to the 2023 meeting with MFFN community members.</p> <p>Should this stage 1 be updated with the information gathered through IK?</p>	At the time of production of the Stage 1 report only the Indigenous Knowledge (IK) report from Marten Falls First Nation has been received and was incorporated. Any additional IK received since the production of the Stage 1 will be incorporated into subsequent reports, such as the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (AA).	Final EA/IS Appendices	1215
Ministry of Transportation	7	<p>Were the resources mapped through IK sessions incorporated into the archaeological potential layer?</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>	At the time of production of the Stage 1 report only the Indigenous Knowledge (IK) report from Marten Falls First Nation has been received and was incorporated. Any additional IK received since the production of the Stage 1 will be incorporated into subsequent reports, such as the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (AA).	Final EA/IS Appendices	1216
Ministry of Transportation	8	The column labelled “Mitigation and Enhancement Measures” in the first row, indicates that “Contaminated soil will be removed and hauled to an approved land facility for disposal”. Should “land facility” be “landfill”? or “waste disposal site”?	The term 'approved land facility' in the Final EA/IS has been used as a broad term to cover a variety of disposal facilities that will be considered during detail design.	Comment noted; see response for details	1217

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		Please ensure the correct reference is used throughout the document.			
Ministry of Transportation	9	<p>In Table 9-10, under the ‘Mitigation and Enhancement Measures’ column, there are references made to implementation and enforcement of speed limits. Some other examples:</p> <p>p. 420: “Implement dust control practices (for example, wetting with water and implementation of speed limits), as required.”</p> <p>p.480: “Speed limits will be posted and enforced to reduce vehicle speeds and associated noise.”</p> <p>p.482: “Speed limits will be posted and enforced to reduce vehicle speeds and associated collisions with wildlife.”</p> <p>Are these speed limits intended to be lower than the posted speed limit of 80 km/h?</p> <p>Who will the speed limits be enforced by?</p> <p>Consider providing more context regarding the speed limit referenced for this purpose (e.g., is it intended to be a</p>	<p>Safety will be a top priority in all implementation and design phases of the Community Access Road. Road design elements including dust control, design speeds and posted speeds will implement provincial best practices in accordance with design standards. It should be noted that the preliminary design on the Community Access Road is currently being conducted, whether the speed limit needs to be adjusted in some areas will be determined during the design phase.</p> <p>Speed enforcement will be determined by roadway authority.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1218

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		reduction from the proposed 80 km/h?)			
Ministry of Transportation	10	<p>Sixth bullet within the column entitled “Mitigation and Enhancement Measures” states “Strip the overburden from bedrock quarry areas before drilling, blasting, or excavating and manage in accordance with the On-Site and Excess Soil Management Regulation under the Ontario Environmental Protection Act”.</p> <p>Does clarity need to be provided with respect to drilling as it relates to soil sampling vs. rock coring/removal? Drilling for soil sampling purposes to meet Ontario Regulation 406/19 may want to occur prior to stripping overburden.</p>	The Final EA/IS has been updated to remove reference to drilling.	Final EA/IS Section 9.4.6.4	1219
Ministry of Transportation	11	<p>This section only acknowledges that Stage 2 assessment is required. If additional areas are added to the project area, that may require Stage 1 assessment and subsequent stages of archaeological assessment may also be required throughout the project area.</p> <p>Considerations for additional Stage 1 and subsequent stages of archaeological assessments need to be included.</p> <p>Marine assessment for waterbodies</p>	Recommendations for future assessments are outlined in Appendix R Archaeological Assessments.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1220

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		needs to be included.			
Ministry of Transportation	12	<p>Fifth bullet from the top of the page states “Organic contaminants (i.e., volatile organic contaminants and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons) ...”. “Should “volatile organic contaminants” be “volatile organic compounds”? Please ensure the correct term is used throughout the document.</p> <p>Do Petroleum Hydrocarbons (PHCs) need to be added to this bullet? Or are PHCs covered in the preceding bullet (i.e., Nutrients and oil and grease)?”</p>	<p>Parameter names (e.g., volatile organic compounds, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and petroleum hydrocarbons) have been reviewed and updated in Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document to provide consistency and correctness. Petroleum hydrocarbons include oil and grease and are included in preceding bullet (i.e., nutrients and oil and grease).</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1222
Ministry of Transportation	13	<p>Page 211 states that “appropriate erosion and sedimentation control measures will be installed...”</p> <p>Consider adding control erosion at the source as a key ESC principle.</p> <p>Suggest integrating ESC planning with EA/planning as sensitive receptors and earth disturbance are identified.</p> <p>Suggest to start identifying high risk areas which will help focus future ESC planning and design efforts.</p>	<p>As outlined in Table 9.3-4 of the Final EA/IS, the Owner/Operator will develop and implement an Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) Plan during the detail design phase. The ESC Plan will identify high risk areas and also consider the results of the Final EA/IS and key receptors.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details. Final EA/IS Table 9.3-4</p>	1226
Ministry of	14	Species at Risk: The population of Lake	The Final EA/IS has been updated to	Appendix AA.	1227

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Transportation		<p>Sturgeon that may be impacted by this project is listed as Special Concern both federally and provincially, if the species or any species is uplisted or found; SARA permits and/or ESA permits or registrations may be required through DFO and MECP under the Species at Risk Act and the Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>Suggestion to include a paragraph regarding potential Species at Risk uplisting or additional species in the project area, and necessary permits/registrations that may be required by both federal and provincial agencies (DFO/MECP) following the Species at Risk Act and the Endangered Species Act.</p>	<p>consider that if any Species at Risk (including Lake Sturgeon) is impacted or is found in the Project Study Area prior to the permitting phase of the Project, the Owner/Operator will pursue additional permitting with respect to Fisheries and Oceans Canada (under the Species at Risk Act) and the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (under the Endangered Species Act and/or the Species Conservation Act). This includes potential Species at Risk uplisting or additional species in the Project Study Area.</p>	Appendix G Section 9.5.	
Ministry of Transportation	15	<p>Second last bullet states “Poly-aromatic hydrocarbons”.</p> <p>Should this be “polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons”? Please ensure the correct term is used throughout the document.</p>	<p>Appendix H Groundwater Technical Support Document has been updated to consistently use the term 'polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons'.</p>	Appendix H Executive Summary, Section 4.3.2.7	1232
Ministry of Transportation	16	<p>Page 54 states that “it is important that mitigation measures are achievable, measurable, verifiable, and monitored for compliance and effectiveness.”</p>	<p>The statement "a robust monitoring project will be undertaken, and adaptive management measures implemented, as required" is from Section 7.3.1.4.3</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	1264

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Page 170 states that “a robust monitoring project will be undertaken, and adaptive management measures implemented, as required” and page 266 notes that the scope of post-construction monitoring and specific objectives of the post-construction monitoring will be determined in subsequent project phases.</p> <p>This is confusing as written – the wording describes objectives for mitigation but not the actual mitigation measure. Suggest keeping this simple and consider the construction activity, possible impact, mitigation and expected outcome. Some impacts will be easy to predict, and standard mitigation will apply; others might require an adaptive management approach during construction. Ideally, monitoring focuses on the highest risk areas.</p> <p>The proponent should document all monitoring commitments in a separate report before the EA is finalized – this will help confirm the objectives, identify overlap to streamline to the extent possible.</p>	<p>Predicted Residual Effects, which falls under Section 7.3.1.4 Changes to Vegetation as a Result of Changes to Groundwater assessment of residual effects of Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document. The sentence following this statement directs the reader to Appendix I Peatlands Technical Support Document - "This monitoring program is described in more detail in the Peatlands Existing Conditions and Effects Assessment Report (WSP & AECOM, 2026)."</p> <p>Section 7.3 of Appendix J assesses residual effects of the Project on vegetation Valued Components, and discusses potential effects and the mitigation measures to prevent or reduce effects on vegetation Valued Components. For further information on monitoring commitments, Section 9 of Appendix J describes the monitoring programs and future commitments throughout the phases of the project - including the pre-construction monitoring program, construction monitoring program and operations monitoring program. A summary of the monitoring programs for each of the technical disciplines is provided in Section 14 of the Final EA/IS.</p>		

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Transportation	17	<p>Description of Existing Conditions discusses Little Brown and Northern Myotis on this page. These two bat species are listed under SARA federally and ESA provincially. This section makes no reference that these two species are listed as Species at Risk (SAR) federally or provincially.</p> <p>In the same section, it notes that there are Pollinating Insects that are Species at Risk and lists what they are. Update section to reflect these two bats' species are also Species at Risk. As permits may be required if the species or its habitat are impacted during project activities.</p>	<p>The executive summary of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document has been updated to include the federal and provincial statues for Little Brown Myotis (<i>Myotis lucifugus</i>) and Northern Myotis (<i>Myotis septentrionalis</i>) under the Species At Risk Act and the Endangered Species Act.</p>	Appendix K Executive Summary	1265
Ministry of Transportation	18	<p>Wolverine is a Species at Risk both federally and provincially. This section makes not reference to this.</p> <p>In the same section, it notes that there are Pollinating Insects that are Species at Risk and lists what they are. Update section to reflect that wolverine is also Species at Risk. As permits may be required if the species or its habitat are impacted during project activities.</p>	<p>The executive summary of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document has been updated to include the federal and provincial statues for wolverine (<i>Gulo gulo</i>) under the Species At Risk Act and the Endangered Species Act.</p>	Appendix K Executive Summary	1266
Ministry of Transportation	19	<p>Species at Risk- Operations and Maintenance - MTO has Best Management Practice Manual, 2017</p>	<p>Sections 7.3.1, 7.3.2, and Table 10-1 of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document have been updated to clarify</p>	Appendix K Sections 7.3.1, 7.3.2,	1267

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>includes practices to ensure impacts to species at risk and habitat are avoided or minimized during routine highway maintenance.</p> <p>Suggest considering the use of MTO's Best Management Practices for Species at Risk Protection During Maintenance Activities manual for sections related to Species at Risk during operations and maintenance where applicable.</p>	<p>that operation and maintenance of the Community Access Road will follow the Ministry of Transportation's Best Management Practices for Species at Risk Protection During Maintenance Activities (MTO 2017).</p>	<p>and Table 10-1</p>	
Ministry of Transportation	20	<p>Removal of beaver dams – consider using MTO Guide for Fisheries – Best Management Practices that includes guidance as it includes guidance when removing beaver dams within a waterbody supporting fish and fish habitat.</p> <p>Consider including this use of this Guide and incorporate into Appendix K in the appropriate sections.</p>	<p>Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document has been updated with the following text: MTO's Guide for Fisheries – "Best Management Practices (2025) will be followed when beaver dams are removed from within a waterbody supporting fish and fish habitat."</p>	Appendix K	1268
Ministry of Transportation	21	<p>Erosion and Sediment Control – All Wildlife Valued Components - MTO has an Environmental Guide for Erosion and Sediment Control During Construction of Highway Projects (2015) that provides the procedures and technical practices for developing and documenting effective Erosion and Sediment Control.</p>	<p>Section 7.3.1.1.4.1 and Table 10-1 of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document have been updated to clarify that the Ministry of Transportation's Environmental Guide for Erosion and Sediment Control During Construction of Highway Projects (MTO 2015) will be incorporated into erosion and sediment</p>	Appendix K Section 7.3.1.1.4.1 and Table 10-1	1269

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Consider including the use of this Guide and incorporate into Appendix K in the appropriate sections.</p>	<p>control measures in the Project environmental monitoring plan.</p>		
Ministry of Transportation	22	<p>States that the Ontario Department of Highways will remove roadkill. If MTO practices are being followed, then reference should be made to the document that will be followed.</p> <p>Update section to include the MTO document that will be followed regarding mitigation measures related to operation and maintenance – inspections of road and rest areas. In addition, remove the name Ontario Department of Highways as this is not accurate to the Ontario Ministry of Transportation.</p> <p>Ensure that all references to MTO materials are accurate and publicly available.</p>	<p>Section 7.3.1.1.8.2 of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document has been updated to replace Ontario Department of Highways with Ontario Ministry of Transportation, and References section has been updated to include the Ministry of Transportation's Maintenance Manual (MTO 2003).</p>	Appendix K Section 7.3.1.1.8.2, References	1275
Ministry of Transportation	23	<p>Regarding potential collisions for wildlife, MTO has a guide outlining mitigating road impacts to wildlife.</p> <p>Consider including this use of this Guide and incorporate into Appendix K in the appropriate sections.</p>	<p>Section 7.3.1 of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document has been updated to reference to the Ministry of Transportations' Environmental Guide to Mitigating Road Impacts to Wildlife (MTO 2017).</p>	Appendix K Section 7.3.1	1276

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Transportation	24	<p>Page 448 states that a “reporting protocol and system will be developed to report incidental wildlife observations and[...] collisions.</p> <p>Are there plans to use Traditional Knowledge and MNR wildlife data to avoid important habitat/hotspots?</p> <p>Mitigation, such as passage benches and ROW clearing should be considered.</p> <p>Suggest this mirror the current approach followed by the OPP and MTO, where appropriate.</p>	<p>The reporting protocol and system will be developed in consultation with interested Indigenous communities and will include Traditional Knowledge regarding wildlife hotspots, if provided during consultation. This comment is considered editorial and has not been addressed in the Final EA/IS.</p> <p>The preliminary design has been updated to incorporate measures to mitigate the risk of vehicle collisions and have considered the approach followed by Ontario Provincial Police and the Ministry of Transportation (e.g., benches inside culverts, posting signage), and Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document has been updated to include mitigations measures.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1277
Ministry of Transportation	25	<p>This section mentions that the assessment of potential effects on birds were informed primarily by assessments completed for other factor areas (i.e., vegetation, terrain, soils, hydrology, etc.).</p> <p>This wording could suggest there were no standalone assessments dedicated to birds.</p> <p>This could also raise the concern that the assessment of effects on birds may have</p>	<p>The executive summary of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document has been updated to state that assessments completed for other factor areas helped to partially inform the assessment for birds.</p>	Appendix L Executive Summary	1278

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		overlooked key stressors that do not fall under those biophysical categories, such as noise, artificial light, and/or human activity/disturbance.			
Ministry of Transportation	26	<p>Why were there no species-specific surveys that target osprey if the species was identified as a Valuable Component?</p> <p>Suggest elaborating on this in the Executive Summary or referring to where this is explained in greater detail.</p>	<p>Bird surveys were conducted as outlined in Attachment B of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document and included breeding bird surveys, autonomous recording unit surveys, marshbird call playback surveys, aerial surveys, and incidental observations. While targeted Osprey surveys were not conducted, Osprey were considered as part of all bird surveys completed for the Community Access Road.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1279
Ministry of Transportation	27	<p>The statement that existing linear features do not affect bird movement is made without supporting evidence, despite established literature showing this is not necessarily the case. Several species designated as “non-SAR” are experiencing notable declines which could raise a concern about the adequacy of a proxy-based approach.</p> <p>Re-consider the language used in this section.</p>	<p>The statement in the Executive Summary of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document is referring to existing conditions. As there are few existing linear features in the effects assessment Regional Study Area at existing conditions (i.e., winter roads, trails), it was assumed that the linear features do not functionally affect movement and habitat connectivity. Additional discussion on existing conditions is provided in Section 5 of Appendix L.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1280
Ministry of Transportation	29	<p>Cites relevant legislation and notes authorizations are required, but does not</p>	<p>This comment related to permitting will be addressed during the permitting stage</p>	<p>Comment noted; see</p>	1281

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>make mention of specific permits required.</p> <p>Suggest being more specific with anticipated authorizations required, where possible.</p>	<p>and will not be incorporated into the Final EA/IS.</p>	<p>response for details.</p>	
Ministry of Transportation	30	<p>Mentions cleaning mud off surfaces to prevent nesting / attracting specific species.</p> <p>Suggest citing the Clean Equipment Protocol for Industry which MTO utilizes.</p>	<p>An Environmental Monitoring Program will be developed by the Owner/Operator during detail design and will reference specific work protocols including the Clean Equipment Protocol for Industry: Inspecting and cleaning equipment for the purposes of invasive species prevention (Peterborough Stewardship Council and Ontario Invasive Plant Council, 2013).</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1282
Ministry of Transportation	31	<p>Page 300 states that a terrestrial biodiversity offset plan is being developed to achieve no net loss of bird habitat even though Section 7 concludes the residual effects on bird populations are predicted to be not significant, as populations are expected to remain self-sustaining and ecologically effective.</p> <p>Explain the rationale for the offset plan, especially given the uncertainty in the effectiveness and timing of such measures.</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS has been updated to include Appendix AB Preliminary Biodiversity Offset Plan and summarizes the results of the residual effects assessment and presents biodiversity offset options for provincially and federally mandated terrestrial Key Biodiversity Components for the Project. The Preliminary Biodiversity Offset Plan will be finalized following additional engagement and consultation with Marten Falls First Nation and other Indigenous communities, the owner/operator of the Community Access</p>	<p>Appendix AB</p>	1283

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			Road and engagement with federal and provincial regulators during subsequent phases of the Project.		
Ministry of Transportation	32	<p>Proposed rest areas with waste receptacles may become wildlife attractors every 25 to 50 kms.</p> <p>Consider practicality of maintenance to prevent accumulation of waste in these areas.</p>	<p>Section 7.3.1.1.8.2 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document states "Rest areas will be available every 50 km along the road during operations. The rest areas will be staggered every 25 km, alternating on each side of the highway. These rest areas will contain waste receptacles. As per the Ministry of Transportation's Rest Area/Picnic Site Maintenance Best Practice (MBP-325), during the rest areas operating season (i.e., months during the year when temperatures remain above 0°C and closing no sooner than October 15), litter in waste receptacles will be removed from rest areas when waste receptacles are 75% full (Ministry of Transportation, 2003)." The practicality of maintenance to prevent accumulation of waste will be further considered during detail design. The frequency of maintenance of rest areas will be the responsibility of the owner/operator, who will be responsible for these areas are kept clean for users and to deter wildlife.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	1284
Ministry of Transportation	33	Marten Falls Community proposed mitigation measure – The Project to be	The mitigation measure was proposed by Marten Falls First Nation and was	Final EA/IS Appendix M:	1285

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>built a 1-hour walking distance from mammal habitat.</p> <p>Please clarify what this distance may involve and how determined.</p>	<p>included to demonstrate consideration for many alternative mitigations and approaches, however, given the Project overlaps mammal habitat for the length of the route, it is not practical to apply this mitigation measure. Additional clarity has been added to Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document to outline how the mitigation measure was considered and why it is not practical for the project.</p>	<p>Ungulates – Section 7.3.1.2.1.2</p>	
Ministry of Transportation	34	<p>Reviewing the 2021 Study Plan for how the project team planned to assess the Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests of Indigenous communities provided valuable project background information. MTO requests to review the consultation record and assessments made of this record, and outcome documentation of this assessment as soon as possible as it will contain important information related to the rights, interests, and concerns of Indigenous communities potentially impacted by the project, and actions or mitigation measures proposed to address them.</p>	<p>A detailed record of consultation is provided in Appendix X Record of Consultation.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1286
Ministry of Transportation	35	<p>Project is described as a two-lane all-season gravel road. Noise modelling in TNM does not predict noise impacts for</p>	<p>Road traffic noise due to the Project was predicted using Traffic Noise Model (TNM) developed by the United States</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for</p>	1287

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>this type of road surface. Some consideration should be given to this limitation of the noise model and thus the relevance of the modelled results.</p> <p>Consider an appropriate factor of safety or adjustment factor to account for differences in noise between gravel road surface and pavement/concrete modelled in TNM.</p>	<p>Federal Highway Administration. The TNM manual states that an 'average' road type should be used unless requested otherwise by the road authority. Therefore, an 'average' road type was used for the modelling of the Project, however other conservative assumptions were made in the road traffic modelling. Attachment G of the Appendix P Acoustic and Vibration Environment Technical Support Document features a traffic noise model sample calculation and the example also indicates that 'average pavement type shall be used unless a state highway agency substantiates the use of a different type with approval FHWA'.</p> <p>Section 2.3.1 of the TNM manual states that "an 'average' composite pavement type [consists] of data for DGAC (dense-graded asphaltic concrete) and PCC (Portland cement concrete) combined."</p> <p>As described in Section 4.8.1 of Appendix P, a conservative approach was followed by excluding potential attenuation from existing buildings or foliage between the Project and a given representative point of reception from the prediction modelling.</p>	<p>details.</p>	

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Transportation	36	<p>What surface will be over bridges and culverts? How was this incorporated into the noise modelling?</p> <p>Clarify.</p>	<p>The Traffic Noise Model assumed an "average" road type (i.e., DGAC (dense-graded asphaltic concrete) and PCC (Portland cement concrete) combined) as the road surface including over bridges and culverts. Noise modelling followed the Traffic Noise Model (TNM) manual developed by the United States Federal Highway Administration as described in Section 4.8.1 of the Appendix P Acoustic and Vibration Environment Technical Support Document.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	1288
Ministry of Transportation	37	<p>Pits, quarries and associated temporary access roads are included in the project.</p> <p>If the sites have not been selected yet, consider providing recommendations for choosing sites so as to alleviate possible noise/vibration issues or concerns from these operations.</p> <p>Consider the applicability of the classification of Construction" if/when the activity lasts for several years. How long will each site remain in operation?</p>	<p>Pit and quarry locations have been selected and are shown in Figure 4-1 of the Appendix P Acoustic and Vibration Environment Technical Support Document.</p> <p>As described in Section 4.8.1.2 of Appendix P, several of the pits and quarries will continue to operate during Community Access Road operations phase and have been assessed as such in the acoustic and vibration assessment.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	1289
Ministry of Transportation	38	<p>There is no content here that relates specifically to acoustics or vibration.</p> <p>Add some wording to address this topic as it relates specifically to acoustics and</p>	<p>Section 7 of Appendix P Acoustic and Vibration Environment Technical Support Document states "where applicable, Gender-Based Analysis Plus has been considered within the assessment of</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	1290

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		vibration and the assessment that was undertaken.	<p>each Valued Component." The absence of discussion related to Gender-Based Analysis Plus within Appendix P indicates that it was deemed not applicable.</p> <p>The Appendix T Community-Well Being Technical Support Document discusses the biophysical factors with potential to influence human health, and includes a discussion of the biophysical determinants to human health affected by exposures to noise and vibration. Similar to Appendix P, Gender-Based Analysis Plus is considered and integrated within the assessment of each Valued Component in Appendix T; and the absence of discussion related to Gender-Based Analysis Plus within the acoustic and vibration sections of Appendix T indicates that it was deemed not applicable.</p>		
Ministry of Transportation	39	The updated MTO Noise Guide (2022) does not use the term "ambient level" as has been used in the past. The comparison is made between Future "Build" Noise Levels and Future "No-Build" Noise Levels. There is often a misconception that MTO compares the Future "Build" Noise Levels with the ambient noise levels (meaning without the highway at all). In the case of this	The language in Section 4.4.2 of Appendix P Acoustic and Vibration Environment Technical Support Document was updated to reflect the language in the updated Ministry of Transportation Ontario (MTO) Noise Guide (2022).	Appendix P Section 4.4.2	1291

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>project, it is the same, but in other MTO projects, such as widenings, this is not the case.</p> <p>Consider changing the language used in this table to better reflect the language that is used in the 2022 MTO Noise Guide in order to clarify standard MTO policy.</p>			
Ministry of Transportation	40	<p>Last bullet includes a commitment for “monitoring to verify the prediction of the effects assessment and effectiveness of the mitigation measures, and a requirement for monitoring of the commitments made in the Terms of Reference and Environmental Assessment/Impact Statement Report”</p> <p>Is this monitoring noise/vibration monitoring?</p>	<p>The recommended noise and vibration monitoring is described in Section 9 of Appendix P Acoustic and Vibration Environment Technical Supporting Document. This comment is considered editorial and has not been addressed in the Final EA/IS.</p>	Appendix P Section 4.6	1292
Ministry of Transportation	41	<p>Last bullet indicates that a ground absorption of 0.5 was used to represent a combination of acoustically soft and hard ground.</p> <p>Provide rationale for why this is representative of the study area and not a ground absorption factor of 1.0, especially given the assumption in the first bullet that does not include</p>	<p>The ground cover throughout the Community Access Road is expected to vary from acoustically soft ground (e.g., grass) to hard ground (e.g., hard dirt, rocky outcrops). Therefore, an average ground absorption factor of 0.5 was used.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1293

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		attenuation from foliage.			
Ministry of Transportation	42	<p>Second paragraph – remove reference to “partial Stage 2” as this suggests that the Wa-01 and Wa-15 river crossings have not been adequately assessed.</p> <p>Please remove reference to “partial Stage 2.”</p>	<p>No updates have been made to Appendix R Archaeological Assessments. The Stage 1 reports included in Appendix R have been updated in response to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism’s (MCM) comments through their formal review and have since been accepted. The Stage 2 report has been submitted to MCM and is currently awaiting feedback through the established MCM review channels.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	1294
Ministry of Transportation	43	<p>Avoidance and Protection – no work can be done within the 20 m protective buffer; Monitoring of work needs to happen within the additional 50 m buffer. The second bullet needs to be changed to clarify this.</p> <p>Please clarify.</p>	<p>No updates have been made to Appendix R Archaeological Assessments. The Stage 1 reports included in Appendix R have been updated in response to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism’s (MCM) comments through their formal review and have since been accepted. The Stage 2 report has been submitted to MCM and is currently awaiting feedback through the established MCM review channels.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1295
Ministry of Transportation	44	<p>There are areas that are recommended for archaeological assessments in the Supplementary Documentation based on information provided by Indigenous</p>	<p>The Indigenous Knowledge reports and the information contained within, are confidential and data sharing is restricted. The Supplementary</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1296

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>communities.</p> <p>Please provide the supplementary document.</p>	Documentation cannot be shared.		
Ministry of Transportation	45	<p>Second paragraph: Original plan to survey 9 river crossings is irrelevant.</p> <p>Please remove information about river crossings that were not surveyed.</p>	<p>No updates have been made to Appendix R Archaeological Assessments. The Stage 1 reports included in Appendix R have been updated in response to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism’s (MCM) comments through their formal review and have since been accepted. The Stage 2 report has been submitted to MCM and is currently awaiting feedback through the established MCM review channels.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	1297
Ministry of Transportation	46	<p>The 1-km radius buffer around WA-01 and WA-15 was fully assessed. How is it a “Partial” Stage 2? Please clarify.</p>	<p>No updates have been made to Appendix R Archaeological Assessments. The Stage 1 reports included in Appendix R have been updated in response to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism’s (MCM) comments through their formal review and have since been accepted. The Stage 2 report has been submitted to MCM and is currently awaiting feedback through the established MCM review channels.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	1298
Ministry of	47	1 km radius buffer around WA-01 and	No updates have been made to	Comment	1299

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Transportation		WA-15 appear to have been completely surveyed according to the mapping provided. Why does this section suggest that there is additional Stage 2 work to be done within the study area as defined by the 1 km radius buffer around the two crossings? Recommendation for Stage 2 should be removed. Please clarify.	Appendix R Archaeological Assessments. The Stage 1 reports included in Appendix R have been updated in response to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism's (MCM) comments through their formal review and have since been accepted. The Stage 2 report has been submitted to MCM and is currently awaiting feedback through the established MCM review channels.	noted; see response for details.	
Ministry of Transportation	48	Was this document updated in 2023? If so, should the results of two Stage 1s and 2 be included here? The document appears to go back and forth between presenting the Stage 1s and 2 as work that will be done and work that has been done. Please clarify.	Two Stage 1AA reports and one Stage 2AA have been included in Appendix R Archaeological Assessments. The Stage 1 reports included in Appendix R have been updated in response to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism's (MCM) comments through their formal review and have since been accepted. The Stage 2 report has been submitted to MCM and is currently awaiting feedback through the established MCM review channels.	Comment noted; see response for details	1300
Ministry of Transportation	49	Cultural heritage study plan – 2023: Should this include the results of the Stage 2? 2 findspots and a registered archaeological site? Please update this section.	No updates have been made to Appendix R Archaeological Assessments. The Stage 1 reports included in Appendix R have been updated in response to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism's (MCM) comments through their formal review	Comment noted; see response for details	1301

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			and have since been accepted. The Stage 2 report has been submitted to MCM and is currently awaiting feedback through the established MCM review channels.		
Ministry of Transportation	50	Combination of two or more listed rationale indicates archaeological potential – according to MCM S&Gs, it is one listed rationale that indicates archaeological potential. Please provide justification for requiring two rationales for indicating archaeological potential.	No updates have been made to Appendix R Archaeological Assessments. The Stage 1 reports included in Appendix R have been updated in response to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism's (MCM) comments through their formal review and have since been accepted. The Stage 2 report has been submitted to MCM and is currently awaiting feedback through the established MCM review channels.	Comment noted; see response for details	1302
Ministry of Transportation	51	Is there an estimate for the emissions avoided due to annual construction of winter roads counted towards the net emissions? Clarify.	This comment is considered editorial and was not addressed in the Final EA/IS.	Comment noted; see response for details	1303
Ministry of Transportation	52	Specify the MOVES version used for emission rate modeling, as the analysis relied on many default values (e.g., age group, fuel formulation), which may vary by model version.) Specify in the report.	The Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulator (MOVES3) model was used (United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2020). This clarification has been added to Appendix S Atmospheric Environment Technical Support Document.	Comment noted; see response for details	1304

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Transportation	53	<p>The Community Well-being Report does a good job of addressing the needs of the close-proximity communities, but more information is needed on the community well-being impacts for all potentially impacted communities to whom the duty to consult has been determined. MTO looks forward to reviewing the Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests Report to ensure that the interests of all potentially impacted communities are considered. MTO also looks forward to reviewing the final Community Well-Being Report as part of the final EA review.</p> <p>Consider adding additional context/wording from all potentially impacted communities to address this gap.</p>	<p>A summary of Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests assessment is available in Appendix O Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests Technical Support Document.</p> <p>The Community Well-Being Technical Support Document is available in Appendix T.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1305
Ministry of Transportation	54	<p>The closest available Automatic Traffic Recorder (ATR) counts collected for 24 hours per day over seven days near Thunder Bay (approximately 400 kilometers southwest of Marten Falls) indicate approximately 88% daytime (i.e. 7:00 AM to 11:00 PM) traffic.</p> <p>There are ATR counts (24 hrs. per day over seven days) available at locations closer to the study area (on Highways</p>	Traffic count data available at locations closer to the study area will be reviewed during detail design.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1306

Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Ministry of Transportation

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		584 and 643 for example). Consider reviewing data from ATR locations closer to the study area, if any.			