

# Appendix C5

## Feedback and Response Log - Indigenous Communities - Mushkegowuk Council



**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|---|---|-------------|
| Mushkegowuk Council | 1                      | <p>Why emails but not names are redacted in the page 94 - B6.2 Incoming Emails and yet in the subsequent section page 124 - B7 Special Interest Groups, the email addresses and the names are redacted? Reading more, specifically the Appendix-X-1 Record of Consultation and Engagement Interested Persons: I don't see a reasoning for your redactions. Can you clarify how these choices are made? Does it have to do with those signing or not signing disclosure agreements at the engagement?</p> | <p>Thank you, James for your comment regarding inconsistencies in our approach to redacting personal information, specific to the Interested Persons Record of Consultation. We redact personal information (i.e., names, addresses, telephone numbers) to prevent public disclosure of sensitive personal details. We endeavor to be consistent with / meets the requirements of the Freedom of Information and Privacy Act . In instances where a person is representative of an organization (e.g., Non-Profit Organization or Corporations), their name, contact information and organization are not typically redacted. There is no correlation between signing or not signing disclosure agreements at the engagement, and redacted names and/or email addresses.</p> <p>Upon receipt of your inquiry, we audited our documents and noted some inconsistencies. Going forward to ensure consistency in our approach, we will adhere to the information provided above across all appendices, including in the appendices for the Interested Persons ROCE, prior to the public release.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 7           |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|---|-------------|
|                     |                        |  | MFFN CAR Project Team  |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 2                      | <p>I found a section of the Draft EA/IS confusing. Page 657 of the document states, "Gaps in snowbanks will be ploughed at least every 1 metre apart and maintained by road maintenance crews throughout the winter season." This regards moose crossings of the road. What does this exactly mean will be done?</p> | <p>Hi James,</p> <p>Thank you for your email. We would like to provide an updated response to your comment received on March 13, 2025.</p> <p>This mitigation measure outlines that road maintenance crews will create and maintain gaps in the snowbanks when they exceed a certain height. These will appear as small openings in the snowbanks and will be spaced at least 1 kilometer apart. We have acknowledged this error (i.e., 1m vs. 1km) in the draft EA/IS and we will correct it for the final EA/IS.</p> <p>The purpose of these gaps is to provide safe crossing points for moose, allowing them to cross the road more easily and reducing the risk of accidents involving vehicles and wildlife. In the Final EA/IS document we will add additional clarity regarding this item and its purpose.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>MFFN CAR Project Team</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 8           |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|-------------|
| Mushkegowuk Council | 3                      | What size is Marten Falls First Nation Territory (not the reserve)?   | <p>Hello James,</p> <p>Thank you for your email. The MFFN CAR Project Team Consultants completed studies in local and regional study areas that were determined for each discipline, however the scope of work carried out to complete the EA / IA process did not require mapping out the full territory of Marten Falls First Nation. As such, the Project Team does not have this information available.</p> <p>You may wish to reach out to the MFFN Band Office who may have information on their territorial boundaries.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>MFFN CAR Project Team</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 9           |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 5                      | Will the public/indigenous affected have a chance to comment on the Final EA/IS for the MFFN-CAR before it is submitted for the 6 sections(Community Well-Being, Visual Environment, Aboriginal and Treaty Rights and Interests, Visual, Peatlands + Atmospheric Environment (Air Quality) not summarized at this time before submission? | <p>Hi James,</p> <p>Thanks for your email.</p> <p>There will be a public review / comment period for the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement, at which time all comments will be directed to the Agency and MECP, with only copies provided to the proponent.</p>   | Comment noted; see response for details | 11          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|------------|------------------------|----------------|--|--------------------------|-------------|
|            |                        |                | <p>While the six sections raised in your email were not summarized in the main body of the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement report, these reports are available in the technical appendices, and all include an executive summary which can be reviewed and commented on. In addition, 11 plain language summaries have been developed, and included in the Assessment Summary, to provide accessible information around the studied value components. This information can be found on our website at <a href="http://eais.martenfallsaccessroad.ca">eais.martenfallsaccessroad.ca</a>. We encourage review and input on these draft materials to inform a higher quality Final report.</p> <p>The Community Wellbeing Report will be circulated in advance of the public review period and will be available with the other Technical Appendices online; distribution is targeted for mid-April. In addition, each of the 23 Indigenous communities listed in Section 11.2 will receive a Preliminary Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests Existing Conditions and Impact Assessment Report for review in Spring 2025. A generalized Summary Report outlining approach and high-level findings, with no confidential information</p> |                          |             |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|---|-------------|
|                     |                        |  | <p>included, will also be prepared and made available publicly for release in the final EA/IS.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>MFFN CAR Project Team</p>  |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 8                      | <p>I believe the Draft EA/IS for MFFN-CAR does not contain info on</p> <p>1. Visual Environment</p> <p>14.1.3.8 Visual Environment</p> <p>At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement this information was not available to summarize. The full Visual Environment Technical Support Document can be found in Appendix V. A summary will be provided in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.</p> <p>2. Aboriginal and Treaty Rights and Interests</p> <p>9.5.2 Aboriginal and Treaty Rights and Interests</p> <p>As described in Section 8.3.4, each of</p> | <p>Hi James,</p> <p>Thank you for your email. The following reports are available in full for review at the specified locations:</p> <p>Visual Environment Technical Support Document - Appendix V<br/>                     Peatlands Technical Support Document - Appendix I<br/>                     Atmospheric Environment Technical Support Document - Appendix S</p> <p>Each of the 23 Indigenous communities listed in Section 11.2 will receive a Preliminary Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests Existing Conditions and Impact Assessment Report for review in Spring 2025.</p> <p>At the time of drafting the Environmental Assessment/Impact Statement, certain discipline-specific information was unavailable for inclusion in the Draft</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 16          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|------------|------------------------|---|--|--------------------------|-------------|
|            |                        | <p>the 23 Indigenous communities listed in Section 11.2 will be issued a Preliminary Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests Existing Conditions and Impact Assessment Report. Marten Falls First Nation's intention is for Indigenous communities to first review this Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement. The feedback will be included as a summary in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement while keeping information confidential and will be developed based on dialogue</p> <p>3. Visual</p> <p>9.5.8 Visual Environment</p> <p>At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement, information from visual was not available to summarize. The full Visual Environment Technical Support Document can be found in Appendix V. A summary will be provided in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.</p> <p>4. Peatlands</p> <p>10.2.5 Peatlands</p> | <p>Report. Summaries of this information will be provided in the Final Environmental Assessment/Impact Statement, scheduled for release in Spring 2026.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>MFFN CAR Project Team</p> |                          |             |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|------------|------------------------|--|----------|--------------------------|-------------|
|            |                        | <p>At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement, the Peatlands cumulative effects assessment information was not available to summarize. The full Peatlands Technical Support Document can be found in Appendix I. A summary will be provided in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.</p> <p>5. Atmospheric Environment</p> <p>10.4.6.1 Air Quality</p> <p>At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement, the Air Quality effects assessment information was not available to summarize. The full Atmospheric Environment Technical Support Document can be found in Appendix S. A summary will be provided in the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.</p> <p>6. Cumulative Effects</p> <p>A full cumulative effects consultation report will be developed for submission with the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement, detailing activities</p> |          |                          |             |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                       | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>conducted, and input received throughout all phases of the Assessment Process. Section 11.8.1 summarizes feedback received on cumulative effects during Milestones 1, 2, and 3, as well as how this feedback has been or will be considered in the Cumulative Effects Assessment Report.</p> <p>Maybe the general public document will contain more complete info? That is what is referred to as the “final” rather than “draft” document?</p>   |  |  |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 8                      | <p>I am just surprised that such a significant document as the draft EA/IS would be officially released in a form that is as you acknowledge, basically unfinished. What percentage of the documents have been translated? Is there a % of the Marten Falls population that is unilingual or are these untranslated documents unavailable to them? It reminds me of the original treaty process whereby the agreements were explained to the populace by proponents before they were signed by the indigenous.</p> | <p>Hello James,</p> <p>Thank you for your continued interest in the Draft EA / IS for the Community Access Road - we appreciate your input.</p> <p>The submission of a Draft version of the EA / IS is intended to provide an advanced preview of the EA / IS submission to Indigenous communities, the public and regulators to allow for an early review of our information, approach and findings.</p> <p>This was done in part because the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement will be submitted by Marten Falls First Nation to the Ministry of the</p> | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p> | 19          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|------------|------------------------|----------------|--|--------------------------|-------------|
|            |                        |                | <p>Environment, Conservation and Parks and the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada for a decision by the Minister and Cabinet. By providing a Draft version early, it provides communities and other interested parties the ability to provide input on the Draft so that it can be considered and / or addressed in the Final.</p> <p>We understand that it may be disappointing that some information was not available at the time of submission, however, we felt it was important to get the majority of the report out in February to ensure that input on much of the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement could be received and incorporated where appropriate;</p> <p>We are working to translate the Executive Summary and related Plain Language Summaries of the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement into Oji-Cree, Ojibway, Swampy Cree and French, for posting on our project website as they become available:<br/> <a href="https://eais.martenfallsaccessroad.ca/">https://eais.martenfallsaccessroad.ca/</a> .</p> <p>We are in touch with our translation partners weekly and, unfortunately, they are expressing continued delays due to</p> |                          |             |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|-------------|
|                     |                        |   | <p>limited translation resources available across Canada. Please note that we do have some translations already available online and commit to posting the remainder as soon as they are provided to us.</p> <p>Information regarding languages spoken by Marten Falls First Nation will be available in the Draft Community Well-Being Technical Support Document: Existing Conditions &amp; Effects Assessment document. The Community Well-Being report will be available mid-April for review, with feedback to be received by mid/late June 2025.</p> <p>Please note that there will still be a review period of 7 weeks once the final EA/IS is posted on the Registry.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>MFFN CAR Project Team</p> |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 13                     | <p>the main use of the Community Access Road will be for Marten Falls First Nation, the Province also wants it to be used for potential future mineral exploration"</p> <p>To assert that the main reason for this road of the Community Access Road will</p> | <p>Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road.</p> <p>Items related to the local employment are discussed in Appendix T - Community</p>  | Comment noted; see response for details | 26          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|---|---|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>be for Marten Falls is concerning. The province/federal governments are paying for this road with the clear rationale that the taxes from future mines will lead to the cost being returned. The cost of this road to Marten Falls is well in excess of \$2,500,000 per resident.</p> <p>Is hiring of a road construction crew to be prioritized for locals/indigenous? How?</p>                                      | <p>Wellbeing Report. As discussed in this report there are mitigations outlined to support the use of local and indigenous training, including offering job readiness programs, providing information on opportunities and training programs in advance to assist community members in obtaining the necessary qualifications, creation of a working group with Marten Falls and Aroland First Nation to discuss issues related to employment and job readiness, and collaboration with Indigenous Employment and Training Services to prioritize hiring Indigenous community members. These items can be found in Table 7.4 - Summary of the Assessment of Effects in the Community Wellbeing Report which can be found in Appendix T.</p> |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 13                     | <p>The Community Access Road will consist of a new all-season multi-purpose road from Painter Lake Road to Marten Falls. Options for road ownership, operation and maintenance activities, and liability are being considered in discussion with the Province."</p> <p>It is unacceptable at this juncture to be unsure of this. All aspects of the environmental assessment are influenced by these potentialities.</p> | <p>We understand your frustration.</p> <p>Discussions with the Province are ongoing and if a decision on these matters is reached between now and when the EA/IS is finalized, we will update the EA/IS to reflect as such. The final road ownership being undetermined does not pose a barrier for successful completion of the EA/IS, as proponents of other project types occasionally sell permitted projects to other entities prior</p>   | Comment noted; see response for details | 27          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|-------------|
|                     |                        |   | to design or operation. The commitments in the EA/IS would transfer to the new ownership.   |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 13                     | <p>While the main use of the Community Access Road will be for our Community, the road will also be used for potential future mineral exploration"</p> <p>This road is part of a very large effort to establish mines in the Ring of Fire. The companies of Juno and Wyloo have spent millions of dollars and have frequently spoken of future plans. The government of Ontario has spoken at great length about plans for development in the area. Upgrades for handling mining truck use are to occur in a few months on roads from Aroland to the start of the MFFN_CAR. For the proponents to speak of this road as a “potential” mining road is very concerning.</p> | <p>Thank you for your feedback.</p> <p>While we are aware of the ongoing discussions and plans for the Ring of Fire area, we want to emphasize that the primary purpose of the Community Access Road is to serve the Marten Falls First Nation. As outlined in Section 4.1.1 of the draft EA/IS, the Provincial government has made several commitments regarding connecting Marten Falls First Nation with the existing highway network, outside of the discussions related to accessing minerals within the Ring of Fire area. Most specifically, the Growth Plan for Northern Ontario from 2011 outlines a commitment to improve roadway access for remote communities.</p> <p>Projects, including ones in the Ring of Fire area, that are considered reasonably foreseeable and have a temporal and/or spatial overlap with the Community Access Road have been considered as part of the cumulative effects assessment. Refer to Section 10 of the draft EA/IS for more details.</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 28          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|-------------|
| Mushkegowuk Council | 13                     | <p>Mino-bimaadziwin (living a good life) includes respecting and providing for all living beings"</p> <p>This report has often mentioned community concerns but not a concern for all living beings. Sufficient efforts have not been committed to in the construction of this road and in how it will eventually be used to Mino-bimaadziwin</p> | <p>Mino-bimaadziwin (living a good life) for all living beings is considered through the environmental assessments / impact assessments process. The environmental assessment process ensures that governments and public bodies consider potential environmental effects before an infrastructure project begins. An impact assessment is a planning tool aimed at increasing the positive effects of a project and reducing the impact of adverse federal effects of a project.</p> <p>As part of the environmental assessment / impact assessment for the Community Access Road, we identified what is valuable from an environmental, economic, social and health perspective. In and around Marten Falls, there are many valued components and we have grouped them into the following categories: water, land and people.</p> <p>This is how all living beings, not only the community concerns that you noted in your comment, have been considered as part of the project.</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 29          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 13                     | Segment 1 – Ogoki Crossing Preferred Route  | Thank you for your question regarding the route selection for Segment 1. Alternative 1 is the preferred route  | Comment noted; see response for         | 30          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|------------|------------------------|---|--|--------------------------|-------------|
|            |                        | <p>Statement 1</p> <p>Alternative 1 was the chosen route. Document states that this route had</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Smaller footprint and shorter road length than the other options;</li> <li>· Least disturbance to accessible habitats for Traditional Use Plants;</li> <li>· Least loss of peatland area and least impacts to fewest peatland types;</li> <li>· Least disturbance to significant landforms, soil, wildlife, wetlands, riparian ecosystems, upland ecosystems, birds, and caribou;</li> <li>· Crosses over the least amount of area of coarse-grained and bedrock surficial materials;</li> <li>· Least disturbed area of carbon sinks; and</li> <li>· Least number of waterbody crossing locations.</li> </ul> | <p>because it was the preferred choice of both Marten Falls First Nation and Aroland First Nations. While Alternative 1 may be the least preferred from an engineering and cost perspective, the communities' stated preference along with its environmental benefits (i.e., smaller footprint and shorter road length compared to the other options, resulting in overall fewer environmental impacts) make it the preferred route.</p> <p>Regarding your question on upgrades to Anaconda Road and Painter Lake Road, at the time when the draft EA/IS was being prepared, the proponent (referred to as others in the draft EA/IS as per your comment) of the upgrades to Anaconda Road and Painter Lake Road was unknown. On January 28, 2025 we learned that the Premier of Ontario, Minister of Northern Development, Minister of Indigenous Affairs and First Nations Economic Reconciliation, and Aroland First Nation Chief signed a Shared Prosperity Agreement to drive economic growth and build and upgrade infrastructure in Northern Ontario. This agreement includes support for upgrades to Anaconda and Painter Lake Roads. We will update the draft EA/IS, where applicable, to reflect this.</p> | <p>details</p>           |             |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|------------|------------------------|---|----------|--------------------------|-------------|
|            |                        | <p>Statement 2</p> <p>This is contrary to engineering analysis that reported it was the least preferred alternative as it</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Fewer bedrock quarry opportunities – requires longer hauls, increases cost;</li> <li>· Complex constructability – the majority of the route traverses poor substrates;</li> <li>· High schedule implications:</li> <li>· Road construction with poor substrates, terrain, and high cost to haul aggregates; and</li> <li>· No means of access without significant upgrades to the Painter Lake Road section;</li> <li>· High maintenance / operational costs due to poor ground terrain compared with other alternatives and gravel haul costs."</li> </ul> <p>These two statements hard to make sense of... is it not simply that</p> |          |                          |             |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>Alternative 1 is shorter but it traverses unsuitable terrain?</p> <p>"For the purposes of route selection, it was assumed that all upgrades to Anaconda Road and Painter Lake Road required to construct and operate Segment 1 will be completed in advance by others."</p> <p>Who are these "others"?</p> |   |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 13                     | <p>"ownership of the Community Access Road has yet to be made. It is currently unknown who will own, maintain and operate the Community Access Road"</p> <p>The plan regarding ownership and road maintenance is an integral part of the approval process and needs to be determined before approval.</p>     | Refer to response to ID 27.   | Comment noted; see response for details | 31          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 13                     | Does the cumulative effect analysis consider the ~ 5kms of secondary roads that commonly result from building a primary access road into virgin territory?  | The methodology for the cumulative effects assessment is outlined in Section 6.8 of the draft EA/IS, and defines the methodology for including spatial, temporal overlap and reasonably foreseeable projects. This section also outlines those reasonably foreseeable projects which were included in the assessment of cumulative effects. Secondary roads which are not currently | Comment noted; see response for details | 32          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                       | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|-------------|
|                     |                        |   | <p>planned are considered not reasonably foreseeable projects, even though we understand that these roads could potentially occur. It would not be possible to include them in this assessment as the location, size, and type of those projects is not currently known. In the permitting for any future roads, stakeholders can request that the proponent consider the cumulative effects those new roads have on the environment, and that cumulative effects assessment would need to consider the effects of the Marten Falls Community Access Road as described in our report. If you are aware of any projects that are reasonably foreseeable in the Project Area, which have defined project footprints, that have not been included in our inclusions list we would welcome that information.</p> |  |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 13                     | <p>Were caribou crossings considered regarding road embankment slope? What long term mitigations will there be to safeguard caribou? Designated crossings? Road closures during times of caribou movement or extreme sensitivity(calving?) Truck convoys rather than 100s of individual vehicles? Reduced speed limits in certain areas? Minimizing of sightlines and travel corridors that favour predators?</p> | <p>Mitigations for Caribou are discussed in Section 9.4.5 beginning on page 601, and mitigations proposed are described in Table 9-27 on page 609. A large number of mitigations for effects related to linear barriers (i.e., the road) are proposed for both the construction and operation phases beginning on page 629, including the development of strategic crossing points. Additional mitigations for caribou would be created</p>  | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p> | 33          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|---|---|-------------|
|                     |                        |  | during detailed design, including determinations of where key crossing points may occur.  |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 13                     | Consistency of units of water used would make this clearer rather than litres for per person/day and cubic metres/day for a camp or construction. Many people do not understand how much a cubic meter of water is in reality.   | Thank you for your comment. We will take this into consideration when we finalize the draft EA/IS.  | Comment noted; see response for details | 34          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 13                     | <p>Waste/wastewater(black water) should be trucked to existing sewage/wastewater facilities with authorization/capacity rather than the construction and operation of onsite leaching beds</p> <p>"Once construction is complete, temporary infrastructure that is no longer needed will be removed and abandoned or decommissioned. Sand and gravel pits, including temporary access roads leading to the pits, will be decommissioned by backfilling, levelling, compacting, and redistributing soils to encourage natural revegetation."</p> <p>Upon decommissioning pits and quarries will there be guaranteed rehabilitation by establishment and maintenance in support of recovery? Monitoring?</p> | <p>Due to the remote nature of this project, at the onset of construction, the ability to truck out sewage and waste will be limited. Accordingly, onsite treatment will be required.</p> <p>The Aggregate Permitting process requires rehabilitation plans for each pit and quarry as a component of the permitting process.</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 35          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|-------------|
| Mushkegowuk Council | 13                     | <p>Peak traffic on the road being estimated as in year 2046 is perplexing. Will this not be ≤ 12 years after the mines begin operating? Are not the mining activities expected to go on for 50-100 years? This “peak” traffic will then consist of a truck on the road every 2 minutes – correct?</p> | <p>General roadway design practice involves forecasting traffic volumes over an 8 to 15 year period, which is intended to coincide with the (typical) future roadway rehabilitation work activities. Once constructed, the described roadway volumes will be monitored and updated, with any future improvements based upon the volume and type of vehicles using the facility.</p> <p>Mining activities that are considered reasonably foreseeable projects have been taken into consideration for the cumulative effects assessment. Section 10 in the draft EA/IS includes information on the projects considered in the cumulative effects assessment by each technical discipline. Table 10-1 also includes project duration for these projects.</p> <p>As you have calculated, a volume of 700 vehicles per day equates to a vehicle every 2 minutes.</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 36          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 14                     | <p>Only half of the road water crossings were assessed for fish habitat and half of fish communities were sampled(if fish are found likely to be due to the habitat assessment?) “The complete description of fish and fish habitat existing conditions</p>   | <p>Additional detail on how the field investigations were conducted, including more information on the rationale for the approach is outlined in Section 4.3.2 of the Fish and Fish Habitat Report - Appendix G and in Section 2.2. of</p>  | Comment noted; see response for details | 37          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>is documented in the Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document (Appendix G).”</p> <p>The work on the ground for this 180km road section consisted of less than a total of 6 weeks for the entire period. This does not seem like sufficient work accounting for the fluctuations in the environment to calculate the effects of the road with any certainty.</p> | <p>Attachment B (which is inside of Appendix G) - Fish and Fish Habitat Baseline Report which provides additional details on the field programs completed in Summer and Fall between 2019 and 2022. Attachment B also documents the findings at each crossing which was assessed. The approach of completing assessments at 50% of the water crossings for the purpose of describing the existing environment to assess effects to fish and fish habitat for the EA/IS was developed through consultation with the Agency, DFO and MNR, as the Fisheries Biologist felt that it would provide enough information to inform the existing condition of the area. The field studies included water crossings identified as culturally significant to Marten Falls and Aroland First Nation. Additional site specific surveys will be conducted during detailed design at each crossing where work will occur below the high water mark, following the determination of crossing design and precise location. This is committed to in the EA / IS in Table 9-10 Summary of Residual Effects for Fish and Fish Habitat on page 407.</p> |                          |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 14                     | The waterbodies that are to be crossed by the road number around 50. The   | The 'waterbodies' that are identified for crossing within the Draft EA / IS are of a   | Comment noted; see       | 38          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                       | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>upgrades to the nearby Gull Bay Road(the other side of Lake Nipigon) plans for installation of 43 culverts. This road is only 10 kilometers long. Why are there so few culverts on the 180km approved route? Will this not be a concern for animals wanting to travel accessing mating sites, foraging, migrating or perhaps snakes seeking their hibernaculum? Can the road edge not be constructed to guide animals to culverts under the road at known paths to prevent them being crushed by vehicles on the road?</p> | <p>size which warrant a structure in accordance with the Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code (i.e., 3.0 metre span minimum). Otherwise, the total number of 'non-structural' (i.e., smaller than 3.0 metre) culverts to be designed and installed continues to be assessed, and will be based upon factors including topography and terrestrial requirements.</p> <p>Wildlife crossings will be further determined in detail design following the detailed micrositing of the route alignment, bridges and other features. At this stage of the project, it is not possible to provide detailed information about the wildlife crossings because the route alignment, bridges, and other features are still being microsited. This detailed design phase is crucial as it allows us to identify the most effective locations for wildlife crossings based on the finalized route and infrastructure layout. Post construction monitoring will additionally inform where crossings may be effective, or where they are ineffective.</p> | <p>response for details</p>                    |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 14                     | <p>Beaver dams at 10% of water crossings.</p> <p>Are there plans for installation of plug resistant culverts to prevent beavers flooding/damaging the road at places</p>  | <p>Section 9 of the draft EA/ IS in Table 9-22, beginning on page 496, includes a number of mitigations outlined for beavers (i.e., screening culverts and regularly checking water crossings for</p>  | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p> | 39          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|---|---|-------------|
|                     |                        | that are problematic from an engineering standpoint?   | evidence of beaver activity, etc.). The design of culverts to avoid impacts to and from beavers is an element that will be considered in detailed design.   |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 14                     | Will simple rest/camping areas be set up at crossing points with rivers considered regarding them likely becoming camping/fishing locations?   | Currently there are no plans to facilitate access to waterbodies for recreational purposes. The details regarding rest areas, and access points would be considered in the detailed design phase of the project, and would be developed in collaboration with Marten Falls First Nation and Aroland First Nation.   | Comment noted; see response for details | 40          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 15                     | <p>Many comments that the road need have wildlife crossings"</p> <p>Will the proponents commit to creating crossings for fish + wildlife to continue to transit over or under where the road is to be created with fences to guide + protect them from traffic fatalities? These might be caribou/moose/wolverines/rabbits/marten /frogs/snakes/turtles or any number of other species. Bridges can be created over the road or underneath where the road crosses depressions in the land. Tunnels for amphibians, reptiles or smaller mammals could save species from extinction.</p> | The final design of the roadway is anticipated to be completed in a manner which accommodates fish and / or reptile passage consistent with the current topography to the degree possible. Otherwise, it's anticipated that larger species will freely cross the roadway (i.e., no fencing or passage system(s)) unless the roadway creates a significant obstruction; in which case a bridge or large culvert will be considered to continue promoting safe passage of wildlife. | Comment noted; see response for details | 41          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|-------------|
| Mushkegowuk Council | 15                     | <p>No invasive plant species were identified during field investigations. It should be noted that absence of invasive plant species in ground inspection sites does not imply that invasive plant species are absent from the entire existing conditions Construction Disturbance Area, existing conditions Local Study Area, or existing conditions Regional Study Area; however, existing conditions indicate negligible to low invasive plant species presence.</p> <p>8.2.5 Wildlife</p> <p>From June to September 2019, 21 remote cameras were set up, and from June 2021 to June 2023, 30 more cameras were added. These cameras recorded for a total of 22,841 days."</p> <p>How were these #s arrived at? Cameras failed some days to record?</p> <p>(120 days x 21 cameras = 2,520) +(730 days x 51 cameras = 37,230) totaling 39,750 camera days</p> <p>What is the size of the territory of Marten Falls First Nation and what % of a species habitat does the road area represent? If habitat is avoided by</p> | <p>The number of days that each camera was active was determined by subtracting the date when the camera was retrieved from the date of deployment, after adjusting for malfunction / interference events (e.g., if batteries died, memory card was full, the camera was knocked down by wildlife, etc.). As such, not all cameras collected data for the same number of days. More details about baseline field studies including the remote camera program are provided in Appendix K (Wildlife) and Appendix M (Ungulate). The wording of this section has been revised for the Final EA/IS.</p> <p>The proposed location of the Community Access Road overlaps entirely with habitat that is currently used year-round or seasonally by many wildlife species, including caribou and moose. Wildlife response to the construction and operation of the Community Access Road is predicted to vary by species, depending on their adaptability and tolerance of disturbance. The potential impacts on the availability and distribution of wildlife habitat (both loss and avoidance of habitat), and potential changes in distribution of the animals, is discussed in detail in Appendix K</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 42          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|-------------|
|                     |                        | caribou 5kms from the road wouldn't that represent a area almost 20% of Marten Falls territory that will now be little used by caribou?   | (Wildlife), Appendix L (Birds) and Appendix M (Ungulate). The potential impacts to Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests are discussed in community-specific ATRI reports.   |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 15                     | Why does so much of the road's northern 2/3s seem to be in prime beaver habitat? Is this just some artefact that has resulted from the nature of the study?   | A habitat suitability model informed by literature review was developed to predict the distribution of beaver habitat throughout the Local Study Area and Regional Study Area. The northern half of the study areas contains a greater distribution of the wetland habitat considered as high quality beaver habitat.  | Comment noted; see response for details | 43          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 15                     | It is unclear whether sightings were from field observations or camera shots. Are they the same?  | The sightings mentioned are from the wildlife cameras. Section 8.2.5 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to clarify.   | Final EA/IS Section 8.2.5               | 44          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 15                     | <p>We don't know much about where many pollinators live in the north because there hasn't been much research. However, there are plenty of plants for pollinators to feed on throughout the study area. Foraging habitat is not considered a limiting factor for pollinating insects in the existing conditions Local Study Area and Regional Study Area."</p> <p>Pollinators a frequently quite specific as to their diet. It isn't sufficient to say that</p> | <p>There are many species of pollinating insects, many of which are foraging generalists, others are more specific in their selection of forage plants.</p> <p>The ecosystems of northern Ontario are less bio-diverse than those in eco-regions further south in the province. The study areas consist of a mosaic of repeating plant communities, within similar assembles of plant species with very few rare plants, and almost no</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 45          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                       | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|--|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>there are plenty of plants for pollinators to feed on. Invasive species are likely going to come into this area as they have in many other areas and the species that rely on a plant that is extirpated due to being outcompeted by the invasive will suffer. This has certainly happened where the invasive Phragmites or the ornamental lupine commonly sold at garden centers, that can breed with native lupine such that the resulting hybrid plants are not suitable for Karner Blue Butterflies now extirpated in Ontario.</p> | <p>invasive species. The pollinating insects that have adapted to inhabit this region, have evolved to the regional ecological context. The plant communities and forage plant species that will be removed by the Community Access Road will remain abundant and widespread.</p> <p>Invasive species can pose a threat to native pollinating plants and the insects that forage on them. The potential effects, mitigation measures, and predicted residual effects of the introduction and spread of invasive plant species is discussed in the Attachment B to the Wildlife Technical Support Document (Appendix K). The assessment predicts that an effect on wildlife populations will occur due to the introduction and spread of invasive plant species. However, these effects are predicted to be confined to the Construction Disturbance Area and negligible in magnitude.</p> |  |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 15                     | <p>The highest number of common yellowthroats was in the Local Study Area, with 0.33 individuals per plot during point count surveys."</p> <p>What size were plots?</p>   | <p>Point counts used a 100m radius plot, therefore the total area of each plot was 3.14 ha.</p>   | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p> | 46          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|-------------|
| Mushkegowuk Council | 15                     | <p>Evening grosbeak: listed as a Special Concern species under both the Species at Risk Act and the Endangered Species Act. These birds usually live in mixed and young forests. They were not found during field studies for the Community Access Road, so they might not live in the Project study areas. Evening grosbeaks don't migrate. They mainly eat insects, so the global decline in insects could reduce their food supply."</p> <p>Evening grosbeaks primarily eat seeds, berries and tree buds. Where was this information sourced from?</p> | <p>The Draft EA/IS wording is incorrect regarding what evening grosbeaks eat, omitting plant seeds and buds (see Section 5.6.2.3 of Appendix L Draft Birds Technical Support Document) that outlines this as "Evening grosbeaks primarily eat insects, including beetles, caterpillars, and aphids, but will also consume plant seeds and buds (Gillihan and Byers, 2020)."</p> <p>The wording in the Final EA/IS has been updated to clarify that Evening Grosbeaks also consume plant seeds and buds, referencing Gillihan and Byers, 2020. The Final EA/IS has further clarified that during the growing season the species primarily relies on insects (with a lesser component consisting of seeds and buds), while in the non-growing season the species will switch its diet to seeds and buds.</p> | Final EA/IS Section 8.2.5               | 47          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 15                     | <p>We assume that eastern migratory caribou will face the same effects as boreal caribou when they are in the ungulates study areas."</p> <p>These animals have very different life habits and the effects cannot be assumed to be the same.</p>  | <p>In cases where effects would be similar for multiple species that use similar habitats, only one species was selected as a Valued Component to reduce assessment redundancy. Understanding the potential effects of the Community Access Road on the selected Valued Components provides inferences about effects on other wildlife species with</p>  | Comment noted; see response for details | 48          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name  | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised                         | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|-------------|------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|-------------|
|             |                        |  | <p>similar life history and habitat requirements. For example, collar data past research and from animals collared for this Project's existing conditions studies suggest that the winter ranges of eastern migratory caribou (<i>Rangifer tarandus</i>) overlap with the Ungulate Local Study Area in some years (Berglund et al., 2014; Pond et al., 2016; Appendix M [Ungulates Technical Support Document]), even though the federally and provincially delineated range boundaries do not indicate they overlap (MNR, 2009a). The assessment of effects from the Community Access Road on boreal woodland caribou is expected to overestimate effects on eastern migratory caribou due to higher frequency and longer duration of interaction with the Community Access Road, as boreal woodland caribou are annual residents of the area; thus, eastern migratory caribou was not selected as a Valued Component, but a qualitative narrative is included where applicable. In addition, mitigation measures implemented for boreal caribou would result in avoidance and minimization of effects on eastern migratory caribou.</p> |                          |             |
| Mushkegowuk | 15                     | What compensatory new habitat, habitat | Table 9.4-14 of the Final EA/IS (formerly   | Comment                  | 49          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|-------------|
| Council             |                        | improvements or increase in survival rate can be offered for habitat lost via road construction/use?  | Table 9-27 of the Draft EA/IS) includes information on proposed mitigation and enhancement measures to avoid, minimize and restore residual effects of the Community Access Road. This includes mitigations for habitat loss and alteration, sensory disturbance, and increased mortality risk from road construction and operation. Mitigations include minimizing overlap with Category 1 areas, and avoiding vegetation clearing and construction activities during caribou sensitive timing windows (May 1 to September 15 for nursery areas, December 1 to March 31 for winter use areas) to the extent practical. Techniques that accelerate revegetation will also be used to maintain or improve ungulate habitat. In addition, as noted in Section 14.4.2.4 of the Final EA/IS, a Preliminary Biodiversity Offset Plan will be developed and implemented for the Community Access Road to achieve a net positive increase in caribou functional habitat. This preliminary plan is provided in Appendix AB of the Final EA/IS. | noted; see response for details         |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 15                     | “They spent less time in the southern parts, where there were more human activities like forestry. Caribou preferred areas far from communities and buildings, which matches other findings | Caribou avoidance of roads and areas with high density of linear features has been well documented across Canada; however, some research in northern Saskatchewan where there is very low  | Comment noted; see response for details | 50          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|---|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>in Northern Ontario (Berglund et al. 2014, Poley et al. 2014).”</p> <p>“The southern part of the caribou Regional Study Area is less suitable for caribou because there are more human activities”</p> <p>This road must be of great concern as it will also increase human activities and result in this not being a preferred area for caribou.</p> | <p>density of roads and low density of predators has shown that roads do not appear to be avoided as strongly. Because of uncertainty associated with caribou response to linear features in this region, the potential effect of linear barriers on caribou distribution and connectivity has been assessed as significant. Information about current understanding of caribou response to disturbances and predicted impacts of the Community Access Road is provided in detail in Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document. Section 8.2.7.1 has been updated in the Final EA/IS.</p> |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 15                     | <p>“Caribou react differently to disturbances like roads and trails, often showing little to no reaction, especially in areas with fewer disturbances. This behaviour is consistent with other studies in the region”</p> <p>This statement does not equate with statements on Page 247/295.</p>   | <p>This statement has been removed from Section 8.2.7.1.2 of the Final EA/IS (formerly Section 8.2.7.1 of the Draft EA/IS).</p>  | Final EA/IS Section 8.2.7.1             | 51          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 15                     | <p>Caribou appear to travel through the northern, northeastern, and central portions of the caribou existing conditions Regional Study Area to reaching their calving and winter ranges, indicating</p>  | <p>The construction of the Community Access Road will increase the linear density in the Missisa caribou range, but the density of roads and associated fragmentation of habitat will still be much</p>  | Comment noted; see response for details | 52          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name  | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|-------------|------------------------|---|--|--------------------------|-------------|
|             |                        | <p>good connectivity in these regions. However, we don't have enough data on caribou in the southern part to understand connectivity there. Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry has noted that many human-made disturbances and linear features in the Nipigon and Pagwachuan ranges may have reduced connectivity and movement in these areas (Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, 2014a, 2014b). Overall, there are few disruptions from human activities in the study area and in the Missisa and Ozhiski caribou ranges in the northern part of the caribou existing conditions Regional Study Area. Currently, caribou survival and reproduction don't seem to be limited by connectivity issues in the caribou existing conditions Local Study Area and northern portion of the caribou existing conditions Regional Study Area. Table 8-41 outlines the start and end dates that collared caribou traveled within pre-calving and fall travel corridors."</p> <p>Would not the construction of a road reduced this habitat connectivity to like the more southerly regions where there are more human disturbances?</p> | <p>less than the density in the southern part of the study area (Nipigon and Pagwachuan ranges), where forestry and other human disturbances are higher in the existing environment. Habitat connectivity is predicted to be reduced in the Caribou Regional Study Area as a result of the linear barrier from the Community Access Road. Detailed information about current understanding of caribou response to linear features and predicted impacts of the Community Access Road on habitat connectivity is provided in Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.</p> |                          |             |
| Mushkegowuk | 16                     | Wolves are the main threat to caribou,  | We agree that polar bears do not hunt  | Comment                  | 53          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                       | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|---|--|-------------|
| Council             |                        | <p>but black bears and occasionally polar bears also hunt them.</p> <p>Polar bears do not hunt caribou in Marten Falls area. Wolves and caribou have coexisted for untold millennia. Recent extinction threats are the result of human related environmental changes, like roads. I am not saying this as a statement against the building of the road but rather to clarify.</p>  | <p>caribou in the Marten Falls area, and that wolves are the primary predator for caribou in Ontario. In Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document, it is noted that polar bears have been reported to opportunistically hunt caribou when they are on the coast of Hudson Bay.</p> | <p>noted; see response for details</p>         |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 16                     | <p>Moose occur across Canada in a wide variety of habitats and is an important harvest animal for Indigenous communities. Moose are not at risk and not federally or provincially listed (Government of Ontario 2023a, Government of Canada 2023). Moose are managed in Ontario within Cervid Ecological Zones and at the scale of wildlife management units."</p> <p><a href="https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/thunder-bay/moose-population-drops-thunder-bay-1.7542243#:~:text=The%20moose%20population%20has%20declined,with%20GPS%20on%20the%20animals.">https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/thunder-bay/moose-population-drops-thunder-bay-1.7542243#:~:text=The%20moose%20population%20has%20declined,with%20GPS%20on%20the%20animals.</a></p> <p>Both traditional ecological knowledge and Western scientific studies agree that</p> | <p>We appreciate and acknowledge the information regarding the hunting tag system.</p>  | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p> | 54          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                       | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>climate change, diseases and parasites are the key drivers of the dwindling moose populations. Moose have been extirpated in many parts of Canada as have been many large mammals that are found in the Marten Falls area. Moose are so rare in some parts of Turtle Island that in order to hunt a moose the hunter must enter a special draw. This entry can win a hunting tag but can only be entered(win or lose) once in the hunter's lifetime.</p> |  |  |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 16                     | <p>Hunting is managed through a tag system</p> <p>For MFFN members</p>  | <p>We appreciate and acknowledge the information regarding the hunting tag system.</p>   | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p> | 55          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 16                     | <p>Water erosion risk was not calculated for organic soils which make up the majority of the road bed. Why? What about erosion from melting permafrost?</p>   | <p>The water erosion equation is designed for mineral soil. If a risk rating were to be assigned to organic areas, it would be "very low" as organic materials are typically effective at preventing water erosion. Areas of organic soil are also associated with level topography, which is not prone to water erosion. If present, permafrost melting would likely not result in water erosion.</p> | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p> | 56          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 16                     | <p>"Areas of organic soils have not been rated but would likely be at a high risk for compaction."</p>  | <p>Settling is a significant consideration in engineering, particularly in non-frozen organic areas. Appropriate engineering</p>   | <p>Comment noted; see response for</p>         | 57          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|-------------|
|                     |                        | The majority (60%) of the roadbed is organic. Settling must be a huge consideration.  | measures will be considered during the next phase of the Community Access Road and incorporated into the construction plan.  | details                                 |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 16                     | No mention of colonization’s well documented history of induced violence, introduced racism + religious prejudice, residential schools or the introduction of diseases that killed millions of the indigenous   | The Final EA/IS has been updated to include a summary of Aboriginal, Treaty Rights and Interests and a summary of Community Wellbeing will be added. These sections include information on the effects of colonialism on Indigenous communities.   | Final EA/IS ATRI and CWB sections       | 58          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 19                     | Most analyses of colonial contact across Turtle Island refer to the introduction of devastating diseases introduced and the resulting deaths of many if not most of the population.   | It is important to acknowledge these devastating diseases and their results. In all archaeological assessment reports this is discussed in Section 1.2.2 and has been updated in Section 8.3.6.2 of the Final EA/IS.   | Final EA/IS Section 8.3.6.2             | 61          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 19                     | <p>In light of the latter statements in the document Winter road sees on “average daily traffic of 9.5 vehicles” and “existing traffic on the winter road is estimated to generate approximately 21.1 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent” annually.</p> <p>“the existing land uses in the area emit about 1,646 tonnes of carbon annually”</p> <p>The proposed road traffic in 2036 would yield ~ 1,554.7 tonnes of carbon</p> | <p>The existing traffic on the winter access road and the resulting GHG emissions are minimal due to its limited accessibility throughout the year.</p> <p>Detailed estimates of GHG emissions from both existing and future road traffic, as well as those associated with land use changes, are provided in Appendix S Atmospheric Environment Technical Support Document.</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 62          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name  | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|-------------|------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|-------------|
|             |                        | <p>annually? Likely significantly more as it would consist of more heavy trucks and their exhaust contains ~ 4X the carbon than a light truck/SUV. Is there an overall calculation of the road's change as far as carbon produced? I am thinking of a balance of carbon release now versus after a road is built? Some analysis of factors like there being less airplane travel but more vehicle use, no diesel generation of electricity versus the carbon used in road or transmission line construction and the switch from the carbon capturing in the existing muskeg(occurring through plant growth) versus the carbon release that will result from the dead sphagnum's digestion/release into the environment or the environmental changes brought about?</p> | <p>Specifically, the annual GHG estimates for the operation of the proposed road are based on the projected maximum vehicular traffic volume for the year 2046 (AECOM, 2024. Marten Falls Community Access Road PD EA – Traffic Data Review). These estimates use emission factors from the US EPA Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator (MOVES), which account for anticipated improvements in engine emission controls and fuel efficiencies in future years. The report notes that "Greenhouse gas emissions from existing and avoided air travel are not quantitatively assessed due to limited flight data availability and the significant uncertainties involved in estimating flight data."</p> <p>The GHG emission estimates related to land use changes followed the Technical Guide Related to the Strategic Assessment of Climate Change, published by Environment and Climate Change Canada. In accordance with this guidance, the project's effects on carbon sinks (i.e., carbon sequestration rates) in disturbed areas, including forest lands and wetlands, are quantified separately from the project's net GHG emissions.</p> |                          |             |
| Mushkegowuk | 19                     | Are there plans to compensate the  | Marten Falls First Nation continues to   | Comment                  | 63          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|---|---|-------------|
| Council             |                        | trapline holders where the road will depopulate or otherwise make areas unusable?  | engage in discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and future operations and maintenance of the Community Access Road. Access and ownership are not within the scope of the Final EA/IS, however it is a matter that will require further dialogue between the communities and the Province. The Marten Falls First Nation Community Access Road Project Team cannot comment on who would be responsible for compensation at this time.  | noted; see response for details.        |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 19                     | <p>“45 waterbody crossings along the Preferred Route will have permanent waterbody crossing structures installed, including 13 culverts, 22 clear-span bridges, and 10 multi-span bridges.”</p> <p>What about culverts for drainage/species transit/migration as these will be an average of 4kms apart? Nearby roads have culverts ~ 400 metres apart. Will there be fencing to guide wildlife to safe crossing points over/under the road?</p> | <p>The 'waterbodies' that are identified for crossing within the Final EA / IS are of a size which warrant a structure in accordance with the Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code (i.e., 3.0 metre span minimum). Otherwise, the total number of 'non-structural' (i.e., smaller than 3.0 metre) culverts to be designed and installed continues to be assessed, and will be based upon factors including topography and wildlife crossing / fish passage considerations.</p> <p>Wildlife crossings will be further determined in the detail design following the detailed micro-siting of the route alignment, bridges and other features. At this stage of the Community Access Road, it is not possible to provide</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 64          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|---|-------------|
|                     |                        |  | <p>detailed information about the wildlife crossings because the route alignment, bridges, and other features are still being microsited. Further, any proposed wildlife crossing will be considered in combination with wildlife fencing. This detail design phase is crucial as it allows us to identify the most effective locations for wildlife crossings based on the finalized route and infrastructure layout. Post construction monitoring will additionally inform where crossings may be effective, or where they are ineffective.</p>                                  |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 19                     | <p>Diversions of waterways involving less than 20% of the drainage area have been documented to produce measurable changes in biota. Timing and the nature of such changes also has considerable effect. Consider the changes brought about by the change in timing of water outflow on eiders by the Great Whale Project due to the altered salinity patterns in Washaybayoh from the lack of a spring freshet after the dam construction. There will be unforeseeable effects.</p> | <p>There is no planned diversion of waterways or drainage area away from natural watershed. Only short-term water diversion (i.e., water transfer from upstream to downstream) around waterbody structures during construction will occur. Waterways/streams with continue to drain to their natural pathways.</p> <p>Land cover changes within local watershed were assessed and discussed in Section 7.3.2.5 of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document. Permanent changes (based on worst case scenario) at selected assessment points were estimated for large</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 65          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|---|-------------|
|                     |                        |  | <p>watersheds (0.07% to 0.17% with mean of 0.1%), medium watersheds (0.37% to 1.77% with mean of 0.7%) and small watershed (0.32% to 4.22% with mean of 2.35%). Considering that the changes are within 5%, impacts to surface water are anticipated to be negligible.</p>   |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 19                     | <p>Negligible – “no changes to aquatic life or potable sources of water are anticipated”</p> <p>Low – “anticipated to remain protective of aquatic life and potable sources of water”</p> <p>Medium - “anticipated to remain protective of aquatic life and potable sources of water”</p> <p>High – “could potentially impair aquatic life or potable sources of water”</p> <p>Do the latter parameters not seem skewed towards the low end seeing as only one of 4 terms describes events being of concern?</p> | <p>We understand the concern that the qualitative descriptors (Negligible, Low, Medium, High) may appear skewed toward the lower end of the scale, given that only the “High” category explicitly describes a potential for adverse effects. However, this is not the case.</p> <p>Medium – While it uses the phrase “anticipated to remain protective of aquatic life and potable sources of water,” the Medium category is not intended to convey low concern. In addition to percent change, the Medium classification also accounts for statistical significance—specifically, situations where predicted changes fall modestly outside natural variation. These cases warrant greater scrutiny because even modest deviations can indicate emerging or uncertain risks.</p> <p>Depending on the degree of statistical significance and the variability of</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 66          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|-------------|
|                     |                        |   | <p>background conditions, additional assessment and/or mitigation measures may be required for Medium-level results. Therefore, the Medium category functions as an intermediate risk level—not skewed toward Low—and is used to flag conditions requiring closer examination even when not expected to result in measurable impairment.</p>   |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 19                     | <p>Oversized bridges/culverts and more numerous culverts than deemed by engineers are needed for wildlife. These would be installed to facilitate animal movement without necessitating road crossing</p> <p>“Waterbody crossing design and construction will maintain the characteristic channel width, depths, slopes, and substrate in the event that a channel realignment is required, noting that: Channel realignments and / or infillings will be avoided through Project planning and design to the extent practicable.</p> <p>Channel realignments and / or infilling will only be undertaken in locations where specific conditions are met and / or where required for safety and security purposes; and if required.</p> | <p>The 'waterbodies' that are identified for crossing within the Final EA / IS are of a size which warrant a structure in accordance with the Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code (i.e., 3.0 metre span minimum). Otherwise, the total number of 'non-structural' (i.e., smaller than 3.0 metre) culverts to be designed and installed continues to be assessed, and will be based upon factors including topography and wildlife crossing / fish passage considerations.</p> <p>We agree that any impacts to Fish and Fish Habitat will need to be discussed with MNR and DFO through their established permitting processes.</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 67          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>A realignment would avoid the use of a Fisheries and Oceans Canada code of practice (required approval by Fisheries and Oceans Canada), with the plan and mitigations requiring reviewed by Ministry of Natural Resources through permitting the water crossing.”</p> <p>As this would affect fish habitat DFO should be involved in plan review as well as MNRF.</p>  |   |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 25                     | <p>Wetlands in the area are mostly peatlands, which were analyzed for their carbon sink capacities. Peatlands are carbon sources, emitting carbon during non-growing seasons. The area includes bogs, fens, and swamps, emitting 14 tonnes, 551 tonnes, and 1,080 tonnes of carbon annually, respectively.</p> <p>To assert that peatlands are a carbon source is very bizarre and contrary to extensively researched information. There are many mentions of the importance of peatlands as carbon sinks and their importance as such. It should be considered that building this road will result in the death of the peatlands that presently exist there and those areas ceasing to sequester carbon from the</p> | <p>It is acknowledged that the results of the GHG assessment are counterintuitive as peatlands, including bogs and fens, are typically considered carbon sinks. However, it is noted that many studies for carbon flux do not include the flux associated with non-growing seasons. The carbon sink analysis followed the guidance in the Strategic Assessment of Climate Change (SACC) Guidance on quantification of net GHG emissions, impact on carbon sinks, mitigation measures, net-zero plan, and upstream GHG assessment (August 2021). This assessment required calculating an annual carbon flux, encompassing both the growing and non-growing seasons.</p> <p>Literature documents that during non-</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 73          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                       | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>atmosphere. The existing peat will also breakdown and the stored carbon released to the atmosphere in the decomposition.</p>  | <p>growing seasons (approximately 212 days per year), bogs and fens are CO2 emitters (sources), whereas during growing seasons (approximately 153 days per year), they are carbon accumulators (sinks). Calculating net carbon flux on an annual basis resulted in a net release of CO2 (source).</p> <p>The following literature supports the analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Webster et al. (2018). Spatially-integrated estimates of net ecosystem exchange and methane fluxes from Canadian peatlands.</li> <li>- Davidson et al. (2022). The unrecognized importance of carbon stocks and fluxes from swamps in Canada and the USA.</li> </ul> <p>Details of the analysis are discussed within Appendix S1 Atmospheric Environment Technical Support Document.</p> |  |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 25                     | <p>“Crashes with wildlife are a serious economic burden. For example, the Ontario Ministry of Transportation 2005 statistics state that roughly 6% of all motor vehicle collisions involve wildlife (<a href="http://www.mto.gov.on.ca/english/safety/wildlife.shtml">www.mto.gov.on.ca/english/safety/wildlife.shtml</a>), which corresponds to about</p> | <p>Wildlife crossings will be further determined in detail design following the detailed micro-siting of the route alignment, bridges and other features. At this stage of the Community Access Road, it is not possible to provide detailed information about the wildlife</p>  | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p> | 74          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                       | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>14,000 crashes per year in Ontario alone. With an estimated average vehicle-damage cost of about \$2,800 per crash (L-P Tardif &amp; Associates 2003)” taken from Traffic Injury Research Foundation</p> <p>These are reported accidents and do not represent the majority of deaths that are vertebrates killed(frogs, snakes, salamanders, birds, bats) or the numerous insects. Will you commit to modern road building techniques to preserve the lives of species living in the areas the road will travel? What will you do?</p> | <p>crossings because the route alignment, bridges, and other features are still being microsited. Further, any proposed wildlife crossing will be considered in combination with wildlife fencing. This detail design phase is crucial as it allows us to identify the most effective locations for wildlife crossings based on the finalized route and infrastructure layout. Post construction monitoring will additionally inform where crossings may be effective, or where they are ineffective.</p>                                |  |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 25                     | <p>Road construction and maintenance would certainly have an impact on water quality. Siltation rates would increase due to environmental change in disturbed and cleared areas. Inevitable accidents resulting in spills, and the required winter sanding would also have a significant effect.</p>  | <p>Due to project-environment interaction, potential impacts are anticipated, and these could be significant if not mitigated. However, to mitigate the anticipated potential project impacts on water quality, mitigation and enhancement measures and best management practices are proposed.</p> <p>Section 7 of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document presents details of potential project impacts and the specific mitigations and enhancement measures to mitigate/minimize each impact on water quality during</p> | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p> | 75          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|---|-------------|
|                     |                        |  | <p>Construction and Operation and Maintenance phases. Residual effect assessment of impacts after the implementation of planned mitigation measures is also presented.</p> <p>In addition, monitoring programs (Section 9 of Appendix F) during pre-construction, construction and operation, and maintenance phases are also proposed to verify the accuracy of effect assessment and effectiveness of mitigation measures.</p> |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 25                     | <p>“the use of herbicide will be restricted around sensitive area (for example, wetlands)”</p> <p>Huge sections of this road are muskeg and therefore sensitive.</p> | <p>The Final EA / IS has been updated for clarity around the use of herbicides. Herbicides use is not planned. Further, the use of chemical vegetation maintenance will be in accordance with applicable legislations/regulations. Table 9.3-4 (formerly Table 9-6) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to include muskeg as a sensitive area.</p>   | Final EA/IS Table 9.3-4                 | 76          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 25                     | <p>Will environmentally friendly vehicles be used? Quieter, lower emissions etc....</p>  | <p>It will be the construction contractor's responsibility to determine the appropriate types of construction vehicles for building the Community Access Road.</p>   | Comment noted; see response for details | 77          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 25                     | <p>Why are white suckers excluded from consideration? They certainly are a</p>   | <p>The approach for selecting the fish Valued Components is described in</p>   | Comment noted; see                      | 78          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS    | Internal ID |
|------------|------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|-------------|
|            |                        | <p>significant species ecologically and in terms of indigenous usage.</p> <p>“valued components fish species (Lake Sturgeon, Northern Pike, Brook Trout, Walleye, Lake Whitefish, and Burbot)”</p> | <p>Section 4.2.2 of Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document. All of the fish species recorded during baseline studies have a role in the ecosystem; however, the purpose for limiting the assessment on Valued Components is to focus on those species that were identified as most valuable based on the presence in the study area, importance to Indigenous users, government priorities (e.g., provincial or federal listed species), and life history requirements and role in the food web. This approach for selecting Valued Components is a common practice in environmental assessments (e.g., Impact Assessment Agency of Canada, 2024).</p> <p>The fish and fish habitat Valued Components in the Final EA/IS are the fish species in the May 2021 Final Fish and Fish Habitat Study Plan (AECOM, 2021). The Study Plan process also incorporated feedback from regulators and Indigenous Groups on the Valued Components. Engagement was also conducted with Indigenous Groups on the preliminary Valued Components (Section 3.2 of Appendix G).</p> <p>One of the key criteria for Valued</p> | <p>response for details</p> |             |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name  | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised                          | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|-------------|------------------------|---|---|--------------------------|-------------|
|             |                        |   | <p>Component selection was whether the potential effects of the Project on the Valued Component can be measured and / or monitored or would be better ascertained through the analysis of a proxy Valued Component (e.g., another species with a similar role in the food web). Taking this approach, the analysis of fish and fish habitat Valued Components captures effects to other species with similar habitat requirements and sensitivities that were not selected as Valued Components, such as White Sucker. The habitat preferences for each life history stage (including spawning timing and habitat) and swim speeds for White Sucker overlap with those of the selected Valued Component species (Lake Sturgeon, Walleye, Brook Trout, Northern Pike, Lake Whitefish, Burbot). By using a suite of Valued Components representing various aspects of the aquatic ecosystem, the EA/IS provides a reliable assessment of effects to fish and fish habitat and to the productivity of fisheries important to Indigenous Groups. In other words, the consideration of White Sucker as a Valued Component in the EA/IS would not change the outcome of the assessment.</p> |                          |             |
| Mushkegowuk | 25                     | The temporary water crossings installed | Temporary structures in the form of   | Comment                  | 79          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|-------------|
| Council             |                        | <p>during construction will all be removed and therefore road access will not be to a larger area than the designed road allows?</p> <p>Does this include all infrastructure(culverts/bridges etc)?<br/>Wouldn't access roads block the natural drainage patterns and leaving culverts in facilitate an environment that is more pre-road construction state?</p> | <p>culverts and/or bridges will be required at water crossings along temporary access roads to aggregate pits and construction camp sites. It is possible that temporary structures may also be required to facilitate the construction of the main bridges. These structures are often installed in close proximity to the bridge site—for example, to support crane girder placement—and will be removed upon completion of the construction.</p> <p>Decommissioning of all temporary roads will be determined in detail design. In general if an access road is to be decommissioned, temporary culverts are removed and the stream/water crossing brought back to natural condition. The access road footprint is generally left in place but made to be un-useable to discourage use. This can be accomplished for example by removing water crossings or by berming specific areas of the access road.</p> | noted; see response for details.        |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 25                     | <p>“Waterbody Crossing: Where a channel allows for fish passage, design and install culverts in fish-bearing waterbodies to allow for fish passage to meet Ministry of Natural Resources Environmental Guidelines for Access Roads and Water Crossings (Ministry of</p>   | <p>Waterbody crossing structures (e.g., culverts, bridges) will be installed at all crossings at fish-bearing waterbodies; these culverts will be designed and installed for fish passage.</p> <p>A total of 45 waterbodies are crossed by</p>   | Comment noted; see response for details | 80          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                       | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|---|--|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>Natural Resources and Forestry, 1990) and Fisheries and Oceans Canada's Standards and Code of Practices (DFO, 2024) and fish passage guidelines”</p> <p>There are only ~ 70 channels that allow fish passage in 180 kilometres?</p>   | <p>the Preferred Route Alternative. Additional undefined water features were identified during baseline field work and/or supporting data from aerial photographs and light detection and ranging imagery). These undefined water features had no defined bed or banks (a criterion for the definition of a waterbody in Ontario) or fish habitat, and therefore, would not require fish passage.</p> <p>If new waterbodies are identified prior to construction, an Aquatics Specialist will assess the waterbody. Depending on the nature of the waterbody, recommendations for construction methods, appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures, and permitting requirements will be made by the Aquatics Specialist and, if necessary, local First Nation communities and appropriate regulatory agencies including Fisheries and Oceans Canada and the Ministry of Natural Resources will be engaged.</p> |  |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 25                     | <p>The effects of blasting and the induced pressures on fish are known to be varied. <a href="https://www.adfg.alaska.gov/static/home/library/pdfs/habitat/blasting_report.pdf">https://www.adfg.alaska.gov/static/home/library/pdfs/habitat/blasting_report.pdf</a> describes a limit of only 10psi/69Kpa before injuries were noted for salmonids.</p> | <p>The overpressure guideline reference used in the Final EA/IS was selected to align with provincial and federal guidance. Guidance in the Ontario Provincial Standard Specification (OPSS) General Specification for the Use of</p>   | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p> | 81          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                       | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|---|--|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>Some of the valued component species in this study area have no known data on blast tolerance and are listed species at risk. Guidelines established that blast induced pressures should not exceed 2.7psi/19 Kpa in spawning gravels when fish are present. The 100Kpa limit in your document seems too high and perhaps based on a lack of knowledge.</p>                             | <p>Explosives (OPSS 2025) indicates that instantaneous pressure measured by water overpressure in or near fish habitat shall not exceed 100 kpa. The OPSS was updated in April 2025 from the previous guidance issued in 2014. This value also aligns with the Fisheries and Oceans Canada document, The Guidelines for the use of Explosives in or Near Canadian Waters (Wright and Hopky 1998), that indicates that 100 kpa overpressure not be exceeded nor a peak particle velocity greater than 13 mm/second in a spawning bed during the period of egg incubation.</p>  |  |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 25                     | <p>The fact that the enhanced access that roads will provide to fishers and hence the increased fishing pressure is characterized in this document as “Not significant” is concerning. The negative effect on the fish populations through this increased fishing pressure, introduction of invasive species, pollution associated with recreation and habitat degradation is certain.</p> | <p>The residual effects of fish survival and reproduction from improved public access to recreational angling areas, including from potential for spread of invasive species, were assessed to be not significant. Residual effects were considered to be significant if they were classified as high in magnitude, at a geographic extent greater than the Construction Disturbance Area, be of longer term in duration, or they represent a substantial management concern. While the residual effects of increased fish pressure are expected outside of the Construction Disturbance Area, and to be long term in duration, the magnitude was</p> | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p> | 82          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|------------|------------------------|----------------|---|--------------------------|-------------|
|            |                        |                | <p>assessed as medium, with no substantial management concerns. A high magnitude effect was not predicted, since after mitigation, it is not expected that increased access to fishing would cause death of fish to a degree that results in changes to population dynamics. As described in the Final EA/IS, a large influx of recreational anglers is not expected since recreational fishers are less likely to travel great distances to hunt and fish (average in Ontario is 225 km, Marten Falls is 430 km from Thunder Bay). However, some increase in fishing pressure is expected, with larger waterbodies with higher value fisheries being the target waters. There is the potential for management concerns through an increased public access leading to changes in angler pressure and fish harvest. However, the resources are expected to continue to be managed through the Ministry of Natural Resources and local communities for recreational and Indigenous harvest, respectively. Recreational fishing is managed by the Ministry of Natural Resources as a public resource through provincial licensing requirements and by establishing rules in terms of season length, catch limits, and catch-and-</p> |                          |             |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|------------|------------------------|----------------|--|--------------------------|-------------|
|            |                        |                | <p>release rules for waterbodies near the Community Access Road.</p> <p>Key mitigation and enhancement measures also include using existing access roads where possible, using best management practices and regulations outlined by the Ministry of Natural Resources to reduce the spread of invasive species, and developing a policy for non Indigenous Project personnel while on shift or at temporary construction camps in regards to any hunting, fishing, or trapping activities. Effects on fish survival and reproduction from changes to public access to recreational fishing are expected to result in minor residual effects on fish populations with effective implementation of mitigation and enhancement measures. There may be a decrease in productivity, but the populations of the Valued Component fish species (Lake Sturgeon, Walleye, Brook Trout, Northern Pike, Lake Whitefish, and Burbot) are anticipated to remain functional, self sustaining, and ecologically effective.</p> <p>Although the productivity of fish populations may decrease from additional fish harvesting, it is not likely to disrupt overall population dynamics;</p> |                          |             |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                 | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|---|--|-------------|
|                     |                        |  | <p>therefore, the magnitude was considered medium (decrease in productivity, potential incidental death of fish to a degree that is not likely to disrupt overall population dynamics but may affect local productivity) and the residual effect is not significant.</p>  |  |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 25                     | Will environmentally friendly construction vehicles be used?   | It will be the construction contractor's responsibility to determine the appropriate types of construction vehicles for building the Community Access Road.   | Comment noted; see response for details  | 83          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 25                     | All camp waste including wastewater need be removed and trucked to established municipal disposal facilities in Aroland or south of that location. This would have the benefit of encouraging conservation of water use. | It might not be feasible to truck all waste and wastewater to municipal disposal facilities due to distance or the capacity of municipal disposal facilities to take the additional volume. The method of domestic sewage disposal at temporary construction camps will be determined during detail design. Options may include holding tank systems with off-site disposal or on-site leaching beds designed in accordance with applicable codes and approvals. If required and when feasible, domestic wastewater will be removed by approved disposal trucks and disposed of at wastewater treatment plants with the authorization and capacity to accept this wastewater. | Comment noted; see response for details. | 84          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|---|-------------|
| Mushkegowuk Council | 25                     | <p>“Residual effects on aquatic biodiversity were also considered not significant.”</p> <p>The very likely introduction of invasive aquatic species has been demonstrated to create permanent changes to the biota in many cases all over Ontario. This is significant. Look at waterways in developed parts of Ontario and you will see significant effects that cannot be managed. Many times in this document you speak of the potential changes. If you aren't sure of the changes to come, how can you suggest that the residual effects will not be significant?</p> | <p>The spread of invasive species from the Community Access Road was captured in the residual effects assessment for increased public access to recreational fishing areas. The introduction of invasive species with increased public access was recognized and identified as a potential effect (i.e., effect before mitigation) in the Final EA/IS. A key mitigation to reduce the potential spread of invasive species is by using best management practices and the regulations outlined by the Ministry of Natural Resources to reduce the spread of invasive species.</p> <p>Residual effects were considered to be significant if they were classified as high in magnitude, at a geographic extent greater than the Construction Disturbance Area, be of longer term in duration, or they represent a substantial management concern. This approach for the assessment of significance was consistent across the biophysical disciplines in the Final EA/IS. While the residual effect of public access resulting in increased potential for invasive species and disease transfer are expected outside of the Construction Disturbance Area, and to be long term in duration, the magnitude was assessed</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 85          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                 | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|-------------|
|                     |                        |  | <p>as medium, with no substantial management concerns.</p> <p>Even with mitigation, it is recognized that there may be an impediment to fish from carrying out life processes or a decrease in productivity with the introduction of invasive species, but it is not likely to disrupt overall population dynamics; therefore, the magnitude was considered medium (decrease in productivity, potential incidental death of fish to a degree that is not likely to disrupt overall population dynamics but may affect local productivity) and the residual effect not significant.</p> |  |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 25                     | The ecological + magnitude contexts need also be established on the basis of an understanding of the likely happenings gained by experiences of similar projects in similar areas. | We agree that an understanding of likely happenings based on the experience of similar projects in similar landscapes should inform the characterization of predicted residual effects and the associated determination of significance. This has been accounted through professional judgement and reference to literature, where available and applicable in the EA/IS.  | Comment noted; see response for details  | 86          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 25                     | Filters eventually clog. The technology that is called a floating road will not allow the flow of groundwater after it settles and accumulates debris.                             | The proposed embankment material used for the Community Access Road—specifically large porous blast rock (also known as muck)—has been selected for  | Comment noted; see response for details. | 87          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|------------|------------------------|---|---|--------------------------|-------------|
|            |                        | <p>Will decommissioning of former access roads to camps/quarries etc. not be a reversible condition if it is decided such by Marten Falls or is this decommissioning certain?</p> | <p>its demonstrated hydraulic conductivity and durability.</p> <p>In similar terrain, this material has shown consistent water movement for nearly a decade. When placed over peat, the muck compresses the organic layer by approximately 35–40%, creating a settled embankment that still allows groundwater flow. Piezometers installed on both sides of such embankments have recorded similar water quantity and quality, indicating that the embankment does not act as a barrier to groundwater movement.</p> <p>Regarding the floating road concept, it is important to clarify that while some settling and accumulation of debris may occur, the design and material selection aim to maintain permeability and avoid long-term obstruction of groundwater flow.</p> <p>As for the decommissioning of former access roads to camps, quarries, etc., this will vary depending on their intended use. Some roads will be temporary and decommissioned after construction or early operational phases. Others—particularly those leading to long-term quarry sites—will remain in place to</p> |                          |             |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|-------------|
|                     |                        |   | support ongoing maintenance activities, such as gravel production.   |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 25                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ministry of Transportation Ontario Provincial Standard Specification 803 to avoid spreading invasive plant species.</li> </ul> <p>The document Ontario Provincial Standard Specification 803 refers to Northern Ontario as any part of Ontario north of a line linking Waubaushene with Ottawa. I fear that this indicates the lack of true northern consideration being applied to much of this construction project</p>  | <p>We acknowledge your comment.</p> <p>While reference to Ontario Provincial Standard Specification 803 has been included, the Final EA/IS also recommends additional mitigation measures to prevent, detect, control and monitor invasive plant species. These measures will be refined and included in the Environmental Protection Plan that will be a project-specific plan to be developed during detail design and implemented during construction.</p>  | Comment noted; see response for details | 88          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 25                     | <p>“Context: Mitigations to limit the introduction and spread of invasive plants are well understood and the methods have been demonstrated to be effective.”</p> <p>This is very questionable statement. Invasive species have frequently proved unstoppable and this road will be a corridor for invasives. The changing climate and increased mobility of species(due to human’s) has resulted in numerous examples of the ecosystem re-balancing as Japanese Kudzu, rats, earthworms, spruce budworm, sparrows,</p> | <p>We recognize that there are several well-documented cases of invasive species causing large-scale changes to ecosystems around the world, including many of the examples provided in the comment. However it should be noted that the text in the EA/IS is specifically referring to the introduction and spread of invasive plant species, therefore some of the examples given are not-applicable (e.g. rats, earthworms, zebra mussels).</p> <p>With respect to invasive plant species, there are well-established methods to minimize their introduction and manage</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 89          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|---|-------------|
|                     |                        | zebra mussels, Eurasian milfoil, Phragmites sp, dandelions, wild pigs and other many other species have moved into many now accessible environments.   | the spread of these species, when they are detected early. It is recognized that once some invasive plant populations become well-established, complete eradication can be very difficult and potentially not-realistic. The Environmental Protection Plan that will be developed for the Community Access Road will have a focus on prevention, early detection and control to minimize the potential for invasive plant populations to become established.   |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 25                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Follow best management practices and environmental approval conditions, permits, or authorizations issued for the Project, including those issued from Environment and Climate Change Canada, Ontario Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks, and Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources.</li> </ul> <p>I think it bears consideration that huge numbers of species on the earth are declining in numbers, becoming extirpated or extinct while “best practices” are followed and clearly, we need to do better as existing “best practices” are not working.</p> | <p>It is acknowledged that biodiversity loss and wildlife species populations declines are a serious, ongoing, and global challenge, and that best practices and mitigation measures are not always successful in preventing declines in wildlife populations.</p> <p>The assessment of the Community Access Road's effects on wildlife took into account the regional context of the study areas, the resilience or vulnerability of the valued components/wildlife species, and the demonstrated effectiveness of mitigation measures.</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 90          |
| Mushkegowuk         | 25                     | “Although beavers are primarily aquatic,   | Discussions are ongoing regarding  | Comment                                 | 91          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                       | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|-------------|
| Council             |                        | <p>movements on land may mean occasional road crossings and the risk of road mortality.”</p> <p>Will construction of travelways for furbearers/ungulates and other animals to traverse the road without threatening these animals lives be committed to? These techniques have been displayed in numerous other places worldwide and they are so much less costly if they are built into the road design.</p> | <p>potential modifications to the engineering design to facilitate safe wildlife crossing and will be considered in the detail design stage.</p>   | <p>noted; see response for details</p>         |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 25                     | <p>Based on density estimates and the amount of high to moderate suitability habitat in the effects assessment Regional Study Area there are estimated to be between 541 and 2,467 Canada warbler nesting territories in the effects assessment Regional Study Area at existing conditions, if high to moderate-quality habitat is fully.</p> <p>The above statement isn't complete.</p>                      | <p>The remainder of this sentence has been revised in the Final EA/IS to read: "if high to moderate quality habitat is fully occupied and at carrying capacity."</p>   | <p>Final EA/IS Section 9.4.4.1.6</p>           | 92          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 26                     | <p>The latter is a quote from the EA/IS regarding woodland caribou.</p> <p>"• Context: Caribou are a threatened species both federally and provincially. Federal and provincial range assessments indicate the caribou</p>  | <p>Ongoing monitoring commitments for caribou and moose during construction and operation have been proposed and described in Section 9 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document. This includes putting collars on caribou and moose to monitor movement and</p> | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p> | 93          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|------------|------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|-------------|
|            |                        | <p>populations in the ranges encompassed by the caribou effects assessment Regional Study Area are self-sustaining but may be at intermediate risk; the two ranges where direct habitat loss will occur (Missisa and Nipigon) both have declining population trends. There is limited risk of vehicle-caribou collisions in the existing conditions. The linear density in the caribou effects assessment Regional Study Area in existing conditions is estimated to be 0.26 kilometres per square kilometre. This includes 29,993 kilometres of permanent linear features and 19,910 kilometres of non permanent linear features (for example, trails, cutlines and legacy forest harvest roads).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direction: Negative</li> <li>• Magnitude: A moderate magnitude of change to survival and reproduction during Operation and Maintenance is predicted in the caribou effects assessment Regional Study Area, relative to existing conditions, because mitigation measures are less enforceable.</li> <li>• Geographic Extent: Local</li> </ul> | <p>identify seasonally important habitat areas and travel corridors. Information from those studies may inform mitigation measures and adaptative management.</p> <p>Detail design features of the road such as consideration for accommodating wildlife-friendly crossings will be considered in the detail design phase of the Community Access Road. During the detail design phase, decisions about mitigations (including whether wildlife over and under passes could be constructed, and if so, where) will take into account best practices from Ministry of Transportation, current understanding of caribou and moose movement relative to the road alignment, recommendations received from comments on the draft EA/IS, and feasibility/constructability based on environmental conditions.</p> |                          |             |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                       | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|--|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>Duration / Reversibility: Long term / Irreversible</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frequency: Continuous"</li> </ul> <p>This argues for intensive mitigation measures and yet there is no intensive solution proposed in the document. I propose ongoing studies to determine those places where road crossings would occur and construction of fences guiding animals to bridges to guide the caribou safely over/across the road. This technique has numerous examples of success for preservation of species. The consideration of effects such as the increase in linear features due to road construction and the assessment of those effects as insignificant seems to ignore the cumulative effect that this development has been shown to have repeatedly in other parts of Canada.</p> |   |  |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 26                     | <p>The introduction of deer into this area via the travel corridor of open habitat is likely to be detrimental to moose due to parasites that can be carried by the deer but, are more impactful to the moose populations.</p>  | <p>We agree that the expansion of deer populations and subsequent increase in predators and introduction of parasites to other ungulates is a potential effect of the Community Access Road. The relationship between ungulate species in the existing environment is described in the Threats to Survival section for caribou (Section 5.1.3.3 of Appendix M</p> | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p> | 94          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                       | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|-------------|
|                     |                        |   | <p>Ungulates Technical Support Document) and moose (Section 5.2.3.2 of Appendix M). A potential increase in deer populations, particularly in the southern part of the Ungulate Local Study Area, is considered in the assessment of Community Access Road effects as part of the Increased Predator Access pathway of effect (Section 7.3.1.2.4 of Appendix M) and as a component of the potential effects of Climate Change in the Cumulative Effects Assessment (Section 8.2.1.1.1 of Appendix M).</p>  |  |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 26                     | <p>Environmental mercury levels should be monitored in soils/waters at construction sites. Disturbance of soils (blasting, soil disturbance due to vehicle use, ditch construction etc) has been linked to an increase in bioavailable mercury.</p> | <p>Monitoring program during construction includes monitoring of water quality parameters of concern, as required, to satisfy the conditions and/or requirements of applicable permits and approvals, and to confirm the effectiveness mitigation and enhancement measures. This will include monitoring of mercury either directly or using suspended solids as a proxy indicator. That said, no significant flooding or flow regime change is expected as a result of the water crossings.</p> <p>Any monitoring program during construction will be the responsibility of the owner/operator of the Community</p> | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p> | 95          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|---|-------------|
|                     |                        |  | <p>Access Road. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road.</p>  |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 26                     | <p>There is the potential for management concerns through an increased public access leading to the spread of invasive species, increased risk of human-ignited wildlife and increased pressure on timber and Traditional Use Plant harvest, however these risks are minor and manageable."</p> <p>If humans are setting moose on fire – this is a significant threat!! Seriously, though.... Invasive species have been cataclysmic in areas very near this proposed development and to refer to this likelihood with descriptors like negligible or low in magnitude or risks are minor and manageable or not significant seems delusional based on examples elsewhere(deer in New Zealand, avian malaria in Hawaii, Burmese Pythons in the Everglades, feral pigs in Southern Ontario etc).</p> | <p>We recognize that there are several well-documented cases of invasive species causing large-scale changes to ecosystems around the world, including many of the examples provided in the comment. However it should be noted that the text in the Final EA/IS is specifically referring to the introduction and spread of invasive plant species, therefore the examples given are not-applicable as they all refer to invasive animal species.</p> <p>With respect to invasive plant species, there are well-established methods to minimize their introduction and manage the spread these species, when they are detected early. It is recognized that once some invasive plant populations become well-established, complete eradication can be very difficult and potentially not-realistic. The Environmental Protection Plan that will be developed for the Community Access Road will have a focus on prevention, early detection and control to minimize the potential for</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 96          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                       | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|--|-------------|
|                     |                        |   | <p>invasive plant populations to become established.</p> <p>While it can never be certain that an invasive plant species will not spread and become problematic in a landscape, we confirm our assessment that with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, including a project-specific Environmental Protection Plan, the magnitude of predicted residual effects on vegetation valued components will be negligible or low and do not represent a substantial concern for the long-term sustainability and ecological function of vegetation valued components in the Regional Study Area. As stated in the Final EA/IS, overall confidence in the assessment of significance for vegetation valued components is moderate.</p> |  |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 26                     | <p>This predicted negative effect on wolverines(a species already at risk of extinction) demands the intensive mitigation measures to ensure the population does not collapse as forecast if bimaadiziwin does indeed form the backbone of this indigenous led project. Safe crossing points for wolverines and other large animals via tunnels/bridges? Seasonal road closures? Trucks/car</p> | <p>It is acknowledged that wolverine will be impacted by the road. Detail design features of the road such as consideration for accommodating wildlife-friendly crossings have not yet been developed at this phase of the Community Access Road. During the upcoming detail design phase, decisions about mitigations (including whether wildlife over and under passes could be</p>   | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p> | 97          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|-------------|
|                     |                        | convoys? Night or dusk/dawn driving bans to allow for the crepuscular creatures to roam safely?   | constructed, and if so, where) will take into account best practices from Ministry of Transportation, current understanding of wolverine habitat use and movement relative to the road alignment, recommendations received from comments on the draft EA/IS, and feasibility/constructability based on environmental conditions.  |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 26                     | The mention of tunnels for allowing frogs/snakes(and I bet turtles, too) is excellent. Are these considered as part of the 70 water crossings of the road or will specially designed crossing be placed at high travel areas? | Wildlife crossings (including those intended for frogs / snakes / turtles) will be further determined in detail design following the detailed micrositing of the route alignment, bridges and other features. At this stage of the Community Access Road, it is not possible to provide detailed information about these crossings because the route alignment, bridges, and other features are still being microsited. This detail design phase is crucial as it allows us to identify the most effective locations for crossings based on the finalized route and infrastructure layout. Post construction monitoring will additionally inform where crossings may be effective, or where they are ineffective. | Comment noted; see response for details | 98          |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 26                     | As stated in the EA/IS the road is expected to be serious in its effects on an already declining species population.  | We are aware of caribou calving enclosures/ maternity pens that have been implemented in western Canada, in   | Comment noted; see response for         | 99          |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                       | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|---|--|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>“the magnitude of the residual effect from linear barriers was assessed as high and determined to be significant”</p> <p>“residual effects from the Community Access Road on caribou and caribou habitat are determined to have a significant influence on self-sustaining and ecologically effective caribou populations”</p> <p>It is therefore imperative that all possible mitigating methods be considered for caribou. Are there thoughts of enclosures during calving season that serve to protect calves from predators during the animal’s most vulnerable early days of life? These have been used with great success in other parts of North America and the world. What if this road were only open from 6am to 6pm and barrier gates were open and closed daily? Would this not be a low-cost mitigation of effects?</p> | <p>areas where there are critically low numbers of caribou. These projects were initiated by the respective provincial governments in collaboration with Indigenous partners. Mitigations related to wildlife population management, particularly something that would include the handling of pregnant females such as the use of maternity pens, are the mandate of the government and as such it would be at the discretion of the Ontario government to implement a maternity pen as a tool to support caribou populations in Ontario.</p> <p>Marten Falls First Nation continues to engage in discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and future operations and maintenance of the Community Access Road. Access is not within the scope of the EA/IS, however it is a matter that will require further dialogue between the communities and the Province.</p> | <p>details</p>                                 |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 26                     | <p>Is use of electric vehicles not feasible for any uses? Pick-up trucks? Inspection vehicles?</p>   | <p>It will be the construction contractor’s responsibility to determine the appropriate types of construction vehicles for building the Community Access Road.</p>  | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p> | 100         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|-------------|
| Mushkegowuk Council | 0                      | <p>Will the “floating road” technique not result in the road area(~1800 Hectare) becoming a carbon source rather than a carbon sink? The vegetation that is crushed and now forming part of the road base must degrade and result in carbon release – correct? Is it not possible to mitigate production of greenhouse gases by offsetting? There must be many available projects that would be carbon negatives. Re-establishing muskeg in damaged habitats for example.</p> | <p>The floating road construction methodology is designed primarily to minimize hydrological impacts by allowing groundwater movement through the permeable embankment and maintaining surface water drainage patterns with equalization culverts. Construction activities, including clearing vegetation and disturbing peat, will result in some release of stored carbon, making portions of the area a temporary carbon source rather than a sink. This effect is not unique to the floating road technique; any road construction in peatland environments would have similar implications.</p> <p>To mitigate this, the floating road approach is considered preferable because it reduces the depth of excavation and minimizes peat disturbance compared to conventional road-building methods.</p> <p>In addition, Appendix AB Preliminary Biodiversity Offset Plan for the Marten Falls First Nation Community Access Road has been prepared which will aim to restore and offset peatland ecosystems, to the extent feasible. The specific approach will be determined through consultation with Environment</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 103         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|---|-------------|
|                     |                        |  | <p>and Climate Change Canada, the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, and the Ministry of Natural Resources, but will generally follow a hierarchy of restoration, reclamation and offset alternatives (e.g. financial compensation directed towards wetland research or inventory work to fill existing information gaps).</p>   |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 0                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further, from increased access, there could be increased fishing pressure on the waterways in proximity to the road which could also adversely impact species abundance. However, fish populations are expected to be self-sustaining and ecologically effective.</li> </ul> <p>Animal and fish populations have been reduced worldwide from increased harvesting pressure. I cannot imagine how this scenario with prove different. Are the predicted decreased populations considered to be self-sustaining and ecologically effective?</p> | <p>The residual effects of fish survival and reproduction from improved public access to recreational angling areas were assessed in Section 7.3.2.8 of Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document. As described in this section, some increase in fishing pressure is expected, with larger waterbodies with higher value fisheries being the target waters. Potential changes in angler pressure will continue to be managed by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Fisheries and Oceans Canada, the government agencies mandated to manage fisheries resources (i.e., fisheries management zones, fish restricted access timing windows, and fish catch limits). Furthermore, fishing is managed as a public resource through provincial licensing requirements and by establishing rules in terms of season</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 104         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|-------------|
|                     |                        |  | <p>length, catch limits, and catch-and-release rules for waterbodies near the Community Access Road. Effects on fish survival and reproduction from changes to public access to recreational fishing are expected to result in minor residual effects on fish populations with mitigation and management measures. There may be a decrease in productivity, but it is not likely to disrupt overall population dynamics, and the populations of the Valued Component fish species are anticipated to remain functional, self sustaining, and ecologically effective. Context for fish and fish habitat Valued Components also considers species sensitivity, resilience, adaptive capacity, and current status and trends.</p> |                          |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 0                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall moose health and population abundance is not expected to decrease as a result of habitat loss.</li> <li>• Northern pike, brook trout, walleye, and lake whitefish / burbot populations may all experience effects in the local area, particularly during the construction phase from loss of habitat (bridge construction) and sedimentation effects. Overall long-term population abundance effects are not expected.</li> </ul> | <p>Moose:</p> <p>The direct loss of moose habitat in the Construction Disturbance Area represents a 1.1% decrease of potential quality habitat in the Local Study Area, and a 0.1% decrease of potential quality habitat in the Regional Study Area, compared to the existing conditions. There is expected to be a high proportion of quality moose habitat remaining in the Local and Regional Study Areas after the construction of the Community Access</p>  |                          | 105         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|------------|------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|-------------|
|            |                        | <p>How can removal of a large portion of the organisms' habitat, the likely introduction of invasive/competing species and the increase in harvesting not result in lowered abundance?</p> | <p>Road. In addition, much of the habitat should remain well distributed and connected in the Regional Study Area. These changes are not expected to result in a measurable influence on the regional abundance of moose and are predicted to support a self-sustaining and ecologically effective population.</p> <p>An increase in access is predicted to occur after the construction of the Community Access Road, which may result in a measurable increase in public access to areas that were largely inaccessible under existing conditions. An increase in mortality risk is expected for moose that occupy habitat within or surrounding the Local Study Area due to increased non-Indigenous (including illegal harvest) and Indigenous hunting pressures. As a result of concerns expressed by Indigenous communities, the assessment of effects on moose has been changed to significant in the Final EA/IS because of uncertainty about increased harvest pressure.</p> <p>Additional details about potential effects of habitat loss and increased access by the public to moose survival and reproduction is described in Section 7.3.1.3 of Appendix M Ungulates</p> |                          |             |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|------------|------------------------|----------------|---|--------------------------|-------------|
|            |                        |                | <p>Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Fish:</p> <p>Small change to fish habitat quantity and quality is expected from direct effects and from sediment release during the construction of waterbody crossings; however, after the implementation of mitigation, these effects are anticipated to be small and localized. The habitat is expected to remain stable and functional with no or limited effects on the productivity of the habitat for maintain the Valued Component fish populations.</p> <p>Standard mitigation and best management practices will be implemented, and environmental approval conditions (e.g., Fisheries and Oceans Canada) will be followed (as described in Section 7.3.1.1.2 of Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document). The right-of-way at water crossings is narrow (100 m), and crossings will be designed such that the channel is not constricted, and downstream flows will be maintained. Sensitive habitats (e.g., spawning areas) will be avoided during construction and instream works will be conducted outside of the restricted activity timing windows</p> |                          |             |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|------------|------------------------|----------------|---|--------------------------|-------------|
|            |                        |                | <p>to protect spawning fish, egg incubation, or eggs and newly hatched fry. Sediment and erosion control measures will be implemented (as described in Section 7.3.1.4.2 in Appendix G) whereby controls will be installed, monitored, and managed to prevent sediment from reaching waterbodies during construction.</p> <p>Although negligible and minor changes are anticipated to fish habitat quantity and quality from the construction of water crossing structures, and the release of sediment respectively, there is no or limited effects on the function or productivity of the habitat, and the Valued Component fish species populations are anticipated to remain self-sustaining and ecologically effective.</p> <p>Residual effects on fish survival and reproduction from improved public access, including the potential spread of invasive species, are described in Sections 7.3.2.8 of Appendix G. Mitigation measures, including best management practices and regulations outlined by the Ministry of Natural Resources will be implemented to reduce the spread of invasive species and limiting fish catches. Local communities</p> |                          |             |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                 | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|--|-------------|
|                     |                        |   | <p>will be responsible for managing their fish catches to a sustainable level for each species.</p> <p>Minor changes to the harvest of fish in individual waterbodies are anticipated. The productivity of fish populations may decrease from the fish harvest, but it is not likely to disrupt overall population dynamics. However, although there may be a decrease in productivity, the populations of the Valued Component fish species are anticipated to remain functional, self-sustaining, and ecologically effective.</p>   |  |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 0                      | <p>Page 747/795</p> <p>“should any merchantable timber be removed for the Project, applicable compensation will be provided for the loss of those trees.”</p> <p>This brings to mind what compensation is being offered for the loss of wildlife habitat and chance for humans(or other animals) to traverse this area without threat of vehicles? Will there be compensation for current tourism operators whose businesses are negatively impacted by the project via the loss of untrammled wilderness, less</p> | <p>After the Community Access Road is constructed, areas of disturbance surrounding it will be rehabilitated to be reflective of the surrounding natural area, providing habitat enhancements adjacent to the Community Access Road. In the circumstance that a business may suffer loss of revenue, the owner/operator will be responsible for working with the business owner to conduct an investigation for these losses. The owner/operator of the Community Access Road is currently unknown. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding ownership and operations of the</p> | Comment noted; see response for details. | 106         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|-------------|
|                     |                        | wildlife/fish?  | Community Access Road.   |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 0                      | A road to Gull Bay in similar habitat nearby has 4.3 culverts per kilometre. Why does the road to MFFN seem to have so few(less that 1/10th of this #)?   | The 'waterbodies' that are identified for crossing within the Final EA/IS are of a size which warrant a structure in accordance with the Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code (i.e., 3.0 metre span minimum). Otherwise, the total number of 'non-structural' (i.e., smaller than 3.0 metre) culverts to be designed and installed continues to be assessed, and will be based upon factors including topography and hydrogeological assessments. | Comment noted; see response for details | 107         |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 29                     | As mining corporation Juno <a href="http://junocorp.com/assets/ring-of-fire">http://junocorp.com/assets/ring-of-fire</a> is the largest Stakeholder in the Ring of Fire it seems an oversight that is not considered here. Here is a link to the presentation to shareholders | The Project Inclusion List (Table 10.1-1 of the Final EA/IS) has been updated to include the information on Juno.  | Final EA/IS Table 10-1                  | 108         |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 29                     | Why is the NRL + Rapid Lynx BB Project depicted differently on maps in Figure 10-2 + 10-3?  | The mapping discrepancies have been updated in the Final EA/IS.  | Final EA/IS Figure 10-3                 | 109         |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 29                     | Overall, the Valued Component fish populations are expected to remain to be self-sustaining and ecologically effective; therefore, the predicted cumulative effects on fish and fish habitat are assessed as not significant.   | The cumulative effects assessment in Section 8 of the Final EA/IS of the fish and fish habitat assessment considers the residual effects of the Community Access Road along with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable   | Comment noted; see response for details | 110         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|------------|------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|-------------|
|            |                        | <p>This assessment on significant effects to fish populations seems to ignore the historical truth that the coming increases in fishing pressure combined with invasive species will be quite significant. Areas that were similarly pristine only a few decades ago are now seeing a great reduction in native fish numbers and new species appear.</p> | <p>activities with effects likely to overlap in type of effect (i.e., Valued Component), temporally, and spatially with the predicted residual effects of the Community Access Road. The cumulative effects assessment builds on the results of the residual effects assessment for the Community Access Road.</p> <p>The pathway of “changes to fish survival and reproduction from improved public access to recreational angling areas” considered both angler pressure and fish harvest and the associated potential for spread of invasive species.</p> <p>Cumulative effects from changes to fish survival and reproduction from improved public access to recreational angling areas on the fish Valued Components were considered not significant as the residual effects were assessed medium in magnitude and they do not represent a substantial management concern. Similar to the residual effects of the Project alone, there is the potential for management concerns through an increased public access leading to changes in angler pressure and fish harvest; however, the resources are expected to continue to be managed</p> |                          |             |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|------------|------------------------|----------------|--|--------------------------|-------------|
|            |                        |                | <p>through Ministry of Natural Resources and local communities for recreational and Indigenous harvest, respectively.</p> <p>Increase in harvest pressure on waterbodies during the projects is anticipated where access has been improved or created as a result of the projects, but most is expected to be on larger waterbodies with known productive fisheries. It is expected that waterbodies that are likely to attract the greatest number of recreational fishers due to these projects have Valued Component species abundances that can support an increase in fishing pressure. Due to the remoteness of the area and small population of people in northern Ontario, minor changes to the harvest of fish in individual waterbodies are anticipated or to the potential for spread of invasive species. As described in the Final EA/IS, a large influx of recreational anglers is not expected since recreational fishers are less likely to travel great distances to hunt and fish (average in Ontario is 225km, Marten Falls is 430 km from Thunder Bay). The productivity of fish populations may decrease from additional fish harvesting, but it is not likely to disrupt overall population dynamics; therefore, the magnitude was</p> |                          |             |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                       | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|--|-------------|
|                     |                        |   | <p>considered medium (decrease in productivity, potential incidental death of fish to a degree that is not likely to disrupt overall population dynamics but may affect local productivity) and the residual effect not significant.</p>  |  |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 1                      | <p>A few decades past the environment was gravely threatened by another mining related pollution. This acid rain caused the acidification of lakes 1,000+ kilometres away. The long range transport of pollutants in the analysis of potential cumulative effects needs to be considered. Similarly heavy metals in dust can be transported long distances. One example of this would be the global increase in mercury from distant sources due to aerial transport of mercury containing dust brought onto the land by precipitation.</p> | <p>A screening of acid deposition potential is included within the effects assessment (Section 4 of Appendix S1). The screening assessment determined that emissions from activity on the road were below the threshold for further detailed assessment.</p> <p>Regarding metals, the Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement and the Technical Support Documents were prepared to meet the requirements outlined in the Terms of Reference, the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines and the technical discipline-specific study plans. Specifically, potential contaminants of concern included in the air quality assessment and dispersion model align with those identified in Section 7.2.2 of the Terms of Reference and Table 1 of the Ministry of Transportation's Environmental Guide for Assessing and Mitigating the Air Quality Impacts and Greenhouse Gas Emissions of Provincial Transportation Projects</p> | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p> | 387         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|-------------|
|                     |                        |   | (MTO 2020). The inclusion of trace metals in the air quality assessment and air dispersion model were not a regulatory requirement and as such were not included as part of the Environmental Assessment.  |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 2                      | Why is the time of draft EA/IS consultation listed as Jan-April when it is Feb-June?  | As communicated on September 25, 2024, the MFFN CAR Project Team advised that the Draft EA / IS would be released to Indigenous Communities in the winter of 2025 with a 120-day review period. As the Draft EA / IS was released on February 19, 2025, the review period for the Draft EA / IS was from February 19, 2025 to June 22, 2025. | Comment noted; see response for details | 388         |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 3                      | <p>A full cumulative effects consultation report will be developed for submission with the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement detailing activities conducted, and input received, through all phases of the Assessment Process.</p> <p>Does this mean that we will have no chance to comment on this report on what we said?</p> | The Cumulative Effects Consultation Report will be included in Appendix X Record of Consultation of the Final EA/IS. Consultation and engagement during the review of the Final EA/IS will be undertaken by the federal and provincial government agencies during a 7-week review period.  | Comment noted; see response for details | 389         |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 4                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The surface water quality assessment identified that mercury levels at the Little Current River and Ogoki River stations were likely elevated due to natural</li> </ul>  | Mercury concentrations observed during the Aquatics Field program completed between 2019 and 2022, specifically undertaken to assess surface water   | Comment noted; see response for details | 390         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|---|---|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>background conditions (Surface Water Technical Support Document).</p> <p>It is generally acknowledged that the great proportion of mercury presently in the environment is anthropogenic. The last ~500 years having seen a 3-8x increase in mercury. Is this the condition that you consider the “natural background” state?</p> | <p>quality, were collected to understand baseline conditions of surface water features that will be potentially crossed by project components. The results that were observed at select locations cannot be inferred to as caused by natural or anthropogenic sources. Recent scientific literature suggests that mercury concentrations, regardless of increases or decreases in concentration, within the general northern Ontario region may stem from atmospheric depositions, anthropomorphic and/or climate change sources. That said, the dynamics of these sources is beyond the scope of the baseline study of existing conditions within the project area. The residual and cumulative effects sections of the surface water report identify best practices to mitigate and/or eliminate potential sources that may be caused by the Community Access Road.</p> |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 5                      | <p>Safety demands a wilderness road like the MFFN-CAR have SOS phones at frequent intervals for weather/wildlife/accidents or just mechanical breakdowns.</p> <p>Traffic management plans need to be concerned with vehicle types. 300 2-ton cars is nothing compared to 300 50-ton</p>  | <p>Detail design elements for the Community Access Road, such as emergency communication systems, traffic management protocols, and convoying requirements, have not yet been finalized. These will be confirmed and refined during the next phase of the Community Access Road.</p>  | Comment noted; see response for details | 391         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>trucks. Considering just vehicle numbers seems very approximate.</p> <p>Will truck transport be convoyed and the 50 ton trucks be preceded by an escort vehicle with a driver and spotter? This would greatly reduce animal disturbances and deaths.</p>   |  |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 6                      | <p>The Black Ash is endangered and was found in the Local Study Area. The Northern Marsh Violet is also in this area.</p> <p>The first time building a road was mentioned one elder said to build it on hard ground, “not in the muskeg as it will be difficult to maintain it.” — Rosie Achneepineskum</p> <p>Segment 3 saw the much shorter Alternative 4 chosen over alternative 1 even though it consisted of muskeg terrain versus the longer route on the hard ground of the esker.</p> | We appreciate and acknowledge your comments.   | Comment noted; see response for details | 392         |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 7                      | Extensive mitigation measures need to be adopted if the at risk caribou are to be saved. Animal bridges? Road closures during calving months, fences at dangerous road sections, predator free enclosures for calving, a moratorium on other developments in habitat etc...   | <p>Measures to mitigate the effects of the Community Access Road are described in Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Mitigations related to wildlife population management, particularly actions that</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 393         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                 | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|---|--|-------------|
|                     |                        |  | <p>would include the handling of pregnant females such as the use of maternity pens, are the mandate of the government and as such it would be at the discretion of the Ontario government to implement a maternity pen as a tool to support caribou populations in Ontario.</p> <p>Detail design features of the road such as consideration for construction of wildlife-friendly crossings (e.g., smooth crush, gentle slope) and modified bridge design for wildlife passage underneath are being considered and will be further developed during the detail design phase. Final decisions about where these mitigation measures will be constructed will be determined and include best practices from Ministry of Transportation, current understanding of caribou and moose movement relative to the road alignment, recommendations received from comments on the draft EA/IS, and feasibility/constructability based on environmental conditions.</p> |  |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 8                      | “The main purpose for the Community Access Road is to provide opportunities to future generations of Marten Falls First Nation and to make the Community sustainable.” | While the cost of infrastructure in remote regions is undeniably high, the Community Access Road is more than a route to mineral development. It is a multi-purpose, all-season connection that will provide Marten Falls First Nation with   | Comment noted; see response for details. | 394         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                       | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>This road will cost ~ \$2,500,000+ for each resident of Marten Falls. It is being constructed to gain access to potentially valuable and necessary minerals. To suggest another “main purpose” seems very untrue. I understand this is the resident’s perspective, but it is not the funder’s reality and they are paying for the road. Be very careful of the bargain being made.</p> | <p>year-round access to essential services, reduce the cost of living, and open up long-term economic opportunities. These include employment, business development, and improved access to healthcare and education. The economic and social benefits for Indigenous communities—and the region as a whole—are significant and must be considered alongside the road’s potential role in resource development.</p>  |  |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 9                      | <p>Who will choose contaminants of concern for groundwater measurements?</p>  | <p>The contaminants of concern would be selected by the Qualified Person retained for environmental monitoring of the Community Access Road. The Qualified Person would be expected to adhere to all permitting requirements and follow relevant standards and regulations (i.e. Ontario Regulation 903: Wells, Canadian Drinking Water Quality Guidelines, Ontario Drinking Water Quality Standards, Soil, Ground Water and Sediment Standards for Use Under Part XV.1 of the Environmental Protection Act, etc.), as well as consider Indigenous Knowledge and stakeholder input when conducting groundwater monitoring.</p> | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p> | 395         |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 10                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If clearing or grubbing are required during the wolverine denning period (February 1 to May 1) in habitat suitable</li> </ul>  | <p>A wolverine den survey plan will be developed in consultation with the Ministry of the Environment,</p>   | <p>Comment noted; see response for</p>         | 396         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                        | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>for wolverine denning, surveys for the presence of wolverine dens will be conducted prior to clearing. Surveys will be conducted from helicopters or drones. The survey extent will include all potentially suitable denning habitat within 4 kilometres of the disturbance. The methods of the surveys will be determined in consultation with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks Species at Risk Branch</p> <p>What chance is there of seeing a wolverine den with a helicopter/drone??</p> | <p>Conservation, and Parks, and will involve helicopter and drone surveying. Aerial surveys will use tracks and potential den features as lines of evidence for wolverine denning. Wolverine tracks are detectable from low flying helicopters. Surveyors will be looking for evidence of wolverine tracks within 4km of the areas to be cleared during the denning period. If wolverine tracks are detected they will be followed until they move further than 4km from construction or they disappear into a suspected den site. A concentration of wolverine tracks is a good indication there could be a den feature in the area. These types of observations will be used to conservatively assume there could be a den site in the area.</p> <p>Ground-based follow-ups may be required in some cases, but aerial surveying is expected to be the most efficient and least impactful method for detecting wolverine dens.</p> | <p>details</p>                                  |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 11                     | <p>At the time of writing the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement this information was not available to summarize. Please refer to Section 8.3.4 for further information. A summary will be provided in the Final</p>   | <p>Marten Falls First Nation is committed to developing a shared understanding of neighbouring Indigenous communities' Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests. Indigenous communities listed in Table 11-2 of the draft EA/IS were</p>   | <p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p> | 397         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                 | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|-------------|
|                     |                        | <p>Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.</p> <p>The Draft of the EA/IS for this project is released 60 days early for Indigenous groups out of respect but this section was missing during the 60 days extra given for indigenous comment?</p>  | <p>issued a Preliminary Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests (ATRI) Existing Conditions and Impact Assessment Report (the ATRI Report) in June and July 2025. Marten Falls First Nation aimed to honour the time needed for feedback on the ATRI Report and values Indigenous communities' input. A 90-day review period was given for the review of the ATRI Report.</p>                             |  |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 12                     | <p>Offsetting plans have previously proven impossible when disturbances have occurred in areas that are pristine. Proponents must be planning on going far afield to improve and thereby create habitat like that destroyed during the construction. In particular in need be recognized that these habitats represent the only ones of their kind left and “offsetting” is not an option.</p> | <p>The difficulty of offsetting for disturbances in previously undisturbed areas is acknowledged. Options including habitat restoration, implementation of habitat protections, and research funding has been considered in the development of Appendix AB Preliminary Biodiversity Offset Plan.</p>   | Comment noted; see response for details  | 398         |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 13                     | <p>Terms occurring frequently often do not specify a clear commitment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- to the extent feasible</li> <li>- where possible</li> <li>- where feasible</li> <li>- will be avoided</li> <li>- to the extent practical</li> <li>- as quickly as possible</li> <li>- minimize potential for changes</li> </ul>  | <p>We acknowledge that terms such as “where feasible,” “to the extent practical,” and “will be considered” can appear non-committal. These phrases are often used during the preliminary design phase to reflect the need for flexibility as more detailed information becomes available. However, we want to emphasize that these commitments will be refined and clarified during the detail design phase,</p> | Comment noted; see response for details. | 399         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                        | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|---|-------------|
|                     |                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- do not represent a substantial management concern</li> <li>- assessed negligible in magnitude</li> <li>- a manageable level</li> <li>- modified or enhanced as necessary through adaptive management</li> <li>- will be considered when planning</li> </ul> | <p>when site-specific conditions and technical constraints are fully understood. We remain committed to working collaboratively with Indigenous communities to ensure that the final design reflects shared priorities and delivers meaningful benefits.</p>   |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 14                     | <p>All the mitigation techniques described in your plans are being carried out and yet, worldwide species are disappearing at a biologically alarming rate. Why are we allowing a project planning this approved approach to do the same?</p>  | <p>We acknowledge your concern regarding the global decline in biodiversity</p> <p>At the project level, the purpose of the mitigation measures in our plans is to make sure that the Community Access Road avoids, minimizes, and mitigates potential impacts in accordance with current legislation, regulatory guidance, and established environmental practice. These measures are not intended to resolve global biodiversity loss, but to make sure that the Community Access Road does not contribute avoidable or unmanaged effects.</p> | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>  | 400         |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 15                     | <p>Total road cost now conservatively ~ \$2B means \$1.5M/person to Webequie Popn 800 and \$2.5M/person to Marten Falls Popn 323</p>   | <p>It is true that the per capita cost of the road infrastructure to the Marten Falls First Nation community seems extremely high when viewed purely through the lens of population numbers. However, it is important to consider that this Community Access Road is not just about serving current residents— it is a</p>   | <p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p> | 401         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|-------------|
|                     |                        |   | strategic investment in long-term economic development, access to essential services, and reconciliation with Indigenous communities.   |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 16                     | <p>Commitment need be made to reduce vehicle animal conflict beyond signage, beveling road banks and clearing snowbanks to facilitate animal crossings. If the proponents are serious about continuing to have healthy populations of wildlife the road’s negative effects need be mitigated as much as possible. That means dedicated animal crossings both as bridges for ungulates and other furbearers and tunnels for reptiles and amphibians. These need facilitate movement both normally and for times of migration. Similarly install oversize clear span bridges that allow passage of wildlife travelling along creeks to travel without crossing the road itself. In the U.S. there are 1,000,000+ wildlife vehicle collisions annually and many more animal deaths that are unnoted. A collision with a moose costs an estimated \$40,000. It is economically sensible for MFFN residents to reduce this likelihood by incorporating advanced design into road construction.</p> | <p>Wildlife crossings will be considered during the detail design stage for the Community Access Road.</p> <p>Regarding the installation of wildlife crossing structures, the following design modifications have been incorporated into the preliminary design and the Final EA/IS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At watercourse crossings that occur within wolverine high-use areas and are on the north-south segment of the preferred route (WA-11, WA-15 and WA-18), modified bridge and bridge embankments will be designed to incorporate terrestrial pathways adjacent to the aquatic habitat and allow for safe wildlife passage.</li> <li>- At culvert locations along the north-south segment of the preferred route (C-01, WA-03, WA-09, WA-12, WA-13, WA-14, and WA-36), modified culverts will be designed to incorporate safe, sub-surface road passage.</li> <li>- Sections 7.3.1.6.5.2 and 7.3.1.3.5.2 of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document of the Final EA/IS have been</li> </ul> | Comment noted; see response for details | 402         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|-------------|
|                     |                        |   | updated to describe the additional mitigation or engineering design modifications to facilitate safe wildlife crossing.   |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 17                     | <p>Roads are the biggest source of human-caused wildlife death in Canada’s national parks.<br/> <a href="https://parks.canada.ca/nature/science/especies-species/routes-roads">https://parks.canada.ca/nature/science/especies-species/routes-roads</a></p> <p>What % of caribou habitat will be lost via road construction of the total land area in the MFFN territory? ~ 20% ?</p> | <p>The percentage of caribou habitat that may be disturbed by road construction cannot yet be confirmed at this stage of the Community Access Road. The EA/IS provides estimates based on the preliminary design, but the exact construction footprint will be refined during detail design. As the Community Access Road design progresses, disturbance areas will be confirmed and opportunities will be identified to minimize impacts to caribou habitat.</p>                       | Comment noted; see response for details | 403         |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 18                     | <p>Marten Falls residents speak of the importance of mino-bimaadiziwin – live a good life- Are they willing to devote a portion of the road’s cost to contribute to it’s not negatively effecting numerous species? What relative importance does the natural world have in our pursuit of improving the human world?</p>   | <p>The importance of mino-bimaadiziwin and the relationship between human well-being and the natural world has been an important consideration throughout development of the Final EA/IS. The Final EA/IS includes assessments of potential effects on species and habitats, and identifies mitigation and monitoring measures to reduce adverse effects and support balance between community well-being and environmental protection.</p> <p>While decisions on project costs and</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 404         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                        | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|-------------|
|                     |                        |   | <p>funding allocations are beyond the scope of the EA/IS, the assessment process is intended to make sure that environmental, cultural, and social values are considered alongside technical and economic factors in project planning.</p>  |   |             |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 19                     | <p>Seems comments are treated differently in documents depending on whether comments support or question the project. Comments supporting the project are sometimes directly quoted + ascribed. Questioning comments are addressed and only ascribed generally.</p> | <p>We appreciate and acknowledge this observation. It is important that all feedback—whether supportive or critical—is treated with consistency and transparency. Both types of input should be acknowledged with equal clarity and fairness, especially when they contribute meaningfully to the discussion.</p> <p>That said, perhaps the lack of direct quotes of criticism is a reflection of the broader community’s desire for the Community Access Road, which has been long anticipated. This context may influence how feedback is presented, but it is still essential to ensure all voices are fairly represented in the documentation. We will take it into consideration when we finalize the EA/IS.</p> | <p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p> | 405         |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 20                     | <p>Aerial transport of pollutants near the road will certainly be a factor.</p>   | <p>We appreciate and acknowledge your comment. The effects assessment includes an evaluation of pollutants typically associated with transportation related emission sources.</p>   | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>  | 406         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                        | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|---|---|-------------|
| Mushkegowuk Council | 21                     | <p>One fiction that needs to be addressed is the concept that the MFFN-CAR is a community project. This road would not be constructed if it did not lead to rich minerals and to maintain otherwise seems a willful blindness and it is a concern that I am being asked to comment on this being the truth.</p>  | <p>The Community Access Road is more than a route to mineral development. It is a multi-purpose, all-season connection that will provide Marten Falls First Nation with year-round access to essential services, reduce the cost of living, and open up long-term economic opportunities. These include employment, business development, and improved access to healthcare and education. The economic and social benefits for Indigenous communities—and the region as a whole—are significant and must be considered alongside the Community Access Road’s potential role in resource development.</p> | <p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p> | 407         |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 22                     | <p>Road Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Invasive species will be introduced</li> <li>- Animals will be struck in collisions</li> <li>- Habitat loss for numerous species</li> <li>- Increase in access for harvesters therefore increased harvest pressure</li> <li>- Road pollution(garbage, exhaust, spills)</li> <li>- Migration/movement disruption for caribou</li> <li>- Will the road be closed for environmental benefit sometimes? Nights? Calving times? Migrations? How would this be done?</li> </ul> | <p>The Final EA/IS has considered all of the potential effects you have identified (wildlife, land use, atmospheric environment and ungulates). Refer to Sections 9.4 and 9.5 of the Final EA/IS for more details on the effects assessments and the proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>With regards to road closures, this is not within the scope of the EA/IS and will require further dialogue between the owner/operator and the Province.</p>   | <p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>  | 408         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS                | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|---|-------------|
| Mushkegowuk Council | 23                     | Any examples of communities that have gone through a similar winter road to awr changes??  | The All-Season Road Connecting Berens River to Poplar River First Nation in Manitoba is a comparable road project constructed in a very similar landscape.   | Comment noted; see response for details | 409         |
| Mushkegowuk Council | 24                     | Invasive(foreign) aquatic + terrestrial weed species, rats/mice, phragmites, zebra + quagga mussels will come into this area. Species will also extend their ranges such as deer, racoons, skunks, plants adapted to waste spaces and full sunshine along roadway. | <p>The effects of the introduction and spread of invasive plant species on all wildlife Valued Components are discussed in Section 7.3.1.1.1 and Section 7.3.3.1.1 of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document. Best management practices and the mitigation measures for controlling the spread of invasive species that will be implemented during construction are well understood and the methods have been demonstrated to be effective. Effects from the introduction of invasive plants on the ability of the wildlife populations in the effects assessment Regional Study Area to remain self-sustaining and ecologically functional are anticipated to be negative but negligible in magnitude.</p> <p>White-tailed deer populations are expanding northward largely as a result of climate change. The effects of white-tail deer expansion on caribou and moose are discussed in Sections 8.2.1 and 8.2.2 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document respectively.</p> | Comment noted; see response for details | 410         |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name          | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised  | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS                 | Internal ID |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|--|-------------|
| Mushkegowuk Council | 25                     | Seeing as Bill 5 is now passed. What will you do if the MFFN-CAR is declared a Special Economic Zone? What would change for this road?  | <p>The introduction of Bill 5 has generated concern among many groups, including Marten Falls First Nation—the Proponent of the Community Access Road.</p> <p>As the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement was prepared and released in advance of the introduction of Bill 5, we do not know how these new bills may impact the overall process. We continue to wait on guidance from the provincial government and will respond appropriately. In the meantime, our commitment to ongoing engagement with Indigenous communities stands. Once more clarity is provided to Marten Falls First Nation on how, if at all, the process will be affected, the Project Team will provide an update.</p> | Comment noted; see response for details. | 412         |
| Mushkegowuk Council |                        | <p>Good Afternoon Callais,<br/>I understood submitting comments on the Draft EA/IS was only until the 22nd of June and would wait to see how those comments are reflected in the Final version of the document that is likely to come out next spring.<br/>The design of the road being in a draft state and no road like this ever having been built in this exact terrain and at this length combines with the uncertain legislative environment to make me</p> | <p>Thank you for your continued interest in the Community Access Road.</p> <p>The over 1,600 comments received on the Draft Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement (EA / IS) are currently being reviewed and considered for inclusion in the Final EA / IS. Please note that a few extensions to the June 23, 2025 submission date were requested and granted. The impact on the overall schedule for submission of the Final EA /</p>  |  | 2002        |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised   | Response  | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|------------|------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|-------------|
|            |                        | <p>concerned. I am concerned with the certainty with which many statements are made. I can't imagine the very smart engineers or other professionals can themselves have much faith that the actions they are describing will be perpetuated in that exact manner.</p> <p>Firstly, is the sudden appearance of Bill 5 and then Bill C-5. The promised Special Economic Zones and other parts of these "laws" are huge shifts in policy that have resulted in law suits being started by the very proponents of these very projects. I would like to hear you address these issues in a more forthright manner.</p> <p>James Tegler BSc, RSE<br/>Senior Environmental Coordinator<br/>Lands and Resources Department,<br/>Mushkegowuk Council</p> | <p>IS is yet to be determined. We will continue to keep Indigenous communities, the public and regulators up to date through our monthly e-blasts and telephone outreach.</p> <p>The Project Team is currently exploring the preliminary design parameters of the Community Access Road. Details on how the road will be designed and built will not be known until the conclusion of the detailed design phase. This phase of work will start should the Community Access Road be approved to proceed by regulators. While no one has built a road through the "exact" terrain as the proposed Community Access Road, the Project Team Consultants have experience designing and building roads in very similar northern environments. The Manitoba East Side Road that connects the road network to Bloodvein First Nation and then terminates in Berens River First Nation is an access road built on very similar terrain as the Preferred Route (i.e., Canadian Shield that encompasses fens, bogs and / or swamps, coupled with rolling rugged terrain comprised of granite outcrops).</p> <p>The introduction of Bills 5 and C5 has generated concern among many groups,</p> |                          |             |

**Table: Summary of Feedback Received and Response / Action – Mushkegowuk Council**

| Group Name | Comment ID from source | Comment Raised | Response   | Addressed in the EA / IS | Internal ID |
|------------|------------------------|----------------|--|--------------------------|-------------|
|            |                        |                | <p>including Marten Falls First Nation as the Proponent of the Community Access Road. As the Draft EA / IS was prepared and released in advance of the introduction of Bills 5 and C5, we do not know how these new bills may impact the overall process. We continue to wait on guidance from the provincial and federal governments and will respond appropriately. In the meantime, our commitment to ongoing engagement with Indigenous communities stands. Once more clarity is known on how, if at all, the process will be affected, the Project Team will provide an update.</p> <p>Sincerely,<br/>Callais</p> |                          |             |