

Appendix C6

Feedback and Response Log - Government Review Team - Ministry of Natural Resources



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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Natural Resources	1	<p>MNR staff appreciate that the draft EA (e.g., Section 7.2.3.2) describes that the proposed pits and quarries required for the Community Access Road, located in the potential sand/gravel and bedrock resource areas (Figure 1-1), will be subject to the Aggregate Resources Act approval process. However, several of the Appendices (e.g., Appendix H page 141 and Appendix K page 438) describe that for a permit to be issued under the Act, additional studies, mitigation plans, consultation and monitoring commitments ‘may’ be required. Please note that the Act requires that applications submit site plans and technical reports according to the Aggregate Resources of Ontario: Site Plan (2020) and Technical Reports and Information (2023) Standards available through: Aggregate resources ontario.ca.</p> <p>In addition, applicants are required to notify and consult on permit applications, as described in sections 0.3, 0.4, 0.5 and 0.11 under Ontario Regulation 244/97.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>References to the Aggregate Resources Act throughout the draft EA, including the</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS has been updated to include reference to the Aggregate Resources Act throughout.</p> <p>The comment on applications relates to permitting (comment type D) and will be addressed during the permitting stage.</p>	Final EA/IS	1500

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Appendices, should be reviewed to ensure the permit application process and information requirements (e.g., site plans, technical reports, and notification and consultation requirements) are clearly described.</p> <p>It is recommended that the project team consider how permit applications can be initiated as early as possible during the detailed design phase of the project to align with the timelines associated with the permit application process (e.g., notification and consultation for applications can extend beyond six months), and the information required to support an application. It is recommended that the project team consider how permit applications can be initiated as early as possible during the detailed design phase of the project. For example, this could include phasing/prioritizing certain permit applications to align with the construction schedule for the project.</p> <p>MNR Aggregates Section would also be pleased to meet with the project team (e.g., pre-consultation) to discuss the permit application process and the information requirements contained in the provincial standards.</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>It is also recommended that the project team consider including an 'Implementation Section' in the final EA, which summarizes the subsequent authorizations (e.g., Aggregate Resources Act permits and Public Lands Act authorizations) required to implement the project.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA D. Permitting Related, Not Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	2	<p>General Comment Throughout the draft EA (e.g., Section 7.2.4 and Table 9-11) the reporting describes that permitted pits and quarries under the Aggregate Resources Act will be 'decommissioned'.</p> <p>The Aggregate Resources Act requires progressive (ongoing) rehabilitation of aggregate sites and, once the resource has been depleted, final rehabilitation is required before the site can be 'surrendered'.</p> <p>It is recommended that the project team update the 'decommissioning' references for pits and quarries in the final EA, to include that sites will be rehabilitated</p>	<p>The second paragraph in Section 7.2.4 of the Final EA/IS has been updated as follows: "Once construction is complete, temporary infrastructure that is no longer needed will be removed and abandoned or decommissioned. Pits and quarries will be rehabilitated and surrendered in accordance with the Aggregate Resources Act".</p>	Final EA/IS Section 7.2.4	1501

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>(progressive and final rehabilitation) and surrendered in accordance with the Act.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA D. Permitting Related, Not Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	3	<p>The draft EA (e.g., Section 7.2.5.2), including the Appendices (e.g., Appendix H page 6), include references to ‘aggregate licenses’ and the ‘licensing process’ under the Aggregate Resources Act.</p> <p>For the portions of the MFCAR that are on Crown land, please note that ‘permits’ under the Aggregate Resources Act are required to extract mineral aggregate resources. An Aggregate Resources Act ‘licence’ is required to extract mineral aggregate resources on private land in designated areas within Ontario.</p> <p>It is recommended that the references to ‘aggregate licences’ in the draft EA, including the Appendices, be updated to ‘aggregate permits’, to align with the requirements of the Act.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA C. Editorial</p>	<p>The bullet point in Table 9.3-6 (formerly Table 9-6) of the Final EA/IS has been updated as follows: "Blasting activities will also be in accordance with aggregate permits issued under Aggregate Resources Act (Government of Ontario, 1990i).</p> <p>The bullet points in Table 9.5-13 (formerly Table 9-36) of the Final EA/IS have been updated as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Blasting at temporary or existing quarries will be carried out to comply with the conditions provided in the aggregate permits, if one exists or is required". - "Quarry blasting will be carried out to comply with the conditions provided in the aggregate permit, if one exists or is required". <p>The reference to aggregate licences has also been removed from the appendices.</p>	Final EA/IS Tables 9.3-6 and Table 9.5-13	1502

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Natural Resources	4	<p>The draft EA (e.g., Section 7.2.4), including the Appendices (e.g., Appendix J page 162), provide a general description of the proposed rehabilitation sequencing for permitted pits and quarries, including that sites will be encouraged to ‘naturally revegetate’.</p> <p>Please note that Site Plan Standard #63 in the ‘Aggregate Resources of Ontario: Site Plan (2020) Standards’ requires that site plans outline the location, layout and type of vegetation that will be established on the site during progressive and final rehabilitation. The type of vegetation (e.g., trees, wetland plants, grass seed mixtures) established will depend on the circumstances of each site and will take into consideration surrounding land uses.</p> <p>The Ministry typically does not support sites being allowed to ‘naturally revegetate,’ as this approach may not achieve the desired rehabilitation outcomes of the Aggregate Resources Act.</p> <p>It is recommended that the references in the final EA, including the Appendices, state that pits and quarries will be allowed to ‘naturally revegetate’ be updated to ‘vegetation will be</p>	<p>The references in the Final EA/IS and appendices have been updated to indicate that vegetation will be established, as outlined on the required Rehabilitation Plan to align with the ‘Aggregate Resources of Ontario: Site Plan (2020) Standards’.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 7.2.4 and appendices: throughout the documents, where applicable.</p>	1503

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>established', as outlined on the required Rehabilitation Plan to align with the 'Aggregate Resources of Ontario: Site Plan (2020) Standards'.</p> <p>A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation) B. Recommended for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	5	<p>These sections describe that aggregate materials will be sourced from 'permanent' pits and quarries established for the Community Access Road.</p> <p>MNR staff appreciate that the long-term maintenance of the Community Access Road will require access to mineral aggregate resources. However, permitted pits and quarries under the Aggregate Resources Act are intended to be interim land uses, and once the resource has been depleted at a site, final rehabilitation is to be completed before the site can be surrendered.</p> <p>It is recommended that the references to pits and quarries in these sections be revised to remove the term 'permanent.' As an alternative, these sections could clarify that the operations for certain permits will extend beyond the initial construction of the Community Access</p>	<p>The references in the Final EA/IS and appendices have been updated to indicate that vegetation will be established, as outlined on the required Rehabilitation Plan to align with the 'Aggregate Resources of Ontario: Site Plan (2020) Standards'.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS and appendices: throughout the documents, where applicable.</p>	1504

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Road, to support the maintenance of the road. This revision could also include that progressive rehabilitation approaches for these sites will be incorporated in the required Rehabilitation Plans under the Aggregate Resources Act.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	6	<p>This section indicates that pits and quarries no-longer used for the operation and maintenance of the Community Access Road will have site-specific rehabilitation plans developed.</p> <p>Please note that the 'Aggregate Resources of Ontario: Site Plan (2020) Standards' requires that permit applications prepare a site plan, which includes how the proposed permit area will be rehabilitated (e.g., Rehabilitation Plan). The rehabilitation of permitted pits and quarries are required to follow the conditions contained in the approved site plans.</p> <p>It is recommended that this section be revised to include that permitted pits and quarries established for the operation and maintenance of the Community Access Road will follow the progressive and final rehabilitation requirements</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS has been updated to include the editorial edit to clearly state that permitted pits and quarries will be rehabilitated (progressive and final) as outlined in the approved site plans in accordance with the Aggregate Resources Act.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Physiography , Terrain, and Soils Future Commitment s section (14.4.2.5), All technical reports sections 2.1.3</p>	1505

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>outlined in the approved site plans under the Act.</p> <p>A. Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	7	<p>MNR staff appreciate the information related to how groundwater elevations will be monitored in support of aggregate permit applications. However, please note that, on a site-by-site basis, the details of the groundwater monitoring program may differ from the approaches described in the draft EA. In addition, the design of the groundwater monitoring program will need to be implemented in accordance with the 'Aggregate Resources of Ontario: Technical Reports and Information (2023) Standards'.</p> <p>It is recommended that this section be updated to direct that the groundwater monitoring program for aggregate permit applications will be designed to fulfill the requirements of the standards, and that the approaches may differ on a site-by-site basis.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA D. Permitting Related, Not Required for EA</p>	<p>A. Section 14 of the Final EA/IS has not been updated as this comment is considered recommended (comment Type B) rather than required for EA (comment Type A).</p> <p>B. The design of groundwater monitoring programs to support aggregate permit application will be implemented in accordance with the Aggregate Resources of Ontario: Technical Reports and Information (2023) Standards. This comment relates to permitting (comment type D) and will be addressed during the permitting stage. No changes will be incorporated into the Final EA/IS.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1506
Ministry of	8	This table indicates that rehabilitation	Table 9.3-4 (formerly Table 9-6) of the	Final EA/IS	1507

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Natural Resources		<p>plans for aggregate permit applications will be developed, as outlined in the 'Aggregate Permits on Crown Lands for Pits and Quarries above Water (MNR 2014)' and the 'Forest Management Planning Manual (MNR 2017).'</p> <p>Please clarify how the 'Aggregate Permits on Crown Lands for Pits and Quarries above Water (MNR 2014)' and the 'Forest Management Planning Manual (MNR 2017)' manuals referenced are intended to inform the development of rehabilitation plans for aggregate permit applications for the Community Access Road.</p> <p>For example, the Forest Management Planning Manual provides specific direction for aggregate pits operating on land that is part of a management unit designated under the Crown Forest Sustainability Act (Section 8 of Ontario Regulation 244/97).</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA C. Editorial</p>	<p>Final EA/IS has been updated as follows: "The aggregate pits will follow the guidelines and associated conditions / requirements of the approved permits, including development of a rehabilitation plan, outlined in Provincial Standards of Ontario - Category 9 - Pit Above Water (Ministry of Natural Resources, 2006) and the Forest Management Planning Manual (Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, 2020)."</p>	<p>Table 9.3-4 (formerly Table 9-6)</p>	
Ministry of Natural Resources	9	<p>The draft EA (Table 9-48) indicates that there are existing mining claims/leases within the construction disturbance area. Please note MNR will have to consider</p>	<p>The contractor responsible for detail design and permitting will consider consulting with the claim/lease holder(s) prior to the submission of the quarry</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1508

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>claims/leases when reviewing aggregate permit applications.</p> <p>A.R Policy 5.00.06 in the Aggregate Resources Policies and Procedures Manual provides some information regarding the Aggregate Resources Act and the Mining Act, including rights to extract consolidated (bedrock) aggregate.</p> <p>It is recommended that the EA project team consult with the claim/lease holder(s) prior to the submission of a permit application, if proposed quarry permit applications are determined to overlap with existing mining claims/leases.</p> <p>D. Permitting Related, Not Required for EA</p>	<p>permit application.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	10	<p>The mitigation and enhancement measures section of the table in the second line notes that: Wash water from cleaning concrete mixing equipment and delivery systems, as well as from vehicles and equipment, will be collected in designated wash-out sites, located at least 30 metres from a waterbody.</p> <p>Recognizing that 30 meters may not be</p>	<p>The phrase “No contamination of rivers or streams by foreign materials is permitted.” has been added to Table 9.3-6 (formerly Table 9-6) in the Final EA/IS.</p>	Final EA/IS Table 9.3-6	1509

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>appropriate if the terrain is still sloping towards the waterbody, MNR recommends wording similar to that contained in the Forest Management Guide for Conserving Biodiversity at the Stand and Site Scales be used: “No contamination of rivers or streams by foreign materials is permitted.”</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	11	<p>The mitigation and enhancement measures section of the table states the following: 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –Channel realignments and / or infillings will be avoided through Project planning and design to the extent practicable. –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. –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 	<p>The phrase “Changes to stream morphology, including fitting a culvert to the channel alignment to minimize changes in stream morphology, will likely require approval by Fisheries and Oceans Canada, with the plan and mitigations requiring reviewed by Ministry of Natural Resources through permitting the water crossing” has been updated in Section 9.4.1.2 and Table 9.3-4 (formerly Table 9-6).</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 9.4.1.2 and Table 9.3-4</p>	1510

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>of Natural Resources through permitting the water crossing.</p> <p>Recommend using wording contained in the Forest Management Guide for Conserving Biodiversity at the Stand and Site Scales regarding stream alignment be noted in the EA/IS: fitting a culvert to the creek alignment to minimize change in stream morphology. Changes to stream morphology will likely require DFO approval.</p> <p>A. Required for EA (per ministry)</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	12	<p>The mitigation and enhancement measures section of the table notes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progressive revegetation of the right-of-way will be implemented. Temporary access roads and trails, temporary construction camps, turn-around areas, waterbody crossings, and temporary laydown areas will be restored to pre-existing compatible condition at the end of Construction Phase. <p>Seeding will follow as close as possible to final cleanup and topsoil material replacement pending seasonal or weather conditions.</p> <p>Please expand on the terminology</p>	The Vegetation Restoration Plan will be prepared during detail design and will consider use of native seeds or appropriate tree species.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1511

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>“restored to pre-existing compatible condition”. This should include the use of the native seed (mentioned elsewhere in the document) or appropriate tree species. MNR suggests including this in the Vegetation Restoration Plan, which has yet to be reviewed. A thorough review of this document will be required prior to permitting, MNR recommends including as part of the Final EA</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA D. Permitting Related, Not Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	13	<p>The mitigation and enhancement measures section of the table notes the following: ...in accordance with Ministry of Natural Resources’ Environmental Guidelines for Access Roads and Water Crossing (Ministry of Natural Resources, 1990).</p> <p>Suggest referencing the Forest Management Guide for Conserving Biodiversity at the Stand and Site Scales (Ministry of Natural Resources, 2010) instead of, or as well as the original Access Road Guideline as these guidelines have been updated and incorporated into the Stand and Site Guide.</p>	Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document has been updated to include the recommended reference (Forest Management Guide for Conserving Biodiversity at the Stand and Site Scales (Ministry of Natural Resources, 2010).	Appendix F Section 7.3.1, Tables 7-7 and 10-1	1512

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		B. Recommended for EA			
Ministry of Natural Resources	14	<p>Valued Component: Forest Industry Project Phase: Construction Description of Potential Effect: Text states - At the time of writing, the Ogoki Forest is not actively harvested nor are any plans for harvesting known.</p> <p>Text is outdated, please update to reflect that there is active harvesting on the Ogoki Forest.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>	The phrase ‘The Ogoki Forest is actively harvested’ has been updated in the Final EA/IS.	Final EA/IS Table 9-48	1513
Ministry of Natural Resources	15	<p>Valued Component: Forest Industry Mitigation and Enhancement Measures: Text states - Should any commercial forest trees be felled within the Ogoki Forest Management area for the construction of the Project, the value of the timber will be determined.</p> <p>Please change the word “commercial” to “merchantable” to be consistent with Ontario’s Scaling Manual. Please update the text to reflect that, should the area NOT be included in an MTO P-Plan prior to permitting, the value of any harvested timber will be invoiced using Ontario’s Crown Timber Charges (i.e. Stumpage);</p>	<p>Table 9.5-39 (formerly Table 9-48) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to replace "commercial" with "merchantable" to reflect the language in the Crown Forest Sustainability Act.</p> <p>It is acknowledge that timber on Crown land is reserved to the Crown and the value of timber will be determined prior to clearing, and an invoice by the Ministry on Natural Resources (MNR) will be expected for the Owner/Operator of the road.</p>	Final EA/IS Table 9.5-40	1514

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>however, the volume (and area) of timber by species is yet to be determined and will be required to be provided to the Ministry prior to permitting.</p> <p>A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	16	<p>Valued Component: Forest Industry Predicted Residual Effect: Text states - Adverse residual effects are not expected as the Construction Disturbance Area overlaps only 0.24 percent of the Ogoki Forest and should any merchantable timber be removed for the Project; applicable compensation will be provided for the loss of those trees.</p> <p>Please elaborate on what is meant by “applicable compensation” for the loss of trees. Note that if the area is under an MTO P-Plan there are no Crown stumpage charges. If the area is not under an MTO P-Plan, charges will include the full stumpage suite including renewal rate charges applicable for the Ogoki Forest. Crown charges are not considered compensation.</p> <p>A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	Merchantable timber removed from the Ogoki Forest for the purposes of the Project will receive "applicable compensation" which will be determined during the detail design phase.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1515

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Natural Resources	17	<p>Upon completion of construction, sand and gravel pits, including temporary access roads leading to the pits will be decommissioned, which will include backfilling, levelling, recompacting, and redistributing organic materials to encourage natural revegetation.</p> <p>Environmental Concern and Potential Effect: Changes to availability, distribution, composition and function of ecosystems and plant populations as a result of direct vegetation loss.</p> <p>Mitigation, Protection, Monitoring, and Study Commitments to be Carried Forward to Detailed Design: Prepare and implement a Vegetation Restoration Plan.</p> <p>Mitigation, Protection, Monitoring, and Study Commitments to be Carried Forward to Construction Operation: Upon completion of construction, sand and gravel pits, including temporary access roads leading to the pits will be decommissioned, which will include backfilling, levelling, recompacting, and redistributing organic materials to encourage natural revegetation..... Temporary quarries not required for</p>	Re-planting forested areas will be considered in the Vegetation Restoration Plan. The Vegetation Restoration Plan will be prepared during detail design.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1516

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>maintenance activities will be abandoned.</p> <p>Please note that natural revegetation may not be appropriate and MNR will require a review of the Vegetation Restoration Plan and reserves the right to request changes or updates to it prior to licensing or permitting. There is no reference to re-planting forested areas post completion/construction. In some cases, planting trees may be the appropriate revegetation measure. Please consider the application of re-planting trees and update the document appropriately.</p> <p>D. Permitting Related, Not Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	18	<p>The document does not include the appropriate level of detail for licencing and permitting the harvest of merchantable timber. It is also unclear what the level of land tenure will be prior to licensing and permitting. Land tenure will partly determine the type of licencing or permitting; and what level of discussion with licence holders on each unit will be required.</p> <p>Please note that MNR will require site</p>	Site specific details will be provided during the permitting stage for timber harvesting.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1517

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>specific details in order to licence or permit any timber harvesting. These details will include detailed mapping, details on end-use of timber, renewal plans (not necessarily seeding).</p> <p>D. Permitting Related, Not Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	19	<p>Many Plans are missing from the draft EA. A thorough review of the plans will be required prior to any permitting and should be included in the EA documents for public consideration.</p> <p>Please provide a summary of plans listed in the Draft, that will expand upon the information in the EA these plans include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vegetation Restoration Plan Spill Management/Contingency Plan Wildlife Management Plan (including beaver) Waste Management Plan Environmental Protection Plan <p>Recommended for EA/Permitting related, not required for EA</p>	<p>The development of these plans is not included in the current scope. They will be addressed in the next phase of the Community Access Road project during the detail design stage.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1518
Ministry of Natural Resources	20	<p>When referencing Marten Falls First Nation Community Based Land Use Plan, please clarify whether it's the</p>	<p>Clarification of references to the Draft Marten Falls First Nation Community Based Land Use Plan has been updated.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for</p>	1519

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>“MFFN CBLUP Terms of Reference” or the “Draft MFFN CBLUP”.</p> <p>Should be noted that as the Draft MFFN CBLUP is not yet a finalized document it is subject to change.</p> <p>Please clarify all references in EA and appendices.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>		details.	
Ministry of Natural Resources	21	<p>Any reference to the MFFN CBLUP’s protected areas should be called by their proper name of “Dedicated Protected Areas”.</p> <p>Please change “Designated” to “Dedicated” for Dedicated Protected Areas throughout all documents in the EA, for accuracy.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	The reference to "Designated Protected Areas" in Table 9.5-39 (formerly Table 9-48) of the Final EA/IS and Appendix U Land and Resource Use Technical Support Document have been changed to "Dedicated Protected Areas".	Final EA/IS Table 9.5-39 Appendix U	1520
Ministry of Natural Resources	22	<p>Use of the term jurisdiction is inaccurate. The project would fall within the MFFN CBLUP proposed planning area. A CBLUP does not provide jurisdiction, it provides land use direction, once approved, under the Far North Act, 2010.</p> <p>Correct for accuracy.</p>	The Final EA/IS and Appendix U Land and Resource Use Technical Support Document have been updated to revise the term "jurisdiction" related to the Marten Falls First Nations Community Based Land Use Plan (CBLUP).	Final EA/IS Appendix U	1521

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		B. Recommended for EA			
Ministry of Natural Resources	23	<p>Project inclusion list- "CBLUPs, where available"</p> <p>Referencing multiple CBLUPs, The Project is mostly in Planning area of the Draft Marten Falls First Nation's Community Based Land Use Plan.</p> <p>If project is taking multiple CBLUPs into consideration, please list CBLUPs that are being referenced.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	Section 6.8.2 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to "Draft Marten Falls First Nation's Community Based Land Use Plan".	Final EA/IS Section 6.8.2	1522
Ministry of Natural Resources	24	<p>Draft Community Land Use Plan</p> <p>Correction: Draft Community Based Land Use Plan</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	The reference to " Draft Community Land Use Plan" has been updated to "Draft Community Based Land Use Plan" in Section 8.1 of the Final EA/IS.	Final EA/IS Section 8.1	1523
Ministry of Natural Resources	25	<p>"Peatlands are more complicated and can locally flow in almost any direction"</p> <p>Inaccurately quoting and paraphrasing the MFFN CBLUP.</p> <p>Suggest referencing a published scientific document or IK from community</p>	The requested edit has not been completed as this comment is considered recommended.	Comment noted; see response for details	1524

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>members and removing MFFN CBLUP as reference.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	26	<p>-Referencing IK from MFFN CBLUP about presence of Blue Spotted Salamander in the project footprint.</p> <p>Page 151 Section 8-13 of MFCAR EA speaks to IK providing information about the Blue-spotted Salamander.</p> <p>The Draft MFFN CBLUP does refer to the Blue-Spotted Salamander it does not explicitly say IK is the source of this information.</p> <p>Suggest removing the Marten Falls CBLUP as reference and only referencing IK as the source of this information.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>	<p>The reference to the Marten Falls First Nation Community Based Land Use Plan (CBLUP; MFFN 2020) will be retained; however, the mention of the CBLUP will be removed from text. Section 8.2.5.4 of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document has been updated to confirm that Indigenous Knowledge provided by Marten Falls First Nation notes that the species is known to occur within the area of Marten Falls First Nation (MFFN 2020).</p>	Appendix K Section 8.2.5.4	1525
Ministry of Natural Resources	27	<p>1. Land Use Compatibility Row states the MFCAR is compatible with existing land use designations, and that road segments that align with existing planning policies will be considered more favourable for route selection.</p>	<p>1. "Existing" has not been updated to "proposed" in reference to land use designations.</p> <p>2. Discussion on the draft Marten Falls First Nation Community Based Land Use Plan and how it may be updated as a</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1526

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>If this is referring to the Draft MFFN CBLUP's land use designations it should be noted that the MFFN CBLUP is still in draft stage and therefore all land use designations are proposed and not finalized.</p> <p>2. This row and Land Use Compatibility/construction row on page 743 state opposite procedures for relationship with CBLUPS, as this one states MFCAR should be compatible with Draft MFFN CBLUP land use direction and on Page 743 it states that Draft MFFN CBLUP land use direction will be amended to conform with MFCAR.</p> <p>3. Land and Resource Use: "The Community Access Road should be compatible with existing land use designations within the Construction Disturbance Area as much as possible. Alternatively, amendment processes will be noted and addressed."</p> <p>Does this reference draft CBLUP?</p> <p>Provincial parks, Dedicated Protected Areas, and protected areas are regulated in Ontario for their preservation of these values. Consideration of potentially effected values will include physical,</p>	<p>result of the Community Access Road is outlined in Section 5.1.2 of Appendix U Land and Resource Use Technical Support Document and described as follows: "Marten Falls First Nation has conveyed that alterations to the proposed Development Protection Area can still occur to address the preferred routing of the Project, given that there is overlap between the Project and the Draft Development Protection Areas. Given that the Community Based Land Use Plan is in draft format, these lands have not been finalized as Development Protection Areas. For the purposes of the alternatives development and preliminary design, the underlying features and values intended for protection through Draft Development Protection Areas were considered to inform avoidance and minimize impacts where feasible."</p> <p>3. "Existing planning policies/designations" includes but is not limited to community based land use plans (i.e., Marten Falls First Nation, and Terms of Reference for Constance Lake First Nations), provincial parks plans/policies, and provincial legislation as outlined in Section 5.1.1 of Appendix U.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>social, and natural science considerations in relation to these values.</p> <p>“Dedicated protected areas” in reference to draft CBLUP?</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please change “existing” to “proposed” in “existing land use designations” as there are currently no approved land use designations. 2. Please correct Land Use Compatibility/construction row on page 743. MFCAR should be compatible with CBLUP land use direction. 3. Please clarify existing planning policies/designations, are they referring to provincial parks or CBLUP? 			
Ministry of Natural Resources	28	<p>“...and Marten Falls Community Land Use Plan”</p> <p>Is this in reference to the draft CBLUP?</p> <p>If so, correction required – Marten Falls Draft Community Based Land Use Plan</p> <p>B Recommended for EA</p>	The requested edit has been completed in the Final EA/IS.	Comment noted; see response for details	1527
Ministry of	29	1. “Despite the proposed repeal of the	The following edits have been made to	Final EA/IS	1528

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Natural Resources		<p>Act. The Ministry of Natural Resources intends to continue land use planning with communities the Ministry of Natural Resources has identified as being in the advanced planning stage”</p> <p>2. Please avoid quoting and/or referencing the draft Far North Land Use Strategy, as it was a document from 2015 that was never finalized.</p> <p>This statement is incorrect. After consideration of its repeal, the Far North Act was amended in 2021. Ontario continues to plan with any/all eligible communities interested in planning.</p> <p>3. “Relevant communities in the region who are continuing the planning process include</p> <p>The communities listed as ‘continuing planning’ are incorrect; please verify with communities, as some may wish to keep their planning status confidential; unless otherwise indicated by the community.</p> <p>4. Some statements in this section disclose information about Aroland and their planning history that is inaccurate, not public, and may upset the community.</p>	<p>Section 8.3.9.2 of the Final EA/IS:</p> <p>1. and 2. reference to the Draft Far North Land Use Strategy has been removed.</p> <p>3. The sentence "Relevant communities in the region who are continuing the planning process include" has been removed.</p> <p>4. Statements relating to Aroland have been removed.</p>	Section 8.3.9.2	

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Suggest editing to be more accurate on the proposed repeal of the FNA and the status of Community Based Land Use Planning in Ontario 2. Review whether statements from Draft Far North Land Use Strategy are still accurate. 3. Please edit wording to show which communities respectively have publicly posted Tor's and Draft Plans. Please remove portion about Aroland and the CBLUP as it is not public knowledge and community may want to keep confidential. 4. Remove/correct for accuracy. <p>B. Recommended for EA C. Editorial</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	30	<p>Page 743/Table 9-48</p> <p>Land Use Compatibility</p> <p>1. Land Use Compatibility/Construction row makes several references to the MFFN CBLUP, stating that the Land Use</p>	<p>The recommendations have been incorporated into Table 9.5-39 (formerly Table 9-48) of the final EA / IS and Appendix U Land and Resource Use Technical Supporting Document as outlined below:</p>	Final EA/IS Table 9.5-39	1529

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Plan will be adjusted and amended to be in conformance and to accommodate the project.</p> <p>The CBLUP is currently in draft phase, and not approved. Direction in the plan does not currently apply to activities on the landscape. Marten Falls and Ontario maintain the ability to draft/change land use direction based on each party's/both parties' interests.</p> <p>2. Due to the absence of land use planning policies for the Construction Disturbance Area and the ability of Marten Falls to adjust their Community Based Land Use Plan, no adverse effects to this valued component are expected, with high confidence."</p> <p>Currently the guideline sections in both land use designations (EMA & DPA) outline practices that would be required to be followed for road building in the Planning Area, once the plan is approved.</p> <p>3. Land Use Plan will be amended to be in conformance and to accommodate the project The MFFN CBLUP was written so as not impede the development of MFCAR. The</p>	<p>1. To clarify the outcomes of a joint planning process between Marten Falls and Ontario cannot be predicted.</p> <p>2. To confirm that presence of guideline sections in both land use designations (EMA & DPA) that outline practices that must be followed for road building in the Planning Area, once the plan is approved.</p> <p>3. References to CBLUP have been updated to confirm that MFCAR will follow land use direction set out in MFFN CBLUP.</p> <p>4. To clarify that the project falls within DPAs and not "adjacent to".</p> <p>5. To confirm the EA mitigations will not influence Ontario/MFFN Far North Act CBLUP decision making.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>intention is that the CBLUP allows for this project to take place within both of its land use designations, but its guidelines must be adhered to. Presently there has been no discussion or intent to adjust the CBLUP to better accommodate the MFCAR, it is the intent of the planning team and the community of Marten Falls that the MFCAR follow the CBLUP.</p> <p>4. “It is anticipated that some of the lands adjacent to the Project will be included as part of the Designated Protected Area to control development”</p> <p>Incorrect name of DPA, statement is incorrect. There are portions of both routes near the Albany River crossing that are directly within DPA boundaries.</p> <p>5. “It is recommended that Marten Falls First Nation be involved in land and resource use planning activities to manage new development that may occur as a result of the Project. Marten Falls First Nation will also update their Community Based Land Use Plan as necessary to align with the Project boundaries.”</p> <p>This oversteps the EA’s ability to direct/influence planning.</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The EA can not assume with any confidence the potential outcomes of a joint planning process between Marten Falls and Ontario, which is subject to public consultation. Revise for accuracy. 2. Please revise for accuracy. 3. Correct all reference to CBLUP to accurately depict MFCAR needing to follow land use direction set out in MFFN CBLUP. 4. The project falls within DPAs and not “adjacent to”. 5. Please remove or revise the mitigations proposed. EA mitigations can not influence Ontario/MFFN Far North Act CBLUP decision making. 			
Ministry of Natural Resources	31	<p>Ministry of Energy, Northern Development and Mines Mishkeegogamang First Nation;</p> <p>Typo. Separate Ministries and Mishkeegogamang First Nation. Different bullets.</p>	The entries have been separated into two different bullet points in Section 11.5.7 (formerly 11.6.5) of the Final EA/IS	Final EA/IS Section 11.6.5	1530

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		C. Editorial			
Ministry of Natural Resources	32	<p>First paragraph of page 44 gives an incorrect interpretation of the Far North Act intent and scope. The Far North Act does not apply to federal lands. Joint-planning towards the development of land use direction does not include consensus-based decision making beyond development of the CBLUP.</p> <p>Please correct for accuracy.</p> <p>A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>Appendix Q Cultural Heritage Technical Support Document has been updated to clarify that the Far North Act does not apply to reserves, federal Crown lands, municipalities of land that is not public land.</p> <p>No updates have been made to Appendix R Archaeological Assessments. The Stage 1 reports included in Appendix R have been updated in response to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism’s (MCM) comments through their formal review process and have since been accepted. The Stage 2 report has been submitted to MCM and is currently awaiting feedback through the established MCM review channels.</p>	Appendix Q Section 4.1	1531
Ministry of Natural Resources	33	<p>Incorrect inclusion of Far North Act (FNA) objectives. i.e. 225,000 km2 no longer an objective within FNA.</p> <p>The Far North Act was amended in 2021; please update for accuracy.</p> <p>Please correct for accuracy.</p> <p>A. Required for EA (per ministry</p>	<p>The reference to Far North Act (FNA) is found within the Cultural Heritage Study Plan, which was finalized in May of 2021 and last revised in November of 2023. As noted in the first paragraph of the preceding introductory section (Section 11, page 43), the information presented was the best available to date.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1532

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		mandate/policy/legislation)			
Ministry of Natural Resources	34	<p>Incorrect assertion about possible heritage conservation applicability under the Far North Act and the applicability of the Planning Act.</p> <p>The Provincial Planning Statement, 2024 is a province wide land use planning policy framework that has replaced the Provincial Policy Statement 2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the Far North, land use planning is guided by the Far North Act, but decisions must still align with the Planning Act and be consistent with the PPS 2024. • The PPS 2024 includes policies that support Indigenous engagement and cultural heritage protection, which align with the goals of the Far North Act. • Municipalities and planning authorities must navigate all three frameworks when making decisions in the Far North. <p>Please update the Provincial Policy Statement to the Provincial Planning Statement, 2024. Please also update the paragraph to reflect the bullets in the comments and rationale and how the legislation and policy play a role in heritage conservation.</p>	<p>The reference to Far North Act and Planning Act are found within the Cultural Heritage Study Plan, which was finalized in May of 2021 and last revised in November of 2023. As noted in the first paragraph of the preceding introductory section (Section 11, page 43), the information presented was the best available to date. The Provincial Planning Statement, 2024 came into effect after the completion of the draft Cultural Heritage report. Appendix Q has been updated to reflect these regulatory changes.</p>	Appendix Q	1533

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Natural Resources	35	<p>-States Draft Community Based Land Use Plan “was used to provided information on the contemporary land use locations, such as trapping, tanning hides and crafting”. With the Section Reference 5.5</p> <p>Unclear what information is being used and how it is being used. The MFFN CBLUP does not disclose specific locations for IK values. Section reference number does not lead to anything related to this in EA or in Draft MFFN CBLUP.</p> <p>Please expand and clarify giving exact details on what specific information is being used and how it is being used.</p> <p>Clarify what the Section Reference 5.5 is referring to.</p>	The requested edit has not been completed as this comment is considered recommended	Comment noted; see response for details	1534
Ministry of Natural Resources	36	<p>Multiple inaccuracies RE: CBLUP under the FNA. References to the draft strategy that are not approved. References to amendment for an incomplete CBLUP as being contained within the draft strategy.</p> <p>Proposed repeal mentioned, but no indication of decision to amend act to enable ongoing planning. MNR’s role in planning is legislated under the Act, not</p>	Appendix Q Land and Resource Use Technical Support Document and Final EA/IS have been updated to provide clarity related to the draft Marten Falls First Nation Community Based Land Use Plan (CBLUP) and to include a description of the planning process between the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) and Indigenous Communities under the Far North Act.	Final EA/IS Appendix Q	1535

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>simply an intention. Please correct for accuracy.</p> <p>Please provide further clarity regarding the nature of the unapproved draft Land Use Strategy. As it is yet to be approved, it does not provide guidance on the listed items referenced within this section.</p> <p>Please remove any reference to which communities are continuing the planning process. This list is inaccurate and MNR does not disclose community efforts in planning until public posting intervals.</p> <p>A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	37	<p>1. “The Designated Protected Area land use zoning”</p> <p>The term “land use zoning” is inaccurate. Correct to “Land Use Designation”</p> <p>2. “This overlap is in contravention of the zoning as outlined in the MFFN CBLUP”</p> <p>The statement is also incorrect The MFCAR is not in in contravention to the land use designations it overlaps.</p> <p>3. “The Study team has been informed</p>	<p>The recommendations have been incorporated into Appendix U Land and Resource Use Technical Support Document as outlined below:</p> <p>1. "Land use zoning" has been replaced with "Land Use Designation."</p> <p>2. The statement about the Community Access Road being in contravention with Community Based Land Use Plan (CBLUP) has been removed.</p> <p>3. "DPA zoning" has been updated to</p>	Appendix U	1536

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>that the DPA zoning in the MFFN CBLUP has been amended by MFFN to accommodate the proposed road as well as aggregate sites and supporting infrastructure areas”</p> <p>Statement is inaccurate, it is the DPA land use designation or simply DPA. MFFN CBLUP has not been amended to accommodate the MFCAR. It has not been finalized therefore has not been amended and it is being developed so that both land use designations accommodate the MFCAR.</p> <p>4. Unclear as to why the paragraph regarding Aroland CBLUP is included. It does not have any clear purpose or consequences for the EA, could potentially be misrepresenting history of Aroland CBLUP. Aroland FN may want to keep that information confidential.</p> <p>5. "During the project operations and maintenance phase, there could be proposals to develop lands in proximity to the project because of new access provided to the area. These developments may not be in line with the MFFN CBLUP. It is assumed that Marten Falls will review these applications regarding their conformity with the</p>	<p>"DPA land use designation" and to confirm the CBLUP has not yet been amended to accommodate the Community Access Road.</p> <p>4. Content regarding the Aroland CBLUP has been removed.</p> <p>5. The statement has been updated to follow the Far North Action Section 14 (1).</p> <p>6. Section 7.2.1 of Appendix U Land and Resource Use Technical Support Document has been updated to confirm that the Marten Falls First Nation Draft Community Based Land Use Plan remains under development and continues to provide an evolving planning framework for future land use considerations.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>CBLUP"</p> <p>Statement is inaccurate. Refer to Far North Action Section 14 (1) for guidance.</p> <p>6. Valued Component #1 Characterization of Residual Effects paragraph is inaccurate. There were no noted required amendments to MFFN CBLUP. Land use designations and permitted land uses and activities are still being drafted. Once finalized if the need to amend the land use designations or permitted land use activities arises as new potential developments are needed/proposed the plan can be amended.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Correct for accuracy 2. Delete statement about MFCAR being in contravention with CBLUP 3. Correct for accuracy 4. Remove content regarding Aroland CBLUP 5. Correct for accuracy 6. Correct for accuracy <p>A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation) B. Recommended for EA</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Natural Resources	38	<p>-Referenced “community-based land use plan” as a source for GIS data and visual environment indicators.</p> <p>Reference is vague and unclear on what plan, what data was used and how it was used.</p> <p>Please clarify whether it is the Draft Marten Falls Community Based Land Use Plan being referenced.</p> <p>Expand on what data was used, and its intended use within the EA.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>	<p>Section 4.3.1 of Appendix V Visual Environment Technical Support Document clarifies that the reference is to the Draft Marten Falls Community-Based Land Use Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1537
Ministry of Natural Resources	39	<p>Text currently reads “The main reason why alternative 1 is the least preferred alternative from an engineering point of view include”. Was the intention here to say the main reason why alternative 4 instead of alternative 1?</p> <p>If this was a mistake, please change alternative 1 to alternative 4 – it appears according to Table 4-7 on page 44 that alternative 4 is the least preferred from an engineering and costs perspective.</p> <p>C. Editorial</p>	<p>The sentence in Section 4.4.3 of the Final EA/IS has been edited to indicate Alternative 4.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 4.4.3</p>	1538

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Natural Resources	40	<p>The MFCAR falls within the northwest region of Ontario, and therefore the Northwest Region Restricted Activity Timing Windows for the Protection of Fish and Fish Habitat). As such the timing restriction for Lake Whitefish in table 9-7 is incorrect. It should be Sept 15th to May 31st, compared to the northeast timing of Sept 15th to May 15th.</p> <p>Please correct the in-water work timing restriction for Lake Whitefish in table 9-7 to reflect the MNR’s northwest region dates, Sept 15th to May 31st. You may find these at: https://www.ontario.ca/page/water-work-timing-window-guidelines</p> <p>A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>Table 8.1-12 (formerly Table 9-7) of the Final EA/IS and Table 5-17 in Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document have been updated to clarify the restricted activity timing window for Lake Whitefish tis September 15 to May 31.</p> <p>Table 8.1-12 (formerly Table 9-7) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to clarify in-water work timing restrictions for Lake Whitefish is September 15 to May 31.</p>	Final EA/IS Table 8.1-12 Appendix G Table 5-17	1539
Ministry of Natural Resources	41	<p>Although an extensive list of mitigation measures has been provided to minimize adverse effects to fish and fish habitat at water crossings, MNR may request additional mitigation measures that are watercrossing specific, as conditions for approval of work permits for water crossing construction.</p> <p>There didn’t appear to be a specific</p>	<p>It is recognized that MNR may request additional mitigation measures through conditions of work permits, such as water crossing specific mitigation measures. This comment relates to permitting and will be addressed during the permitting stage.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1540

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>acknowledgement in the mitigation measures associated with fish and fish habitat that additional mitigation measures may be proposed by MNR through conditions of work permits.</p> <p>Please include a statement or possibly footnote in Section 9.3.3.4 indicating acknowledgement that additional water crossing-specific mitigation measures may be required by MNR (in replacement or addition of those in Table 9-10: Summary of Residual Effects for Fish and Fish Habitat) as conditions of work permits during the permitting phase. For example: brook trout streams that do not freeze to the bottom over winter, a condition of permitting a snowfill crossing would be to install culverts below the snowpack to ensure the natural water flow throughout winter is maintained which will allow for the natural passage of brook trout through that crossing.</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	42	In cases where the fishery community inventories at the location of the proposed project are not well documented and there is uncertainty in fish community present, the most restrictive in-water timing window must be used.	Table 9.3-7 (formerly Table 9-10) in the Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement and several locations within in the Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document: Existing Conditions & Effects Assessment (Appendix G) includes the following:	Comment noted; see response for details	1541

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Please add a note in Section 9.3.3.4 or below Table 9-10 stating that the most restrictive in-water timing window will be used for waterbodies where fish communities are unknown or poorly documented. This reflects that there may not be enough data at every crossing to apply a shorter timing window.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The restricted activity timing windows for each waterbody crossing will be finalized by the Ministry of Natural Resources during permitting. <p>As a result, an additional footnote was not added in the Final EA/IS.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	43	<p>The report states that “During the first winter, snow filling and packing will be used to cross major wet areas enabling access for the construction of roads, bridges, and major culverts”. At any time of year, the free movement of water and fish passage must not be blocked upstream or downstream of a waterbody or crossing, except during temporary construction or removal of a crossing.</p> <p>For snow fills and ice crossings, when water flow on permanent watercourses is assumed or confirmed to be occurring under the watercourse ice, a culvert can also be placed on top of the frozen channel before building the snow fill to add further reinforcement to the crossing while also providing for the movement of water and/or fish in the event that a seasonal winter thaw occurs.</p>	<p>The phrase “During the first winter, snow fill crossings may be used to cross significantly wet areas, without impeding the free movement of water and the passage of fish, to enable access for the construction of roads, bridges, and major culverts” has been updated in Section 7.2.3 of the Final EA/IS.</p> <p>A description of where culverts and/or bridges may be required and what criteria will be used to make this determination will be developed during detail design.</p> <p>Site specific water crossing information will be provided during the permitting stage.</p>	Final EA/IS 7.2.3	1542

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>This is particularly important in streams where fall-spawning species (e.g., brook trout, lake whitefish, lake trout) are known or suspected. Blocking these flows—such as by packing snow into a watercourse that normally doesn't freeze to the bottom—can disrupt fish movement, spawning, and overwintering survival. In such cases, culverts should be installed below the snow fill to maintain natural flow.</p> <p>Cables are often attached to culverts to facilitate removal before the spring freshet.</p> <p>Please ensure it is clear in the EA that it is not the intent to impede the free movement of water and the passage of fish while utilizing snow fill type crossings to traverse significant wet areas during the winter. This would be best accomplished by modifying the sentence to “During the first winter, snow fill crossings may be used to cross significantly wet areas, without impeding the free movement of water and the passage of fish, to enable access for the construction of roads, bridges, and major culverts”.</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>MNR would also like to see a description where culverts and/or bridges may be required and what criteria will be used to make this determination. Please identify mitigation and impacts of potential use of culverts and bridges during construction.</p> <p>MNR will require site specific water crossing information at permitting.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	44	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Mitigation measure states that Environmental Monitors will monitor the installation, use, and removal of waterbody crossing structures, and that they will confirm the appropriate waterbody crossing structure is being used and that the proper permits are in place.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please provide supplementary information about the Environmental Monitors roles and responsibilities, and how and where they are intended to be utilized somewhere in this section to create a better understanding of how their use will equate to an effective mitigation measure.</p>	<p>Environmental Monitors contracted to conduct environmental monitoring activities for the Project will have appropriate experience and training for their role, preferably as an Environmental Professional.</p> <p>The role and responsibilities of the Environmental Monitors are described in Sections 7.3.1 and 9.2 of Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environmental Monitors and Indigenous Environmental Monitors will be on site during construction to confirm that all waterbodies crossed by the Preferred Route right-of-way and access roads have been identified and documented in the waterbody crossing list. - The Environmental Monitors will 	Comment noted; see response for details.	2003

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Type of Comment: Recommended for EA</p>	<p>monitor the installation, use, and removal of waterbody crossing structures and confirm that the appropriate waterbody crossing structure is being used.</p> <p>- The Environmental Monitor will be on site at each waterbody crossing during construction to make sure all site-specific permit requirements (e.g., Fisheries and Oceans Canada and the Ministry of Natural Resources approvals and permits) are in place and that the construction crew is adhering to the conditions therein.</p> <p>The Environmental Monitors will also make sure that the mitigation and enhancement measures outlined in the EA/IS, and the anticipated Environmental Protection Plan to be developed during detail design are implemented during construction, thus allowing for the protection of fish and fish habitat during construction.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	45	<p>Mitigation measure states to “maintain buffer zones of 30 metres around waterbodies, and limit clearing of riparian vegetation to the extent practical...”.</p> <p>Are there any activities other than a watercrossing where clearing would be required close to a waterbody, and why</p>	<p>This mitigation measure is based on best management practices, experience on other projects, and professional judgement to allow flexibility during detail design. Activities that will require work within 30 meters of waterbodies will be determined during detail design.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	1543

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>would there need to be additional vegetation clearing except directly at and adjacent to the watercrossing?</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	46	<p>On page 413 of Table 9-10, one mitigation measure states “Do not use herbicides during future maintenance”. Conversely, on page 421, another mitigation measure states “Use mechanical or manual methods to clear vegetation – herbicide use is not permitted”. There is a lack of consistency among similar mitigation measures and saying do not use versus is not permitted can mean two different things.</p> <p>Please consider revising the mitigation measures to be consistent throughout the document. Please also refer to why herbicide use is not permitted.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS has been updated for clarity around use of herbicides. Herbicide use is not planned. Vegetation will be largely removed by mechanical means, except within 10 m of a watercourse or wetland. In these areas, vegetation will be removed manually, using chain saws and other hand-held equipment, while leaving the undergrowth and duff layer undisturbed to prevent erosion.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1544
Ministry of Natural Resources	47	<p>Caution should be exercised in stating that “recontouring disturbed areas to restore drainage patterns and the approximate preconstruction profile” is a viable and safe mitigation measure as it has the potential for sediment deposition</p>	<p>The mitigation “Recontour disturbed areas to restore drainage patterns and the approximate preconstruction profile” in Table 9.3-7 (formerly Table 9-10) of the Final EA/IS and in Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1545

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>into waterbodies, beyond the potential deposition during installation of watercrossing structures. Watercrossing installations/constructions should never alter a watercourse so much that it requires recontouring. To do so may unknowingly change the way the water flows naturally downstream, which could include new cuts into stream banks downstream that have an effect of depositing that cut-out sediment somewhere else downstream, and potentially on sensitive spawning habitat. This mitigation measure should come with a caveat or qualifying statement that states “this should be completed with caution and in a manner that avoids depositing sediment into the watercourse”.</p> <p>Please add to the following mitigation measure: “recontouring disturbed areas to restore drainage patterns and the approximate preconstruction profile” the following qualifying statement: “this should be completed with caution and in a manner that avoids depositing sediment into the watercourse”.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>	<p>Document indicates that the recontouring is done to establish the drainage pattern and profile that was present prior to construction. The intent is to prevent changes to the way that water flows and changes to channel morphology. All necessary sediment and erosion measures would be applied during this activity as outlined in Section 7.3.1.4.2 of Appendix G, as it would still be considered part of the instream construction activities.</p> <p>The requested edit has not been completed as this comment is considered recommended.</p>		
Ministry of	48	MNR will want to review/approve the	A sediment and erosion control plan and	Comment	1546

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Natural Resources		<p>following mitigation measures as condition of a work permit approval for installation of a water crossing,</p> <p>1. “Develop and follow a Sediment and Erosion Control Plan in accordance with Ontario Provincial Standard Specifications Construction Specification for Temporary Erosion Control (Ontario Provincial Standard Specifications, 2021a) and Construction Specification for Temporary Sediment Control (Ontario Provincial Standard Specifications, 2020)”.</p> <p>2. “Prepare and implement a Dust/Air Quality Management Plan”.</p> <p>Please confirm that a sediment and erosion control plan and a Dust/Air Quality Management Plan will be written and included in the Final EA/IS for MNR review and approval.</p> <p>D. Permitting Related, Not Required for EA</p>	<p>dust/air quality management plan will be prepared by the owner/operator before construction of the Community Access Road.</p>	<p>noted; see response for details.</p>	
Ministry of Natural Resources	49	<p>It is unclear how the project team proposes to reduce the risk of invasive species being introduced into the project area. The EA should include best management practices that will be implemented to reduce the spread of</p>	<p>The main body of the Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement provides a high-level summary of the fish and fish habitat assessment that is provided in full detail in Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1547

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>invasive species.</p> <p>Please outline the specific best management practices that are recommended to be implemented that are expected to help reduce the spread of invasive species. Outline in the document what the anticipated risks are (e.g. most likely invasives to be spread) and what the likelihood of invasives being spread is within the Project Area.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>	<p>The potential for increased introduction and / or spread of invasive species and pathogens is considered under the Changes to Fish Survival and Reproduction from Improved Public Access to Recreational Angling Areas effect pathway in Section 7.3.1.10 of Appendix G. Section 7.3.2.8 of Appendix G describes the residual effects, and identifies a key mitigation and enhancement measure including using best management practices and regulations outlined by the Ministry of Natural Resources to reduce the spread of invasive species.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	50	<p>1. MNR will want to review/approve the Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan that describes specific measures that would be implemented if a spill occurred.</p> <p>2. For the mitigation measure to “store fuel and other materials for machinery to prevent any deleterious substances from entering a waterbody”, please indicate that the specific details for this mitigation measure will be included in the Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan to be developed and implemented. Providing these details will enable MNR</p>	<p>1. A Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan will be prepared by the owner/operator before the construction of the Community Access Road and will include commitments to report releases to the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) Spills Action Centre at 1-800-268-6060, and implement corrective action and mitigation measures following release(s).</p> <p>2. Specific details regarding fuel and material storage mitigation measures will be included in the Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan to be</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1548

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>to determine if this mitigation measure will be effective in minimizing residual effects.</p> <p>3. To ensure contractors and operators are exercising care and caution with hazardous material please include a mitigation measure around training requirements to avoid spills and response protocols.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>1. Please prepare a Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan that describes specific measures that would be implemented if a spill occurred” for MNR review and approval. Please also include in the EA/IS that spills of any harmful material (e.g., fuel, fluids, silt, etc.) will be reported to the MECP Spills Action Centre at 1-800-268-6060 and take corrective measures, as part of this mitigation measure.</p> <p>2. For the mitigation measure to “store fuel and other materials for machinery to prevent any deleterious substances from entering a waterbody”, please indicate that the specific details for this mitigation measure will be included in the Spill Prevention and Emergency Response</p>	<p>developed and implemented by the owner/operator. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road.”</p> <p>3.The Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan will include mitigation measures including Project-specific training/information sessions regarding best management practices to avoid negatively affecting fish and fish habitat.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Plan to be developed and implemented.</p> <p>3.Please include a mitigation measure to Ensure that local site- and project-specific training/information sessions delivering information about best management practices to avoid negatively affecting fish and fish habitat is provided to all contractors by qualified personnel.</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	51	<p>In Table 9-10 for the potential effect of changes to fish survival and reproduction from improved public access to recreational angling areas, there are 2 issues identified with the mitigation measures provided.</p> <p>The mitigation strategy refers to general measures for fish habitat impacts, but it is unclear how most of these measures specifically address the concern of increased public access. Only two clear actions are outlined – minimizing construction duration and removing unneeded temporary infrastructure. Other measures lack direct relevance to the public access issue. There is a sense that the current list of mitigation measures is too short and that more targeted strategies should be considered.</p>	<p>The main body of the Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement provides a high-level summary of the fish and fish habitat assessment that is provided in full detail in Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Changes to Fish Survival and Reproduction from Improved Public Access to Recreational Angling Areas is assessed in Section 7.3.1.10, with residual effects in Section 7.3.2.8 of Appendix G.</p> <p>As described in Section 7.3.2.8 of Appendix G, key mitigation and enhancement measures to minimize effects on fish survival and reproduction from improved public access to</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1549

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Despite the concerns, the EA authors have provided reasonable explanations suggesting that a significant rise in recreational angling is unlikely during or after construction.</p> <p>The Project Area is expected to remain relatively remote and inaccessible, making it unlikely to become a popular destination for recreational anglers. As such, the risk of overharvesting fisheries due to increased access is considered low.</p> <p>The native fisheries within the Project Area are expected to be healthy and robust and resilient enough to withstand some additional fishing pressure.</p> <p>Clearly explain how each mitigation and enhancement measure addresses the specific concern of increased public access, not just fish habitat impacts.</p> <p>Please consider adding specific strategies that directly mitigate potential impacts from improved public access (signage, access restrictions, monitoring plans).</p> <p>Further elaborate on the rationale for expecting minimal recreational angling</p>	<p>recreational angling areas include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using existing access roads where possible; 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. <p>In addition, potential changes in angler pressure and fish harvest will continue to be managed by the Ministry of Natural Resources, the government agency mandated to manage fisheries resources (e.g., fisheries management zones, fishing seasons, catch limits, closures). Furthermore, fishing is managed as a public resource through provincial licensing requirements and by establishing rules in terms of season length, catch limits, and catch and-release rules for waterbodies near the Project. Local communities will be responsible for managing their resources by limiting fish catch to a sustainable level for each species.</p> <p>The Owner/Operator will work with local Indigenous communities and regulators to consider other mitigation as appropriate (e.g., signs, access restrictions).</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>activity, possibly with supporting data or case studies.</p> <p>Acknowledge the perception that current measures may be insufficient and explain how stakeholder concerns have been considered.</p> <p>Ensure that references to other mitigation measures are clearly linked and contextualized for the reader.</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	52	<p>The document lists “using existing access roads where possible” and “using existing waterbody crossing structures where possible” as mitigation measures to reduce impacts on fish and fish habitat. However, including these measures—both in the main text and in Table 9-10—may overstate how many existing roads and crossings are actually available for use. This could give a misleading impression of how widely these measures can be applied across the Project Area.</p> <p>To improve accuracy, it would be helpful to either: Qualify that existing roads and crossings are limited in number, or Provide an estimate or count of how many existing features could realistically be used instead of building new ones.</p>	<p>Using existing access roads where possible is being considered during the preliminary design of the Community Access Road and associated access roads. Although there was not a large amount of existing access roads in the area, this was still an objective that was considered and will continue to be considered in detail design. Section 2.14 of Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document has been updated to indicate that existing access roads were used where possible; however, access was limited in the area.</p> <p>An estimate or actual count of existing roads and crossings used in place of new infrastructure, and adjustments requested to Table 9.3-7 (formerly Table 9-10) have not been updated in the Final EA/IS as this comment is considered</p>	Appendix G Section 2.1.4	1550

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Clarify Availability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a statement noting that existing access roads and waterbody crossings are limited in number across the Project Area. <p>Quantify Where Possible</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include an estimate or actual count of existing roads and crossings that could be used in place of new construction. <p>Adjust Table 9-10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise the table to reflect the limited applicability of these measures, ensuring they are not presented as broadly viable if that's not the case. <p>Align Text and Tables</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure consistency between the narrative and tabular content regarding the feasibility and extent of using existing infrastructure. <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>	recommended.		
Ministry of Natural Resources	53	<p>In the Executive Summary under Monitoring and Follow-Up, the statement reads:</p> <p>“Monitoring programs for the various phases of the Project will be implemented to verify effects predictions and effectiveness of mitigation and enhancement measures for fish and fish habitat and apply adaptive management, if required.”</p>	<p>The “if required” was referencing the potential for adaptive management. The Executive Summary of Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document has been updated to provide clarity that adaptive management will be applied, if required, based on monitoring results.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1551

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>The phrase “if required” is unclear—it could be interpreted as applying only to adaptive management, or to the implementation of monitoring programs as a whole. Given the scale of the Project and its location in a hydrologically sensitive area, it’s important to clearly state that monitoring programs will be implemented. These programs are essential to evaluate the effectiveness of mitigation measures for fish and fish habitat and to ensure that any necessary adjustments can be made.</p> <p>Revise the sentence to clearly state that monitoring programs will be implemented, and that adaptive management will be applied if required based on monitoring results.</p> <p>Use definitive language to reflect the importance of monitoring in such a sensitive landscape (e.g., “Monitoring programs will be developed and implemented...”).</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	54	The second paragraph suggests that spawning areas for all Valued Component fish species were identified	Sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 of Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document have been updated to clarify	Appendix G Sections 5.2.1 and	1552

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>during field surveys. As written, it implies that actual spawning activity was observed. However, it is likely that the surveys identified potential spawning habitat rather than confirmed spawning sites with observed fish activity. If this is the case, the text should be revised to clearly distinguish between observed spawning behavior and the identification of suitable habitat.</p> <p>Please revise text accordingly.</p>	<p>that observations during field surveys identified spawning areas habitat (e.g., suitable spawning substrate, water depth and velocity, habitat type).</p>	<p>5.2.2</p>	
<p>Ministry of Natural Resources</p>	<p>55</p>	<p>Two discrepancies on page 122 were found:</p> <p>1) The section speaks to fall timing restrictions but does not include spring timing restrictions.</p> <p>2) The second paragraph appears to contain an error, as it states that “A fall restricted activity timing window to September 1 was included for waterbodies that have potential Cisco, Brook Trout, or Lake Trout spawning habitat, and to September 15 for waterbodies that have potential Lake Whitefish spawning habitat”.</p> <p>Please revise text to align with the requirements of MNR’s In-Water Work</p>	<p>A spring window was applied, as shown in Table 7-2 of Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document. Section 7.1 of Appendix G has been updated for clarity.</p>	<p>Appendix G Section 7.1</p>	<p>1553</p>

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Timing Window Guidelines as follows: “All waterbodies had the spring restricted activity timing window applied to them due to the known or likely presence of spring spawning fish within them. Waterbodies with suspected or known fall fish spawning habitat had a fall restricted activity timing window applied beginning on September 1 for waterbodies that have potential Cisco, Brook Trout, or Lake Trout spawning habitat, and beginning on September 15 for waterbodies that have potential Lake Whitefish spawning habitat”.</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	56	<p>This Section discusses water crossings drainage areas ranging in size from <1km² to >18,000km². The crossings are further divided up into small watersheds, medium watersheds, and large watersheds. Please provide a characteristic annual hydrograph for each of small, medium, and large watersheds. The monthly data is helpful but it would be worth characterizing the hydrology of the crossings using some daily data values. I realize that the daily hydrographs may include using both WSC gauge data results and modelling results.</p> <p>Provide daily data hydrographs that</p>	<p>Hydrological and hydraulic analysis for each waterbody crossing will be completed during detail design phase as a part of bridge and culvert design. Hydrographs will be developed for small, medium and large scale drainage areas and provided in permitting applications.</p> <p>Section 5.2 of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document has been updated to include prorated daily data hydrographs, derived from Water Survey of Canada stations located nearby, representing small, medium, and large watersheds within the Albany and Ogoki catchments.</p>	Appendix F Section 5.2	1554

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		represent the small, medium, and large scale drainage areas.			
Ministry of Natural Resources	57	<p>There appears to be no Flood Frequency Analysis results in the Appendix.</p> <p>Please present the results from flood frequency analysis for large, medium, and small water crossings. Specifically look at and provide the Q100, Q50, and Q25 events. Include the Albany and Ogoki Rivers at the site of the proposed crossing, and examples of medium and small crossings. Please provide information on data used and flood frequency analysis methods.</p>	<p>Waterbody crossing specific flood frequency analysis will be completed during detail design phase as a part of bridge and culvert design and provided in permitting applications.</p> <p>Table 5-5 of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document has been updated to present results of low and high flow analysis of flow records at Water Survey of Canada stations within approximately 100 km of existing conditions aquatics Local Study Area. High level estimate of prorated flows (7Q20, Q25, Q50 and Q100) at each waterbody crossing have been provided in Table 7-2 of Appendix F.</p>	Appendix F Tables 5-5, 7-2	1555
Ministry of Natural Resources	58	<p>The Cumulative Effects Assessment section discusses short term water taking during the construction phase which will affect surface water quantity with reductions in streamflows and / or water levels at nearby waterbodies. Please discuss this in detail further.</p> <p>Provide information or an estimate on the total expected water taking at an example site in litres per day. Is it</p>	Water taking and discharge plans will be prepared during detail design phase and will be provided in permitting applications. As discussed in details in Section 7 of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document, consideration will be given to environmental and ecological factors such as watershed sizes, flowrate in waterbody and fish spawning season.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1556

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>possible or likely that water taking will not occur in crossings with drainage areas <10km²? Or perhaps limit the water taking from crossings with drainage areas >500km²? Avoid water taking during fish spawning season and summer low flow periods? Further information on this is needed.</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	59	<p>This section states that “Provincially accepted hydrologic methods will be used to determine design flows”. How appropriate are these methods in the peat and bog environment found along the proposed road route? Should other modelling methods be considered?</p> <p>Please detail any challenges or concerns with using the proposed hydrology methods in a peat and bog environment.</p>	<p>There is no reference to "Provincially accepted hydrologic methods will be used to determine design flows" in Section 8.2.1 of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document, however, Section 4.7.1 of Appendix F confirms that federally and provincially acceptable methods were followed. Design flows will be determined following federally and provincially acceptable methods including methods appropriate for peat environments. The requested edit has not been completed as this comment is considered recommended.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1557
Ministry of Natural Resources	60	<p>Thank-you for providing the Water Crossing Surveys information and all the detailed mapping. This is very helpful and appreciated. I am glad there is a chapter in the Environmental Assessment dedicated entirely to Climate Change.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the inclusion of a Climate Change chapter was appreciated by the Ministry.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1558

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		No action required.			
Ministry of Natural Resources	61	<p>This Section discusses other regulatory requirements and indicates that the road will be designed in accordance with the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) Roadside Design Manual.</p> <p>Indicate the proposed road classification of the permanent access road and any temporary aggregate or other access roads.</p>	The purpose of the executive summary is to provide a high-level overview of the Final EA/IS. This comment relates to permitting and will be addressed during the permitting stage. It will not be incorporated into the Final EA/IS.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1559
Ministry of Natural Resources	62	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Section 7.1.2.2 discusses equalization culverts to address spring-melt, storm runoff and maintaining existing surface water drainage patterns in the area. Section 8.2.8.4.2 indicates that in the construction area 48% of the area is very poorly to imperfectly drained. A road embankment constructed on very poor to imperfectly drained peatlands will impede the natural surface and sub-surface flow across the peatlands. There is potential for local water ponding on the upstream side of the embankment and local drying of peatlands on the downstream of the embankments.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution:</p>	Opportunity for placement of regularly spaced equalization culverts will be determined during detail design.	Comment noted; see response for details.	2004

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Discuss the opportunity for regularly spaced equalization culverts in the road embankment to impact the upstream ponding and downstream drying in the poorly drained areas.</p> <p>Type of Comment: B. Recommended for EA.</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	63	<p>The section states that bridges will be designed to meet the 1-in-100 year flood scenario.</p> <p>Indicate the amount of freeboard that will be provided for the 1-in-100 year flood scenario. Indicate the flood standard for permanent culverts including required freeboard.</p>	<p>The requested level of detail will be available during detail design. This comment relates to permitting and will be addressed during the permitting stage. It will not be incorporated into the Final EA/IS.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1560
Ministry of Natural Resources	64	<p>The section does not indicate the flood design standard for temporary bridges and culverts.</p> <p>Indicate the flood standard for temporary bridges and culverts including required freeboard.</p>	<p>This comment relates to permitting and will be addressed during the permitting stage. It will not be incorporated into the Final EA/IS.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1561
Ministry of Natural Resources	65	<p>The total number of waterbody crossings in Table 5-2 is 104 compared with a total number of 91 documented in Table 5-1 on page 57 and Section 5.1.5 on page 81.</p>	<p>Tables 5-1 and 5-2 of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document have been updated to clarify 85 watercourse crossings. Note that Table 5-2 presents number of</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1562

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>The total number of waterbody crossings is not consistent between the three documented locations in the report. Please correct to provide consistency and accuracy.</p>	<p>watercourse crossings only while Table 5-1 presents number of all waterbody crossings.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	66	<p>The section indicates that the expected waterbody crossings range from first to fourth order stream systems.</p> <p>Please provide definition/clarification on the meaning of first to fourth order stream systems.</p>	<p>Section 5.2 of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document has been updated to provide definitions of first to fourth order stream systems as follows: a first to fourth order stream system classifies streams based on the hierarchy of their tributaries. First-order streams are the smallest, with no tributaries flowing into them. When two first-order streams merge, they form a second-order stream. When two second-order streams join, they create a third-order stream, and two third-order streams form a fourth-order stream.</p>	Appendix F Section 5.2	1563
Ministry of Natural Resources	67	<p>The table has a column for Flow Rate (L/s). The table does not identify what the flow rate represents? Does the flow represent bank full flow, seasonal flow, mean annual flow or some other flow?</p> <p>Please clarify the flow type that is represented in the table.</p>	<p>Flow rates represent results of the measured flow rate, based on spot flow measurements, that were recorded during field visits. Field flow measurement data is provided in Attachment H of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document. A footnote has been added to Table 7-2 of Appendix F to provide clarification.</p>	Appendix F Table 7-2	1564

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Natural Resources	68	<p>Under the column of Project Activities – Constructing Bridges and Culverts, the table references two Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) documents: (1) Ontario Regulation 454/96, Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act; and, (2) Environmental Guidelines for Access Roads and Water Crossings.</p> <p>In addition to the two referenced MNR documents please include Technical Guide River & Stream Systems: Flooding Hazard Limit, MNR, 2002.</p>	<p>Section 7.3.1 and Tables 7-7 and 10-1 of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document have been updated to include the suggested reference: Technical Guide River & Stream Systems: Flooding Hazard Limit (MNR, 2002).</p>	<p>Appendix F Section 7.3.1 and Tables 7-7 and 10-1</p>	1566
Ministry of Natural Resources	69	<p>The section discusses monitoring/inspecting all new permanent water crossings for physical function and condition in accordance with the MTO Inspection Guide and Manual.</p> <p>Please clarify whether the monitoring/inspection program will consider the common problems identified in Section 7.3.1.4.1, page 121 including: debris, ice or beaver activity blocking culvert inlet or constricting waterway opening.</p>	<p>The monitoring plan outlined in Section 9.3 of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document will include debris, ice and/or beaver activity and will be the responsibility of the owner/operator of the Community Access Road.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1567
Ministry of Natural Resources	70	<p>The rows SW-03 and SW-04 refer to Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) documents: (1) Ontario Regulation 454/96, Lakes and Rivers Improvement</p>	<p>Section 7.3.1 and Tables 7-7 and 10-1 of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document have been updated to include the suggested reference:</p>	<p>Appendix F Section 7.3.1 and Tables 7-7 and 10-1</p>	1570

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Act; and, (2) Environmental Guidelines for Access Roads and Water Crossings in the design of water crossings.</p> <p>In addition to the two referenced MNR documents please include Technical Guide River & Stream Systems: Flooding Hazard Limit, MNR, 2002.</p>	<p>Technical Guide River & Stream Systems: Flooding Hazard Limit (MNR, 2002).</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	71	<p>The Category of Water Body size in the table falls into three sizes: small, medium and large.</p> <p>Please confirm that the small, medium and larger water body size definitions are consistent with the definitions in Appendix F, Section 5.2, pages 82-83.</p>	<p>The definitions of small, medium, and large waterbodies presented in Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document deviate from the definitions proposed earlier in the Surface Water Study Plan (Attachement A of Appendix F). Table 4-1 of Appendix F provides a summary of all deviations from the Study Plan including watershed categories based on the watershed sizes, along with descriptions and rationale for the change.</p> <p>Appendix F and the Final EA/IS have been updated for consistency and correct threshold of watershed sizes, where required.</p>	Final EA/IS Appendix F	1572
Ministry of Natural Resources	72	<p>The section indicates that provincially accepted hydrologic methods will be used to determine the design flows. Each method has an associated level of uncertainty. Most of the regional frequency methodologies developed for</p>	<p>The comment relates to permitting and will be addressed during the permitting stage. It will not be incorporated into the Final EA/IS.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1579

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Ontario have little or no consideration for the very poorly drained peat lands that are characteristic of the study area.</p> <p>Please indicate how the design flows will be validated given the expected level of uncertainty in the method results and limited applicability of the methodologies to the very poorly drained peat lands.</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	73	<p>This section is titled Temporary Construction Camps, Water Use is a subheading under Construction Camps. In water use it refers to water use for construction of the road.</p> <p>Consider moving the water use for the road under the general road construction heading so it is easier for reviewers to find.</p>	<p>The opening sentence of the section indicates that: "Water will be required to support both camp and construction activities". Therefore the section includes information relating to those two activities and has not been edited.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1584
Ministry of Natural Resources	74	<p>Paragraph 4, last sentence, references a permafrost management plan.</p> <p>Is the permafrost management plan a standard plan used in northern Canada or is it something the road Project Team will be creating? Please specify which permafrost management plan will be used.</p>	<p>Permafrost management plan is considered a best management practice for infrastructure located on permafrost. A permafrost management plan will be prepared for the Project.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1585
Ministry of	75	<p>It would be helpful to show the Painter</p>	<p>Figures 8.2-37b and 8.2-38b (formerly</p>	<p>Final EA/IS</p>	1587

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Natural Resources		<p>Lake Road on the maps for reference. (the small portion outside the study area).</p> <p>Please consider adding the Painter Lake Road on to the maps so it shows outside the study area as a continuous road.</p>	<p>Figures 8-43b and 8-44b) of the Final EA/IS have been updated to include Painter Lake Road.</p>	<p>Figures 8.2-37b and 8.2-38b</p>	
Ministry of Natural Resources	76	<p>Crown land use planning will not be taking place for this project. Reference to the Guide for Crown Land Use Planning is not required for the EA. The Guide helps MNR in carrying out land use planning in areas covered by the Guide. The Crown Land Use Policy Atlas is comparable to an Official Municipal Plan and can be referenced here instead. It holds all of MNR's Crown land use direction in a web based mapping platform for easy reference. The Southern portion of the study area is in G2697 Geraldton Area and is a general use area. Present uses include mining, forestry, cottaging, tourism, Crown land recreation, fishing, hunting, and fur harvesting. The policy report for this area allows for the development and maintenance of new roads. The remainder of the road is in the Far North.</p> <p>The Municipality of Greenstone portion of Sec. 8.3.9.2 could be covered in</p>	<p>The updates to the Land and Resource Use Technical Support Document include reference to CLUPA, existing Crown Land policies and procedures (as it relates to Remote Tourism, trapping, etc.). Several sections have been updated for consistency with the guiding legislation, policies, procedures and plans that fall within the Local Study Area and the Regional Study Area.</p> <p>Furthermore, the reference to term the Guide for Crown Land Use Planning has been removed from Section 8.3.9.1 of the Final EA/IS.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 8.3.9.1 Appendix U</p>	1591

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>8.3.9.1.2 Official Plan for the Municipality of Greenstone.</p> <p>Please update this section to reference the Crown Land Use Policy Atlas as the source for Crown land use policy and land use direction.</p> <p>Please consider moving the Municipality of Greenstone information to Sec. 8.3.9.1.3</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	77	<p>It is difficult to see anything on this map other than the labels. The focus is intended to be on the mineral exploration projects in the RSA, it takes reviewers a lot of extra time to decipher where they are. It is also difficult to see the proposed MFCAR route with the segment nodes and potential campsites.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Making the labels smaller and less prominent so they don't take over the map. 2. Removing segment nodes and potential campsites. 3. Changing the colour of the First Nation Reserves so that they differ from the Major Industrial Mineral Operation. 4. If keeping the segment nodes consider changing the Gold Mine colour. 5. Consider removing Potential 	<p>Figure 8.3-18 (formerly Figure 8-67) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to facilitate its review as outlined below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Labels have been made smaller and less prominent to reduce overlap. 2. Potential campsites have been removed. 3. The colour of the First Nation Reserves have been update to differentiate from the Major Industrial Mineral Operation. 4. Segment nodes were kept and the Gold Mine colour was changed. 5. Potential Aggregate Source has been removed from the legend. 	Final EA/IS Figure 8.3-18	1595

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		Aggregate Source from legend as they are not visible on the map. (it provides more information to confuse the reviewer/reader).			
Ministry of Natural Resources	78	<p>The preferred route inside the local study area looks like it is the same colour as the provincial parks when not zoomed right into the map. The Preferred Route is also not shown in the legend. This map has brown hash marked First Nation Reserves while other maps have dark purple. Provincial Parks are light green on this map and dark teal on others.</p> <p>The preferred route also is very similar to provincial parks on this map.</p>	<p>Figures 9.3-1 and 9.3-2 (formerly Figures 9-1 and 9-2) of the Final EA/IS have been updated as outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The colouring/hatching for Provincial Parks and local study area have been updated to differentiate. - Preferred Route has been added to the legend. - The colouring/hatching for First Nation Reserves and Provincial Parks have been updated to align with other figures. 	Final EA/IS Figures 9.3-1 and 9.3-2	1599
Ministry of Natural Resources	79	<p>The trapping LSA should be one merged polygon that encompasses the traplines. The way it is shown on the map the reviewer can't see the individual trapline boundaries that are green.</p> <p>Please consider merging the trapline polygons selected for the LSA and just showing the outer boundary as the LSA.</p>	Figure 8.3-17 (formerly Figure 8-66) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to merge the trapline local study areas into one polygon.	Final EA/IS Figure 8.3-17	1601
Ministry of Natural	80	A few of the colour choices for the roads are quite similar and the limited colour	The colors for the road lines on Figure 6-1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to	Final EA/IS Figure 6-1	1603

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Resources		<p>contrast makes them hard to distinguish between lines. In addition, the project location labels obscure quite a bit of the map background.</p> <p>Please adjust the road line colours to make it a bit easier to distinguish between lines and choose an alternative label for the project locations that is more subtle to make it easier to visualize other components of the map.</p> <p>Please consider providing an online GIS database that can be provided to reviewers to assist with the review. Please ensure data provided is appropriate for public consumption and not confidential.</p>	<p>include less similar colors. An interactive online version of Figure 6-1 can be found on the website https://eais.martenfallsaccessroad.ca/.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	81	<p>MNR's role in permitting will depend on road ownership.</p> <p>MNR is providing feedback with the understanding that the authorization for construction activities and ancillary land uses will primarily fall under the Public Lands Act. (PLA) for activities occurring on Crown land.</p> <p>Permits and authorizations required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work permits for road and trail construction and any upgrades to existing roads and trails beyond minor maintenance activities 	<p>Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding ownership and operations of the Community Access Road, including liability and access.</p> <p>A table, similar to Table 13-1 of the Terms of Reference, has been inserted into Section 5.1.1 of the Final EA/IS. The table lists the potential permits and approvals which may be required following the EA process.</p>	Final EA/IS Section 5.1.1	1605

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work permits for all water crossing construction over Crown lands • Agreements for bridges, and culverts >3m • Land Use Permits for temporary work camps, temporary storage areas/laydown yards, monitoring wells on Crown Land. Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act (LRIA). approvals may be required for temporary dewatering activities during construction of roads or water crossings. <p>Clarify how MNR’s role in permitting, liability and access considerations under the PLA and LRIA would apply and include a list of potential permits or authorizations in the EA.</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	82	<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>The start of study area and preferred route overlaps with the Painter Lake Road which is currently an MNR Crown road (previously SFL responsible). MNR understands that MTO has preliminarily assumed the travelled road corridor and is making plans for widening and</p>	A discussion on the upgrade work on the Anaconda and Painter Lake Roads is not a regulatory requirement and as such was not developed as part of the EA/IS.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1608

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>realignment of the Anaconda Painter Lake Road (APLR) Network. However, timeframe for completion is unclear.</p> <p>It is recommended that the EA include a discussion on the potential impacts if the upgrade work on the Anaconda and Painter Lake Roads is not completed prior to the start of MFCAR construction.</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	83	Correct the repetition in the phrase 'Fish and Fish and Fish Habitat' to ensure clarity.	The sentence in Section 8.1.4.2 of the Final EA/IS has been corrected as follows: "Details about these 73 features, including aerial photos and Light Detection and Ranging images, are in Attachment D of the Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document (Appendix G)".	Final EA/IS Section 8.1.4.2	1610
Ministry of Natural Resources	84	<p>This table outlines how the changes will be measured, but not how the changes will be mitigated if necessary.</p> <p>Perhaps tables 8-52 and 8-53 could be joined and include mitigations for ease of reading and understanding.</p>	The purpose of presenting the information in two tables was to highlight the information shared by communities separate from the technical information, such as indicators, rationale of selection and measure of change. Section 8 of the Draft EA/IS presents existing conditions while Section 9 presents residual effects with mitigation measures. Therefore, the discussion on mitigation measures is included in Section 9 of the Draft EA/IS.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1612
Ministry of	85	This table is not easily interpreted.	Table 9-2 of the Final EA/IS is designed	Comment	1614

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Natural Resources		Please describe how the table is to be interpreted.	to illustrate how the direct project-environment interactions identified by each environmental discipline may also lead to indirect interactions with other disciplines. Each technical report provides a more detailed explanation of these indirect effects in the "Potential Effects" section.	noted; see response for details.	
Ministry of Natural Resources	86	<p>Valued Component: Remote Outfitters Mitigation and Enhancement Measures: "Restrict public access to the Community Access Road corridor during construction. Gate temporary access roads and block and restore as soon as possible after they are no longer needed. Permanent access roads used for maintenance activities will be gated while not in use."</p> <p>Establishing road restrictions through gates and signs may require authorizations under the PLA to limit access to Crown lands. Additional details and considerations required for permitting. Given the remote area, monitoring these restrictions may be challenging.</p> <p>The section of Table 9-48 related to Recreation and Tourism during the Construction phase and Operations and Maintenance phase does not reflect the</p>	<p>Monitoring road restrictions will be the responsibility of the owner/operator of the Community Access Road. All pits/quarries will require restricted access per the Aggregate Resources Act Regulation 244/97 Section 0.13(1)1.</p> <p>Appendix U Land and Resource Use Technical Support Document has been updated to include effects on established/authorized remote tourism operations.</p>	Appendix U	1616

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>potential impact to authorized remote tourism establishments in the study area should hunting or access be restricted.</p> <p>Include discussion on implementing monitoring and compliance of road restrictions. Provide details on planned gate and sign locations for detailed design and potential permitting. Tourism related access restrictions along this existing road section are seasonal.</p> <p>Consider effects mitigation and enhancement measures may have on established/authorized remote tourism operations.</p> <p>Suggest adding a Description of Potential Effects related to the potential to increase access to existing authorized remote tourism establishments and subsequently, including a mitigation and enhancement measure.</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	87	<p>“Because the residual effects from the increased noise during Construction are not predicted to be long-term in duration or frequent, the residual effects during Construction are assessed as not significant.”</p> <p>“As the magnitude of the residual effects from the increased noise due to road</p>	Commercial Outposts were considered in the assessment of impacts by noise. No changes to the characterization of residual effects is warranted.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1615

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>operations is low, and the residual effects from the increased noise due to quarry use are not predicted to be frequent, the residual effects during operations are assessed as not significant.”</p> <p>Some of the Potential Aggregate Sources are located in close proximity to Commercial Outpost Camps (e.g., Painter Lake Type B LUP on South Shore, and Sand and Gravel on North Shore).</p> <p>Please consider that residual effects during Construction in areas close to Commercial Outpost Camps during their summer/fall operating season would be considered significant to the operator, regardless of the short duration. Suggest updating the effect to reflect this.</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	88	<p>Under Recreation and Tourism the Description of Effects is only considering activities in the Albany River Provincial Park. There is a separate row for Parks and Protected areas.</p> <p>Please consider recreation and tourism outside of the Albany River Provincial Park in the Recreational and Tourism row of table 7.7 and provide mitigation measures for these if they differ from</p>	<p>Recreation and tourism values outside of the Albany River Provincial Park were considered in the assessment. Section 5.3 of Appendix V Visual Environment Technical Support Document describes these users including canoe routes, commercial outpost camps, and temporary hunt camps as part of the Recreation and Tourism Valued Component.</p>	Appendix V Table 7-2	1613

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>what was provided for parks. These values include canoe routes, commercial outpost camps, temporary hunt camps.</p>	<p>Table 7-2 of Appendix V has been updated to include two distinct Recreation and Tourism entries: one for the Albany and Ogoki River crossing viewsheds, and another for “Areas outside of the Albany and Ogoki River crossing Viewsheds,” which captures the canoe routes, outpost camps, and temporary hunt camps noted in the comment.</p> <p>Mitigation for these receptors is included in the corridor-wide measures in Section 7.5 of Appendix V.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	89	<p>Temporary infrastructure and roads are to be abandoned/decommissioned after construction. MNR authorizations will be required for the temporary infrastructure, and will include a decommissioning plan</p>	<p>The decommissioning plan for temporary infrastructure and roads will be provided to MNR after construction.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	1611
Ministry of Natural Resources	90	<p>The section addressing predicted effects on recreation and community well being is not noted in the table.</p> <p>The predicted effects on recreation are only in consideration of the community. There should also be a predicted effect to the public (e.g. remote tourism). Please note which section to find the effects addressed, as well as include an assessment of the effect it will have on</p>	<p>The effects assessment on recreation and remote tourism is addressed in Section 9.6.1.6 and recreation and community wellbeing is addressed in Section 9.6.1.8 of the Final EA/IS.</p>		1609

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		the general public.			
Ministry of Natural Resources	91	The document states “Camera location 26, near a fishing camp that may want to relocate”. It is unclear who owns the fishing camp or the permanency of the fishing camp, or if it is the camera that is to be relocated. Please elaborate on engagement with the camp owner.	Appendix V Visual Environment Technical Support Document has been updated and there is no longer reference to "Camera location 26".	Appendix V	1607
Ministry of Natural Resources	92	The phase in the future commitments states N/A. There should be a timeframe for when the commitment will be met Please add to the table in which phase the commitment will be met.	Section 9, and Tables 9-1 to 9-3 of Appendix V Visual Environment Technical Support Document have been updated to include the timing and frequency of the commitments.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1606
Ministry of Natural Resources	93	Temporary access roads and camps, staging areas and stockpile areas are to be abandoned and/or blocked to discourage public use. Further description of revegetation should be included. Please include the revegetation plans for temporary infrastructure decommissioning in this section.	The Land and Resource Use Report (Appendix U) and Final EA/IS has been updated to reflect revegetation / rehabilitation plans for temporary access roads.	Final EA/IS Appendix U	1604
Ministry of Natural Resources	94	The outfitter camps that were identified did not identify which type of outfitter camps or type of tenure in place. Outfitter camps were called leases, which is	Section 7.2.6 of Appendix U Land and Resource Use Technical Support Document has been updated to include a description of type of tenure for outfitter	Appendix U	1602

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>incorrect, but also says that they are renewed on an annual basis leading me to believe that they are Type B outpost camps.</p> <p>Please correct the terminology for whichever tenure is being identified. (i.e. Land Use Permit, Lease, Type B Land Use Permit for temporary hunt camps).</p>	camps.		
Ministry of Natural Resources	95	<p>Comment 95</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>A) These could include but not limited to a spill contingency plan, waste management plan, emergency response plan and wildlife management plan.</p> <p>B) A project-specific environmental monitoring program will be developed and implemented that includes the monitoring commitments related to valued components presented in the EA/IS.</p> <p>When will this environmental monitoring program be developed? If post-EA/IS, will all the project-specific environmental details to be provided and comprehensively documented within the EA/IS or is new material expected to be</p>	<p>Recommendation A The spill contingency, waste management and emergency response plans will be completed at the next stage of the project</p> <p>Recommendation B Proposed mitigation measures include the collaboration with local existing environmental advisory committees to support the development and implementation of environmental monitoring programs. The objective is to include Indigenous interests and perspectives, particularly concerning resources utilized for rights-based purposes. In the absence of an existing advisory committee with an aligned mandate to Marten Falls First Nation, work with relevant agencies and Indigenous Peoples to establish a Terms of Reference for one. The monitoring</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1654

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>brought forward post-EA/IS?</p> <p>Proposed Action:</p> <p>A) MNR recommends including these additional plans as part of the Final EA/IS to allow for review and streamlining. At a minimum, please provide a detailed outline of what these plans will encompass within the EA/IS, so the Ministry can assess whether mandated interests have been impacted and appropriately mitigated.</p> <p>B) Please clarify when this environmental monitoring program will be developed. At a minimum, a detailed outline of what the program will encompass should be included within the EA/IS, so the Ministry can assess whether mandated interests have been impacted and appropriately mitigated.</p>	<p>programs will be completed at tender process.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	96	<p>As written, the section suggests the list of requirements were discussed and covered in section 4.</p> <p>However, discussion of some of these points was quite limited and minimal details were provided to highlight the magnitude of quantifiable differences compared to focusing strictly on</p>	<p>Appendix A provides information on the metrics considered by each factor in identifying a preferred alternative. As explained in Section 4.4 this was present to Marten Falls members to make an informed decision on the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Section 4.1 provides a discussion as to why doing nothing is not an option for the</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details</p>	1657

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>qualitative descriptions. Please discuss the quantities of the different alternatives more fully.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution:</p> <p>Greater discussion and detail regarding the applied mitigation measures and quantifying effects is recommended. Direct comparison of the assessment categories for the do-nothing option in a similar fashion as the method used to discuss the route alternatives would improve understanding.</p>	<p>community of Marten Falls First Nation. There are no mitigation measures to the community's remote location, the impacts to climate change on the reliability of the winter access road or the cost of relying on air transportation for goods and services.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	97	<p>Comment 97</p> <p>Operations and Maintenance Phase - Is addressing any road sinkage considered basic maintenance within this context? Given the unique design considerations for building this road through extensive peatland area, what highways are being used for comparison?</p> <p>Please provide feedback on the questions identified for each phase. Please provide feedback on the questions identified for each phase.</p>	<p>Addressing road settlement will be part of the operations and maintenance phase. There are comparable roads in Manitoba, for example Rice River Road. A memorandum was sent to the MTO in August of 2023 from the three road projects. This memorandum provides information on the construction approach and describes the experience of the comparable roads in Manitoba, including a discussion on road settlement. The memorandum has been included in Appendix W.</p>	Appendix W	1660
Ministry of Natural	98	<p>Comment 98</p>	<p>A: The Project Study Area includes two alternative routes as outlined on Figure</p>	<p>Comment noted; see</p>	1729

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Resources		<p>Comment:</p> <p>A) Section 6.6 Existing Conditions: Section 6.5.2 Spatial Boundaries defines the Construction Development Area (CDA), Project Study Area, Local Study Area (LSA) and Regional Study Area (RSA)</p> <p>The section 6.6 creates some confusion as to the purpose and use of the term Project Study Area. As described within the draft EA/IS, Local and Regional Study areas define the scope of information collected for each valued component. However, this data then appears to be applied equally to defining the existing conditions of the Project Study Area.</p> <p>B) Section 7.2.1 Planning and Preliminary Design states: A key component of the preliminary design is.... Does this indicate the Project Study Area 5km buffer has been reduced to the Construction Development Area 100m corridor as part of this micro-siting exercise? Thus, changing the built-in flexibility to a 40m buffer for adjustment during the detailed design?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution:</p> <p>A) Please clarify the intent of the Project</p>	<p>4-1 and described in Section 4 of the Final EA/IS. Once a Final Route is approved by the regulator detail design can advance. The Project Study Area allows Marten Falls First Nation flexibility when micro-siting the Community Access Road and supporting infrastructure within the Project Study Area without the need of an amendment, as the EA/IS was completed on the Project Study Area.</p> <p>B: Micro-siting has not been undertaken.</p>	response for details.	

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Study Area in the EA/IS. Does it cover some aspect of the project not already provided for by the LSA, RSA and CDA? All baseline studies are based on the defined Local and Regional Study Areas, with the ancillary infrastructure and road right-of-way corridor planned to be located within the Construction Development Area.</p> <p>B) Please confirm whether it is correct to interpret that the Project Study Area has been micro-sited down to the Construction Development Area width, and any future shifting of right-of-way road activities will remain within the boundaries Construction Development Area.</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	99	<p>Comment 99</p> <p>Comment: The section starts by describing how potential effects are identified, followed by a high-level overview of the entire residual effects assessment process. The overview touches on identifying potential effects, mitigation measures, and predicting residual effects. The section ends by circling back to potential effects and describing the different potential effects the Project may encounter.</p>	The recommendation has not been incorporated into Section 6.7 of the Final EA/IS as this comment is recommended rather than required for EA.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1730

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>The readability of the section could be improved, as confusion and duplication arise by discussing mitigation and residual effects within the “identifying potential effects” section, especially when followed by “identifying mitigation and enhancement measures” and “assessing residual effects” sections. By shifting the overview of the high-level assessment process to section 6.7, the EA/IS readability will improve, and subsequent sections will focus on each step in-detail while keeping the content in sequence.</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	100	<p>Comment 100</p> <p>Comment: The project inclusions list includes physical activities that may have spatial or temporal overlap with the Community Access Road as part of the cumulative effects assessment. Looking at the list of sources reviewed, it is unclear if the following were considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Winter roads - Winter road realignments (outside of the Northern Highways Program) - Renewable energy projects (if applicable) 	<p>The Project Inclusions List has been updated in Table 10.1-1 (formerly Table 10-1) and Appendix E Project Inclusions List of the Final EA/IS to include applicable projects, where publicly available information was available at the time the cumulative effects assessment was prepared.</p>	Final EA/IS Table 10-1 Appendix E	1731

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please clarify whether any of specified activities were considered as part of project inclusions list; if not, please ensure they are considered in the Final EA/IS.</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	101	<p>Comment 101</p> <p>Comment: No high-level summary of types of projects included in the cumulative effects assessment is provided within the main text.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please provide a brief quantitative and qualitative summary of the activities documented by each discipline as part of the cumulative effects assessment within this section. Alignment with classifications used in Table 6-2 would be beneficial. The sources do not characterize the baseline condition.</p>	Section 6.8.2 of the Final EA/IS includes a brief quantitative and qualitative summary of the activities documented by each discipline as part of the cumulative effects assessment.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1732
Ministry of Natural Resources	102	<p>Comment 102</p> <p>Comment: [...] the following projects are in closer proximity to the Community Access Road and are more likely to have a temporal</p>	The location of each project is shown on the Inclusions List Map in Figure 10.1-1 (formerly Figure 10-1), and the distance of each project in relation to the MFCAR is listed in Table 10.1-1 (formerly Table 10-1) and Appendix E Project Inclusions	Comment noted; see response for details	1733

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>and / or spatial overlap.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please specify the distance to the Community Access Road that is considered within “closer proximity” and whether this distance varied and how distances were determined.</p>	<p>List. How a project was considered to be within close proximity was based on the technical disciplines professional judgement and was different for each one. The specific distance considered by each technical disciplines and how it was determined has not been updated in the Final EA/IS as this comment is considered recommended rather than required for EA.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	103	<p>Comment: The table provides a list of anticipated components of the Community Access Road. Some additional questions have arisen regarding the details of the following rows: A) Borrow areas, aggregate and borrow source areas, and aggregate sites – 40 aggregate sites B) Road maintenance facilities, rest stops, and pull-out areas – to be confirmed during detailed design</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: MNR requests additional information be provided to address each concern. A) Please specify if this number is strictly for along the preferred route Construction Development Area or if this number includes sites outside of the preferred route footprint.</p>	<p>A: Borrow sites are within the Project Study Area only along the Preferred Route.</p> <p>B: This information will be determined during detail design.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1734

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>B) Please elaborate on whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a typical or minimum footprint size applies for each of these styles of areas. - a standard exists or the Project has a set goal as to how many of these areas will be established along the proposed roadway. - detailed design will target specific areas for these components (e.g., located near resources, upland features or occurring frequently along the line). 			
Ministry of Natural Resources	104	<p>Comment 104</p> <p>Comment: Additional temporary clearing occurring in certain locations to accommodate construction activities, access, borrow areas, aggregate source areas, aggregate sources, and temporary infrastructure such as staging areas, camps, and debris and / or timber stockpiles will be required. When are these areas to be determined? Pg 81 paragraph 2 Detailed design</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution:</p> <p>MNR requires all temporary infrastructure locations to be identified at the time of the EA/IS. If preliminary footprints and locations are</p>	<p>A Band Council Resolution for the Community Access Road Preferred Route was issued in August 2024 and geotechnical work could not commence until the winter of 2025. These are key inputs required to be able to advance the design and preliminary footprint of the Community Access Road, including the location of all temporary infrastructure.</p> <p>The Final EA / IS was conducted on the Project Study Area as shown on Figure ES 4-1 of the Final EA/IS and which is the most up to date footprint. As stated in Section 6.5.2 of the Final EA/IS, the Project Study Area consists of a corridor area 2.5 km from the centreline. Minor adjustments within the area are generally permissible during detail design. However, any significant deviation</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1735

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		not provided for each of these temporary infrastructure components at the planning phase within this EA/IS, then please be aware, subsequent changes to the Project may require an amendment to the EA.	beyond it may require additional assessment and regulatory review. It should be noted that there are currently no plans for the Preferred Route to be outside the Project Study Area.		
Ministry of Natural Resources	105	<p>Comment 105</p> <p>Comment: Culverts</p> <p>Proposed Action/Rationale: Clearly address and discuss cross-drainage planning along the road. Please adjust the culvert section to clearly distinguish between culvert installations <5m and cross-drainage equalization culverts.</p>	Information on cross drainage planning and culvert installations for each crossing will be determined during detail design.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1736
Ministry of Natural Resources	106	<p>Comment 106</p> <p>Comment: Paragraph 2 Will crushed rock be cleaned as part of the process to reduce fine debris release and sedimentation into nearby waterways and wetlands?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please elaborate on whether a cleaning process is planned or what alternative</p>	In accordance with standard construction processes, mitigations and specifications will be included within construction contracts requiring pre-washing of crushed rock when placed within specified radius of waterbodies. Additional mitigations requiring the use and placement of mitigation measures such as silt curtains will be included in direct response to the specific needs of specific waterbodies. Determination of these specific needs at the various	Comment noted; see response for details.	1737

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		measures are being put in place to reduce the release of fine debris into the environment during construction.	waterbody sites throughout the project will be determined as part of the detail design phase.		
Ministry of Natural Resources	107	<p>Comment 107</p> <p>Comment: For example, tree clearing is ideally performed outside the nesting periods for migratory birds to avoid disturbing birds and their nests. If seasonal windows cannot be adhered to, additional permitting and mitigation measures will be required.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please specify if these additional permitting and mitigation measures will be outlined within the EA/IS, as no reference is currently supplied.</p>	<p>If tree clearing is required during the migratory bird nesting season, qualified staff will conduct non-intrusive nest surveys within seven days prior to any clearing. Any active nests or areas where breeding behaviour is observed will be flagged and protected with appropriate buffers until nesting is complete. All environmental approval conditions, permits, and authorizations for the Project—including those issued by Environment and Climate Change Canada, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, and the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources—will be fully adhered to during Construction.</p> <p>Additional details are provided in the Bird Technical Support Document (Appendix L) and in Section 9 of the Final EA/IS.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1738
Ministry of Natural Resources	108	<p>Comment 108</p> <p>Comment: 7.2.3 Construction</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: As currently proposed, the Project has</p>	<p>The EA/IS for the Community Access Road was not completed on a final footprint but on two alternative routes. The Terms of Reference require the preliminary study area and description of the existing environment to include each alternative route. Section 4 of the EA/IS</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1739

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>deferred identification of many of the specified features until detailed design phase.</p> <p>MNR requires all permanent and temporary infrastructure locations to be identified at the time of the EA/IS, including staging areas, camps and temporary access roads.</p> <p>In addition, “snow filling and packing” are mentioned. Please clarify if this is referencing snow fill crossings in advance of culvert installation or a reference to crossing muskeg. If it is in reference to snow fill crossings, this would require permitting approval and should be built into the EA/IS.</p>	<p>describes the route selection process, however the resulting selection is not named the final route, but the Preferred Route as it has not been approved by the regulators. The preliminary design of the Community Road has not been finalized and feedback received on the Draft EA/IS has resulted in additional changes, some of which will affect temporary infrastructure. As such, MFFN cannot at this time identify all permanent and temporary infrastructure locations as these will be identified during the detail design stage.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	109	<p>Comment 109</p> <p>Comment: MNR wishes to better understand the scale of unobstructed area between the ditches and the cleared area boundary. Is the ditching and roadbed anticipated to extend as far as the cleared 80m in some instances or will there always be a buffered distance of cleared area beyond the ditching embankments?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please include a distance measurement from existing ground to existing ground</p>	<p>The width of the unobstructed area between the roadside ditches and the cleared boundary will vary throughout the project limits, providing a specific distance measurement is not practical, but distances will range from 9.0 m to 19.0 m due to factors including: natural topography, localized ditching requirements (ie. some sections of the roadway will feature natural drainage and will not require specific roadside ditches), profile elevations of the roadways, and natural tree/bush lines.</p> <p>The comment of "beneficial to see geotextile" is unclear in terms of the</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	1757

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>(edge of the outside ditch embankments), if possible. In addition, MNR would find it beneficial to see geotextile added to the cross-section figure.</p> <p>Type of Comment: B. Recommended for the EA</p>	<p>application of geotextile. The use of geotextile in roadway construction is typically incorporated as a mitigation to specific geotechnical findings and applications and is informed by geotechnical investigations and recommendations as part of the detail design process.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	110	<p>Comment 110</p> <p>Comment: The first step in construction involves clearing and removing vegetation and grubbing the soil (in other words, remove remaining soil, stumps, and other organic material). This is done to prepare the Construction Development Area (a 100-metre-wide right-of-way) for road construction, temporary construction staging areas, and access roads and trails. [...] Vegetation clearing and grubbing will also occur at construction laydown and staging areas, as well as temporary construction camps. Trees will mainly be removed using heavy machinery, although hand-clearing (for example chainsaws) may be used for small-scale efforts, such as those around sensitive features.</p> <p>Several questions arise from the above summary:</p>	<p>The requested information will be determined during detail design.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1759

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>- Are all staging areas proposed for upland areas? Or will some overlap muskeg? If muskeg is being used, how is the wet ground being mitigated? Would use only be in the winter or is infilling being proposed to extend the timing window in which the area could be used?</p> <p>- How are peatland features to be treated? Will grubbing remove all organics from these areas where the road overlaps them?</p> <p>- What definition is being given to sensitive features and what features qualify? Do riparian areas qualify?</p> <p>- “May be used” creates uncertainty as to how often hand-clearing will be applied. Is it possible to be more specific as to the scenarios in which it will be employed?</p> <p>- Will machine travel be restricted within a certain travel distance of waterways or waterbodies? Will machine reach and hand-clearing be solely utilized to clear these areas to reduce compaction, ruts, erosion and sedimentation along these water features?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please address the questions in the comment section and elaborate on the nuances surrounding vegetation clearing and grubbing. MNR will need to know if clearing is</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>occurring outside of the 60-metre planned corridor for ancillary features beyond the right-of-way, because there are implications for permitting if this is to occur, such as tree clearing approvals. In addition, greater clarity is needed in relation to any removal of organics from wetlands and how they will be disposed or utilized.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	111	<p>Comment 111</p> <p>Comment: Figure 7-3 to 7-8 are AI generated images using Adobe Firefly. Does the project have any real-life examples that can be used from other similar projects in comparable terrain? Can the project provide real-life examples of the construction methods to be used, such as the bridge installation structures in remote locations?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please replace the AI generated examples with real-life images comparable to the landscape and terrain</p>	AI-generated imagery was selected as the most effective way to visually illustrate construction activities described in Section 7 of the Final EA/IS. AI-generated images had the advantage of being able to include similar vegetation and terrain as the one for Community Access Road.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1760

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>conditions anticipated and/or share similar installation construction methods. A description within the caption of how each image is comparable would be beneficial.</p> <p>Type of Comment: B. Recommended for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	112	<p>Comment 112</p> <p>Comment: How is merchantable timber to be reused? Will it be used for lumber, firewood or another market? What size/volume of stockpiles are being proposed? What size of timber and what other materials are being referenced in relation to stockpiles? Will the timber be processed into chips prior to stockpiling? What type of sites are being proposed for burn locations?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: MNR wishes to have more information on how merchantable timber is proposed to be used to better assess the feasibility. The Far North landscape has a long history of large fires and limited to no fire suppression. Given the risk of wildfire in the project area and the potential for unusable cut timber to become fuel on</p>	<p>The requested information will be determined during detail design. The owner/operator will coordinate with MNR on how merchantable and non-merchantable timber is used or disposed, as well as obtaining burn permits if any are needed.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1761

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>the ground, please elaborate on how stockpiled material may be used to restore temporarily disturbed areas, where the stockpiles will be placed and how long material will be stockpiled prior to use. Please elaborate on whether unusable timber will be chipped as part of stockpiling.</p> <p>MNR will have conditions on how merchantable and non-merchantable timber is used or disposed, including timelines on when such efforts should be completed.</p> <p>Burn permits will be required to burn at any proposed designated sites as a part of permitting if inside of the fire burning season (April 1 – October 31).</p> <p>Fire prevention mitigation measures should also be incorporated into brush and timber disposal planning as well and can be included in the Fire Prevention and Preparedness Plan.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	113	<p>Comment 113</p> <p>Comment: Temporary access roads and trails [...]</p>	<p>The mention of trails has been removed from the Final EA/IS.</p> <p>The need for temporary helicopter landing pads or flight air strips will be determined during detail design.</p>	Final EA/IS Section 7.2.3.1	1763

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Proposed Action/Solution: MNR requests a definition of the difference proposed between a road and a trail. Elaborate on what scenarios trails will be utilized over roads and how the clearing width of a trail differs from a temporary road. Please clarify if temporary helicopter landing pads or flight air strips are part of the emergency access plan or staging areas. Most temporary roads are to occur in the right-of-way (ROW). Please elaborate on what percentage of temporary roads are anticipated to fall outside of the ROW. All temporary ancillary infrastructure must be identified at the time of the EA/IS, to provide a comprehensive description and analysis of project impacts. Grading is mentioned within the section. Please clarify if aggregate will be required to carry out this activity, and where it will be sourced if being used.</p>	<p>The sentence in the second paragraph within Section 7.2.3.1 - Temporary Access Road subsection has been updated as follows: Temporary roads will be developed within the right-of-way of the Community Access Road".</p> <p>Aggregate will be required for the community access road aggregate sites are shown on Figures ES 4-1 and 4-7.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	114	<p>Comment 114</p> <p>Comment: Pits and quarries will be developed at aggregate sites...</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Pits and quarries have different</p>	<p>The reference to pits has been removed and the sentence in Section 7.2.3.2 has been updated as follows: "Quarries will be developed at aggregate sites (Figure 1-1) to provide crushed rock and granular materials for construction of the Community Access Road and temporary access roads".</p>	Final EA/IS Section 7.2.3.2	1764

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>definitions. Pits and quarries deal with different types of material (see definitions under https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90a08%20). One deals with consolidated material while the other addresses unconsolidated material. MNR recommends removing pits from section 7.2.3.2 as pits are not applicable to blasting. In addition, MNR suggest the EA/IS could benefit from clearly describing the distinction between a pit and a quarry, where most appropriate, and ensuring proper use of these terms throughout the documents.</p> <p>Type of Comment: C. Editorial</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	115	<p>Comment 115</p> <p>Comment: Organic materials will be stripped, stockpiled, and may be used along the road grade slope and / or back slopes to encourage regeneration. [...] What depth of organic material is anticipated to be removed from peatland surfaces as part of the road construction activities? Is peat extraction planned as part of construction? If it is, will the peat be repurposed or disposed?</p>	<p>See the Proposed Peatland Road & Construction Approach Memo included in Appendix W for information on the road construction approach over peatlands. Additionally, see Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document for information on revegetation.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1766

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Proposed Action/Solution: Peat degradation and erosion are considered a carbon release. The volume of organics to be removed from peatland surfaces is unclear. Please elaborate on whether peat extraction will take place and how, and at what scale if it is to occur. Elaborate on what types of terrain are considered poor subgrades and will require geotextile overlay. Please reference where the different types of sedimentation control measures are listed alongside the scenarios in which they will be deployed. Please clarify the triggers for determining natural vegetation rehabilitation methods versus seeding methods, including any monitoring or timing requirements associated with the decision framework.</p> <p>Type of comment: A. Required for EA (Per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	116	<p>Comment 116</p> <p>Comment: Are the same mitigation measures and techniques being applied equally to both bridge and culvert installations, or are</p>	<p>The information requested will be determined during detail design. The recommendation to have a separate section on culvert and cross drainage installations has not been updated in the Final EA/IS as this comment is</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1767

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>some methods specific to the type of installation? Where are these details located? Are they compiled into one location for easier reference and implementation?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please reference where water crossing techniques and mitigation measures are provided along with a listing of the necessary approvals. Sometimes there are opportunities to upgrade to a higher design flow standards where the environmental benefits would be significant. Elaborate on whether such opportunities are to be considered as a part of this project, and if so, where information can be found. MNR also recommends including another section to directly speak to culvert and cross drainage installations.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation) and B. Recommended for EA</p>	<p>considered recommended rather than required for EA.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	117	<p>Comment 117</p> <p>Comment: 7.2.3.6 Temporary Construction Camps 7.2.3.9 Temporary Infrastructure for</p>	<p>The location and footprint of construction camps, laydown areas and staging areas will be determined during detail design. The approximate location of construction camps are identified on Figure ES 4-1 of</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1785

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Construction The location and footprint of all potential temporary ancillary infrastructure should be identified at the time of the EA/IS, including proposed camps, laydown areas and staging areas. This is especially important where these areas fall outside of the proposed 60m cleared area of the right-of-way or beyond the Construction Development Area footprint. If not, additional environmental assessment approvals may be necessary (e.g. MNR Class EA).</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please clarify what is meant by “along” or “near” in terms of proximity to the Construction Development Area and other components of the Community Access Road. Do any proposed locations fall outside of the Local Study Area? If so please provide the locations. Where camps fall within the Construction Development Area, will the footprint fall within the cleared timber corridor (60m) or within the right-of-way footprint but outside of the area cleared for the roadway?</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry</p>	<p>the Final EA/IS. The Final EA/IS was conducted on the Project Study Area and as such construction camps, laydown areas and staging areas will be placed within the Project Study Area.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		mandate/policy/legislation)			
Ministry of Natural Resources	118	<p>Comment 118</p> <p>Comment: A spill contingency plan will be prepared during the detailed design phase and refined by the construction contractor. [...] In general, a spill contingency plan includes information on spill response procedures, equipment, safety, communications, and training.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please elaborate on what procedures would be included as part of the spill response in the Spill Contingency Plan. MNR recommends the procedures include best management practices, mitigation measures and response timelines. MNR requests the plan be submitted prior to permitting.</p> <p>Type of Comment: B. Recommended for EA</p>	<p>The sentence in Section 7.2.3.7 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to "In general, a spill contingency plan incorporates best management practices and includes mitigation measures, response timelines, spill response procedure information, equipment, safety, communications, and training."</p> <p>The responsibility for preparing the Spill Contingency Plan will form part of the tender package for selecting construction operators. Marten Falls will collaborate with the province and the selected contractor to meet best practices and provincial guidance. However, the plan will not be submitted to MNR for review.</p>	Final EA/IS Section 7.2.3.7	1786
Ministry of Natural Resources	119	<p>Comment 119</p> <p>Comment: A waste management plan will be developed during the detailed design phase. In general, this plan will include</p>	<p>The sentence in Section 7.2.3.10 of the Final EA/IS has been updated as follows: "In general, this plan will include collection, transportation, reduction, reuse, repurposing, recycling, prevention, disposal of waste and preventative</p>	Final EA/IS Section 7.2.3.10	1787

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>collection, transportation, reduction, reuse, repurposing, recycling, prevention, and disposal of waste.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please elaborate on whether the waste management plan addresses any wildlife interactions, such as preventative measures including securing waste and minimizing attractants, or in the worst-case scenario, nuisance wildlife management.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Permitting Related, Not Required for EA</p>	measures to address wildlife interactions		
Ministry of Natural Resources	120	<p>Comment 120</p> <p>Comment: Construction Phase Decommissioning</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: MNR expects all permanent and temporary ancillary infrastructure to be identified at the time of the EA/IS. All temporary ancillary infrastructure will require decommissioning, remediation and rehabilitation as part of the Construction Phase Decommissioning. Revegetation management may be required to expedite the return of</p>	The second paragraph in Section 7.2.4 has been updated as follows: "Once construction is complete, temporary infrastructure that is no longer needed will be removed and abandoned or decommissioned. Pits and quarries will be rehabilitated and surrendered in accordance with the Aggregate Resources Act".	Final EA/IS Section 7.2.4	1788

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>vegetation to temporary use areas to reduce unauthorized access to surrounding areas.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	121	<p>Comment 121</p> <p>Comment: A) Activities during this phase include vehicular road use, routine grading, adding gravel, vegetation management, snow clearing, sightlines maintenance, sign maintenance, and culvert clearing. Measures proposed to reduce potential conflicts with beavers are not clear. Additionally, any infrastructure put in place to deter beavers shall not impede fish passage.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Rationale: A) Please add “beaver dam removal”. MNR requests beaver activity management be detailed within the EA/IS including mitigation measures and best management practices to be followed. Creation of an operations plan to house these details is requested. Provide the opportunity for MFFN to express interest in the responsibility of this component.</p>	<p>A: The first sentence in Section 7.2.5 of the Final EA/IS has been amended as follows: "Activities during this phase include vehicular road use, routine grading, adding gravel, vegetation management, snow clearing, sightlines maintenance, sign maintenance, culvert cleaning and beaver dam removal".</p> <p>The beginning of Section 7.2.5.2 of the Final EA/IS has been amended as follows: "Maintenance activities for the Community Access Road will include routine grading, adding gravel, vegetation management, snow clearing, culvert cleaning, and beaver dam removal. The Ministry of Transportation Ontario Guide for Fisheries – Best Management Practices (2025) will be followed when beaver dams are removed from within a waterbody supporting fish and fish habitat.</p> <p>B: An Environmental Protection Plan will</p>	Final EA/IS Sections 7.2.5 and 7.2.5.2	1789

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation) D. Permitting Related, Not Required for EA</p>	<p>be developed for the Community Access Road operations and maintenance. It will include information on managing beaver activities, such as dam removal.</p> <p>C. The development of the Environmental Protection Plan will be the responsibility of the owner/operator of the Community Access Road. Marten Falls First Nations continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road. The involvement of Marten Falls First Nations in the development of the Environmental Protection Plan will be determine through project ownership/operations.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	122	<p>Comment 122</p> <p>Comment: • Winter roads can see 600 vehicles per day. Traffic volumes are also likely to see a shift in personal and commercial traffic patterns once an all-season road is open.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please clarify if potential future mining traffic was incorporated as a component of traffic levels into the north-south estimate.</p>	Appendix W includes the traffic data review for the Community Access Road.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1790

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	123	<p>Comment 123</p> <p>Comment: What is the anticipated footprint for the turnaround and storage areas? Is it possible to provide tentative locations and footprints as part of the EA/IS? Or do they fit into the spacing of the existing right-of-way footprint? Will they fall within or outside of the Construction Development Area? • Will they fall within or outside of the proposed 60m cleared corridor that forms the road right-of-way?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution MNR requires all permanent infrastructure locations to be identified at the time of the EA/IS. 1. If preliminary footprints and locations for the turnarounds fall outside of the proposed 60m cleared corridor or extend beyond the Construction Development Area and are not provided for at the planning phase within this EA/IS, then subsequent class environmental assessment review may be required.</p>	<p>The requested information on turnaround and storage areas will be determined during detail design. They are anticipated to be located within the Project Study Area (Figure ES 4-1) and as such within this EA/IS.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1791

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	124	<p>Comment 124</p> <p>Comment: An important residual effect following the implementation of mitigation measures could be sensory disturbance to wildlife along the road corridor, similar to the cumulative effects analogy in Section 6.8 Cumulative Effects Assessment. Given the future linkages with the Webequie Supply Road and the Northern Road Link Project, there will be an irreversible, long-term, cumulative effect of traffic volumes that will affect wildlife directly (e.g., vehicle collisions, hunting access) and indirectly (e.g., sensory disturbance). There will be long-term monitoring of noise near the community but what about along the roadway? The EA/IS includes a commitment to monitor wildlife observations using remote cameras at selected reference sites. Pairing this information with acoustic monitoring may help evaluate any effects of sensory disturbance. Little is known about the effects of sensory disturbance on wildlife,</p>	<p>Long-term noise monitoring was not identified as a requirement in the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (TISG) or in the Terms of Reference (TOR).</p> <p>Details about monitoring programs during the construction and operations of the Project will be described in the Environmental Protection Plan, which will be prepared prior to the Project authorization process to inform provincial and federal authorizations, as necessary. A long-term monitoring strategy for sensory disturbance during the construction and operations phases was considered as part of the development of the draft Terrestrial Biodiversity Offset Plan which is provided as Appendix AB. The Terrestrial Biodiversity Offsetting Plan will be finalized during detail design.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1792

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>particularly caribou.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: MNR requests that the EA/IA include a commitment to monitor noise levels from the road to evaluate the effectiveness of mitigation measures and assess the effects of sensory disturbance. This monitoring should be conducted in conjunction with traffic volume data, wildlife-vehicle collision records, and wildlife observations to determine any direct or indirect impacts on wildlife. MNR wishes to see a long-term monitoring strategy for sensory disturbance as well.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p> <p>Page/Section # (copying here because it exceeds character limit for the "Section" box. Pg 63 / Section 6.7.1 Identify Potential Effects. Pg 74 / Section 6.8.2 Project Inclusions List. Pg 327 / Section 8.3.5.2 Noise. Pg 959 / Section 14.2.2.4 Ungulates. Pg 960 / Section 14.2.3.2 Acoustic and Vibration Environment. Pg 966 / Section 14.3.2.2 Wildlife</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Natural Resources	125	<p>Comment 125</p> <p>Comment: Table 8-14 Caribou, boreal population – Act as a representative species for eastern migratory caribou 8.2.7.1 For this assessment, the forest-dwelling boreal caribou will be treated as stand-in for all caribou. We assume that eastern migratory caribous will face the same effects as boreal caribous when they are in the ungulates study areas. Some eastern migratory caribou do occupy a similar geography within the study area as the boreal caribou ecotype during the winter. However, clear differences in behaviour have resulted in distinguishing Woodland Caribou by ecotype between boreal and eastern migratory caribou, especially in terms of movement and habitat use. Given this knowledge, the rationale to support the assumption that eastern migratory caribou will face the same effects as boreal caribou is needed.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please provide justification with references to support this assertion and statements or provide location in the</p>	<p>Section 5.1.3 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document describes the population status of both ecotypes: Boreal Caribou and Eastern Migratory Caribou.</p> <p>Sections 5.1.2.1 and 7.1.1.2.1, 5.1.2.2 and 7.1.1.2.2 of Appendix M provide a qualitative discussion regarding eastern migratory range and movement periods.</p> <p>Caribou collar data collected by Webequie First Nation was not available before submission of the Draft EA/IS. A data sharing agreement has since been signed between the three road projects (i.e., Marten Falls Community Access Road, Webequie Supply Road (WSR), Northern Road Link (NRL)) and Caribou collar data has been shared. The Webequie First Nation collar data has been incorporated into the Final EA/IS and Appendix M. All collar data collected over the study period, regardless of if collar was on a Boreal or Eastern Migratory Caribou, were used in the assessment of effects in the Ungulate Local Study Area and Caribou Regional Study Area.</p> <p>Section 7.1.1 of Appendix M includes a discussion on the differences between</p>	Appendix K Section 7.1.1	1793

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>appendices. For example, MNR requests a description be included of the differences between the caribou ecotypes, how their habitats compare (similarities and differences) and rationale for why the boreal ecotype fits as a stand-in for both ecotypes in this study area. The description should also address the likelihood or prevalence of Boreal versus Eastern Migratory ecotypes in the area. In addition, please clarify how caribou collaring data is being analyzed in terms of ecotype, addressing whether all the data for both species is being used for all assessment components or data is being split by ecotype for key lifecycle windows or provide reference to where it is located in the appendices.</p> <p>Type of Comment: Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>Caribou ecotypes, their habitats, and why the boreal ecotype acts as proxy for all Caribou.</p>		
<p>Ministry of Natural Resources</p>	<p>126</p>	<p>Comment 126</p> <p>Comment: Ungulates – Moose Rationale for Selection A) As written, it is not clear which habitats will be included if measuring changes in the amount of different quality</p>	<p>A) The column “Rationale for Selection” refers to the rationale for selection of the Valued Component, not the indicators (i.e., habitat availability, habitat distribution, and survival and reproduction). More details on the rationale for selection of Valued Components and explanation of</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	<p>1794</p>

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>habitats and moose use of available habitat. B) Strong influence on dynamics and persistence of caribou populations This is an incorrect statement. C) “Large home ranges” is not a suitable rationale for selecting Habitat availability (quantity and quality), Habitat distribution (arrangement and connectivity), and Survival and reproduction as Indicators for the moose component.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Rationale: A) MNR recommends providing an example to clarify the intent. B) Please change to “Strong influence on dynamics and persistence of moose populations”. C) Please provide justification for this assertion with references or remove the phrasing from the rationale.</p> <p>Type of Comment: C. Editorial</p>	<p>indicators are provided in Section 4.2.2 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.</p> <p>B) This is written as intended. Part of the supporting rationale for including moose as a Valued Component is because of the dynamics between moose, wolf, and caribou, and the impact on the persistence of a species at risk (caribou).</p> <p>C) The column “Rationale for Selection” refers to the rationale for selection of the Valued Component, not the indicators (i.e., habitat availability, habitat distribution, and survival and reproduction). Additional details about selection and rationale for Valued Components, including references, is included in Section 4.2.2 of Appendix M.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	127	<p>Comment 127</p> <p>Comment: Table 8-15 Spatial Boundaries of Land Disciplines Figure 8-11 Ungulates Existing Conditions Local Study Area, Caribou</p>	<p>Rationale for the Regional Study Areas (RSAs) used in Final EA/IS and Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document are as follows:</p> <p>Caribou RSA: The federal government provided comments on the draft</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1795

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>and Moose Regional Study Area Figure 8-33 Federal and Provincial Caribou Range Boundaries in Ontario and Project Study Areas The Regional Study Areas for both caribou and moose are much too large to be relevant to potential effects of the proposed road (i.e., it is not relevant to include all 4 caribou ranges and all WMUs that intersect the Local Study Area). These are not “ecologically appropriate” scales.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Discuss the assumptions and considerations associated with selecting such large Regional Study Areas and how they are being utilized to ensure potential effects remain relevant and at an ecologically appropriate scale.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>Ungulates Study Plan requesting the inclusion of the Ozhiski range in the RSA along with the Missisa, Nipigon, and Pagwachuan ranges. The Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) Species at Risk Branch provided comments on the draft Ungulates Work Plan requesting that Ozhiski be included in the RSA. A record of comments from provincial and federal regulators are provided in Appendix B of Attachment A of Appendix M.</p> <p>Moose RSA: Moose populations are managed in Ontario by the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) at the scale of Wildlife Management Units. For the Community Access Road to assess effects to moose populations relative to the spatial scale in which they are managed as a big game species, it was necessary to apply this scale. The proposed study area was included in the draft Ungulates Study Plan, which was reviewed by regulators in 2020, and regulators did not provide comments related to study area selection.</p> <p>For both caribou and moose, changes in indicators are also measured and characterized at the scale of the Local Study Area (LSA) to provide relevant</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>ecological context at a smaller scale. Describing effects across more than one scale is ecologically appropriate and provides more confidence in effects conclusions.</p>		
<p>Ministry of Natural Resources</p>	<p>128</p>	<p>Comment 128</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>A) The ungulate existing conditions Local Study Area is primarily located within the Missisa range.</p> <p>B) Table 8-39 Caribou Ranges Intersected by the Ungulate Local Study Area and Caribou Regional Study Area</p> <p>C) Field investigations were conducted from 2019 to 2023 and consisted of caribou collaring and mortality investigations, two winter recruitment and distribution aerial surveys and a remote camera monitoring program.</p> <p>D) From September 2021 to March 2023, nine collared caribou died, mostly in conifer swamps and black spruce forests, with wolf predation being the most common cause of death. Two occurred outside the caribou existing conditions Regional Study Area.</p> <p>As of March 31, 2023, 19 collars were still active (nine animals died, and two collars malfunctioned and were removed).</p>	<p>A. The study areas for the ungulate assessment are provided in Section 4.2.3 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document. The Caribou Local Study Area is defined as the Construction Disturbance Area plus a 10 km buffer.</p> <p>B. The Construction Disturbance Area is described in Section 4.2.3 of Appendix M.</p> <p>C. Information about how collared caribou were determined to be Boreal or Eastern Migratory is provided in Attachment C of Appendix M. Collars were only placed on female Caribou and cannot be used describe male Caribou movement patterns. Details about methods and results of baseline field studies including aerial surveys, remote camera monitoring, incidental observations, and mortality investigations are provided in the Attachment B of Appendix M.</p> <p>D. Details about methods and results of</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	<p>1796</p>

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Please provide the following:</p> <p>A) Specify the width of the Local Study Area from the Construction Development Area.</p> <p>B) Provide the same information for the Construction Development Area and the footprint sum of all temporary ancillary infrastructure that extends outside of this area as well.</p> <p>C) Elaborate on what number/percentage of collared caribou were identified as boreal versus eastern migratory, and how this distinction was determined. In addition, speak to how male caribou movement compares to adult female patterns. A summary table of the findings for the aerial surveys and remote camera monitoring is also requested, along with a summary of where the incidental observations were recorded. Specify the number of mortality investigations completed.</p> <p>D) Elaborate if there were any patterns regarding high predation rates at certain times of the year compared to other times and if the patterns were significant. In addition, provide more detail on what ecotypes suffered mortalities. A map of the mortality locations would be useful. Elaborate on the provided numbers in terms of ecotype.</p>	<p>baseline field studies including mortality investigations are provided in the Attachment B of Appendix M.</p> <p>E. Details about Caribou ecotype are provided in Attachment C of Appendix M.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	129	<p>Comment 129</p> <p>Comment: Some of the symbology is hard to tell apart due to poor colour contrast. In addition, readability would improve if the map was split into two maps – one showing the caribou ranges at a provincial level and a second showing the caribou range overlap with the nearby caribou ranges. The three map scales squeezed into one take away from the detail. A map featuring the various field study footprints and locations would be beneficial.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: MNR recommends splitting Figure 8-33 into two maps and including another map to illustrate the fieldwork carried out for Woodland Caribou over the project study areas.</p> <p>Type of Comment: B. Recommended for EA</p>	<p>A) Section 4.2.3 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document provides a description of the Local Study Area (LSA). The LSA was defined as the Construction Disturbance Area plus a 10 km buffer on either side.</p> <p>B) Section 4.2.3 of Appendix M provides a description of the Construction Disturbance Area. All temporary ancillary infrastructure are within the Construction Disturbance Area.</p> <p>C) Information regarding how collared caribou were determined to be boreal or eastern migratory is provided in Attachment C of Appendix M. Collars were only placed on female caribou and cannot be used to describe male caribou movement patterns. Details about methods and results of baseline field studies including aerial surveys, remote camera monitoring, incidental observations, and mortality investigations are provided in the Attachment B of Appendix M.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1797

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>D) Details regarding methods and results of baseline field studies including mortality investigations are provided in the Attachment B of Appendix M.</p> <p>E) Details regarding caribou ecotypes are provided in Attachment C of Appendix M.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	130	<p>Comment 130</p> <p>Comment: Aerial surveys in February 2022 and February 2023 observed 184 caribou in 2022 and 457 in 2023, mostly in treed bog and fen habitats. Little information is provided about the methodology used or the findings beyond # of caribou observed and most common habitats.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please provide a reference to the location in the appendices in the main EA document.</p> <p>Type of Comment: Details: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation) Map: B. Recommended for EA</p>	<p>A. Details regarding methods and results of baseline aerial surveys is provided in Sections 4.2.6 and 5.3 of Attachment B of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.</p> <p>B. Maps corresponding with the baseline aerial survey results are provided in Appendix M.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1798
Ministry of	131	Comment 131	Section 7.1.1 of Appendix M Ungulates	Comment	1799

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Natural Resources		<p>Comment:</p> <p>A) Ontario's General Habitat Description divides woodland caribou habitat into three categories [...]. How were differences between caribou ecotypes considered when utilizing the General Habitat Description? Was the amount of protected habitat summarized in Table 8-40 based on the 2013 delineation or revised for current impacts? Already known areas were upgraded based on new data. Were areas previously listed as unknown also upgraded? Were any downgraded? B) [...] There are no known Category 1 travel corridors for caribou in the Local Study Area, but data from tracking collars identified 150,123 hectares of potential new Category 1 travel corridors in the northern part of the Local Study Area. How were travel corridors for Eastern Migratory Caribou considered? C) [...] Some areas might be used seasonally but weren't identified because the caribou there weren't tracked. However, since the southern part of the caribou Regional Study Area also has low habitat quality, it's likely caribou don't use it as much as the northern part. Did the planned capture effort /</p>	<p>Technical Support Document has been updated to include a narrative regarding differences between Boreal Caribou and Eastern Migratory Caribou ecotypes and how they were considered in the assessments.</p> <p>Under the recent amendments to the Endangered Species Act and creation of the new Species Conservation Act, travel corridors will no longer be identified or protected as Category 1 habitat for Boreal Caribou. However, the importance of travel corridor habitat for Caribou in Ontario is recognized. As such, the Final EA/IS and Appendix M, have been updated to identify travel corridors separately for Boreal and Eastern Migratory Caribou. A detailed description of methods for determining potential new Category 1 area is provided in Section 4.3.4.3 of Appendix M. A qualitative discussion is provided regarding eastern migratory range and movement periods in Sections 5.1.2.1, 7.1.1.2.1, 5.1.2.2 and 7.1.1.2.2 of Appendix M.</p> <p>Data from Caribou collars and field findings informed the modelling, as described in Attachment C of Appendix M. The Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) Science and Research branch</p>	noted; see response for details.	

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>methodology for collaring along the route corridor differ from what actually occurred? Where is the discussion on search and capture effort and whether it was evenly distributed from north to south?</p> <p>Do field findings support limited use of the southern part of the range? Is there still functional sensitive habitat available that's being used (e.g., wintering areas, travel corridors)? What seasons are being referred to when stating "seasonally"?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Ontario's General Habitat Description only speaks to forest-dwelling caribou (Boreal ecotype). This poses concerns when considering impacts to the Eastern Migratory ecotype, especially calving and migration/travel corridors. Please provide detail on how these differences were considered in the EA/IS. If these differences were not considered, then consideration of Eastern Migratory caribou is requested in the final EA/IS for functional habitat use and travel corridor differences, or detailed rationale must be provided for why such considerations are not warranted with applicable references. In addition, MNR requests clarification on</p>	<p>has been monitoring Caribou in the Caribou Regional Study Area (RSA) with collars deployed from 2009 to 2011 and annually since 2020. Researchers at MNR have collaborated on the Community Access Road's collaring program, and have heard the limitations to where collars were deployed, and summaries on Caribou movement and behaviour throughout the Caribou RSA. Detailed information about collar deployments is provided in Attachment B of Appendix M.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>how general habitat and travel corridors are being defined and identified for Eastern Migratory caribou and how new data is being incorporated into that assessment. Include how habitat was identified using ecosite mapping and landcover classifications.</p> <p>MNR also requests a discussion of how the modelling compared to the field findings. Discuss how caribou collar deployment informs the findings and whether the collars are a good representation of caribou activity across the whole study area. Please describe what data was utilized as a part of the assessment.</p> <p>Please provide citations for the applicable appendices and if this information is not discussed in detail please address the above.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	132	<p>Comment 132</p> <p>Comment: Footnotes a) Habitat categories are described in MNR (2013a) and MECP (personal communication, 2022)</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS and Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document have been updated to identify travel corridors separately for boreal and eastern migratory caribou. Section 7.1. of Appendix M has been updated to include a discussion on the differences between</p>	<p>Appendix M Section 7.1.1</p>	1800

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>f) Potential new areas delineated according to methods. The table only focuses on habitat delineation for the Boreal ecotype of woodland caribou.</p> <p>A) How are habitat categories being defined and considered for Eastern Migratory woodland caribou, given MNR (2013a) guidance is explicitly for the Boreal ecotype.</p> <p>C) What document is being referenced in this bullet?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: MNR requests to see Eastern Migratory ecotype considerations for habitat and travel corridors where their ecotype is functionally different from the Boreal ecotype. Please provide documentation and references for how Eastern Migratory woodland caribou are being considered. In addition, as an editorial recommendation, please provide the reference for new area delineation methods.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation) C. Editorial</p>	<p>Caribou ecotypes, their habitats, how they are considered in the assessment and why the boreal ecotype acts as proxy for all Caribou.</p> <p>Methods to delineate new areas was based on the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) 2013 General Habitat Descriptions and guidance provided during a virtual meeting with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) Species at Risk Branch (SARB) on 2 June 2022 as outlined in the Reference List of Appendix M.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Natural Resources	133	<p>Comment 133</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>A) From 2020 to 2022, collared caribou showed a higher winter activity in the northwest part of the caribou existing conditions Regional Study Area (Figure 8-35 and Figure 8-36). How did this compare to field observations? Was there distribution throughout the rest of the area as well, just not collared?</p> <p>B) Since the 1960s, eastern migratory caribou have been spending their summers further east along the Hudson Bay coast [...]; this aligns with the concentrated use during calving and summer seasons in the northeast corner of the province, outside the caribou existing conditions Regional Study Area, by eastern migratory caribou collared for the Community Access Road.</p> <p>What about migration routes for Eastern Migratory (EM) caribou? What dates were used for assigning seasonal windows? What number of caribou were determined to be EM? What modeling confidence does the project provide given the number of individuals of this ecotype? When did the boreal and EM animals separate? Did habitat preferences differ at all by ecotype or</p>	<p>Details regarding methods and results of all baseline field studies is provided in Attachment B of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document. Details regarding statistical analyses for determining seasonal ranges is provided in Attachment C of Appendix M. A discussion regarding the existing environment for boreal and eastern migratory caribou in the Regional Study Area, including findings from historical studies and research, is provided in Section 5.1 and 7.1 of Appendix M.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1801

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>were their habitat choices the same? Are their movement differences for EM males compared to females and calves?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please discuss how field survey findings (e.g., cameras, aerial surveys, incidental observations) compared to the collaring findings, and to historical studies and research.</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	134	<p>Comment 134</p> <p>Comment: A) There is a large area misidentified as Federal lands on the figure. B) Inset map of road location within Ontario is hard to see. C) Caribou: Did Eastern Migratory and Boreal caribou winter use align? Was the mean predicted probability of occupancy based on habitat and collar density? What variables were considered to determine occupancy? How were the occupancy categories selected (e.g., manual intervals or natural breaks)? Did the data show any natural variation? Moose: Were the occupation ranges built upon habitat suitability alone or did it incorporate field data as well? What was the standard error, given the figure only shows mean predicted use?</p>	<p>A) The federal lands layer has been corrected on all figures in the Final EA/IS and Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document. B) Figures 8.2.7.1 and 8.2.7.1 in the Final EA/IS have been updated for improved readability. C) Details regarding statistical analyses for caribou seasonal ranges and moose occupancy are located in Sections 3.1 and 4.2 of Attachment C of Appendix M, respectively. D) Details regarding occupancy modelling results are summarized in Appendix M and are detailed in Section 3.4 of Attachment C of Appendix M.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1802

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>D) Missing context on how mean occupancy was determined and what methodology was used. This includes details of confidence intervals and precision targets. Is there a statistically significant difference between the occupancy ranges?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution:</p> <p>A) Please correct federal lands layer in the maps.</p> <p>B) Please zoom in the extent of the upper right inset maps for improved readability.</p> <p>C) Describe in the text how winter occupancy was determined, the source of the methodology, variables considered, the confidence interval, precision targets, and how the occupancy ranges were selected for use in the figure.</p> <p>D) A table summary of the occupancy data would be beneficial.</p> <p>Type of Comment:</p> <p>A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p> <p>B. Recommended for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	135	<p>Comment 135</p> <p>Comment:</p>	Detailed information regarding seasonal ranges, including timing windows, is provided in Sections 5.1.2.1 and	Final EA/IS Appendix M	1803

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>What timing windows were used for each seasonal period? Does the data represent both boreal and eastern migratory ecotypes? Are these ranges based on all field data collected or solely collaring data?</p> <p>As displayed, MNR is unable to tell if there is overlap between years, difference between ecotypes, or number of individuals present in each area (if based solely on collar data).</p> <p>Is there any evidence for why there is no activity for any season to the northwest of project? Can the absence of activity help inform the assessment at all?</p> <p>The figures give no indication of movement from season to season. Was there any discernable movement or migration patterns? Will the road interrupt any movement flows or patterns?</p> <p>Does the absence of activity to the east align with the current winter road alignment or some other type of disturbance? Is there an indication of avoidance of an anthropogenic feature on the landscape?</p> <p>How does seasonal distribution compare to the habitat availability classes mentioned earlier in the section? Does the activity align or differ from the habitat classification?</p>	<p>7.1.1.2.1 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document. Methods describing how individual seasonal ranges were estimated are available in Attachment C of Appendix M. A visual representation of movement and migration patterns and seasonally important habitats were provided in the classified version of Appendix M, and were redacted from the unclassified version if there were concerns about sharing data about species at risk.</p> <p>All figures related to caribou have been updated in the Final EA/IS including identifying travel corridors for boreal and eastern migratory ecotypes separately.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please specify the timing window being used for each season, the data used for the assessment and whether the data for the two ecotypes is combined, separated or both for use in the figures. MNR requests the figures define between caribou ecotypes when their behaviour differs sufficiently to warrant separation. Figures should also clearly articulate when data is being combined for the two ecotypes for Please specify the timing window being used for each season, the data used for the assessment and whether the data for the two ecotypes is combined, separated or both for use in the figures. MNR requests the figures define between caribou ecotypes when their behaviour differs sufficiently to warrant separation. Figures should also clearly articulate when data is being combined for the two ecotypes for analysis and visual representation. Ensure figures represent overlapping use and number of collars present (if strictly using collaring data). Please ensure greater colour contrast between the summer and fall seasonal ranges and project layers (i.e., yellows and oranges). Activity is shown in the southwestern part</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>of the project area, therefore, please explain why reference is made to the southern part of the project as being less likely to be used given a clear indication of use throughout all seasons. While abundance of use may differ, the summary should still clearly articulate the yearly presence of caribou in some areas of the southern project area.</p> <p>MNR wishes to see a visual representation of any movement or migration patterns on the landscape.</p> <p>MNR wishes to see thorough discussion of how caribou activity compared to the habitat classes. A visual representation may be beneficial.</p> <p>Addition maps and larger maps may be required to address the above concerns.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation) C. Editorial</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	136	<p>Comment 136</p> <p>Comment: A) Caribou evaluated in this IA/EA tended to prefer peatland areas and avoid upland forests [...] The suggestion that “caribou react differently to disturbances like roads and</p>	<p>A) Section 8.2.7.1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to correctly align with information presented on the current understanding of caribou response to disturbances and predicted effects of the Community Access Road provided in Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document. Risks associated with</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1804

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>trails, often showing little to no reaction, especially in areas with fewer disturbances.” What is the basis for this assertion? What studies are being referenced?</p> <p>Does avoidance of large bodies of water refer to open water?</p> <p>What seasons are being referred to? And by avoid, is this referencing skirting versus crossing?</p> <p>Has consideration of disease spread (e.g., brainworm) also been consider as part of this EA/IS?</p> <p>B) However, we don’t have enough data on caribou in the southern part to understand connectivity there. Should more data be collected to better gauge the magnitude of impact the road might have on connectivity in the southern portion of the corridor? Were collars deployed in the area? Does this impact both the boreal and eastern migratory ecotypes?</p> <p>C) Overall, there are few disruptions from human activities in the study area [...] How have caribou responded to these few disruptions? Are mining exploration and geotechnical survey activities considered as a disruption?</p> <p>If connectivity is unknown, how does survival and reproduction appear in the southern portion of the Regional Study</p>	<p>disease spread are provided in Sections 5.1.3.3.5 and 5.2.3.2.2 of Appendix M.</p> <p>B) Information regarding limitations to where and when collars were deployed, caribou movment and connectivity throughout the Caribou Regional Study Area (RSA) have been communicated to the Ministry of Natural Resources since 2021 as part of collaborative efforts related to caribou collaring programs, collar retrievals, mortality investigations and interim findings. Details regarding methods and results of all baseline field studies, including collaring, is provided in Attachment B of Appendix M. A discussion about existing conditions for connectivity is included in Sections 5.1.2.2 and 7.1.1.2 of Appendix M, and an assessment of the Community Access Road's potential effects on connectivity is provided in Sections 7.3.1.2.3 of Appendix M.</p> <p>C) Details about the existing environment for caribou in the Local Study Area and Caribou RSA are provided in Section 5.1 and 7.1 in Appendix M. A description of factors that were evaluated for changes in survival and reproduction are provided in Section 7.2 of Appendix M.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Area? What general factors are being used to assess caribou survival and reproduction? Is it the project's collaring data and calf count/cow numbers from the aerial winter surveys? Is disturbance being considered?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: A) MNR requests rationale be provided for the stance that caribou show little to no reaction to disturbances like roads and trails. Please include supporting references. Please elaborate with regards to "their response to water can change with the seasons". Specify what kind of avoidance is occurring, how prevalent it is, and how the seasonal response varies. Please speak to the risks associated with disease spread.</p> <p>B) Please outline data or methodology gaps leading to the inability to assess connectivity in the south end of the project area. Identify what data or changes would be needed to address this gap. Specify which caribou ecotypes this issue impacts.</p> <p>C) Describe the disruptions referenced and the types of disruptions considered. Elaborate on how caribou are responding to them.</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Elaborate on the condition of caribou survival and reproduction in the southern part of the project area. Speak to the factors and data being considered when determining caribou reproduction and survival condition.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	137	<p>Comment 137</p> <p>Comment: A) Recent monitoring of caribou collared [...] Were annual survival rate findings based on the 30 collars deployed? Is the Environment Canada 2011a reference referring to the Scientific Assessment to inform the identification of critical habitat for Woodland Caribou Boreal Population, in Canada? If so, the paper evaluated the contribution of natural and anthropogenic disturbances to Boreal caribou range condition and the likelihood of various range conditions supporting self-sustaining populations over a 20-year period across Canada. The national Boreal caribou 85% adult survival rate did not directly infer a stable and increasing population growth. The</p>	<p>A) Section 16 has been updated with the reference for "EC 2011c". Adult survival rates are based on Integrated Range Assessments and the Ontario Far North study. The estimates represent ranges and not confidence intervals. The 85% survival rate in EC (2011a) is based on demographic rates reported in the literature across several jurisdictions in Canada (EC 2011a) and represents a national average. Details regarding disturbances within the Caribou Local Study Area and Regional Study Area are provided in Section 5 of Appendix M. Information on adult survival and calf recruitment rates is provided in Section 5.1.3.2 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.</p> <p>B) See response to A)</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1805

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>population condition was assessed by considering percent total disturbance and recruitment (i.e., fire and 500m-buffered anthropogenic disturbance). The paper did not show how the 85% national average was determined.</p> <p>What confidence interval and precision target were used for this calculation?</p> <p>Summarize how the collar deployment occurred along the road corridor. Did collar deployment occur equally along the entire length of the road corridor to target caribou distribution, survival and reproduction equally along all parts of the project?</p> <p>Did the Project study method replicate the methodology of the 2011a study?</p> <p>Behavioural life history between Eastern Migratory and Boreal ecotypes differs substantially. What were the findings for each type?</p> <p>B) Caribou collared in February 2021 had blood samples collected to determine pregnancy status at the time of capture. Of 30 animals, 83 percent were pregnant, [...]</p> <p>Eighty percent pregnancy rate supports a stable population, at best, but reflects the minimum rate needed.</p> <p>C) Winter aerial surveys in 2022 and 2023 estimated that there are about 33.5 calves for every 100 adult female caribou</p>	<p>C) Prediction confidence is discussed in detail in Sections 7.3.4 and 8.2.3 of Appendix M.</p> <p>D) Details regarding methods and results of all baseline field studies, including the winter aerial surveys, are provided in Attachment B of Appendix M.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>[...], What calves per cow does the project consider stable versus growing for woodland caribou? Thirty calves / 100 cows would be the minimum level needed to maintain a stable population. If the estimate falls within the 25 calves / 100 cows, which is feasible given it is the low end of the confidence interval, the findings indicate a declining population. What confidence interval and precision target were used for this calculation? Was the percentage for calves only for the groups with more than 50% of animals sexed? How does this compare to other studies that look at calf abundance within a population sample? D) What number of female caribou and calves were surveyed during the 2022 and 2023 surveys? What number were identified as unknown or male?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: A) Reference is missing from Section 16. Please provide. In addition, please provide the original source for the 85% adult survival rate. Please provide detail on the type and percent of total disturbance within the study areas. Please provide the confidence intervals targeted and the achieved results. In addition, please</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>include precision targets used for assessing mean population and demographic estimates. Or provide references to the location of this information in the appendix.</p> <p>B) Please elaborate on what the variation between 82 to 100 percent pregnancy rate means to population recruitment and demographics.</p> <p>C) Elaborate on the confidence intervals targeted and the achieved results, along with precision targets used. The inferences made need to speak to the confidence range, as falling in the lower end of the confidence range does not indicate a stable or increasing population. Clarify how percentage of calves was calculated.</p> <p>D) Provide a summary of the numbers counted during the aerial winter survey by sex for all surveys, but also indicate which samples were used for the calving recruitment calculations.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation) C. Editorial</p>			
Ministry of Natural	138	Comment 138	Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document provides detailed information	Comment noted; see	1806

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Resources		<p>Comment: The way the EA is set up it makes it difficult to cross reference or find information with ease. It may be more helpful for reviewers to cross reference the appendix in the main body of the EA. When reading the main body it is difficult to answer the following questions: How were Eastern Migratory caribou distinguished from Boreal caribou? What is the purpose of the table and what will the data be used for? Table does not specify if these dates are for all years or just one year. Row 3/Column 5 lists two 23s. Is this an error or meant to indicate a year date? No confidence intervals or precision targets are provided to help gauge the accuracy and precision of the data. What are caribous-years? These travel dates differ from provincial guidance for Boreal caribou.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please provide a reference in the main EA document to where this information is in the appendix. Or detail methods used to distinguish the two ecotypes of collared individuals. Please include a description of the table contents and their purpose, including speaking to what the data informs and</p>	<p>related to all ungulates, existing conditions, residual and cumulative effects assessments, and monitoring programs. Specific details regarding methods and results of all baseline field studies, including the distinguishing the two ecotypes of collared individuals, are provided in Attachment B of Appendix M.</p> <p>Details related to the contents of Table 8-41 of the Final EA/IS are provided in Section 7.1.1.2.2 of Appendix M.</p> <p>Confidence intervals and prevision targets have not been added to Table 8-41.</p> <p>Detailed information about travel corridors and a description of the table contents is included in Sections 5.1.2.2 and 7.1.1.2.2 of Appendix M. Timeframes for potential new Category 1 habitat were selected based on dates when movement patterns of collared individuals were observed, rather than a pre-determined month. For example, in Ministry of Natural Resources' (MNR) General Habitat Description Guidance (MNR 2013), travel corridors are defined as any locations during the months of April and November. However, caribou collared for the Project demonstrated</p>	response for details.	

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>defining caribou-years and percent of caribou-years. Provide confidence intervals and precision targets to the table. Provide rationale for the deviation from provincial timing windows, and provide how travel dates were determined. Explain how the project findings compared to the provincial guidance.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation) C. Editorial</p>	<p>migratory movement behaviour in May. The Final EA/IS and Appendix M will be updated to describe in more detail the approach to identify cutoff dates for potential new Category 1 habitat. In addition, a discussion will be provided to clarify the difference between this approach and that identified in the provided reference.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	139	<p>Comment 139</p> <p>Comment: Wolverers are the main threat to caribou, but black bears and occasionally polar bears also hunt them [...] A) The Project suggests that polar bears occasionally hunt caribou. In addition, what kind of numbers is the project referring to when specifying “not in large numbers”? B) In addition, there is a suggestion that human hunting is not significant because it has been banned since 1929. This is misleading. This statement is specific only to non-Indigenous hunting. MNR understands that Indigenous</p>	<p>A: In Section 5.1.3.3 (Threats to Survival) of Appendix M (Ungulates Technical Support Document: Existing Conditions and Effects Assessment), it is noted (with reference) that polar bears have been reported to opportunistically hunt eastern migratory caribou when they are on the coast of Hudson Bay.</p> <p>B: Information about hunting pressure, including specifying that the ban on caribou hunting only applies to non-Indigenous individuals, is included in Sections 5.1.3.3 and 7.1.1.3 (Threats to Survival) of Appendix M (Ungulates Technical Support Document: Existing Conditions and Effects Assessment).</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1807

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>hunting of woodland caribou does occur, although the ministry does not have data on Indigenous harvest levels. MNR also does not have data on poaching harvest levels.</p> <p>Where the statement is not specific to non-Indigenous harvest, the claim that Indigenous hunting is not significant requires additional context.</p> <p>C) Additional information is needed in the climate change discussion.</p> <p>Habitat availability was described using data models. How does climate change effect food supply? How does it impact lichen, browse and other food sources? Climate poses a threat to habitat by: Drying? Habitat changes? Invasives? Habitat shift? Discussion needs to be more specific.</p> <p>In terms of wetlands, what suitable habitats would there likely be a reduction in? How are wetlands considered sensitive to climate change?</p> <p>Deer are not discussed in detail and need to elaborate on what this means, such as driving a potential shift in moose and predation.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: A) Provide reference(s) for the suggestion that polar bears hunt caribou. Clarify what is meant by “not in large</p>	<p>C: A detailed discussion about climate change effects on caribou and caribou habitat including the potential effect of a shift in deer populations is included in Section 5.1.3.3.5 of Appendix M.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>numbers” and the reference for wolf and bear population numbers.</p> <p>B) Please clarify if this statement relates to non-Indigenous hunting only or provide rationale for why Indigenous hunting is not deemed significant. Please elaborate on the impact of poaching on harvest levels as well.</p> <p>C) Elaborate on the climate change discussion by specifying how food supplies are anticipated to change, how it poses a threat to habitat, which suitable habitats are anticipated to be impacted, and why wetlands are considered sensitive in this landscape. Identify the habitat classification system and models that were used along with references.</p> <p>Elaborate on the impact of deer and what a shift in deer populations north could mean.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation) C. Editorial</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	140	<p>Comment 140</p> <p>Comment: A) Moose are not at risk and not federally or provincially listed.</p>	<p>A) Information regarding moose population status within the Ungulate study areas is provided in Section 5.2 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1808

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Moose have seen significant declines in northwestern Ontario in recent years. Where is there a discussion about provincial moose population data or the Cervid Ecological Framework? B) Field surveys used planes and helicopters to track moose.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: A) MNR recommends briefly speaking to the moose population status around the project area and in the region. A discussion of what the Cervid Ecological Framework entails for the Far North is recommended as well. B) Specify the method type, duration, timing and effort of the field studies used to observe moose. Please map the findings, including showing the different data collection methods, if applicable.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation) B. Recommended for EA</p>	<p>B) Details regarding methods and results of all baseline field studies, including field studies for moose, are provided in Attachment B of Appendix M. Details regarding statistical analyses is located in Attachment C of Appendix M.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	141	<p>Comment 141</p> <p>Comment: A) We describe habitat availability using habitat associations, suitability, and use, which are estimated with data models.</p>	<p>A: Details about statistical analyses are in Section 4.1 of Attachment C (Ungulates Statistical Analyses and Modelling) of Appendix M.</p> <p>B: Details about methods and results of</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1809

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>B) During field studies in the ungulate existing conditions Local Study Area, moose were detected in a variety of habitat types but were most commonly observed in deciduous forest habitat with remote cameras and during aerial surveys.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: A) Please outline the habitat availability models used, their design and previous documented uses. Discuss how the model did in field verification. Include how habitat was identified using ecosite mapping and landcover classifications. B) Discuss the “variety of habitat types” in which moose were detected beyond deciduous forest. Describe the number of detections for moose compared to the number of active camera locations. Provide detail on the survey efforts carried out to monitor or observe moose, including details such as type, duration, timing and effort. Please map the findings.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>all baseline field studies, including maps, are in Sections 4.2.6, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 of Attachment B of Appendix M.</p>		
Ministry of Natural	142	Comment 142	A) Habitat availability for moose was presented for the winter season,	Appendix M Sections	1810

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Resources		<p>Comment:</p> <p>A) Paragraph 1 on page 254. Table 8-42 shows winter habitat availability. What about spring, summer and fall? Does the winter habitat represent late or early winter habitat, or both? Was there different availability between early and later winter moose habitat?</p> <p>Are the “best habitats” what was modeled or where moose were observed? What conclusions were made about quality of habitat modeling after field verification?</p> <p>Is good high? Terminology differs from habitat modelling.</p> <p>B) Paragraph 2 page 254</p> <p>How does this compare with field findings where moose were detected in a variety of habitat types but were most commonly observed in deciduous forest habitat with remote cameras and during aerial surveys? Does this conclusion have a confidence interval and precision targets?</p> <p>C) Citation is missing from Section 16 References.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution:</p> <p>A) Clarify if the best habitats for moose were considered the same for both the local and regional study area. If they</p>	<p>including early and late winter, as winter represents a key limiting factor for moose populations due to decreased forage availability, access to forage, and movement in northern Ontario (Kelsall & Telfer, 1974). During winter, reduced access to quality forage, deep snow and extreme temperatures, can substantially influence moose habitat availability and distribution, and survival rate (Dussault et al., 2006; Priadka et al., 2022). Habitat availability and distribution for moose will continue to be informed by the winter moose Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) model (Attachment C of Appendix M). Text describing habitat use by moose in spring, summer, and fall has been included in Sections 7.1.1.2 and 7.1.2.2 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Section 8.2.7.2 of the Final EA/IS describing the “best habitats for moose” will be rephrased as “habitats expected to be highly suitability for moose”. In addition, “good habitat” will be rephrased to “high suitability habitat”. A statement will be added to explain that habitat suitability predicted from the winter HSI model was used to inform winter moose habitat availability.</p>	<p>7.1.1.2 and 7.1.2.2 Final EA/IS Section 16</p>	

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>differ, please outline the factors and reasoning considered.</p> <p>Provide habitat availability for winter and summer seasons and speak to the habitat typically used by moose in the fall and spring.</p> <p>Discuss and provide an assessment of the habitat availability for late and early winter moose habitat.</p> <p>Habitat assessments need to include methodology and references. Clarify whether the field verification of the habitat assessment outputs was completed or if field data was incorporated into the assessment process.</p> <p>Address terminology differences, including discussing the connection between habitat suitability terms and habitat availability.</p> <p>B) Define “generally”. Provide details on the variation and confidence interval. Clarify if models incorporated observations or if field verification was used to verify modeled habitat delineations.</p> <p>Discuss how predictive habitat modelling compared to field habitat classification on the ground. Provide details on how moose habitat modeling was field verified, if completed prior to moose field surveys.</p>	<p>Moose habitat availability and habitat suitability are discussed in detail in Sections 5.2.1 and 7.1.2 of Appendix M, and discussions of the potential effect of habitat loss and habitat alteration, sensory disturbance, and linear barriers are provided in Sections 7.3.1.3.1, 7.3.1.3.2, 7.3.1.3.3 of Appendix M, respectively.</p> <p>Details on the methods and results of the moose winter HSI model and validation are provided in Section 4.1 of Attachment C of Appendix M. As described in the Section 4.1 of Appendix M, the moose HSI model was validated using moose observations collected during aerial surveys (fixed wing flights) conducted for the Community Access Road in winter. Model predictions were highly correlated with weighted moose observations (Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient [rs] = 1.0). Therefore, the HSI model is a good predictor of habitat suitability for moose in winter. Field habitat classification on the ground was not conducted.</p> <p>B) Details on the methods and results of the moose winter HSI model and validation are provided in Section 4.1 of Attachment C of Appendix M. While top</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Discuss moose range within Ontario and whether that plays a role in moose occupancy observations. Given moose were most commonly observed in deciduous forest habitat with remote cameras and aerial surveys, please discuss how these observations compare to the moose occupancy models. Provide confidence intervals and precision targets for occupancy model. C) Please provide the missing citation in Section 16.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>models and associated habitat variables differed between years, spatial patterns of winter use of the ungulate existing conditions Local Study Area by moose were generally consistent. Based on the top performing occupancy models across both study years, higher moose occupancy was predicted to occur in the southern part of the existing conditions in the Ungulates Local Study Area (LSA), which is characterized by upland forested habitats. Predicted moose occupancy was higher in areas with more mixedwood forest, deciduous forest, and coniferous forest. Predicted moose occupancy was limited in the northeastern part of the existing conditions of the Ungulates LSA, which is dominated by peatlands. The results align with previous occupancy modelling by Poley et al. (2014) where moose occupancy was positively correlated with mixed forests and negatively related to open bogs and fens. Moose occupancy model results are described in more detail in Sections 5.2.1.4 and 7.1.1.1.5 in Appendix M, and in Section 4.2 of Attachment C (Ungulates Statistical Analyses and Modelling) of Appendix M.</p> <p>C) The reference for Poley et al. (2014) has been added to Section 16 of the</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			Final EA/IS.		
Ministry of Natural Resources	143	<p>Comment 143</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>A) Title indicates habitat availability, but column heading is habitat suitability. These are not the same. Clarity is needed to better understand what type of habitat is being studied.</p> <p>B) No information is provided for the Construction Development Area.</p> <p>C) No definitions are provided for the habitat categories. Are they based on cover, browse, and wetland compositions?</p> <p>Are the habitat categories based on assessing for all seasons or strictly identifying habitat just the winter season? How is the winter season defined timing-wise? If winter habitat only, is it late winter habitat, early winter habitat or both? How does this recognize the differences between the two winter habitats? How does this differ from other seasons?</p> <p>1. D) Moose winter habitat availability was determined but why not summer habitat availability?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Response:</p> <p>A) Clarify whether the table is</p>	<p>A) Table 8-42 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to clarify Habitat Suitability rather than Habitat Availability.</p> <p>B) Table 8-42 Section 8.2.7.2 of the Final EA/IS have been updated to include data for the Construction Development Area similar to that provided for the Ungulate Local and Regional Study Areas. Sections 7.1.2, and 7.3.1 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document have also been updated to include data for the Construction Development Area.</p> <p>C) Habitat categories for the moose habitat suitability models are described in Sections 5.2.1.3 and 7.1.2.1.2, and Attachment C of Appendix M.</p> <p>D) Habitat availability for moose was presented for the winter season, including early and late winter as winter represents a key limiting factor for moose populations due to decreased forage availability, access to forage, and movement in northern Ontario (Kelsall & Telfer, 1974). During winter, reduced access to quality forage, deep snow and extreme temperatures, can substantially influence moose habitat availability and</p>	Final EA/IS Table 8-42 Appendix M Sections 7.1.2, 7.3.1, 7.1.1.2 and 7.1.2.2	1811

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>considering habitat availability or suitability. Correct the title or column heading for consistency.</p> <p>B) Please provide data for the Construction Development Area similar to what is provided for the Local and Regional Study Areas.</p> <p>C) Define habitat categories and what ecotypes are assigned to each. Specify the timing window being considered winter habitat. Explain whether late and early winter habitat are being considered separately or together, along with rationale for the decision.</p> <p>Compare and discuss winter habitat preferences to other seasonal habitat preferences.</p> <p>D) Moose winter habitat availability was determined but why not summer habitat availability?</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>distribution, and survival rate (Dussault et al., 2006; Priadka et al., 2022). Habitat availability and distribution for moose will continue to be informed by the winter moose Habitat Suitability Index (HIS) model. Text describing habitat use by moose in spring, summer, and fall will be provided in Section 7.1.1.2 and 7.1.2.2 of Appendix M.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	144	<p>Comment 144</p> <p>Comment: A) There is a large area misidentified as Federal lands on the figure. B) Burns can be an attractant to moose</p>	<p>A) The federal lands layer has been updated on all figures of the Final EA/IS and associated Appendices.</p> <p>B) Moose were expected have a positive relationship with intermediate-aged</p>	Final EA/IS Appendices	1812

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>for many years after a fire. Similarly, moose are often found in or close to high browse areas in early winter, such as cutovers and burns. There is a substantial burn from 1995 that crosses a good portion of the project study area, but the area does not appear to be flagged as highly suitable as other fires of a similar age or even older.</p> <p>How is fire disturbance and general disturbance factoring into habitat suitability classification assignments? What age of fire disturbances, or other disturbed areas, are considered in moose habitat suitability and how does it influence suitability classification?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: A) Please correct federal lands layer in map. B) Provide detail on how habitat classes are defined and what weight fire and general disturbances are given in the assignment of habitat suitability. Please also outline what fire ages are being considered beneficial for moose.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>stands that contain regenerating forage, which was included in the habitat suitability model. Stands aged 5 to 20 and 20 to 40 years since disturbance or depletion were assigned as high suitability. This includes the large fire from 1995 that crosses the Ungulates Local Study Area as outlined on Figure 7-16 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document. Details regarding statistical analyses are provided in Attachment C of Appendix M.</p>		
Ministry of	145	Comment 145	A) Connectivity in existing conditions is	Comment	1813

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Natural Resources		<p>Comment:</p> <p>A) In the Local Study Area good moose habitats are mostly found [...] How was connectivity assessed? What methodology was used? What defines good versus poor connectivity? Is this assessment for specifically for winter habitat? If so, how were other seasonal habitats modelled and considered? If not, what role did the different types of winter and summer habitats contribute to the assessment for connectivity? How were they weighted? What is the assessment for the Construction Development Area? The project needs to gauge what the loss will be for all permanent and ancillary infrastructure as a part of their assessment of impact. Is “good” moose habitat the same as “high”, like referenced in past text? Inconsistency in the terminology used.</p> <p>B) Significant wildlife habitats area areas crucial for wildlife and plants. For moose, important habitats include places where they feed on aquatic plants, mineral licks where they get essential minerals, and calving sites where they give birth. [...] Mineral licks can be natural or man-made, like salt along roads. Significant wildlife habitat for moose can</p>	<p>discussed in Sections 5.1.2, 5.2.2, 7.1.1.2, 7.1.2.2 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document, and in Sections 7.3.1.2.3, 7.3.1.3.3 of Appendix M related to potential effect of linear barriers. Also, please see response to the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) Comment #142 above regarding winter habitat availability and habitat use in other seasons and use of “good” and “high” suitability, and the response to MNR Comment #143 above assessment of the Construction Disturbance Area.</p> <p>B) Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH) for moose, as defined by guidance documents developed by MNR, includes aquatic feeding areas, mineral licks, calving sites, and late winter habitat. There is no specific category for seeps and springs, but these are incorporated in ecosites classed as aquatic feeding areas. Ecological Land Classification (ELC) ecosite classification was determined and mapped for the Vegetation Local Study Area (LSA). Due to the lack of Ecoregion Criteria Schedule for the SWHs in the ungulates study areas, candidate SWH identification was not used and was determined not to be as useful as the Habitat Suitability Index Models used for</p>	noted; see response for details.	

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>also include seeps and springs, and potentially cervid movement corridors between key significant wildlife habitat features.</p> <p>Significant wildlife habitat does not include anthropogenic mineral lick sources such as roadsides.</p> <p>Has candidate significant wildlife habitat been identified for all project areas?</p> <p>Ecological Land Classification ecosite codes can be used to identify the features on the landscape more easily.</p> <p>C) In the southern part of the moose Regional Study Area, there are several important habitats for moose, including aquatic feeding areas, calving sites, and mineral licks. No such habitats have been recorded in the moose Local Study Area, but they likely exist and just haven't been documented yet.</p> <p>How was significant wildlife habitat assessed and determined for the entire project area? Were the specified records for the Regional Study Area identified by incidental observation or existing desktop records alone?</p> <p>The EA/IS acknowledges that aquatic feeding areas, calving sites, and mineral licks occur in the Local Study Area, but have not been documented.</p> <p>D) Candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat does not appear to have been formally</p>	<p>wildlife valued components.</p> <p>C) The Terms of Reference did not require identification of candidate SWH, but existing records in provincial datasets were used in the assessment. There is no Ecoregion Criteria Schedule available for identifying candidate SWH in the ecoregion where the Community Access Road occurs (Significant wildlife habitat ecoregions ontario.ca). However, the alternative modelling approaches (i.e., Habitat Suitability Index models) to identify highly suitable habitat for moose in the ungulate study areas were used. The habitat models incorporate ecosite features important to moose. The ecosites in the high suitability categories were informed in part by provincial guidance for SWH (moose late winter habitat) from the nearest ecoregion (Significant Wildlife Habitat Criteria Schedules For Ecoregion 3E).</p> <p>D) Refer to response C.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>surveyed or modeled.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: A) Describe how connectivity is assessed along with the methodology and references used. Define what qualifies and quantifies good habitat versus poor connectivity. Elaborate on how different types of habitat contributed to the connectivity assessment. Clarify whether this assessment is specifically for winter habitat and what factors were considered. Elaborate on how the different types of winter habitat were considered. Elaborate on how other seasonal habitats were modeled, weighted and considered. Provide the assessment for the Construction Development Area, including all permanent and ancillary infrastructure. Recommend removing inconsistency in moose habitat qualifier terms. If not, define “good” moose habitat and clarify if it is the same as “high” suitability. B) Significant wildlife habitat assessment should consider seeps and springs. Candidate cervid movement corridors are also recommended where aquatic feeding habitat and mineral lick habitats are identified.</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Please remove anthropogenic mineral lick sources from the significant wildlife habitat list.</p> <p>Request candidate significant wildlife habitat be identified for all project areas. Classification of the landscape by Ecological Land Classification Ecosites is highly recommended.</p> <p>C) MNR requests candidate aquatic feeding areas, calving sites, and mineral licks be identified for the Construction Development Area, Local Study Area and Regional Study Area in their entirety. MNR also requests seeps and springs and cervid movement corridors be considered, or rationale be provided for why these features would not be suitable significant wildlife habitat for the project areas.</p> <p>D) Detail how candidate and confirmed significant wildlife habitat was assessed and determined for the entire project area.</p> <p>If no formal survey or modeling has occurred, MNR requests candidate significant wildlife habitat be identified at a minimum.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Natural Resources	146	<p>Comment 146</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>A) What references are used for the statement regarding lifespan, survival rates and high prevalence of twins?</p> <p>B) What are the densities for the habitats in question within the Project?</p> <p>C) There is the suggestion that moose populations increased with changes in management practices but have declined recently. At the provincial scale, moose populations have stabilized and are increasing in some Wildlife Management Units (WMUs). In WMUs 1D and 17, moose populations are at or above their objective range but 18A is well below the objective.</p> <p>The statement is too broad, inaccurate, and needs to be more specific about moose numbers in the Study Area.</p> <p>D) More discussion is needed. How is Indigenous harvest anticipated to influence moose populations, given management practices largely focus on non-Indigenous harvest? What is the situation in the Construction Development Area?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution:</p> <p>A) Specify any references used.</p> <p>B) Specify the moose density for the</p>	<p>A) As noted in Section 6.6 of the Final EA/IS, detailed descriptions of existing conditions for each discipline are provided in the Technical Support Documents in the appendices. References for all statements are included in Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document. References related to moose lifespan and other life history attributes are provided in Section 5.2.3 of Appendix M.</p> <p>B) Details about existing understanding of moose populations are provided in Section 5.2.3 of Appendix M.</p> <p>C) Details about existing understanding of moose populations are provided in Section 5.2.3 of Appendix M which includes predator abundance and distribution, parasites and disease, hunting pressure, and climate change.</p> <p>D) Additional discussion on the tag system has been added to Section 7.3.2.3 of Appendix M.</p>	Appendix M Section 7.3.2.3	1814

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>study areas within the Project.</p> <p>C) Discuss the specifics of moose population dynamics and numbers in the Study Area, including the Construction Development Area, Local Study Area and Regional Study Area.</p> <p>Provide details on current Indigenous harvest within the Study Area.</p> <p>Provide more details about the prevalence of disease and ticks in the Study Area and further south. Discuss the vectors for dispersal and whether there is any deer presence in the Study Area.</p> <p>D) Specify that the tag system is only used for non-Indigenous hunting.</p> <p>Elaborate on poaching and Indigenous harvest levels. Speak to the level of harvest within the Wildlife Management Units that overlap with the Project and their success rates.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	147	<p>Comment 147</p> <p>Comment: Eskers are important for lichen growth that supports caribou. Eskers should be considered critical habitat for caribou in</p>	<p>The phrase “Eskers are important for lichen growth that support caribou.” has been included in Section 8.2.8.6.2 of the Final EA/IS.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 8.2.8.6.2</p>	1815

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>the same way Aquatic Feeding Areas are considered important to moose.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Acknowledge the importance of eskers for lichen growth that supports caribou.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	148	<p>Comment 148</p> <p>Comment: Traffic volume can have direct and indirect effects on wildlife.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Monitor traffic volume to assess direct and indirect effects of vehicles.</p> <p>Type of Comment: D. Permitting Related, Not Required for EA</p>	Monitoring traffic volume will be determined by the owner/operator of the Community Assess Road.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1816
Ministry of Natural Resources	149	<p>Comment 149</p> <p>Comment: A general habitat model was used to predict suitable maternity roosting habitat for little brown myotis and northern myotis.</p>	The wildlife habitat models are described in Attachment C of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document. As required by the Terms of Reference, the habitat suitability model for bat habitat focuses on Little Brown Myotis and Northern Myotis maternity roost habitat.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1817

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>A spatial capture-recapture model was used to predict wolverine densities. American marten habitat was modelled using a habitat suitability model. Beaver habitat was modelled using a habitat suitability model.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please identify the habitat model that was used for each species along with references. Specify how this general habitat model compares to habitat used by Big Brown Bats. Or provide a reference in the main EA document to the location of this information in the appendices,</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>Due to the similarities in roosting habitat requirements between Big Brown Bat and Little Brown Myotis, the habitat model is valid for both species.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	150	<p>Comment 150</p> <p>Comment: The EA/IA contains limited information to help MNR understand how Caribou habitat was modelled within the Regional Study Area using ecosite mapping and landcover classes. The EA/IA does not describe how the new travel corridors were identified.</p>	<p>Details on the methods used for Caribou habitat modelling are available in Attachment C of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Methods to delineate new Category 1 areas were based on the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) 2013 General Habitat Descriptions and guidance provided during a virtual meeting with</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1818

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>The EA/IA suggests that predation risk is not expected to be a limiting factor of caribou under existing conditions. However, the future increase in linear feature density is not considered.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please provide reference to the location of this information in the appendix. Or provide methods of the habitat modelling (with relevant rationale and references), including how habitat was identified using ecosite mapping and landcover classifications. Please provide the methods (including relevant rationale and references) used to identify new travel corridors. along with references and how they apply to the different caribou ecotypes. Acknowledge that predation could increase in the future because of the project. Discuss how this increase in linear feature density would impact caribou predation levels.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) on 2 June 2022 (this personal communication reference is included in the Reference List of Appendix M).</p> <p>Timeframes for potential new travel corridors were selected based on dates when movement patterns of collared individuals were observed, rather than a pre-determined month (e.g., in MNR 2013 General Habitat Description guidance, travel corridors are defined as any locations during the months of April and November, but caribou collared for this Project demonstrated migratory movement behaviour in May). The Final EA/IS and Appendix M will be updated to describe in more detail the approach to identify relevant cutoff dates for potential new Category 1 habitat.</p> <p>In the Final EA/IS, travel corridors have been identified separately for boreal and eastern migratory caribou. Caribou collar data collected by Webequie First Nation was not available before submission of the Draft EA/IS. A data sharing agreement has since been signed between the three road projects (i.e., Marten Falls Community Access Road, Webequie Supply Road (WSR), Northern</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>Road Link (NRL)) and Caribou collar data has been shared. The Final EA/IS has been updated to incorporate additional collar data.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the effects of construction, operation and maintenance of the Project related to increased predator access and linear feature density, including literature references, are provided in Section 7.3.1.2.4 of Appendix M.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	151	<p>Comment 151</p> <p>Comment: To identify effects of the project on significant wildlife habitat values, those values need to first be identified. Aquatic feeding sites, mineral licks, and calving sites have been assessed by MNR outside the Study Area but require assessment within the local study area and regional study area where MNR data is unavailable.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Documentation of aquatic feeding areas, moose calving sites, and mineral licks in the Local Study Area is required. MNR also recommends documenting seeps and springs and cervid movement</p>	<p>The Project does not overlap with known Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH) for moose (i.e., aquatic feeding sites, calving sites, and mineral licks). The Terms of Reference did not require identification of candidate SWH, but existing records in provincial datasets were used in the assessment. There is no Ecoregion Criteria Schedule available for identifying candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat in the ecoregion where the Project occurs (Significant wildlife habitat ecoregions ontario.ca). However, the alternative modelling approaches (i.e., Habitat Suitability Index models) to identify highly suitable habitat for moose in the Project study areas were used. The habitat models incorporate ecosite features important to moose. The ecosites in the</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1819

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>corridors, if appropriate for the ecoregions overlapped by the Project. If not applicable provide rationale for why they are not appropriate.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>high suitability categories were informed in part by provincial guidance for Significant Wildlife Habitat (moose late winter habitat) from the nearest ecoregion (Significant Wildlife Habitat Criteria Schedules For Ecoregion 3E).</p> <p>SWH for moose, as defined by guidance documents developed by the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), includes aquatic feeding areas, mineral licks, calving sites, and late winter habitat. There is no specific category for seeps and springs, but these are incorporated in ecosites classed as aquatic feeding areas.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	152	<p>Comment 152</p> <p>Comment: The EA/IA suggests that mitigation and enhancement measures for moose habitat loss will include minimizing overlap of the project with significant wildlife habitat. However, the EA/IA does not identify what the significant wildlife habitat features for moose are.</p> <p>Proposed Response/Solution: Please specify that the Project route will minimize overlap or removal of aquatic feeding areas, moose calving sites, and</p>	<p>The Project does not overlap with known Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH) for moose (i.e., aquatic feeding sites, calving sites, and mineral licks. The Terms of Reference did not require identification of candidate SWH.</p> <p>SWH for moose, as defined by guidance documents developed by the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), includes aquatic feeding areas, mineral licks, calving sites, and late winter habitat. There is no specific category for seeps and springs, but these are incorporated in ecosites classed as aquatic feeding</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1820

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>mineral licks in the Local Study Area. In addition, the MNR recommends considering seeps and springs and cervid movement corridors, if appropriate. If not applicable provide rationale for why they are not appropriate.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>areas.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	153	<p>Comment 153</p> <p>Comment: A) Acknowledges a moderate magnitude of change in the Nipigon range due to caribou habitat loss and alteration during construction but does not provide suggestions for mitigation or compensation. B) Similar to above, indication that there will be a Long-Term Irreversible effect of caribou habitat loss and alteration during construction that will be significant in the Nipigon range. Similar to above, acknowledges a moderate magnitude of change in the Nipigon range due to caribou habitat loss and alteration during operation and maintenance but does not provide suggestions for mitigation or</p>	<p>Potential residual effects are described in Section 9.4.5 of the Final EA/IS Table 9.4-14 (formerly Table 9-27) and in more detail in Section 7 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document. Table 9.4-14 includes information on proposed mitigation and enhancement measures to avoid, minimize and restore residual effects of the Project, including 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</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1821

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>compensation.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Address how habitat loss and alteration in the Nipigon range will be mitigated or compensated.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>that accelerate revegetation will also be used to maintain or improve ungulate habitat. Mitigation measures proposed for the Project include areas within the Nipigon range.</p> <p>A Preliminary Biodiversity Offset Plan has been developed and is available in Appendix AB. The Plan was prepared in response to federal and provincial legislative requirements for the Final Marten Falls First Nation Community Access Road Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement Report. It summarizes the results of the residual effects assessment and presents biodiversity offset options for provincially and federally mandated terrestrial Key Biodiversity Components for the Project.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	154	<p>Comment 154</p> <p>Comment: The EA/IS claims that although there will be a long-term irreversible effect of sensory disturbance during: A) construction phase, it will not have a significant effect on caribou. How is this known? Won't it end when construction is completed? B) operation and maintenance phase, it will not have a significant effect on</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of the effects of construction, operation and maintenance of the Project related to sensory disturbance including rationale, justification, and literature references are provided in Section 7.3.1.2.2 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1822

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>caribou. How is this known?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: In the discussion of the long-term irreversible effects of construction, operation and maintenance on sensory disturbance, please provide justification for non-significant effect on caribou with references.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	155	<p>Comment 155</p> <p>Comment: The EA/IS claims that there will be a long-term irreversible effect of linear barriers in all ranges except Pagwachuan during operation and maintenance, and it will have a significant effect on caribou. How is this known?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Address how the effects of linear barriers will be mitigated or compensated.</p>	<p>Detailed information, including references, about statements regarding potential effects of linear barriers are provided in Section 7.3.1.2.3 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.</p> <p>A Preliminary Biodiversity Offset Plan has been developed and included in Appendix AB. The Plan was prepared in response to federal and provincial legislative requirements for the Final Marten Falls First Nation Community Access Road Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement Report. It summarizes the results of the residual effects assessment and presents biodiversity offset options for provincially</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1841

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			and federally mandated terrestrial Key Biodiversity Components for the Project.		
Ministry of Natural Resources	156	<p>Comment 156</p> <p>Comment: The EA/IS claims that there will be a long-term irreversible effect of: A) increased predator access in the Regional Study Area during construction, operation and maintenance B) increased public access in the Regional Study Area during operation and maintenance that will not have a significant effect on caribou survival and reproduction. These conclusions appear to be based on the change in linear feature density. In addition, increase public access also suggests caribou may face an increase in Indigenous hunting pressures, and illegal harvest by non-Indigenous hunters, due to increased human access. How is it known that increased hunting will not produce an effect caribou (and moose) numbers in the Regional Study Area? Previous studies (Rempel et al. 1997, Racey et al. 2000, Bontan et al. 2001) show that increased road access leads to declining moose populations and there is no justification to believe that would not</p>	<p>A. A detailed assessment of the effects of construction, operation and maintenance of the Project related to increased predator access to caribou populations, including literature references, are in Section 7.3.1.2.4 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.</p> <p>B. Caribou: A detailed assessment of the effects of construction, operation and maintenance of the Project related to increase public access to caribou populations, including literature references, are in Section 7.3.1.2.5 of Appendix M.</p> <p>Moose: As a result of concerns expressed in comments received from Indigenous communities and other reviewers, the assessment of Project's residual effects on moose was revised to significant in the Final EA/IS due to high uncertainty in the increase in harvest pressure from improved public access.</p> <p>As described in Section 7.3.1.3.5 of Appendix M, an increase in moose harvest is expected by registered hunters and Indigenous hunters as access</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1842

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>also apply to caribou populations.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: A) In the discussion of the long-term irreversible effects of construction, operation and maintenance on increased predator access, please provide justification for non-significant effect on caribou survival and reproduction with references. B) Explain how increased hunting will not produce an effect caribou and moose numbers in the Regional Study Area along with justification with references.</p> <p>Type of Comment: Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>improves, however, the magnitude of change in hunting pressure is largely unknown. The unknown amount of illegal harvest of moose was also considered in the assessment. It is expected that the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) will continue to adaptively manage moose harvest by non-Indigenous hunters at sustainable levels by adjusting the number of hunting tags allocated annually in each Wildlife Management Unit (WMU) based on available population status data (Government of Ontario, 2023d). However, adaptive management through MNR's tag system is not a mitigation implemented by the Project and there is uncertainty if the increase in non-Indigenous hunting pressure will be managed at sustainable levels. Additionally, it is unclear how improved access from the Project will affect moose harvest by Indigenous hunters, as there is no mandatory or voluntary reporting of Indigenous harvest and current regional levels are unknown.</p> <p>Given the uncertainty in the magnitude of potential increase in moose harvest and the limited data on current harvest levels, the residual effects assessment for moose has been revised to precautionarily assume that the increase</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>in hunter harvest could reach unsustainable levels and lead to decreased resilience and maintenance of the self-sustaining and ecologically effective regional moose population. As such, residual effects on moose from increase in public access are precautionarily considered significant.</p>		
<p>Ministry of Natural Resources</p>	<p>157</p>	<p>Comment 157</p> <p>Comment: Statements should likely read “Gaps in snowbanks will be ploughed at least every 1 kilometre apart and maintained by road maintenance crews throughout the winter season”.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please correct, if applicable.</p> <p>Type of Comment: C. Editorial</p>	<p>The statement in Table 9.4-14 (formerly Table 9-27) of the Final EA/IS has been updated to "Gaps in snowbanks will be ploughed at least every 1 kilometre apart and maintained by road maintenance crews throughout the winter season".</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Table 9-27</p>	<p>1845</p>
<p>Ministry of Natural Resources</p>	<p>158</p>	<p>Comment 158</p> <p>Comment: The EA/IS claims that there will be a long-term irreversible effect of vehicle collisions in the Regional Study Area during operation and maintenance that will not have a significant effect on</p>	<p>The potential residual effects of vehicle collisions, mitigation and enhancement measures are described in Sections 7.3.1.2.6 and 7.3.1.3.6 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document. Traffic volume modelling or collision risk modelling was not a requirement of the Ungulates Study Plan (Attachment A of</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	<p>1846</p>

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>caribou and moose mortality. This conclusion appears to be based on the change in linear feature density. How is this known? Is it more likely related to traffic volume?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: MNR requests rationale for this outcome for both eastern migratory caribou and moose including justification with references.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>Appendix M).</p> <p>Mitigation to minimize the residual effects of vehicle traffic have been described under the following Project-environment interactions: sensory disturbance, linear barriers, and collisions with vehicles and equipment (Section 7.3.1 of Appendix M). Examples include concentrating construction activities spatially and temporally to minimize fragmentation and barriers to movement, reduced traffic speeds for heavy trucks during construction, leaving gaps in road berms and snowbanks to allow for movement across construction areas and the road, and signage in areas where wildlife are regularly observed and reduced speed limits in Category 1 caribou habitat areas. Monitoring during construction and operation phases of the Project has been proposed in Section 9 of Appendix M.</p> <p>Project residual effects from ungulate-vehicle collisions are expected to be measurable at the individual level and localized to the road corridor but are not expected to affect the regional population's ability to be self-sustaining or ecologically effective. Therefore, this Project interaction was considered not</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			significant.		
Ministry of Natural Resources	159	<p>Comment 159</p> <p>Comment: The EA/IS suggests that mitigation and enhancement measures will avoid sensitive moose habitat such as mineral licks but what about Aquatic Feeding Areas and other Significant Wildlife Habitat features?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please include Aquatic Feeding Areas, moose calving sites, seeps and springs and cervid movement corridors in sensitive moose habitats to be avoided.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>Significant Wildlife Habitat for moose, as defined by guidance documents developed by the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) includes aquatic feeding areas, mineral licks, calving sites, and late winter habitat. There is no specific category for seeps and springs, but these are incorporated in ecosites classed as aquatic feeding areas.</p> <p>The Project does not overlap with known Significant Wildlife Habitat for moose, therefore no specific mitigation measures for Significant Wildlife Habitat are proposed. The Terms of Reference did not require identification of candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat, but existing records in provincial datasets were used in the assessment. There is no Ecoregion Criteria Schedule available for identifying candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat in the ecoregion where the Project occurs (Significant wildlife habitat ecoregions ontario.ca). However, the alternative modelling approaches (i.e., Habitat Suitability Index models) to identify highly suitable habitat for moose in the Project study areas were used. The habitat models incorporate ecosite features important to moose. The</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1847

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>ecosites in the high suitability categories were informed in part by provincial guidance for Significant Wildlife Habitat (moose late winter habitat) from the nearest ecoregion (Significant Wildlife Habitat Criteria Schedules For Ecoregion 3E).</p>		
<p>Ministry of Natural Resources</p>	<p>160</p>	<p>Comment 160</p> <p>Comment: The EA/IS suggests that mitigation and enhancement measures for: A) caribou habitat loss B) caribou sensory disturbance C) linear barriers D) increased predator access during construction will include locating the Project route to minimize overlap with significant wildlife habitat for moose but does not identify what they are.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Specify that the Project route will minimize overlap or removal of aquatic feeding areas, moose calving sites, mineral licks, seeps and springs, and cervid movement corridors and minimize linear barriers that may affect moose access to these significant wildlife habitat features in the Local Study Area.</p>	<p>Significant Wildlife Habitat for moose, as defined by guidance documents developed by the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) includes aquatic feeding areas, mineral licks, calving sites, and late winter habitat. There is no specific category for seeps and springs or cervid movement corridors.</p> <p>The Project does not overlap with known Significant Wildlife Habitat for moose (e.g., aquatic feeding sites, calving sites, and mineral licks).</p> <p>Potential effects that could result in changes in moose movement (i.e., linear barriers) were identified and assessed for construction and operation of the Project. Mitigations were described to avoid and minimize effects. Potential effects are described in the Final EA/IS Table 9.4-14 (formerly Table 9-27) and in more detail in Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document. Additional mitigations</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Appendix M</p>	<p>1848</p>

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>to reduce the adverse effects of linear barriers on wildlife movement, including moose, have been included in the Final EA/IS and Appendix M.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	161	<p>Comment 161</p> <p>Comment: Mitigation and Enhancement Measures for: A) habitat loss during construction B) habitat loss during operation and maintenance C) sensory disturbance during construction includes “The Project construction schedule will avoid activities during the sensitive timing windows for caribou (May 1 to September 15 for nursery areas, December 1 to March 31 for winter use areas) in known and potential new Category 1 areas, to the extent practical. When activity restrictions cannot be followed, the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks will be engaged to determine alternative approaches”. This applies to caribou, but does it also apply to moose?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please clarify and correct if this also applies to moose by providing similar</p>	<p>There is no publicly available sensitive timing windows for moose in Ontario.</p> <p>Based on well-known biological characteristics of the species, moose are most sensitive in early winter (December to February) and calving season (spring/early summer). These periods align with the publicly available provincial guidance about sensitive timing windows for boreal caribou (May 1 to September 15 and December 1 to March 31) and would also be protective of moose.</p> <p>As noted on Table 7-20 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document, mitigation for blasting activities where timing windows cannot be adhered to includes “follow environmental approval conditions, permits, or authorizations issued for the Project, including those issued from Environment and Climate Change Canada, Ontario Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks, and the Ministry of Natural Resources.”</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1849

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>dates for moose or remove the statements. MNR is the contact for Eastern Migratory Caribou and moose.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	162	<p>Comment: The EA/IS suggests Geographic Extent of Predicted Residual Effect of: A) habitat loss B) habitat alteration during operation and maintenance will be Local for habitat availability and survival and reproduction; Regional for habitat distribution (caribou movement and connectivity) that will not have a significant effect. Does this apply to moose as well?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Specify if this also applies to moose or remove.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>Section 7.3.1.3 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document includes a detailed description of the potential Project-environment interactions related to moose habitat loss and alteration, sensory disturbance, linear barriers, increased predator access, increase in public access, and collisions with vehicles and equipment.</p> <p>The statement has not been included for Moose, however, remains part of the summary of Boreal Caribou residual effects outlined in Table 9.4-14 (formerly Table 9-27).</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1851
Ministry of Natural Resources	163	<p>Comment: The EA/IS claims that although there will be a long-term irreversible effect of</p>	<p>Section 7.3.1.3 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document includes a detailed description of the potential</p>	Comment noted; see response for	1852

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>sensory disturbance and linear barriers during:</p> <p>A) the construction phase, it will not have a significant effect on caribou. How is this known? What about moose? Won't it end when construction is completed?</p> <p>B) operation and maintenance, it will not have a significant effect on caribou. How is this known? What about moose?</p> <p>The EA/IS claims that although there will be a long-term irreversible effect of sensory disturbance and linear barriers during:</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: The MNR requests a rationale and supporting justification for the provided statements, including references—particularly those indicating that moose habituate to traffic—and an explanation of how the effects of linear barriers on moose will be mitigated, with appropriate citations</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>Project-environment interactions related to moose habitat loss and alteration, sensory disturbance, linear barriers, increased predator access, increase in public access, and collisions with vehicles and equipment. This section includes rationale and supporting justification for the assessment results, and proposed mitigations. Mitigation measures for effects of linear barriers is provided in Tables 7-31 and 10-1 of Appendix M.</p>	<p>details.</p>	
<p>Ministry of Natural Resources</p>	<p>164</p>	<p>Comment: The EA/IS claims there will be a long-term irreversible effect of increased predator access in the Regional Study</p>	<p>Section 7.3.1.3 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document includes a detailed description of the potential Project-environment interactions related</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	<p>1853</p>

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Area during: A) construction that will not have a significant effect on moose survival and reproduction. B) operation and maintenance that will not have a significant effect on moose survival and reproduction. This conclusion appears to be based on the change in linear feature density.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Describe potential effects on moose and provide justification with references.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>to moose habitat loss and alteration, sensory disturbance, linear barriers, increased predator access, increase in public access, and collisions with vehicles and equipment. This section includes rationale and supporting justification for the assessment results, and proposed mitigations.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	165	<p>Comment: Mitigation and Enhancement Measures for increase in public access during construction include “Implement an Environmental Protection Plan that includes measures to control, and / or restrict public use of access roads during Construction. Measures will include gates / manned gates, signage, reduced road standard, reduced speed limits, felling of timber across temporary access roads after reclaimed, removal of temporary watercourse crossings. Posting and enforcement of restricted</p>	<p>The Environmental Protection Plan will be prepared by the contractor before the construction of the Community Access Road and include how mitigation measures will be implemented.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for more details</p>	1854

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>access and speed signage will follow the Construction Specification for Temporary Traffic Control Devices (Ontario Provincial Standard Specification, 2016).”</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Indicate how these measures will be implemented in the Environmental Protection Plan.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	166	<p>Comment: The EA/IS claims that there will be a long-term irreversible effect of increased public access in the Regional Study Area during: A) construction that will not have a significant effect on moose survival and reproduction. This conclusion appears to be based on the change in linear feature density. Won't it end when construction is completed? B) operation and maintenance that will not have a significant effect on moose survival and reproduction but also suggest moose may face an increase in Indigenous hunting pressures, and illegal harvest by non-Indigenous hunters, due to increased human access. Claim</p>	<p>Section 7.3.1.3 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document includes a detailed description of the potential Project-environment interactions related to moose habitat loss and alteration, sensory disturbance, linear barriers, increased predator access, increase in public access, and collisions with vehicles and equipment. This section includes rationale and supporting justification for the assessment results, and proposed mitigations.</p> <p>As a result of concerns expressed in comments received from Indigenous communities and other reviewers, the assessment of Project's residual effects on moose will be revised to significant in</p>	Final EA/IS Appendix M	1855

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>appears to be based on the change in linear feature density. How is it known that increased hunting will not have an effect on moose numbers in the RSA? Previous studies (Rempel et al. 1997, Racey et al. 2000, Bottan et al. 2001) show that increased road access leads to declining moose populations.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: A) MNR requests references showing that estimated road density will not have an effect. B) Please provide rationale for this stance including justification with references.</p> <p>Type of comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>the Final EA/IS due to high uncertainty in the increase in harvest pressure from improved public access.</p> <p>As described in Section 7.3.1.3.5 of Appendix M, an increase in moose harvest is expected by registered hunters and Indigenous hunters as access improves, but the magnitude of change in hunting pressure is largely unknown. The unknown amount of illegal harvest of moose was also considered in the assessment. It is expected that the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) will continue to adaptively manage moose harvest by non-Indigenous hunters at sustainable levels by adjusting the number of hunting tags allocated annually in each Wildlife Management Unit (WMU) based on available population status data (Government of Ontario, 2023d). However, adaptive management through MNR's tag system is not a mitigation implemented by the Project and there is uncertainty if the increase in non-Indigenous hunting pressure will be managed at sustainable levels. Additionally, it is unclear how improved access from the Project will affect moose harvest by Indigenous hunters, as there is no mandatory or voluntary reporting of Indigenous harvest</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>and current regional levels are unknown.</p> <p>Given the uncertainty in the magnitude of potential increase in moose harvest and the limited data on current harvest levels, the residual effects assessment for moose will be revised to precautionarily assume that the increase in hunter harvest could reach unsustainable levels and lead to decreased resilience and maintenance of the self-sustaining and ecologically effective regional moose population. As such, residual effects on moose from increase in public access are precautionarily considered significant.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	167	<p>Comment: The EA/IS suggests that “Moose-vehicle collisions generally increase along roads with greater traffic volumes, vehicle speeds, frequency of road crossings by moose, and with roadside attractants (for example, early seral vegetation or de-icing salt).”</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please provide references for this suggestion.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry</p>	A detailed assessment of the effects of construction, operation and maintenance of the Project related to moose vehicle collisions, including literature references, are in Section 7.3.1.3.6 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.		1856

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		mandate/policy/legislation)			
Ministry of Natural Resources	168	<p>Comment: The EA/IS suggests that “Residual effects on caribou due to sensory disturbance, increased predator access, increase in public access, collisions with vehicles and equipment, changes in groundwater, and fugitive dust emissions were determined to be not significant (Table 9-27).” MNR disagrees with this conclusion with regard to sensory disturbance, increased predator access, increase in public access and collisions with vehicles for reasons given above Table 9-27 counting rows from the top (Rows 39, 40, 42-44, 46, 53-56, 60-62, 64-66, 68).</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please see suggestions at Rows 39, 40, 42-44, 46, 53-56, 60-62, 64-66, 68</p> <p>Type of Comment: B. Recommended for EA and/or D. Permitting Related, Not Required for EA</p>	Table 9.4-14 (formerly Table 9-27) of the Final EA/IS has been reviewed and update.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1857
Ministry of Natural Resources	169	<p>Comment: The EA/IS suggests that:</p>	Sections 5.1.2.1, 5.1.2.2, 7.1.1.2.1 and 7.1.1.2.2 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document provide	Comment noted; see response for	1858

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>A) “residual effects on caribou from habitat loss and alteration and linear barriers [...]</p> <p>B) “the Community Access Road may disrupt seasonal movements across ranges [...]</p> <p>C) “seasonal movements across ranges may be disrupted permanently, [...]</p> <p>These are very important effects that could result in caribou extirpation from the Local Study Area and possibly the Regional Study Area over time.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Address how the following can be mitigated or compensated for eastern migratory caribou:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - habitat loss and alteration and effects of linear barriers - disruption of seasonal movements and connectivity between populations <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>qualitative discussions about eastern migratory caribou range and movement periods. A detailed assessment of the effects of construction, operation and maintenance of the Project related to habitat loss and alteration and linear barriers, including literature references, are in Sections 7.3.1.2.1 and 7.3.1.2.3 of Appendix M, respectively.</p> <p>A Preliminary Biodiversity Offset Plan has been developed and is included in Appendix AB. The Plan was prepared in response to federal and provincial legislative requirements for the Final Marten Falls First Nation Community Access Road Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement Report. It summarizes the results of the residual effects assessment and presents biodiversity offset options for provincially and federally mandated terrestrial Key Biodiversity Components for the Project.</p>	<p>details.</p>	
<p>Ministry of Natural Resources</p>	<p>170</p>	<p>Comment: The EA/IS suggests that habitat loss in the Nipigon Range will have little to no influence on caribou survival because relative to existing conditions it is a small incremental increase.</p>	<p>Nipigon range is already below the 65% undisturbed habitat threshold, and as such, the effect of habitat loss was assessed as significant in the Nipigon range as outlined in Section 7.3.3 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support</p>	<p>Appendix AB</p>	<p>1859</p>

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>However, habitat for caribou will continue to remain below the required 65% threshold. Consequently, any increase in habitat loss is important and should be avoided.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Address how habitat loss in the Nipigon range will be mitigated or compensated</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>Document. However, in practice, an increase of 0.3% disturbance is unlikely to result in a measurable change in survival and reproduction at the population level relative to the state of the population in the existing range condition. Additional rationale to support this statement is provided in Section 7.3.1.2.1 of Appendix M.</p> <p>A Preliminary Biodiversity Offset Plan has been developed and is included in Appendix AB. The Plan was prepared in response to federal and provincial legislative requirements for the Final Marten Falls First Nation Community Access Road Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement Report. It summarizes the results of the residual effects assessment and presents biodiversity offset options for provincially and federally mandated terrestrial Key Biodiversity Components for the Project.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	171	<p>Comment: The EA/IS suggests that previous research has demonstrated behavioural plasticity of caribou ecotypes.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Define what is meant by behavioural plasticity and provide references to</p>	<p>A qualitative discussion of behavioural plasticity, including reference to studies, reports and literature, is included in Sections 5.1.2.2 and 5.1.3.1 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document. The Final EA/IS and Appendix M have been updated to clarify which caribou switched ecotypes during</p>	Final EA/IS Appendix M	1860

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>where this is demonstrated.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>the period of the study.</p> <p>Caribou collar data collected by Webequie First Nation was not available before submission of the Draft EA/IS. A data sharing agreement has since been signed between the three road projects (i.e., Marten Falls Community Access Road, Webequie Supply Road (WSR), Northern Road Link (NRL)) and Caribou collar data has been shared. The Final EA/IS has been updated to incorporate additional collar data.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	172	<p>Comment: The EA/IS suggests that “Other studies have detected variation in the responses of caribou to linear developments from strong avoidance to degrees of habituation and adaptive capacity to travel across roads.” References are missing.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please provide references to the studies being sourced in this statement.</p>	Detailed information, including references, about current understanding of caribou response to linear features is included in Section 5.1.2.3 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1861
Ministry of Natural Resources	173	<p>Comment: The EA/IS suggests that “naive caribou may exhibit strong avoidance behaviours during construction and operations of the Community Access Road.”</p>	Detailed information, including references, about statements regarding potential effects of linear barriers and caribou avoidance behaviour are provided in Section 7.3.1.2.3 of Appendix	Comment noted; see response for details.	1862

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>The opposite prediction might be true if naïve caribou are curious.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please provide references to studies showing this caribou avoidance behaviour or other reactions.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>M Ungulates Technical Support Document.</p>		
<p>Ministry of Natural Resources</p>	<p>174</p>	<p>Comment: The EA/IS suggests that “the combined 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.” This is extremely important and could result in caribou extirpation from the Local Study Area and the Regional Study Area over time.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Address how the residual effects of the Community Access Road on caribou can be mitigated or compensated. Or provide a reference in the main EA document to the location of this information in the appendices,</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of the residual effects of construction, operation and maintenance of the Project related to habitat loss and alteration, sensory disturbance, linear barriers, increase in predator access, increase in public access, and collisions with vehicles and equipment, including rationale, justification, and literature references are in Section 7.3.1.2 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.</p> <p>A Preliminary Biodiversity Offset Plan has been developed and is included in Appendix AB. The Plan was prepared in response to federal and provincial legislative requirements for the Final Marten Falls First Nation Community Access Road Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement Report. It</p>	<p>Appendix AB</p>	<p>1871</p>

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>summarizes the results of the residual effects assessment and presents biodiversity offset options for provincially and federally mandated terrestrial Key Biodiversity Components for the Project.</p>		
<p>Ministry of Natural Resources</p>	<p>175</p>	<p>Comment: A) The EA/IS suggests that the residual effects from Project interactions will not have significant effects on moose populations and the effect on their habitat will be moderate, even though they are irreversible. The EA/IS also suggests that during operation and maintenance that recreation and tourism effects due to noise and access will not be significant. MNR disagrees with this suggestion given the following rationale provided within the EA/IS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - long-term irreversible effects of increased public access Table 9-48 counting rows from the top (rows 44, 64, 65) - habitat loss and alteration (rows 51, 52) - sensory disturbance (rows 55, 56) - linear barriers (rows 58, 59) - predator access (rows 61, 62) - vehicle collisions (rows 66, 68) Previous studies (Rempel et al. 1997, Racey et al. 2000, Botton et al. 2001) show that increased road density and access leads to declining moose</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of the effects to moose populations of construction, operation and maintenance of the Project, related to habitat loss and alteration, sensory disturbance, linear barriers, increase in predator access, increase in public access, and collisions with vehicles and equipment, including rationale, justification, and literature references, are provided in Section 7.3.1.3 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.</p> <p>As a result of concerns expressed in comments received from Indigenous communities and other reviewers, the assessment of Project’s residual effects on moose was revised to significant in the Final EA/IS due to high uncertainty in the increase in harvest pressure from improved public access.</p> <p>As described in Section 7.3.1.3.5 of Appendix M, an increase in moose harvest is expected by registered hunters and Indigenous hunters as access</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Appendix M</p>	<p>1875</p>

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>populations. This summary is too broadly written.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: MNR request this section be revised with appropriate reference to the preceding sections where these effects were discussed. Additional rationale is needed to support the conclusion that the Project interactions will not have significant effects on moose populations or their habitat.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>improves, but the magnitude of change in hunting pressure is largely unknown. The unknown amount of illegal harvest of moose was also considered in the assessment. It is expected that the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) will continue to adaptively manage moose harvest by non-Indigenous hunters at sustainable levels by adjusting the number of hunting tags allocated annually in each Wildlife Management Unit (WMU) based on available population status data (Government of Ontario, 2023d). However, adaptive management through MNR's tag system is not a mitigation implemented by the Project and there is uncertainty if the increase in non-Indigenous hunting pressure will be managed at sustainable levels. Additionally, it is unclear how improved access from the Project will affect moose harvest by Indigenous hunters, as there is no mandatory or voluntary reporting of Indigenous harvest and current regional levels are unknown.</p> <p>Given the uncertainty in the magnitude of potential increase in moose harvest and the limited data on current harvest levels, the residual effects assessment for moose will be revised to precautionarily assume that the increase in hunter</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>harvest could reach unsustainable levels and lead to decreased resilience and maintenance of the self-sustaining and ecologically effective regional moose population. As such, residual effects on moose from increase in public access are precautionarily considered significant.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	176	<p>Comment: Predicted cumulative effects on: A) American marten B) beaver C) reptiles and amphibians after implementation of the Project and the other reasonably foreseeable developments will not be significant but confidence for the assessment of significance is considered low. This indicates more needs to be known.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: The predicted confidence for the assessment of significance was low. Provide the references and citations used to determine the cumulative effects of road developments on American marten, beaver, and reptiles and amphibians.</p>	<p>Prediction confidence for the residual effects on reptiles and amphibians was considered moderate. References and citations for the determination of cumulative effects of the Community Access Road and the other reasonably foreseeable developments are provided in Sections 8.2.4, 8.2.5, and 8.2.6. of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1877
Ministry of Natural	177	<p>Comment: The EA/IS expects that there will be a</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of the residual effects of construction, operation and</p>	<p>Comment noted; see</p>	1881

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Resources		<p>long-term irreversible effect of linear barriers on caribou in the Missisa Range.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Address how the effects of linear barriers will be mitigated or compensated. Or provide a reference in the main EA document to the location in the appendices.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>maintenance of the Project related to linear barriers and mitigation measures, including rationale, justification, and literature references, are provided in Section 7.3.1.2.3 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.</p> <p>A Preliminary Biodiversity Offset Plan has been developed and included as Appendix AB. The Plan was prepared in response to federal and provincial legislative requirements for the Final Marten Falls First Nation Community Access Road Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement Report. It summarizes the results of the residual effects assessment and presents biodiversity offset options for provincially and federally mandated terrestrial Key Biodiversity Components for the Project.</p>	response for details.	
Ministry of Natural Resources	178	<p>Comment: A) The EA/IS suggests that “the combined cumulative effects from the Project, reasonably foreseeable developments, and forest harvest activities are predicted to result in a significant adverse effect on caribou in the Nipigon range, because any incremental increase in disturbance (habitat loss) would be considered significant.”</p>	<p>A. A qualitative discussion of forestry is included in Section 8.2.1.1.1 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document. As noted in that section, the precise details about the projected amount or spatial layout of future forest harvest (i.e., whether the harvest will be within or outside of the part of the Forest Management Unit that overlaps with the Caribou Regional Study Area) were not publicly available for this assessment. As</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1884

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>This is an important conclusion and indicates mitigation is necessary.</p> <p>B) “the cumulative effects from reasonably foreseeable developments are predicted to be not significant for caribou in the Ozhiski range.”</p> <p>C) “the cumulative effects from reasonably foreseeable developments are predicted to be not significant for caribou in the Pagwachuan range.”</p> <p>Will this continue to be true if the Northern Road Link and Webeque Supply Road projects are approved?</p> <p>The EA/IS suggests that:</p> <p>D) “Specifically, the cumulative effects of habitat loss in the Nipigon range and the cumulative effects of linear barriers in the Missisa range and in the caribou effects assessment Regional Study Area were assessed as significant. As a result, the combined cumulative residual effects on caribou and caribou habitat are determined to have a significant influence on self-sustaining and ecologically effective caribou populations in the caribou effects assessment Regional Study Area.”</p> <p>E) “the combined residual cumulative effects from the Community Access Road and past, present and reasonably foreseeable developments on caribou and caribou habitat are determined to</p>	<p>such, the amount of habitat lost in the Caribou Regional Study Area from forest harvest could not be quantified.</p> <p>B. Potential cumulative effects and mitigation and enhancement measures for habitat loss and alteration, sensory disturbance, linear barriers, increased predator access, increase in public access, increase in collisions with vehicles and equipment, fugitive dust emissions, and changes to groundwater in the Project study areas, including Ozhiski and Pagwachuan Ranges are described in Section 8.2 of Appendix M.</p> <p>C. Refer to response B.</p> <p>D. Refer to response B.</p> <p>E. Refer to response B.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>have a significant influence on self-sustaining and ecologically effective caribou populations in the caribou effects assessment Regional Study Area". These are very important effects that could result in caribou extirpation from the Local Study Area and possibly the Regional Study Area over time.</p> <p>Proposed Action: Please provide a reference in the main EA document. to the location of the information noted below in the appendices Please provide a reference in the main EA document. to the location of the information noted below in the appendices A, Need to suggest how forest harvest activities can be mitigated or compensated. B, C Need to consider the cumulative effects in the Ozhiski and Pagwachuan Ranges of additional road developments. D, E Address how these cumulative effects can be mitigated or compensated (e.g., Propose an alternative Overall Net Benefit) for caribou: - Habitat loss - Linear barriers - Community Access Road and past, present and reasonably foreseeable</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>developments</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation) B. Recommended for EA D. Permitting Related, Not Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	179	<p>Comment:</p> <p>The EA/IS suggests that “The predicted cumulative residual effects on moose are of negligible to moderate magnitude, long-term duration, and reversible to irreversible.” This might be true in the Regional Study Area but not likely in the Local Study Area. This could also apply to caribou populations.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Address how this could have an effect surrounding communities.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>Potential cumulative effects and mitigation and enhancement measures for habitat loss and alteration, sensory disturbance, linear barriers, increased predator access, increase in public access, increase in collisions with vehicles and equipment, fugitive dust emissions, and changes to groundwater are described in Section 8.2 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document. The geographic extent of the cumulative effects assessment is described in Section 4.4.3.2.2. of Appendix M.</p> <p>The assessment of the Project on moose and caribou (Appendix M) focuses on evaluating the potential and residual ecological effects on the ungulate Valued Component. The significance determination of adverse residual effects on ungulate valued components was evaluated using the assessment</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1885

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>endpoints of self-sustaining and ecologically effective populations as significance thresholds.</p> <p>The assessment does not include the broader cultural and relational importance of moose and caribou for Indigenous communities. Effects to Indigenous cultural relationships with moose and caribou, cultural continuity and wellbeing, traditional harvest and traditional land and resource use are assessed separately in Appendix O Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests Technical Support Document.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	180	<p>Comment: The EA/IS suggests that “the cumulative residual effects from past, present and reasonably foreseeable activities (including the Community Access Road) and climate change on moose are considered not significant assuming the mitigation measures outlined in Section 9 are implemented.” This statement does not appear justified given preceding assessment of Project interactions. For example see table 9-27 for summary of residual effects for ungulates: - long-term irreversible effects of increased public access count down</p>	Section 10.3.5.4.2 (formerly Section 10.3.5.1) of the Final EA/IS has been updated and no longer contains the statement noted in the comment.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1886

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>rows from table 9-27 (rows 44, 64, 65) - sensory disturbance (rows 55, 56) - vehicle collisions (rows 66,68) Previous studies (Rempel et al. 1997, Racey et al. 2000, Bottan et al. 2001) show that increased road density and access leads to declining moose populations.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Statement needs to be justified with references. For the previous studies listed, please see the following citations: Rempel, R. S., Elkie, P. C., Rodgers, A. R., & Gluck, M. J. (1997). Timber-Management and Natural-Disturbance Effects on Moose Habitat: Landscape Evaluation. The Journal of Wildlife Management, 61(2), 517–524. Racey, G.D., and T. Armstrong, 2000. Woodland caribou range occupancy in northwestern Ontario: past and present. Rangifer, Special Issue No.12: 173-184. Bottan, B. J., L. M. Hunt, W. Haider, and A. R. Rodgers. 2001. Thunder Bay moose hunters: environmental characteristics and choice preferences. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Thunder Bay, Ontario. CNFER Technical Re-port TR-007.</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Type of Comment: B. Recommended for EA and/or D. Permitting Related, Not Required for EA</p>			
<p>Ministry of Natural Resources</p>	<p>181</p>	<p>Comment: What are “wildlife sweeps”?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Provide a definition of “wildlife sweeps” and elaborate on how and where they will be utilized.</p> <p>Type of Comment: B. Recommended for EA.</p>	<p>The following definition of wildlife sweeps is provided in Section 9.2 of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document: "Ground-based or aerial pre-clearing surveys (“wildlife sweeps”) will be completed within a biologically relevant distance of the Construction Disturbance Area and during time periods wherein vulnerable wildlife may be present (e.g. mammal dens during the denning period) to avoid disturbing habitats and/or harming or killing animals. Under the direction of the Environmental Monitor and Indigenous Environmental Monitor, prior to any clearing or grubbing, the wildlife sweeps will include activities such as surveying for sensitive wildlife habitats/features, including mammal dens, beaver lodges, amphibian breeding habitats (e.g. presence of egg masses) and reptile habitats (hibernating, nesting/gestational and overwintering areas), and bat maternity roost habitat (i.e. presence of snags and cavity trees that could support maternity roosting), and documenting the presence of large</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	<p>1887</p>

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>mammals."</p> <p>Details of the ground-based pre-clearing surveys (i.e., wildlife sweeps) will be described in the Environmental Protection Plan which will be developed by the Owner/Operator.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	182	<p>Comment: "non-intrusive pre-clearing nest surveys will occur within 3 to 7 days prior to clearing"</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Provide details on pre-clearing nest surveys or indicate where those details can be found.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	A high-level nest survey protocol has been added to Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document. A more detailed work instruction will be developed prior to clearing.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1888
Ministry of Natural Resources	183	<p>Comment: The EA/IS indicates monitoring of caribou locations commencing with construction activities to identify pre-defined spatial buffer areas. Who will undertake the collaring? In addition, a collaring program is also proposed for moose. How will observations be used and what is meant by "allow for identification of changes</p>	Details about monitoring programs during the construction and operations of the Project will be described in the Environmental Protection Plan which will be developed by the Owner/Operator of the Community Access Road prior to the Project authorization process to inform provincial and federal authorizations, as necessary. Final decisions related to Caribou monitoring will be determined	Comment noted; see response for details.	1889

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>related to areas where moose occur” in terms of operations? Will the two surveys (moose and caribou) be run out of the same program?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: The MNR requests more details on the proposed new collaring construction monitoring program for both moose and caribou. Please note MNR is responsible for Eastern Migratory Caribou.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	<p>through engagement with Indigenous communities and regulators as outlined in Section 9.2 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	184	<p>Comment: The EA/IS suggests that mitigation and enhancement measures will minimize or avoid the use of eskers during construction but almost half (5 of 11) natural esker landforms will be permanently disturbed within the Local Study Area and have a long-term irreversible effect. Eskers are important features for the development of spruce-lichen woodlands (Hare 1950, Hustich 1951, Ahti 1964, 1967, Kershaw and Rouse 1971, Bird et al. 1980) that support significant lichen growth for caribou and should be</p>	<p>The phrase “Eskers are important for lichen growth that support caribou.” has been included in Section 8.2.8.6.2 of the Final EA/IS.</p> <p>The use of eskers for aggregate resources will be minimized or avoided by using bedrock quarries or other sand and gravel resources whenever possible as outlined in Table 10-1 of Appendix N Physiography, Terrain and Soil.</p>	Final EA/IS Section 8.2.8.6.2	1890

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>considered critical habitat for caribou (in the same way aquatic feeding areas are avoided to benefit moose).</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: MNR recommends assessing whether eskers would qualify as significant wildlife habitat in the Project ecoregions. MNR requests the Project avoid the use of eskers.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation) And B. Recommended for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	185	<p>Comment: A) Does all ancillary infrastructure fall within the 100-metre-wide right-of-way? If not, the dimensions of any ancillary infrastructure extending outside of the ROW should have parameters provided for it, such as construction footprint. Their sizing should be added into the total Construction Development Area size. B) Please note that the Construction Development Area is improperly labelled as Construction Disturbance Area in the table. C) "The Regional Study Area was extended to include areas where the</p>	<p>A. All temporary and permanent infrastructure will be located within the Construction Disturbance Area as outlined in Section 6.5.2 of the Final EA/IS.</p> <p>B. The Final EA/IS has been updated to utilize the term Construction Disturbance Area throughout.</p> <p>C. Three tertiary watersheds (i.e., 4GD Upper Albany – Makokibatan, 4GE Lower Ogoki, and 4GF Upper Albany – Muswabik) are intersected by the centre line of the Preferred Route. Portions of</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1891

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Local Study Area falls outside of these tertiary watersheds.” Can this be quantified?</p> <p>D) Absence of the peatlands section at the time of draft EA/IS review is concerning and makes it challenging for MNR to provide feedback prior to the final. Will the row referring to peatlands be updated with more detail for the final? Why is the Project Study Area not also referenced in the table?</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution:</p> <p>A) Elaborate on the footprint of all ancillary infrastructure that will extend beyond the 100m ROW. MNR expects all temporary and permanent infrastructure to be provided at the time of the EA/IS, otherwise there will implications for permitting.</p> <p>B) Please ensure the proper terminology for the Construction Development Area is used throughout the document, rather than Construction Disturbance Area.</p> <p>C) Quantify what area falls outside the tertiary watersheds, including area and percent amounts.</p> <p>D) MNR requests more detail be provided for the peatland components during the final EA/IS. Similarly, provide detail for Figure 8-3 (Page 107) and any other incomplete peatland sections.</p>	<p>the Local Study Area fall outside the three tertiary watersheds and the Regional Study Area includes areas where the LSA falls outside these three tertiary watersheds. See Table 8-2 and Figure 8-1 of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document for details.</p> <p>D. Details on the peatland assessment are provided in Appendix I Peatlands Technical Support Document.</p> <p>E. The Project Study Area was not used for the assessment. The Project Construction Disturbance Area and Local Study Areas were used for the assessment and are described in Section 6.5.2 of the Final EA/IS.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Please provide details as to the purpose of the Project Study Area. If it is to be used for the construction flexibility for shifting the Construction Development Area, then similar level of assessment and reported detail as the Local Study Area should be provided throughout the EA/IS.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation) And B. Recommended for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	186	<p>Comment: Can the Regional Study Area (RSA) be added? Or if the scale makes it hard to see the Local Study Area, then providing the RSA in another figure would be very beneficial.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: Please provide a mapped product of the Regional Study Area for aquatics.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	The Regional Study Area has been added to Figure 8-1 of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1892
Ministry of Natural	187	<p>Comment: A) It includes three smaller watersheds:</p>	The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to	Comment noted; see	1893

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Resources		<p>[...] What type? Are they tertiary? How are they oriented in relation to each other? B) Each smaller watershed lists the number of watercourses, lakes or ponds and undefined waterbodies that is crossed by the Community Access Road. What is an undefined waterbody? How are they being actioned? Are they vernal pools that might support amphibians? C) Table 7-1 (Page 77) states that there are 47 bridges and 21 culverts to be installed for a total of 68 crossings. In contrast, the Community Access Road is stated to cross 85 watercourses over the three small watersheds in this section (46 in 4GD, 36 in 4GE and 3 in 4GF). The number of watercourse crossings does not line up between the two. Why are installations not proposed for the other 17 watercourse crossings? Similarly, water crossing numbers in Section 8.1.4.2 do not align with previous bridge and culvert installation numbers.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: A) Please provide the watershed classification and a map to illustrate how the watersheds are oriented around the Project. B) Define undefined waterbody and elaborate on how they will be actioned</p>	<p>make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth.</p> <p>A. Details on the watershed classification are provided in detail in Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document.</p> <p>B. A description of undefined waterbodies and how they will be addressed is provided in Appendix F.</p> <p>C. Discussions on the water crossings are provided in Appendix F.</p>	response for details.	

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>and addressed throughout the Project. Discuss any wildlife or fisheries values they may support in the applicable subsequent sections.</p> <p>C) Please explain why seventeen water crossings are not addressed by the currently proposed water crossing installations.</p> <p>Type of Comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	188	<p>Hydrological features—including small streams, springs, and groundwater discharge areas are important for fish and wildlife habitats. Intermittent streams support diverse aquatic and semi-aquatic life. Woodland pools, though typically fishless due to isolation and seasonal water, offer unique habitats for many vertebrates and invertebrates. Seventy-three undefined water features were identified as being without defined beds or banks via imagery and aerial flights. The Project chose not to consider them as waterbodies and excluded them from the crossing list. Aerial surveys of water crossings should not replace normal field reconnaissance, although very helpful for planning.</p>	<p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth.</p> <p>A. As described in Section 4.3.1.2 of Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document, a desktop review of existing information sources and previous studies was completed to inform and augment the baseline information gathered from the field investigations to characterize the aquatic environment, including water crossing types.</p> <p>B. All water crossings will be field verified</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1914

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Permitting may still be required for these water features depending on ground verification of aerial findings and site visits when flow levels are high, rather than seasonally low.</p> <p>The aerial survey dates were September 5th or 6th. The dry season in the Far North is generally in the summer months from June to early September.</p> <p>Looking at the pictures and imagery provided in Appendix G – Attachment D, the ground is hard to see in some photos due to canopy closure. Other features appear to be associated with wetland complexes that may be inundated seasonally.</p> <p>Please provide the water crossing type for the seventy-three water crossings identified. Were any sites ground verified?</p> <p>Contingency planning is requested along with field verification in advance of crossing the feature during construction. Efforts need to be made to avoid crossing recognizable ephemeral streams, springs, seeps, and other areas of groundwater discharge. Where a crossing is necessary, mitigation should be applied, which may require installation of a crossing structure.</p> <p>Use of construction and maintenance</p>	<p>to inform submissions during the permitting phase.</p> <p>C. Considerations have been made to avoid crossing recognizable ephemeral streams, springs, seeps, and other areas of groundwater discharge. Crossing structures will be determined during detail design.</p> <p>D. Mitigation measures are provided in Tables 7-6 and 10-1 of Appendix G.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>techniques and practices to minimize impacts to hydrologic flow and wetland function are necessary. Natural water movements should not be impeded, accelerated, or diverted. Timing windows should be considered for these areas as well.</p> <p>A - Required for EA D - Permitting Related, Not Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	189	<p>Figure 8-4 This figure should be captioned Figure 8-4a at the top. Are road upgrades planned for the road access outside or between aquatic local study areas to access the bedrock site or the road corridor? Will any of the water crossing installations associated with these roads need to be upgraded? In addition, there is no road shown connecting this existing road to the other forestry roads in the southwest corner of the map. Are additional road, crossings or upgrades needed here as well? Road mapping appears to be incomplete. Figure 8-4b through Figure 8-4e Why are crossings not identified on the access roads to potential aggregate sites? An unmarked stream / river crossing is visible on each figure.</p>	<p>Figures from Section 8 of the Final EA/IS have been updated based on feedback received.</p> <p>The aggregate pits identified on Figure 8.1-4 (formerly Figure 8-4) are intended to be potential sources and are not yet confirmed. Aggregate pit details continue to be subject to preliminary investigative activities and geotechnical reporting. The aggregate pits and quarries to be used for the Community Access Road and associated water crossings required to access pits and quarries will be determined during detail design. All water crossings will be assessed as required for permit submissions.</p> <p>No updated to the Regional Study Area have been made for the Final EA/IS. The</p>	Final EA/IS Section 8 Figures	1915

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Were crossing structures on ancillary roads considered in the water crossing assessment? Figure 8-4e</p> <p>How is the Regional Study Area being expanded to incorporate the two identified potential aggregate sites? What buffer is being applied? Figure 8-4f</p> <p>Why are no defined water crossings indicated at the visible stream crossings shown on the water layer? There are two on alternative 4 in the SW corner of the map, one on the alternative 1 / 4 route between water crossing 10 & 19, and one between the two marked potential sand and gravel areas on the right of the map.</p> <p>Please correct Figure 8-4a title. Please ensure all existing roads are mapped. If existing roads are planned to be upgraded through this project, MNR requests these activities be assessed and discussed within the EA/IS. Explain why there are visible watercourses on the map along the alternative corridors, ancillary roads and between proposed aggregate sites without water crossings assigned. MNR requests all defined and undefined crossings be represented on the map,</p>	<p>two potential aggregate sites identified in Figure 8.1-4e (formerly Figure 8-4e) were considered as part of the assessment within the Local Study Area.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>including demarking crossings planned for installation. Address whether ancillary infrastructure was assessed for water crossing installation potential, including access to potential aggregate sites. If not, ensure all temporary and permanent ancillary infrastructure is identified and addressed within the EA/IS including any potential water crossing installations. Explain how the Regional Study Area is being expanded to incorporate the two identified potential aggregate sites in Figure 8-4e.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	190	<p>The desktop review included a review of aerial imagery and Light Detection and Ranging (where available) to develop the waterbody crossing list.[...] Is there a contingency plan for addressing situations where on the ground findings differ from aerial / desktop preparations? Are there plans for ground-truthing each crossing in advance of construction to confirm aerial information and collect additional ground information to inform permitting?</p> <p>MNR will require field verification of all</p>	<p>Field verification of all water crossings will be completed to inform submissions during the permitting phase.</p> <p>Information related to field verification of water crossings completed as part of the EA/IS is provided in Attachment B of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1916

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>crossings for permitting purposes. A contingency plan should be developed to outline the procedure for when field findings do not align with aerial / desktop planning.</p> <p>Please provide the number and percentage of water crossings ground surveyed. Describe how water crossings were selected for field verification.</p> <p>D - Permitting Related, Not Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	191	<p>Based on a review of publicly available hydropower (MNR, 2001), Ontario Power Generation (2019) reports, and Water Survey of Canada Hydrometric datasets (Environment Canada, 2022), there are no known hydropower generating stations or active dams in the Local and Regional Study Areas.</p> <p>Ontario and First Nations are looking to establish new clean electricity supply options: Ontario working in partnership with northern First Nations to end reliance on diesel fuel</p> <p>The Independent Electricity Systems Operator (IESO) Northern Ontario Connection Study is developing “options to connect remote First Nations communities to the grid that currently rely</p>	<p>The Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement and the Technical Support Documents were prepared to meet the requirements outlined in the Terms of Reference, the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines and the technical discipline-specific study plans. Inclusion of projects in the cumulative effects assessment (CEA) that do not meet the criteria of reasonably foreseeable is not a regulatory requirement and as such was not developed as part of the Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement. For a project to be considered reasonably foreseeable, sufficient information about the activity must have been available to make a reasonable assessment of its potential effects (i.e., in the planning / approvals /</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1917

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>on diesel generators for electricity, improve reliability for First Nation communities that are already grid-connected, support critical minerals mining development in the region, and enable the development of new hydro and renewable resources”.</p> <p>MNR and Geospatial Ontario have a layer for Waterpower Potential Sites. There are sites in Northern Ontario with strong potential, such as the Little Jackfish site. Several hydropower locations are within protected areas for which waterpower generation is not permitted under the Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves Act. MNR recommends considering Waterpower Potential Sites outside of protected areas for the EA/IS as a component of their assessment.</p> <p>B - Recommended for EA</p>	<p>design phase).</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	192	<p>Table 8-5 lists the number of watercourses crossed by the right-of-way.</p> <p>4GD – Upper Albany – Makokibatan = 54 4GE – Lower Ogoki = 46 4GF – Upper Albany – Muswabik = 4 This equals a total of 104 watercourses. This number differs from the number of water courses listed earlier in this section</p>	<p>Tables 5-1 and 5-2 of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document have been updated to clarify 85 watercourse crossings. Note that Table 5-2 presents number of watercourse crossings only while Table 5-1 presents number of all waterbody crossings.</p>	Appendix F Tables 5-1 and 5-2	1910

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>(i.e., 68 water crossing installations (page 77), 85 watercourses / 91 water features with 6 lakes included (page 109)).</p> <p>Please explain the difference between the different number reports on water crossings throughout the EA/IS.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	193	<p>There are some colour contrast issues between some of the markers, lines and polygons. It is hard to distinguish between them on the map with the colours being so similar.</p> <p>Please adjust the colour contrast to make it easier to distinguish between: Provincial parks / Alternative routes / 50 person camps First Nation communities / sand and gravel / WSC Aggregate Site Access / 200 person camps Reducing the size of the outline on the polygons would help as well.</p> <p>B - Recommended for EA C - Editorial</p>	Figures in Section 8 of the Final EA/IS have been updated based on editorial comments.	Final EA/IS Section 8	1911
Ministry of	194	Many feasibility studies completed by	For an activity to be considered	Comment	1912

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Natural Resources		<p>First Nation communities for winter road realignment projects may exist. Most communities are considering such plans because of the impact of climate change and are at varying stages of planning and approvals.</p> <p>The development of new linear disturbances, especially of an all-season road nature, on the landscape will strongly contribute to cumulative effects.</p> <p>In the cumulative effects assessment, please consider the contribution of winter road realignments and all-season road developments as future foreseeable disturbances.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>foreseeable and included in the cumulative effects assessment (CEA), sufficient information about the activity must have been available to make a reasonable assessment of its potential effects (i.e., in the planning / approvals / design stage). This included development that is certain or reasonably foreseeable and activities with additive effects, where appropriate (Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, 2018). Reasonably foreseeable activities that were not considered are those that have no publicly disclosed development plan or other information regarding the location and type of project/activity. For a potential future project to be considered in the CEA, preliminary information such as the location and type of activity, extent of the footprint, project components, and anticipated timelines are needed to evaluate if effects from the Project and the potential future project will overlap.</p> <p>The project inclusion list is provided in Table 10-1 of the Final EA/IS and includes the Winter Access Road Realignment Project which includes 3,200 km of winter access roads in Northern Ontario.</p>	noted; see response for details.	
Ministry of	195	Project is located within the transition	Section 5 of Appendix K Wildlife	Comment	1913

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Natural Resources		<p>zone between ecoregions and ecozones, straddling Ecodistricts 2W-2, 2W-3, 2E-1 and to a lesser extent 2E-4.</p> <p>The transition zone between ecoregion 2W and ecoregion 2E in Ontario is important for biodiversity because it serves as a convergence zone for species and ecosystems. These zones often exhibit higher biodiversity than adjacent regions, especially when they include a variety of microhabitats. A dynamic environment is created in these areas by having these different ecosystems and ecological processes come together. These hotspots for biodiversity can support critical species adaptation to climate change. These areas can also be sensitive to human disturbance.</p> <p>For example, there is a general lack of detail and attention to the transition zone between the boreal shield and lowlands and how that may impact habitat requirements and availability through modelling.</p> <p>Discuss the biodiversity and environmental significance of this transition zone to the Far North of Ontario. Discuss whether this transition zone between Ecoregion 2W and 2E has particular importance for species in the</p>	<p>Technical Support Document has been updated to provide additional details on the ecological importance of this ecoregional transition.</p>	<p>noted; see response for details.</p>	

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>area and any previous examples of its sensitivity or tolerance to human activities. References are encouraged. Please also include additional details on how the current existing condition and potential impacts to the species and habitats found within these two landscapes may differ in magnitude.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	196	<p>Organic Samples: Four out of 13 were potentially acid generating, while the rest were not. Does this have implications for excavating organics from the right-of-way, remediation and rehabilitation use?</p> <p>Please specify the impact of 30% of organic sampling sites potentially being acid generating and the implications for the Project.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>As outlined in Section 5.5, of the potentially acid generating samples, only two samples of organic material samples were from locations within the Construction Disturbance Area. Both of these samples were further assessed to have no geochemical acid potential based on the analyzed sulphur contents.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1918
Ministry of Natural Resources	197	<p>At the time of writing the Draft EA/IS, the peatland existing conditions information was not available to summarize. This full Peatlands Technical Document can be found in Appendix I. A summary will be provided in the Final EA/IS. Absence of a summary of the peatland</p>	<p>Details on the peatland assessment are provided in Appendix I Peatlands Technical Support Document and were used to inform other discipline assessments, as required.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1919

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>section raises concerns for its incorporation into other technical reviews (e.g., vegetation).</p> <p>Please clarify if the peatlands report findings were available to be considered and incorporated into other technical reviews.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	198	<p>Bird Habitat / Waterfowl and Waterbirds / Other Bird Species Were any rookery or nest locations shared? Caribou Habitat Was effort made to map the caribou migration routes mentioned by Weenusk First Nation?</p> <p>Please elaborate on whether inquires were made with regards to nesting grounds or sites, and mapping of caribou migration routes along the Community Access Road.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	As outlined in Table 3-1 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document, information provided by Weenusk First Nation related to Caribou migration routes was used to inform the existing conditions component of the assessment.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1920
Ministry of Natural Resources	199	<p>Vegetation Why is measures of change for vegetation not being considered at the Regional Study Area level as well?</p>	Vegetation: Measures of change for vegetation were not considered for the Regional Study Area (RSA) as the RSA was used for the cumulative effects	Comment noted; see response for details.	1921

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Vegetation Upland Ecosystems Why is indicator of ecosystem health not considered under rationale for selection? Vegetation – Designated Areas What classifies as an Environmentally Significant Area or significant woodland in this EA/IS? What is the scope of the critical landform / vegetation associations? Is this a reference to Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves only, or does it also refer to assessing representation for the entire study area using the available landform / vegetation association data at an ecodistrict level? Why is function and composition not an indicator? Why is ecosystem support not considered under rationale? Why is changes to function and composition not a measure of change, especially for species at risk? Wildlife – Bats Non-species at risk bats are considered as part of the valued component. How are the habitat and behavioural differences for Big Brown Bats being considered with only Little Brown Myotis and Northern Myotis being identified? Wildlife – Birds What is the rationale for considering osprey and boreal owl as the species</p>	<p>assessment and not for evaluating Project-related effects as outlined in Sections 4.2.3, 7.1, 7.3 and 8.1.1 of Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Vegetation Upland Ecosystems: Consideration for ecosystem health was included, however, not under the term "ecosystem health". Rationale for selection of upland ecosystems is outlined in Section 4.2.2 of Appendix J and included ecosystem support (e.g., habitat for flora/fauna, hydrological functions, nutrient cycling, carbon storage), cultural/economic/social value, and habitat for Traditional Use plants and Species at Risk.</p> <p>Vegetation – Designated Areas: Environmentally significant areas and significant woodlands are defined by the Province, and are not present within the Project study areas.</p> <p>Critical Landform / Vegetation Association (CLVA): The scope of CLVA is eco-district wide and is not limited to protected areas as defined in Section 5.6 of Appendix J.</p> <p>Function and Composition as an</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>best suited for representing the raptor category? There is concern on whether they are best fit to represent all raptors. Physiography, Soils and Terrain Why is changes in distribution and abundance not being considered under measures of change? This may be significant when assessing the impact of the Project on features such as eskers.</p> <p>Please provide a response for each of the questions identified.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>Indicator: Function and composition are indicators for all ecosystem-level Valued Components, including Designated Areas and upland, wetland, and riparian ecosystems as outlined in Section 4.2.2 of Appendix J.</p> <p>Ecosystem Support: Ecosystem support was considered and expressed through rationale. While Table 4-2 does not literally use the term “ecosystem support”, the definition of Designated Areas inherently includes ecosystem support functions (e.g., biodiversity representation, habitat protection) as described in Sections 4.2.2 and 5.6 of Appendix J.</p> <p>Changes to Function and Composition: Changes to function and composition were evaluated qualitatively as part of the residual effects. Limitations to quantitative assessment of changes to function and composition are outlined in Section 4.3.6 and 4.2.2 of Appendix J.</p> <p>Wildlife – Bats: Non-Species At Risk bats (i.e., big brown bat) are not considered valued components. Little brown myotis and northern myotis were selected as the representative species of the bat valued component. All bat species including big</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			<p>brown bat were included in the existing conditions surveys as reported in Attachment B of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document. The existing conditions assessment of hibernation habitat for little brown myotis and northern myotis adequately applies to big brown bat hibernation habitat (i.e., no hibernacula are present in the wildlife Regional Study Area). The maternity roost habitat for big brown bat is likewise covered by the assessment of effect on little brown myotis and northern myotis.</p> <p>Wildlife – Birds: Bird Valued Components were determined in consultation with the Canadian Wildlife Service as species to represent specific habitat.</p> <p>Physiography, Soils and Terrain: A measurement of the change in quantity (abundance) and distribution of both terrain and soil is included in Appendix N Physiography, Terrain and Soils. Eskers are included under "topography" or "terrain unit" and include an assessment of quantity and distribution of eskers.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	200	<p>What is the project footprint? Is the right-of-way located based on the road centreline? Does the Construction Development</p>	<p>The Project footprint is described in Section 6 and 7 of the Final EA/IS, and includes a list of feature the road right-of-way is based on such as all-season</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1922

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Area include all ancillary infrastructure? For the Local Study Areas that specify “preferred route”, is the aggregate anticipated to be sourced outside of this area? If so, how is this additional footprint being considered? For the Vegetation and Physiography, Terrain and Soils Local Study Areas, what is the rationale for a 500-metre buffer on infrastructure areas falling outside of the original Local Study Area rather than a buffer equivalent to the Local Study Area? Vegetation and wildlife have the same 11-kilometre buffer on either side of the centreline, yet their area size is different. What is the reasoning for this difference in area? Why is project footprint included in the vegetation local study area, and vegetation and wildlife regional study areas, but not in any other local or regional study area? Why does the existing conditions study area and effects assessment study area not match in the local and regional study areas for birds? Does the effects assessment study area include all ancillary infrastructure? For ungulates, what is the local study area buffer placed on? Does the local study area include the Construction</p>	<p>gravel road, bridges, culverts, aggregate and borrow sources, temporary access roads, potential construction camps, temporary work areas, road maintenance facilities, rest stops and pull out areas.</p> <p>The Construction Disturbance Area includes all activities expected to take place during the construction phase for the Community Access Road as described in Section 6.5.2 of the Final EA/IS.</p> <p>Potential aggregate sources are includes in the Construction Disturbance Area as outlined in Section 6.5.2 of the Final EA/IS.</p> <p>Rationale for the Project study areas is provided in Section 6 of the Final EA/IS.</p> <p>Rationale for discipline specific study areas is provided in the Technical Support Documents.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Development Area? If not, then why is a different approach being taken than with the other local study areas?</p> <p>For ungulates, the regional study area intersects four caribou ranges. The term intersects creates confusion. Does this mean the regional study area consists of the four ranges or portions of them? Is there a buffer from the centreline involved?</p> <p>Define project footprint and its purpose. Clarify what feature the road right-of-way is based on.</p> <p>The Construction Development Area should include all area associated with ancillary infrastructure that falls outside of the road right-of-way.</p> <p>Elaborate on whether aggregate will be sources from outside the preferred route area. If it is, define how this additional footprint area is being considered.</p> <p>Provide the rationale for a 500-metre buffer on ancillary infrastructure falling outside of the Local Study Area rather than having an equivalent buffer to the Study Area being applied.</p> <p>Explain why there is a difference in area sizing for equivalent regional study area buffers.</p> <p>Provide rationale for inclusion of project footprint in one local and two regional</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>study areas, but not across all local and regional study areas. Provide rationale for the division of the local and regional study areas into existing conditions study areas and effects assessment study areas. Provide justification for the why the effects assessment is only considering the preferred route rather than all alternatives. Specify if the effects assessment includes all ancillary infrastructure areas. Specify what the local study area is buffering and whether it includes the Construction Development Area. If not, provide rationale for a different approach being taken compared to other local study areas. Clarify whether the regional study area consists of the four caribou ranges or is based on a different measurement.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	201	<p>Figure 8-7 Vegetation What about access to the bedrock on the south end of the Project? Will access only be via winter road during the narrow time frame it is open? Figure 8-7 Vegetation and Figure 8-8 Wildlife Why are the local and regional study</p>	<p>Figures within Section 8 of the Final EA/IS have been updated.</p> <p>Aggregate extraction is planned to be carried out along the pits and quarries identified along the Preferred Route as shown on Figure ES 4-1 of the Final EA/IS.</p>	Final EA/IS Section 8	1923

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>areas different when their definitions are the same? Why are the scales different?</p> <p>Figure 8-10 Birds Map is missing legend items for comparison (e.g., camps, routes, access roads, aggregate sites)</p> <p>Figure 8-11 Ungulates Scale is hard to see and compare with all three areas on one map. Why does the Construction Development Area not appear to include road alternatives too?</p> <p>Figure 8-12 Physiography, Terrain and Soils Shouldn't Construction Development Area include the road alternatives themselves? Recommend maintaining the previous symbology rather than switching to a new symbology within the same map series. A) Is aggregate extraction planned to be carried out from both alternative route sources or solely along the preferred route?</p> <p>Figure 8-7 Vegetation Clarify how the bedrock to the south end of the Project will be accessed. If year-round access is needed, access to be assessed and shown on the map.</p> <p>Figure 8-7 Vegetation and Figure 8-8 Wildlife</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Explain why the local and regional study areas different when their definitions are the same. Request the maps be provided at the same scale for easier comparison.</p> <p>Figure 8-10 Birds Ensure missing legend items are included (e.g., camps, routes, access roads, aggregate sites).</p> <p>Figure 8-11 Ungulates Please provide two maps. One for the Local Study Area and one for the two different Regional Study Areas. Please include the missing legend items in the Local Study Area map for comparison with the boundary.</p> <p>MNR recommend removing the existing legend symbology and maintaining the previous legend style instead.</p> <p>Figure 8-12 Physiography, Terrain and Soils MNR recommends removing the existing legend symbology and using the previous legend style instead, rather than switching to a new symbology within the same map series.</p> <p>A) Confirm whether aggregate extraction is planned for both identified potential alternative route aggregate sources or solely restricted to the preferred route.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Natural Resources	202	<p>Do riparian areas consider watercourses as well? Eskers are rare on this landscape. Why were they not considered as a separate subset like riparian areas? What constitutes “accessible” for traditional plant harvest? If areas are not deemed “accessible”, are they still valued or removed from consideration? Can “accessible” change with time, pressure, or climate change? (Appendix J). Can a high-level summary table of all vegetation ecosystem types be included? Can a list of the ecosites that make up each of the three main ecosystem types be provided?</p> <p>Clarify if riparian areas include vegetation areas within 30 metres of waterbodies AND watercourses. MNR requests eskers be considered a subset of the vegetation assessment like the riparian areas, given the unique habitats it can support in this landscape. Define “accessible” and its parameters, including how it might change over time and with pressure or climate change. Elaborate on what happens with traditional plant harvest habitat areas not deemed accessible and how they are treated within effects assessment. Provide a list of ecosites that were</p>	<p>As defined in Section 2.2.2 of Attachment B of Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document, riparian communities were identified by buffering all watercourses and waterbodies by 30 m.</p> <p>Eskers are considered as part of the terrain and soil assessment in Appendix N Physiography, Terrain and Soils Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Determination of accessibility of traditional use plants is provided in Section 4.3.3 of Appendix J.</p> <p>A description of components of each ecosystem type is provided in Section 3 of Attachment B of Appendix J.</p> <p>Table 5-4 of Appendix J provides a summary of ecosystem type within the vegetation study areas.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1924

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>classed into each of the three ecosystem types. While small summary tables are provided individually for each ecosystem type, MNR recommends including one larger table that provides all the detail in one location for easier cross reference.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	203	<p>Duplication of information noted and editorial suggestion regarding ecoregion and ecodistrict information.</p> <p>Please note the second paragraph is a duplication of the information provided in the first. A table summary of the ecoregion / ecodistrict features would improve readability and allow for easier reference.</p> <p>B - Recommended for EA C - Editorial</p>	<p>Section 8.2.4.1 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to remove the duplication.</p> <p>Ecoregions are outlined on Figure 5-1 of Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document.</p>	Final EA/IS Section 8.2.4.1	1925
Ministry of Natural Resources	204	<p>Is the local study area and regional study area illustrated on the map a representation for vegetation?</p> <p>Specify the local study area and regional study area being represented in the map on the legend.</p>	<p>Figures within Section 8 of the Final EA/IS have been updated. The vegetation Local Study Area and Regional Study Area are provided on Figure 4-1 of Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document, and Figure 3-1 of Attachment B of Appendix J.</p>	Final EA/IS Section 8	1926

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		A - Required for EA			
Ministry of Natural Resources	205	<p>Construction Development Area data is often missing from tables that compare Local Study Area and Regional Study Areas hectares and percentages (e.g., ecosystem / habitat availability, habitat suitability).</p> <p>Any tables that provide a comparison of hectare and percentage data should always ensure all three areas are presented, including Construction Development Area, Local Study Area and Regional Study Area. For example, Table 8-16 to 8-18, 8-24 to 8-27, 8-39 & 8-42.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	Tables throughout Section 8.2 of the Final EA/IS have been updated to include comparison to the Construction Disturbance Area.	Final EA/IS Section 8.2	1927
Ministry of Natural Resources	206	<p>What ecosites make up each ecosystem type? Human-Altered lands are not defined. What falls into this category? Can it be all ecosystem types or just upland? Similarly, what falls in the “other” category? Is it also all ecosystem types or specific to upland sites? What kind of underlying landform features are present? What are the percentages? Can the landform / vegetation associations be used here to</p>	Information on ecosites is provided in Sections 4, 5 and 7 of Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1928

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>better assess representation within the study areas? Is it possible to get ecosite mapping as well? How is the Regional Study Area assessed? Are the same groupings used for the regional study area as the local study area? What about the Construction Development Area?</p> <p>Specify the ecosite codes used to define each ecosystem type in the vegetation ecosystem groupings. Define what “human-altered” and “other” lands. Provide rationale for why landform / vegetation associations (LVs) and their representation are not being considered in this section. As this data exists for the ecodistricts overlapping the Project, MNR would like to see LVs considered and incorporated into the vegetation analysis. Please include a summary of the hectares and percentages for each ecosite at the Construction Development Area, and Local and Regional Study Areas. MNR highly encourages using ecosite resolution, as the product would make supporting the wildlife habitat assessment components easier. Clarify if the construction development</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>area, local study area and regional study area all have the same vegetation groupings (with the same ecosite types) for each ecosystem.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	207	<p>Figure 8-14 Series Map doesn't show the full extent of the Local Study Area between the different maps.</p> <p>A white background or hillshade would be less busy than having imagery outside of the study areas.</p> <p>Having the inset map more zoomed in would make it easier to see the red box location on the road corridor.</p> <p>From the hatch pattern of the parks, it is hard to determine what the underlying vegetation types are.</p> <p>There are number of layers in the legend that do not show up in the maps. Some of the map series do not have consistency in their legends which creates confusion.</p> <p>Do winter roads / roads qualify as "human-altered" or "other"? If they do, can the legend reflect this categorization?</p> <p>Are sand / gravel / bedrock sites all upland ecosystems? Unable to tell the underlying vegetation classification with</p>	<p>Figures in Section 8 of the Final EA/IS have been updated based on comments provided.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1929

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>the potential overlaid on top. For watercourses and waterbodies, do they not all classify as water in the ecosystem categorization? Can they all be one colour? Are there sizing criteria? There appears to be as some water is classed as the ecosystem water colour and other larger lakes are still defined as the waterbody or watercourse colours. Does this differentiation affect the impact assessment? Contrast is hard to distinguish between: Forest types, Provincial Parks and swamp Marsh, water and waterbodies upland and wetland ecosystem types bedrock and sand / gravel riparian ecosystems, aggregate site access roads and 200 person camps 50 person camps, upland ecosystems, provincial parks and alternative corridors local study area and regional study area construction camp access and water Rock / barren and sand / gravel Figure 8-15 Why is a similar mapping product not provided for upland ecosites? Figure 8-14a Title is missing the “a” What about access to the southern bedrock potential site? Is access only via</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>winter road with its associated timing restrictions? Are not upgrades or water crossings needed?</p> <p>Figure 8-14 and 8-15 Series Visibility of features Ensure the full Local Study Area is visible in the map series. Use a white background or hillshade instead of imagery to reduce visual clutter. Improve colour contrast to make it easier to distinguish between layers. Simplifying Water Layers Define the scope of the water ecosystem. If all large waterbodies and watercourses are included, use a single symbology rather than multiple types. Underlying Vegetation Visibility Modify solid or hatched polygons to reveal underlying vegetation classification. Legend Consistency and Clarity If a layer isn't shown, consider removing it from the legend and maintain a consistent legend throughout the map series. If sand, gravel and bedrock each fall within a single grouping, please provide a label on the legend. Clarify whether winter roads and roads are "human-altered"; if so, note this in the</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>legend. If aggregate sites are all upland ecosystems, consider indicating this in the legend instead of altering symbology.</p> <p>Adjust the inset map scale for better readability. Please provide the Regional Study Area vegetation mapping. Provide a map illustrating the upland ecosites for comparison Figure 8-14a Add missing “a” to the caption title. Address what the access will be to the southern bedrock potential site throughout the EA/IS.</p> <p>.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	208	<p>What stocking was applied to sparse treed? What is considered early successional? Why are eskers not broken out at all or incorporated here?</p> <p>Define what constitutes an upland ecosystem and each of the vegetation community groupings within, including listing the ecosites used to describe each. Include the definition used for sparse treed (e.g., stocking or canopy</p>	<p>Upland ecosystems are defined as ecological units underlain by mineral soils, with uniform geology, soils, topography, and hydrology, supporting upland vegetation communities (i.e., coniferous forest, deciduous forest, mixed forest, rock / barren, early successional / sparse treed) as described in Section 5 of Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Sparse treed are defined as low canopy</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1930

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>closure) and early successional (e.g., disturbance type). MNR requests that esker features be incorporated into the vegetation ecosystem categorization.</p> <p>A - Required for EA B - Recommended for EA</p>	<p>closure, typically <30%, and in some ecosites <10%, with widely spaced trees and low structural complexity as described in Section 5 of Appendix J.</p> <p>Early Successional are defined as vegetation communities that have arisen following recent disturbance (e.g., fire, blowdown, harvest, or anthropogenic site disturbance), typically displaying low canopy closure, dominance of pioneer species, and reduced woody cover as described in Section 5 of Appendix J.</p> <p>As eskers are surficial geology features, eskers have been completed as part of the terrain assessment in Appendix N Physiography, Terrain and Soils Technical Support Document.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	209	<p>Wetland ecosystems and vegetation community groupings within.</p> <p>Define what constitutes a wetland ecosystem and each of the vegetation community groupings within, including listing the ecosites used to describe each.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>Definitions of wetland ecosystems and each vegetation community are provided in Sections 4, 5 and 7 of Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1931
Ministry of	210	General Table Comment	Function performance is outlined in	Final EA/IS	1932

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Natural Resources		<p>Recommend removing the bullets in the table when there is only one bullet in each cell.</p> <p>How are the different function “performances” defined?</p> <p>What about social / cultural value (e.g., aesthetics, traditional harvest, education, research, spiritual or ceremonial, cultural heritage, etc.)?</p> <p>What about recreational value (e.g., angling, hunting, fuelwood, boating, bait, nature appreciation, ecosystem study, wildlife, cranberries, wood products, trapping, etc.)?</p> <p>Function Category / Hydrological (2nd row)</p> <p>The first hydrological seems to be an editorial mistake and should specify hydrogeological.</p> <p>Function / Hydrological (1st row)</p> <p>Should flow augmentation and flood attenuation also be added? What about as a physical barrier?</p> <p>Description / Hydrological (3rd row)</p> <p>Emergent plants and shrubs are listed but there are different types of wetlands. Should this consider non-forested and forested wetland vegetation?</p> <p>Function Category / Biogeochemical / Climate (4th row)</p> <p>Is this being looked at both the ground and surface water levels?</p>	<p>Section 5.4.3 of Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Consideration for social, cultural and recreational functions of wetlands were made based on information shared by interested persons and Indigenous Peoples, including Indigenous Knowledge as outlined in Section 3 of Appendix J.</p> <p>The comments for Table 8-19 have been reviewed and incorporates, as appropriate and as time allowed.</p>	Table 8-19	

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Function / Biogeochemical / Climate (4th row) Additional terms potentially worth considering – transformation, sediment trapping, immobilization, erosion control, nutrient cycling. Description – Habitat (7th & 8th row) Habitat can be terrestrial and aquatic – so why is there not a fish row? What about connectivity? Habitat can be seasonally importance staging or migration areas. Bog Function Performance – Habitat (7th row) What about caribou observations (page 202 Section 8.2.5)?</p> <p>Define function performance for each level. Add in considerations for social, cultural and recreations functions of wetlands. Please consider the provided comments for each specific row for consideration, inclusion or in some cases revision.</p> <p>A - Required for EA B - Recommended for EA C - Editorial</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	211	This makes up about 4.4 percent of the Local Study Area and 4 percent of the Regional Study Area.	The Construction Disturbance Area has not been added to Table 8.2-8 (formerly Table 8-20). Areas for the Regional Study	Comment noted; see response for	1933

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Only the Local Study Area hectares and percentages are shown. Is it possible to include the Regional Study Area results in the same table as well? What about the “other” grouping? Should the human-altered grouping be a subset of upland if that is its only wetland ecosystem type? Does area (hectare) represent the volume of area within a riparian zone or the area of the vegetation community grouping within the Local Study Area?</p> <p>Please include the Construction Development Area and Regional Study Area results within the same table. Consider making human-altered a grouping under wetland versus a separate ecosystem type if the category is only capturing upland areas. Please add a bit more detail to the headings to make the contents of the columns clearer. If this is strictly the area of the riparian zone in these groupings, it would be beneficial to show the total hectares (of the entire study area) for each of those groupings as well.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>Area are presented on Table 8.2-9.</p> <p>Human-altered disturbances generally occur on upland ecosystems, however, as they are not a vegetation community, human-altered disturbances are presented separately in Tables 8.2-8 and 8.2-9.</p> <p>No changes have been made to the headings in Tables 8.2-8 and 8.2-9 (formerly Tables 8-20 and 8-21).</p>	<p>details.</p>	
Ministry of Natural	212	Using anthropogenic instead of human-altered.	Both anthropogenic and human-altered remain used in the Final EA/IS as this	Comment noted; see	1934

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Resources		<p>Recommend sticking with one terminology throughout the EA/IS.</p> <p>B - Recommended for EA</p>	comment is considered recommended.	response for details.	
Ministry of Natural Resources	213	<p>Have landform / vegetation associations been considered outside of protected areas? Information is available by ecodistrict. Critical LVs are not available, but the data helps consider representation and areas with limited representation may be worth looking at in more detail.</p> <p>MNR recommends landform / vegetation association data be used within the EA/IS to support the Project's assessment of representation and rarity.</p> <p>B - Recommended for EA</p>	Critical landform / vegetation association (CLVA) data has been used within Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document to characterize the existing environment and which ecosites are represented as outlined in Section 5.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1935
Ministry of Natural Resources	214	<p>A list of 43 traditional use plant species was created by reviewing desktop resources and Indigenous Knowledge provided within the Eabametoong First Nation Biodiversity Atlas (no date). [...] The information provided by Marten Falls First Nation and Aroland First Nation included an additional 13 traditional use plant species [...] This equals a total of 56 plant species.</p>	<p>Prickly rose is included in Table 8.2-11 (formerly Table 8-23).</p> <p>A description of the identification of traditional use plants is provided in Section 5.7 of Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document. The 43 species listed in Table 8.2-11 (formerly Table 8-23) were used to complete the Traditional Use Plant Habitat Suitability</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1936

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Why are they not all provided in Table 8-23?</p> <p>What about the following species listed elsewhere in the EA/IS, rock tripe lichen, wild celery, lowbush cranberry, prickly rose and bulrush?</p> <p>Please ensure the list is comprehensive of all the traditional use plants discussed throughout the EA/IS.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>and Accessibility mapping. Additional species were identified following completion of the mapping and are acknowledged for their traditional use in Section 5.7.1 of Appendix J, however, the additional species were not used to determine Traditional Use Plant Habitat Suitability and Accessibility.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	215	<p>What was the level of investigation? Were conservation concern plant communities considered as well?</p> <p>Please describe the level of investigation and effort put into determining likelihood and presence of species at risk and species of conservation concern on the three main study areas.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>Details on vegetation survey methodology is provided in Attachment B of Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1937
Ministry of Natural Resources	216	<p>No map or table is provided. Data for the Regional Study Area and Construction Development Area are not included. How does this compare to earlier human-altered amounts? Are they using the same data? Was human altered earlier a sum of both anthropogenic and natural</p>	<p>Human-altered (anthropogenic) disturbances and natural disturbances are considered separate. Anthropogenic disturbances include roads, trails, camps, staging areas, mines, mining features and other footprints associated with development. Natural disturbances</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1938

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>amounts or just the human caused amounts? If it didn't include the nature caused amounts, did that get covered by "other"?</p> <p>Please provide a map of the anthropogenic (human-altered) disturbances and natural disturbances. Include a table referencing the hectares and percentages for the Construction Development Area, Local Study Area and Regional Study Area as well. Please clarify how this data relates to earlier vegetation assessments referencing human-altered, early successional and other categories.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>include wildfire, blowdown / windthrow, diseases and pest outbreaks, and weather-related events (e.g., storms).</p> <p>Anthropogenic disturbances are shown on Figure 8.2-8 of the Final EA/IS.</p> <p>Areas and percentages of anthropogenic and natural disturbances within the LSA and RSA is provided in Section 5 of Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	217	<p>What volume of presence is suggested? What other species might be encountered? Is there competition for habitat? How are bats known to migrate from unknown winter habitats outside of the area? What is classed as maternity roost habitat?</p> <p>Are the habitat suitability for bats assigned the same between the Local Study Area and the Regional Study Area?</p> <p>Please provide context regarding the bat</p>	<p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth.</p> <p>- A full description of methods and results of the baseline bat studies completed for the Community Access Road is provided in Attachment B of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1939

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>species in the area and any other bats that were documented at the survey stations beyond the little brown myotis and northern myotis.</p> <p>Elaborate on the anticipated density of bats in the area and what ecosites are being modeled as maternity roost habitat. Clarify which species are being referred to when stating that “bats that live in the Regional Study Area during the summer migrate from unknown winter habitats outside the area” and provide references to support this position.</p> <p>If the habitat suitability is not classified the same for the Construction Development Area, Local Study Area and the Regional Study Area, please provide rationale for why a different approach is need with references. Similar rationale and justification should be provided any time a different approach is being applied across a habitat grouping between the three main study areas throughout this EA/IS.</p> <p>Or provide a reference in the main EA document to the location of this information in the appendices,</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>- Bat density has not been measured as this is not possible with the research methods employed. Relative bat activity levels for all species detected are reported in Attachment B of Appendix K. Bat habitat modelling is provided in Appendix K. The modelling methods are described in Attachment C of Appendix K.</p> <p>- The statement “bats that live in the RSA during the summer migrate from unknown winter habitats outside the area” refers to all bat species. No overwintering habitat for hibernating or migrating bats is present in the wildlife RSA.</p> <p>- Modelling of bat habitat was consistent between the Construction Disturbance Area, LSA, and RSA. The methods for habitat modelling are described in Attachment C of Appendix K. A description of how ecosites were mapped for the LSA and RSA is provided in Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document.</p>		
Ministry of Natural	218	No definitions or descriptions are provided for how habitat suitability or	Details on the wildlife assessment requested are provided in Appendix K	Final EA/IS Section 8	1940

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Resources		<p>habitat availability was assigned or determined for each wildlife valued component.</p> <p>Variable use of suitability bins and lack of clear discussion of why they are divided out the way they are (e.g., high, moderate, low, nil – sometimes all are used, sometimes only a couple, other times they are binned together).</p> <p>There appears to be a decent amount of swapping around of terms interchangeably, which is discouraged. For example, text used good habitat, but habitat suitability table uses nil, low, moderate and high.</p> <p>Numerous references within the section are missing citations from the reference section.</p> <p>The footnote used in Table 8-26 (page 211) is very helpful but would be even more beneficial if it pointed to the section within the Appendix that applies.</p> <p>Habitat suitability and habitat availability are not the same thing and cannot be used interchangeably. In several locations within the Wildlife Section the terms are used as if interchangeable. This needs to be addressed and corrected.</p> <p>In many figures it is hard to distinguish between some of the symbology due to the colours being very similar or the</p>	<p>Wildlife Technical Support Document. Section 8 of the Final EA/IS has been updated for consistency of language and to include references, where required. Figures within Section 8 of the Final EA/IS have been updated.</p> <p>The Terms of Reference did not require identification of candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH), but existing records in provincial datasets were used in the assessment. There is no Ecoregion Criteria Schedule available for identifying candidate SWH in the ecoregion where the Project occurs (Significant wildlife habitat ecoregions ontario.ca). However, the alternative modelling approaches (i.e., Habitat Suitability Index models) to identify highly suitable habitat for the wildlife Valued Components in the Project study areas were used. The habitat models incorporate ecosite features important to the wildlife VCs. The ecosites in the suitability categories were informed in part by provincial guidance for Significant Wildlife Habitat from the nearest ecoregion (Significant Wildlife Habitat Criteria Schedules For Ecoregion 3E - https://docs.ontario.ca/documents/4813/schedule-3e-2015-final-s.pdf).</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>same.</p> <p>Inconsistent terminology is common between table headers, table and figure captions, table contents and figure legends. Terminology needs to be consistently used when components are meant to reference each other.</p> <p>There is a lack of tie back to ecosite codes and an absence of modeling for candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH). SWH can help identify areas for wildlife denning, feeding, gathering, thermal refuge, nutrients sources, nesting, breeding, overwintering and movement corridors.</p> <p>Please provide additional information in each wildlife subsection to define habitat suitability and / or habitat availability for each valued component, including ecosites assigned to each grouping and the methodology for the modeling along with confidence intervals, precision targets and any limitations to model assumptions.</p> <p>Elaborate on how the groupings were delineated or determined.</p> <p>Elaborate on any field verification work that was completed to confirm and verify the habitat models.</p> <p>This includes Table 8-24 to 8-27.</p> <p>Ensure terminology from the text to the</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>tables is consistently used. Please make sure to provide the full citations for any sources within the reference section. MNR recommends using a similar footnote with an explicit section referenced within the Appendix for all similar tables if the descriptions and categories are not provided or defined within the surrounding text. This would be beneficial for all EA/IS sections that point to one of the Supporting Technical Documents within an Appendix. Ensure the appropriate term (suitability or availability) is used for the style of assessment. Please do not use the terms interchangeably going forward. Adjusting the symbology colour scheme so that there is more contrast for improved readability. Ensure terminology is consistently and appropriately used between text, tables and figures when referencing the same data. MNR would like to see modeling of candidate SWH for wildlife as a component of baseline characterization</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of	219	Why is the suitable not more evenly	The difference in distribution of suitable	Comment	1941

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Natural Resources		<p>scattered? The Regional Study Area appears to have a smooth scattering or transition of suitable habitat across the study area, while the Local Study Area breaks that distribution quite distinctively. Why is there that break in pattern? In addition, the Regional Study Area looks like more than 4.7% suitable habitat. Is this the case? Why are only 18 acoustic stations shown when 51 cameras were specified earlier?</p> <p>Please provide an explanation for the noticeable lack of suitable habitat from the Local Study Area compared to surrounding Regional Study Area. Clarify if the percent of suitable habitat in the Regional Study Area is properly mapped given the map appears to show more than 4.7% area. Explain why only the acoustic stations area shown and not the cameras as well.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>bat habitat between the RSA and the LSA is due to the distribution of ecosites. As described in Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document, ecosites were mapped differently between the LSA and RSA. Ecosite classification and mapping for the LSA consisted of a desktop photo interpretation mapping exercise completed by KBM Resources Group and included assessment using two imagery sources viewed in 3D, using software called Summit Evolution. Field surveys were completed within a subset of mapped ecosites to verify and update the desktop mapping. Vegetation community mapping in the RSA was assembled using the Ontario Land Cover Compilation Version 2.0. Ecosites in the LSA were rolled up into vegetation groupings that align with categories in the provincial dataset to allow consistent mapping, and at the same level of detail, across both study areas</p> <p>The habitat metrics for the LSA and RSA have been reviewed and confirmed to be accurate.</p> <p>Wildlife cameras were not used for the bat study.</p>	noted; see response for details.	
Ministry of	220	What is the trapping abundance? How	Details related to American marten	Comment	1942

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Natural Resources		<p>was this field studied? Were there any incidental observations? How many wolverine stations are there? Were remote camera stations intended to target marten or where observations incidental? Is there a study or references to support habitat connectivity statement? Given the species' ability to adapt, is the Project suggesting fragmentation of habitat is not a risk? This seems in contradiction to their lack of use of open, non-forested habitats. Can the transects be mapped on the existing map? What volume of tracks were documented? Was there a lack of observations? How feasible was it to track marten abundance through aerial snow surveys? Was it effective for documenting activity? What is the existing hunting pressure? What is the estimated density of the species in this landscape? Indigenous Knowledge shared by Marten Falls First Nation noted that February is a sensitive time for the marten as they tend to mate during this time. If we're considering sensitive periods for the species, when are the young born? Is this considered a sensitive window as well?</p> <p>Elaborate on trapping abundance in this</p>	<p>including field studies, incidental observations, Indigenous Knowledge provided, trapping abundance, and hunting pressure are provided in Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Impacts on American marten distribution as a result of the impacts on habitat loss and alteration on connectivity related to the Community Access Road is discussed in Section 7.3.1.4.1.1 of Appendix K. Following parturition, kits are dependent on their mother and the protection of their dens. This period of dependence is considered part of the protected denning period.</p>	noted; see response for details.	

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>area. Explain how American marten were studied in the field and describe the number of incidental observations and how they were used.</p> <p>Specify the number of wolverine stations mentioned. Explain the methodology behind the camera stations and whether they targeted or took incidental captures of American marten. Or provide a reference in the main EA document to the location of this information in the appendices.</p> <p>Provide references for the stance that American marten will be unaffected by habitat connectivity changes. Discuss how habitat fragmentation may impact the species.</p> <p>Please provide a map with the transects show or add them to the current marten map. MNR wishes to get a better understanding of the breadth and distribution of the survey effort. Describe how effective and feasible it was to survey marten from the air. Clarify if the survey methodology was intended to target marten directly or if observations were incidental in nature.</p> <p>Construction Disturbance Area should read Construction Development Area.</p> <p>Describe the existing hunting pressure on the species and what the estimated distribution and abundance is across the</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>study areas. Consider whether denning with young should also be considered a sensitive window for the species.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	221	<p>Mapped suitable habitat looks more than the 52% and 46% listed in the Table 8-25. Are there buffers on the polygons? Are there any camera units that were used to field verify for this species? What about the incidental cavity nesting documentation?</p> <p>Please confirm the percentage of suitable habitat with the mapped product, and the listed amounts appear to be off visually. If there is an error, please provide an explanation as to why. Recommend adding the camera units that were used for field observation and incidental denning observations to the map.</p> <p>Please confirm whether a buffer or outline is being applied to the polygons.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>The habitat metrics for the LSA and RSA have been reviewed and confirmed to be accurate. No buffers were applied to the habitat polygons.</p> <p>Details on the American marten survey methods and results are provided in Attachment B of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document.</p> <p>See first response above.</p>		1943
Ministry of Natural Resources	222	<p>The importance of eskers on this landscape is insufficiently discussed. There is no reference to the rarity of</p>	<p>Mapping of eskers is provided in Appendix N Physiography, Terrain and Soils Technical Support Document.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for</p>	1944

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>eskera within a good portion of the project area or their importance as an upland habitat source or hotspot for biodiversity. Many species are reliant on the habitats they provide.</p> <p>Looking to The Ecosystems of Ontario, Part 1: Ecozones and Ecoregions: The topography in the Hudson Bay Lowlands Ecozone is extremely flat with minor morainal ridges and long eskers providing local relief.</p> <p>In comparison, the Ontario Shield Ecozone has diverse surficial geology including morainal, organic and glaciolacustrine deposits, plus eskers and drumlins.</p> <p>Eskers provide an important source of upland habitat in a landscape categorized as being 73% wetlands in the Local Study Area, according to this EA/IS.</p> <p>MNR requests eskers be assessed not only as a potential aggregate material source, but for their contribution to biodiversity, unique vegetation communities, landform representation within the ecoregions and support of wildlife habitat.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>Detailed mapping identified five eskers (sinuous low ridges composed of glaciofluvial sand and gravel) in the Construction Disturbance Area, and published surficial geology mapping at a scale of 1:1,000,000 identified five additional unconfirmed eskers in the Physiography, Terrain and Soils RSA.</p> <p>Discussion related to biodiversity, vegetation communities and wildlife habitat are discussed in the discipline specific Technical Support Documents. For example, Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document includes a discussion on the significant lichen growth for caribou that is present on eskers.</p>	<p>details.</p>	

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Natural Resources	223	<p>Have provincial trapping records for beaver been considered? Were the field surveys targeted towards identifying beavers or more incidental observation capture while targeting a different species? Is it possible to see the search area represented on a map?</p> <p>Is there any evidence or studies to suggest increased presence along roads or with road development?</p> <p>The best habitat for beavers in the Regional Study Area includes small bodies of open water (less than 8 hectares) and areas near water with upland deciduous forests or thicket swamps where they can find food. Is this also the best habitat for the Local Study Area and Construction Development Area? Was habitat suitability assigned differently depending on the study area?</p> <p>If not completed to date, MNR requests the Project also consider any trapping records in the vicinity.</p> <p>Provide detail regarding the methodology used for the field surveys. Specify the survey target and the level of effort used to survey for beavers. The level of survey effort influences how the results can be interpreted and the confidence in the findings.</p>	<p>Trapping records were obtained from the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) for the preparation of the existing conditions report.</p> <p>The methodology used for the field surveys are described in Attachment B of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document. Appendix K also includes a figure illustrating beaver lodges observed in the Wildlife Regional Study Area.</p> <p>The beaver habitat model, including confidence and precision, is described in Attachment C of Appendix K.</p> <p>Predicted residual effects of the Community Access Road on beaver are described in Appendix K.</p> <p>Information related to ecosites and habitat suitability are provided in Attachment C of Appendix K.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1945

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>MNR recommend including the search area and findings in the existing map or on a separate map to help illustrate the population distribution observed.</p> <p>Discuss how these findings compared to the habitat suitability modelling, including the confidence and precision of the modeling results.</p> <p>Assess and provide any evidence or studies that look at beaver abundance with road density or road development.</p> <p>MNR wishes to better understand how the beaver will respond to this project proposal.</p> <p>Provide the ecosites used to define each habitat suitability. Clarify if the suitability considerations remain the same across study areas or change. Include rationale if different suitability considerations are being applied between the study areas.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	224	<p>The Local Study Area shows quite low percentages for moderate and low suitability habitat. The Regional Study Area also reflects this in the moderate grouping. How is suitability defined? What ecotypes are assigned to each grouping? Are five categories appropriate or is there a distinguishable, significant difference between high to moderate and</p>	<p>Beaver habitat suitability classification is described in Attachment C of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1946

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>low to poor? Was the survey design and suitability groupings based on previous established methodologies or research? Most of the Local Study Area and Regional Study Area has poor habitat for beavers because it mainly consists of conifer swamps and upland forests. Most is a bit misleading for the Local Study Area given high and moderate habitat suitability equate to roughly 36% of the study area with poor making up roughly 57%.</p> <p>Define how suitability is classed including the ecosites assigned to each grouping. Discuss if this category system has been used in other projects and the methodology / research behind using five groupings.</p> <p>A - Required for EA B - Recommended for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	225	<p>Are the same ecosites being used for classifying habitat availability between the Regional Study Area and the Local Study Area?</p> <p>Looking at the Local Study Area, the map looks like more than 35% is identified as high habitat availability. How does this compare to the suitability calculations? It would be helpful to have the beaver</p>	<p>The same ecosites are being used to assess habitat availability and habitat suitability between the Local Study Area (LSA), Regional Study Area (RSA) and the Construction Disturbance Area (CDA). However, as described in Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document, ecosites were mapped differently between the LSA and RSA.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1947

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>lodges mapped to visualize the data. Colour contrast is poor between the study area boundaries and the habitat availability mapping.</p> <p>Clarify if the same ecosites are being used to assess habitat availability and habitat suitability between the Local Study Area, Regional Study Area and the Construction Development Area. Confirm whether Table 8-26 and Figure 8-20 are supposed to be habitat suitability or habitat availability. Also verify that the mapping is correct, as the Local Study Area appears to potentially be highlighting more than 35% indicated within the table as high habitat availability.</p> <p>MNR also recommends adjusting to symbology colours to minimize the number of layers with very similar colours which make it challenging to clearly distinguish between features.</p> <p>A - Required for EA B - Recommended for EA</p>	<p>Ecosite classification and mapping for the LSA consisted of a desktop photo interpretation mapping exercise completed by KBM Resources Group and included assessment using two imagery sources viewed in 3D, using software called Summit Evolution. Field surveys were completed in a subset of mapped ecosites to verify and update the desktop mapping. Vegetation community mapping in the RSA was assembled using the Ontario Land Cover Compilation Version 2.0. Ecosites in the LSA were rolled up into vegetation groupings that align with categories in the provincial dataset to allow consistent mapping, and at the same level of detail, across both study areas</p> <p>The habitat metrics for the LSA and RSA have been reviewed and confirmed to be accurate.</p> <p>Figures in Section 8 of the Final EA/IS have been updated.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	226	<p>General</p> <p>Can a summary table be provided for all the “other” mammals? Has any habitat analysis or habitat description been completed for these species from which</p>	<p>Details on mammal observations are provided in Attachment B of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Provision of a description of the</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1948

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>the observations can be compared? Has there been any notable difference between ecodistricts or from north to south? Any notable distribution patterns across the study area? Have there been observations of young? Is there any research or studies that speak to distribution, abundance or density of these other species in the study areas? 8.2.5.3.1 Black Bear and 8.2.5.3.2 Gray Wolf Why are only 30 stations mentioned when 51 stations were listed under the American Marten? What are landcover classes referring to? 8.2.5.3.3 Canda Lynx and 8.2.5.3.4 Red Fox How many stations are being referred to? Were the observations all at different stations? How many stations in total? What landcover classes were the lynx recorded at?</p> <p>MNR recommends providing a summary table of the observations for other mammals. Provide a description of the anticipated distribution and abundance for each species with references pulling from available research, science and Indigenous Knowledge.</p>	<p>anticipated distribution, abundance and habitat preferences for each species was not a requirement of the Terms of Reference.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Adding a description of their habitat preferences would be beneficial. Discuss any notable observations or patterns in terms of landscape use. A map showing the camera locations where each species was observed, versus not observed would be helpful and is encouraged.</p> <p>Clarify why only 30 stations are mentioned for Black Bear compared to the 51 referenced for American Marten. Clarify how many stations are being referred to for Canada Lynx and Red Fox and specify whether the observations were seen at different stations or at the same location.</p> <p>A - Required for EA B - Recommended for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	227	<p>What habitats are used for each of these species? Are there areas where they are more likely to be encountered? Is there variation in abundance from north to south?</p> <p>What was the number of autonomous recording units deployed versus units with observations? Is there enough data to gauge abundance or distribution with confidence?</p> <p>Indigenous Knowledge provided by Marten Falls First Nation within the</p>	<p>Descriptions of habitats for each species of reptile and amphibian is provided in Section 5.3 of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document. Distribution is shown on Figure 5-16 of Attachment B of Appendix K.</p> <p>Information related to units deployed versus number of units with observations is provided in Attachment B of Appendix K.</p>	Appendix K, Attachment B, Figure 5-16	1949

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Community’s draft land use plan has noted that [blue-spotted salamander] is known to occur [...]</p> <p>With the Indigenous Knowledge, there is a likelihood that the species may be encountered. Is any fieldwork planned to survey for them? Is there a process in place to ensure any incidental observations will be documented and recorded? Is there any abundance information from the Moosonee records? Many amphibians and reptiles use different habitats at different stages of their lives. However, they do not move far and tend to stay in the same area. Why is this not reflected in a habitat description or in separate seasonal mapping? Would this narrow down the likelihood / habitat suitability for certain species depending on their preference (e.g., terrestrial versus aquatic life stages)? Need to quantify “tend to stay in the same area”, as some species can move distances a great as 500m. This can be a fair large shift when a buffer of only 3km is applied as the Local Study Area. Table 8-27</p> <p>Are all the species the same? Or does habitat availability or habitat suitability (need to clarify) vary by species, including salamanders and reptiles?</p>	<p>As described in Section 9.2 of Appendix K, a reporting protocol and system to report incidental wildlife observations and wildlife-vehicle collisions (e.g., bats, furbearers, other large mammals, reptiles, amphibians) during Construction and Operations will be developed. The details of the incidental wildlife and wildlife-vehicle collision reporting system will be described in the Environmental Protection Plan.</p> <p>The observation of the blue-spotted salamander in the Moosonee area is a research grade observation from iNaturalist.</p> <p>Information related to habitat uses and life stages is provided in Appendix K, and Attachment C of Appendix K.</p> <p>Habitat preferences are discussed in Section 5.3 of Appendix K.</p> <p>The requested figure updates are provided on Figure 5-16 of Attachment B of Appendix K.</p> <p>The areas around Brundrit Lake and Kapikotogwa River have a greater proportion of upland plant communities compared to other areas where</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Figure 8-21 Where were the Autonomous Recording Units (ARUs) deployed? Why is there a band of lower likelihood around Brundrit Lake and Kapikotogwa River?</p> <p>Describe the habitats used by each species and their abundance and distribution from north to south, where science or Indigenous Knowledge is available.</p> <p>Specify the number of units deployed versus number of units with observations by species. Discuss whether there is sufficient data to infer species abundance or distribution with confidence.</p> <p>MNR encourages the Project to create a plan or process for documenting and recording incidental observations during the construction phase to bolster the number of available records for these species in the area.</p> <p>Provide more context on the observations in the Moosonee area.</p> <p>Elaborate on different habitat uses at different life stages and provide more context. Discuss the implications for baseline characterization and habitat suitability (or habitat availability) modeling.</p>	<p>amphibian habitat is more common.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Clarify if all listed species have the same habitat preference, or if it varies by species.</p> <p>Add symbology to the map that shows the ARUs with observations and those without.</p> <p>Discuss the two bands of lower likelihood in the suitability mapping and what the driving it.</p> <p>A - Required for EA B - Recommended for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	228	<p>Were field efforts carried out to observe the three bumble bees and two lady beetle species?</p> <p>What habitat / ecosystem type is most suitable for foraging?</p> <p>Is there any understanding of the abundance or distribution of these species?</p> <p>What is the population trend and associated cause for the other three species (Ashton cuckoo bumble bee, Suckley's cuckoo bumble bee, and yellow-banded bumble bee)?</p> <p>Describe any field efforts carried out. Elaborate on what habitat / ecosystem types are most suitable for foraging, including ecosites if possible.</p> <p>Provide a summary on the current</p>	<p>No targeted surveys for three bumble bee and two lady beetle species were conducted. Incidental observations were recorded during vegetation and wildlife field surveys.</p> <p>Information related to habitat / ecosystem types most suitable for foraging is provided in Section 5.4 of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Discussion on Ashton cuckoo bumble bee, Suckley's cuckoo bumble bee, and yellow-banded bumble bee is provided in Section 5.4 of Appendix K.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1950

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>understanding of the abundance and distribution of these species. Provide a brief description on the status and reason for declines for the remaining three species (Ashton cuckoo bumble bee, Suckley’s cuckoo bumble bee, and yellow-banded bumble bee).</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	229	<p>Limited discussion is provided for how habitat suitability or habitat availability was assigned or determined for each valued component. There is no discussion of which ecosites make up each habitat grouping. There is also a lack of discussion regarding field verification of the models or how observation summary findings factor into or affect habitat suitability. Variable use of suitability bins and limited discussion of why they are divided out the way they are (e.g., high, moderate, low, poor – sometimes all are used, other times they are binned into two groups). More broadly, why was habitat suitability chosen for modeling versus categorizing bird habitat use by the ecosystem / vegetation types defined within the vegetation section and determining the likelihood of a species using that habitat? Is there greater confidence and precision</p>	<p>Information related to modelling bird presence, abundance, distribution and habitat is provided in Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document, including Attachment C.</p> <p>Information related to habitat modelling is presented in Attachment C of Appendix L, as well as information related to vegetation availability mapping.</p> <p>Information related to field surveys is presented in Attachment B of Appendix L.</p> <p>The Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement (EA / IS) was prepared to meet provincial and federal regulatory requirements including the provincial Terms of Reference (TOR) and the federal Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (TISG) for the Project, and</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1951

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>in habitat suitability over other methods? There needs to be a better link between the vegetation classification and bird habitat suitability.</p> <p>There are a few references that are missing citations from the reference section 16.</p> <p>In many figures it is hard to distinguish between some of the symbology due to the colours being very similar or the same. For example:</p> <p>Local Study Area / High Habitat Suitability Moderate and Low Habitat Suitability Waterbodies / Low Habitat Suitability Local Study Area / Low to Poor Habitat Suitability Regional Study Area / Low to Poor Habitat Suitability</p> <p>In addition, as currently mapped, it is not possible to distinguish the habitat suitability under Provincial Parks. Rationale is not provided for why particular species were selected to best represent each bird valued component. A brief description of why for each species would be beneficial and help clarify some of the choices. Is an estimated abundance and distribution evenly across the entire study area factor in? Did the Project look for more specialized species over species that are more</p>	<p>follow the Study Plan as provided in Attachment A of Appendix L. The decision to look at habitat suitability for characterizing bird habitat rather than focusing on identifying their likelihood of using the various ecosystem types was in alignment with the TOR and TISG.</p> <p>Citations in Section 16 have been updated, as required.</p> <p>Figures in Appendix L have been updated.</p> <p>Rationale for each species selected is provided in Appendix L and was conducted to meet the TOR and TISG.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>adaptable? Is there good representation across the entire corridor or are there gaps arising because of the selected indicator species? What consideration was given to migratory versus resident species? Were “priority” species prioritized?</p> <p>Please provide additional information in each bird subsection to define the different data sources used to model bird presence, abundance and distribution, including the methodology for the modeling along with confidence intervals, precision targets and any limitations to model assumptions. Define habitat suitability and / or habitat availability for each valued component, including ecosites assigned to each grouping. Discuss whether habitat suitability models had a component of ground-truthing incorporated to verify its effectiveness as part of the characterization exercise. Discuss how field observations compare to the habitat suitability model outputs and factor into or influence habitat suitability modeling. Elaborate on how vegetation availability mapping is used to verify habitat suitability as well.</p> <p>Elaborate on the choice and reasoning behind the delineated groupings and</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>habitat categorization for Table 8-28 to 8-38, including the model accuracy, precision and confidence. Discuss the findings of the habitat suitability modeling for each figure on how the results compared to the species preferences. In addition, discuss why the Project chose to look at habitat suitability for characterizing bird habitat rather than focusing on identifying their likelihood of using the various ecosystem types outlined in the Vegetation assessment. Elaborate on any differences there is in modeling confidence and precision. Or provide reference to the location in the appendix.</p> <p>Create a better link between vegetation classification efforts and bird habitat suitability modeling, along with the objectives of the baseline characterization, field survey findings and reliability, accuracy, precision and confidence of the results.</p> <p>Please make sure to provide the full citations for any sources used within Section 16.</p> <p>Adjusting the symbology colour scheme so that there is more contrast for improved readability. Also recommended to switch the Provincial Park hatching to allow for viewing the habitat suitability categorization below.</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Provide rationale for each species selected to best represent their bird valued component. Discuss the factors that led to their selection, including the advantages and disadvantages. In addition, in each species section, provide a comparison of how that species compares to the other species within that habitat grouping. Or provide reference to the appendix.</p> <p>Discuss whether the selected species provide fulsome coverage of all areas of the Project study areas and are robust indicator species for the area. Identify any gaps that may arise from the selected indicator species.</p> <p>Or provide a reference in the main EA document to the location of this information in the appendices,</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	230	<p>A summary table for each bird subsection of species anticipated to be in the area and species found, along with Species at Risk would be helpful. Especially if information was included such as habitat descriptions specifying the habitat typically used (e.g., forest birds – conifer, deciduous, mix), nesting preferences (ground, cavity, tree / colony, solitary), migratory versus resident, priority status</p>	<p>Additional information for each bird species is provided in Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document.</p>		1952

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>and a summary of their field survey detections.</p> <p>Rather than have each bird section results divided up, could all species observations for a habitat class be documented collectively in a table. For example, like Table 8-30 except for all forest bird species with the additional details.</p> <p>Please note Construction Disturbance Area is incorrect.</p> <p>Provide a summary table for each bird subsection that identifies the bird species anticipated versus found in the Project study areas along with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Habitat preference Nesting behaviours Migratory or resident Priority Status and Bird Conservation Region(s) Species at Risk and / or Conservation Concern Status Survey styles used Summary of counts Highest number of individuals on plot Average number of individuals on plot Survey timing <p>Construction Disturbance Area should be switched to Construction Development Area to align with Section 6.5.2 Spatial Boundaries.</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		A - Required for EA			
Ministry of Natural Resources	231	<p>A) Can positive observation counts be denoted on each habitat suitability map and an overarching “all search effort” map be provided upfront, so there is an opportunity to visualize presence across the landscape? Or is there too much data that it’d need to be a separate map from the habitat suitability maps?</p> <p>B) Highest number of individuals on plot are often reported in the text, but not compared to habitat suitability modeling. Has consideration been given to creating a proportional symbol map to represent the number of individuals on plot? An illustration of search effort would be beneficial too.</p> <p>How are these numbers being used for baseline characterization? Are they being used to define abundance across the study areas? What methodology is being used and what are the precision targets and confidence intervals?</p> <p>C) How did the individuals per plot compare to other areas within the same study area and to the other study areas?</p> <p>A) Consider providing a visual</p>	<p>Additional information for each bird species is provided in Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document.</p> <p>The request from MNR would require a significant level of effort and would not change to outcome of the effects assessment and as such was not addressed in the Final EA/IS.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1953

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>representation of each species presence data in conjunction with the habitat suitability mapping. A map of all survey efforts should be incorporated at the start of the Birds section.</p> <p>B) Discuss these result findings in greater detail in tangent with greater discussion of the modeling habitat suitability outputs. Elaborate on how individuals on plot varied across the study areas, including speaking to the average number of individuals on the plot as well.</p> <p>MNR requests a proportional symbol map or some other visual mapping product to represent the number of individuals on plot across the Project study areas for each species. Please also include a map (or map series) illustrating the search effort for the bird surveys across the Project study areas. Elaborate on how these numbers of individuals on plot will be used. If the numbers are being used for assessing abundance, elaborate on the methodology used along with the precision targets and confidence intervals.</p> <p>C) Elaborate on how individuals per plot compared to across areas within the</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Project study areas.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	232	<p>A) Did Autonomous Recording Units, point count and aerial survey look to target specific species or focus on even distribution of habitat across the Project study areas? There is a lack of tie back to ecosite codes and an absence of modeling for candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH). SWH can help identify areas for bird nesting, gathering, foraging, breeding, staging and stopover.</p> <p>B) There is a discussion of migration in the Shorebirds section. Why is there not a similar discussion in other sections as well?</p> <p>A) Summarize the methodology behind site selection for ARUs, point counts and aerial surveys to help answer the question of whether the field work focused on habitat distribution or species suitability as their primary survey objective. Address whether data collection was sufficient to meet baseline characterization needs for each species, along with their precision targets and confidence intervals/</p>	<p>A. Methodology and results of field surveys are provided in Attachment B of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document. Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH) was not a requirement of the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (TISG) and was therefore not included.</p> <p>B. Discussion on Shorebirds is provided in Appendix L.</p> <p>C. See response to A.</p> <p>D. See response to A. Information on migration was not a requirement of the TISG and was therefore not included.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1954

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Discuss at the start of each subsection. Specify the survey types considered for each species (e.g., ARUs, point counts, aerial flights, etc.) and specify whether the surveys specifically targeted the species and its habitat, or observations were collected by chance but were not the primary objective.</p> <p>B) MNR would like to see modeling of candidate SWH for birds as a component of baseline characterization. Each subsection should briefly touch upon the proportion of migratory birds in their group and the proportion of birds that are year-round residents. For migrating groups, specify when they typically arrive and depart, and whether they are breeding in the area or passing through on their way further north. Or provide a reference in the main EA document to the location of this information in the appendices,</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	233	<p>A) Lack of discussion of model outputs shown in figures within the text.</p> <p>B) What is the definition of a Bird Conservation Region and a priority species? How does a species earn the distinction of being a “priority” species?</p>	<p>A. Information related to modelling is provided in Attachment C of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document.</p> <p>B. Definition of Bird Conservation Region is provided in Appendix L.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1955

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>There is no visual map of the Bird Conservation Regions regularly referenced.</p> <p>C) Are the priority species mentioned included in the number of species identified for the Project? It is never clear if the list of priority species fully aligns with the Project list or if additional species might be identified that are not included in the Project list.</p> <p>D) There is some discussion of what species breed in the area, but not consistently. Similarly, there is some discussion of risks to a species, but not throughout the section.</p> <p>A) MNR would like to see model output figures better discussed within the EA/IS text for what the habitat suitability maps show, such as what is “linked” or associated with what vegetation type, relationships to be aware of, estimated densities of birds by suitability category, how the field survey findings compare to the model outputs, and precision targets and confidence intervals associated with the model output.</p> <p>B) Define what is meant by Bird Conservation Region and priority species, and how priority species are selected. Include a brief description of the applicable Bird Conservation Regions</p>	<p>C. Discussion on priority species is provided in Appendix L.</p> <p>D. Discussion on the potential impacts of climate change on bird species is provided in Sections 5 and 8 of Appendix L.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>that overlap the Project. Please include a map depicting the Bird Conservation Regions near the front of the section.</p> <p>C) The subsections need to be clear on how the Project species list and priority species list compare. A summary table for each bird subsection including all species and denoting which are priority species would address this concern (see Action / Solution F above).</p> <p>D) For each species discuss whether they breed in the area and if they do, what habitat they use. Please also elaborate on the risk or potential harms facing species (e.g., climate change, wetland drying), as it helps bring attention to the habitat areas most at risk for each species.</p> <p>Or provide a reference in the main EA document to the location of this information in the appendices,</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	234	<p>Data was collected from various surveys (point count, call playback, aerial, and autonomous recording units) to analyze bird populations.</p> <p>Predicted bird abundance was categorized into four levels (high, moderate, low, poor) based on survey data. Suitable habitats were those in the</p>	<p>Information related to field survey methodology and results is provided in Attachment B of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Information related to habitat availability is provided in Section 5 of Appendix L.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1956

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>moderate and high categories. Habitat availability was assessed for different scenarios. Habitat suitability is not always reliable predictors of habitat abundance. Abundance can be influenced by factors not captured but suitability models.</p> <p>Please provide a reference in the main EA document to the location of this information in the appendices,</p> <p>MNR recommends including a summary table of the effort and findings for each survey type by species. Describe the four categories (high, moderate, low, poor) along with confidence intervals and precision targets. Elaborate on the different scenarios being considered for habitat availability. Confirm whether predicted bird abundance is being treated as equivalent to habitat suitability. Specify where the habitat availability results are used and captured.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>Habitat availability provided in Section 5 is used to assess residual effects from the Community Access Road in Section 7 of Appendix L.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	235	Research shows there could be 65 forest bird species in the Project study areas, and 64 of these were found during	The five species at risk birds are included in the 65 forest bird species potentially to be found in the Project study areas as	Comment noted; see response for	1957

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>surveys from 2018 to 2022. There is also a chance that five forest bird Species at Risk, listed federally and provincially, could be in the Project study areas. [...] Several forest bird species are considered priority species in a least one of the two Bird Conservation Regions that overlap the Local and Regional Study Areas (Bird Region 8 ON [Boreal Softwood Shield]) [Environment Canada 2013, 2014]). There are 32 priority forest bird species in these regions.</p> <p>Clarify if the 5 SAR birds are a part or in addition to the 65 forest bird species. Clarify if the text is referring to the same group with relation to “several” and “32 priority species”. Specify the timing of the surveys for evening grosbeaks.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>outlined in Section 5.1 of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document.</p> <p>The term "several" is used in the introductory paragraph to a discussion on priority species. Details on priority species of forest birds is provided in Section 5.1 of Appendix L.</p> <p>Methodology for bird surveys is provided in Attachment B of Appendix L.</p>	<p>details.</p>	
<p>Ministry of Natural Resources</p>	<p>236</p>	<p>Red-eyed Vireo There were found in the highest numbers in deciduous and coniferous forests in the Construction Disturbance Area, with 1.75 individuals per plot. They were most frequently detected in the southern part of the Local Study Area near the Albany River.</p>	<p>Information related to Red-eyed Vireo survey results is provided in Section 5 and Attachment B of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	<p>1958</p>

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Table 8-28 Please note “Local” is missing from one of the column headers.</p> <p>Red-eyed Vireo Discuss the findings of highest numbers near the southern part of the Local Study Area near the Albany River and what might be the reason.</p> <p>Table 8-28 Update table headings to add in the missing “Local”.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	237	<p>Ovenbirds Is there a species example with more presence north of the Albany? The ovenbird is meant to represent mixed forests, but this is where they were least common.</p> <p>Table 8-29 Would a low-poor grouping like Dark-eyed Junco have been more appropriate for the ovenbird too?</p> <p>Figure 8-23 What is the draw to the area just south of the Ogoki River? There are no large water bodies shown. Are wetlands equally appealing as water bodies? Why is there a large horseshoe shaped area of poor habitat suitability at the</p>	<p>Bird Valued Components were selected in consultation with the Canadian Wildlife Service and were determined to be the best species for the assigned habitats and were widely documented during the environmental assessment surveys (Section 6.1.2 of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document).</p> <p>Discussion on habitat models, including mixed forest habitat type is provided in Attachment C of Appendix L.</p> <p>Additional discussion related to Ovenbirds is provided in Sections 5 and 6, and Attachment B of Appendix L.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1959

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>south end of the Project area? Is it because of depletion? It seems like it might not fit the pattern.</p> <p>Ovenbirds Discuss whether this species is a good example for presence north of the Albany, including its limitations as an indicator species. Discuss how the less common presence in mixed forest impacts considerations for this species as an indicator species and baseline characterization of bird use in the mixed forest habitat type. Table 8-29 Discuss what considerations went into the habitat suitability considerations and explain the rationale for keeping low and poor suitability separate rather than grouping it as low-poor like for the Dark-eyed Junco. Figure 8-23 Discuss the factors that might be creating high habitat suitability in the area south of the Ogoki River, given the limited presence of large water bodies. Discuss what factors might be leading to there being a large horseshoe shaped area of poor habitat suitability at the south end of the Project area.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Natural Resources	238	<p>Dark-eyed Juncos</p> <p>Dark-eyed juncos were most commonly found in wetlands in the Local Study [...]</p> <p>As the indicator species for disturbed and conifer forested habitat, are they still the best indicator species for conifer forest?</p> <p>The highest number of Dark-eyed juncos was 0.70 individuals per plot in the Local Study Area during point counts, and 1.25 individuals per plot in the Construction Disturbance Area during autonomous recording unit surveys.</p> <p>They were “evenly detected throughout the study areas”, yet the habitat suitability mapping shows clear modeling for best habitat to the south. Should the even detection be more clearly visible in the model output?</p> <p>How did the Regional Study Area compare for number of individuals on plot?</p> <p>Will impact be based upon the highest number of individuals on plot? How do survey methods equate to each other when comparing their findings? Is the difference in quantities a reflection of differences in survey method or actual population differences on the ground?</p> <p>Table 8-30</p> <p>Why are high, moderate, low and poor not separated? What considerations went into deciding to bin these habitat</p>	<p>Bird Valued Components were selected in consultation with the Canadian Wildlife Service and were determined to be the best species for the assigned habitats as well as Dark-eyed Juncos were widely documented during the environmental assessment surveys (Section 6.1.3 of Attachment B of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document).</p> <p>Discussion on habitat modelling is provided in Attachment C of Appendix L.</p> <p>Additional discussion related to Dark-eyed Junco is provided in Sections 5 and 6, and Attachment B of Appendix L.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1960

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>suitability categories?</p> <p>Dark-eyed Juncos Discuss if this species is still the best indicator species for conifer forest, including the pros and cons. Explain why there appears to be differences between the species being “evenly detected throughout the study areas” and the habitat suitability mapping showing the best habitat to the south. Describe how detection is incorporated into the modelling. Provide the Regional Study Area number of individuals on plot for comparison. A great opportunity to combine this into the table format structure. Explain how the model accounts for different survey methods and assumptions when combining the data together. Similarly, describe how best to compare their findings. Discuss whether differences in individuals on plot is a reflection of differences in survey method or population differences on the ground. Table 8-30 Provide rationale for why high, moderate, low and poor are not separated into four categories, including any considerations that went into the decision.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Natural Resources	239	<p>Studies suggest that 17 raptor species might be in the Project study areas, and 15 of these were found during field surveys from 2018 to 2022. [...] Eight raptor species are considered priority species [...] Six of these species (bald eagle, boreal owl, golden eagle, northern goshawk, northern hawk owl, and sharp-shinned hawk) were found during field surveys from 2018 to 2022. Did field surveys focus on the 8 priority species or all 17 potential raptor species? Were appropriate habitats targeted for all species or was the 6 out of 8 priority species observations incidental? Was any consideration given for resident versus migratory when deciding indicator species? Or are all considered migratory in this area? What was the rationale for osprey representing diurnal and boreal owl representing nocturnal raptors, given they are not the most common or abundant raptors in the area. Osprey especially have different nesting and foraging habits from most raptors.</p> <p>Clarify whether field surveys focused on priority species or all 17 potential raptor species. Discuss whether survey observations were incidental or the result of targeted</p>	<p>Field surveys focused on all potential raptor species in the Project study areas as outlined in Section 5.2 of Attachment B of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Observations of raptors included sightings of individuals, active stick nests with adults or chicks present, and auditory observations of raptors calling as outlined in Section 5.2.2 of Attachment B of Appendix L.</p> <p>A discussion on indicator species selection is provided in Section 9 of Appendix L.</p> <p>A discussion of raptor species is provided in Section 5.2 of Appendix L.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1961

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>habitat reconnaissance. Describe the considerations that factored into determining the indicator species. Describe how migration versus resident behaviour factored into the decision, if considered. Discuss the similarities and differences between osprey and boreal owl and other raptor species.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	240	<p>Osprey Was data collection for osprey incidental or purposeful? Did aerial surveys actively target suitable habitat areas for osprey nests? What time of year was the aerial survey completed? If hatchlings were present, that suggest the survey timing window was not optimal and likely late which would mean snow would have been melted from the nests, making them much more difficult to spot from the air. Figure 8-25 Map seems odd with the Regional Study Area being almost completely low to poor while there is more of a mix of suitability in the Local Study Area. The Regional Study Area looks like it might not even reach its 16%. Given ospreys fishing prowess, it seems unusual the larger</p>	<p>Observations of raptors, including Osprey, included sightings of individuals, active stick nests with adults or chicks present, and auditory observations of raptors calling as outlined in Section 5.2.2 of Attachment B of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document.</p> <p>A description of field survey methodology specific to Osprey is provided in Section 4 of Attachment B of Appendix L.</p> <p>A discussion on habitat modelling and habitat suitability for Osprey is provided in Attachment C of Appendix L.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1962

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>waterbodies in the Regional Study Area would not support moderate to high habitat suitability.</p> <p>Osprey Clarify whether the data collection for osprey was incidental, targeted or both. Clarify whether targeted nest surveys were completed. Describe the purpose of the aerial survey and the time of year it was completed. Figure 8-25 Clarify whether the habitat suitability assessment for osprey was the same between the Project study areas. Describe whether it is possible for the Regional Study Area to appear poor or low suitability if no data collection was completed in the area, given the suitability models are in part predicated on available survey data.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	241	<p>Boreal Owl Boreal owls live in coniferous, deciduous, and mixed forests, preferring mature and old forests. Suitable habitat for boreal owl covers 5- to 70 percent of each study area. The southern, central, and northwestern parts of the Regional Study Area, including northwest of Marten</p>	<p>A discussion on Boreal Owl habitat is provided in Section 5.2.2 of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document.</p> <p>A discussion on breeding/reproduction is provided in Section 5.2.2 of Appendix L.</p> <p>A discussion on habitat modelling and</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1963

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Falls, have moderate to high suitability of habitat for them.</p> <p>Is use of mature timber also size dependent? Or is it simply forest composition? Does their preference for old forest correlate to their foraging behaviour and a preference for minimal understory vegetation?</p> <p>What is the breeding season and what are their preferred nesting and roosting habits?</p> <p>There is repetition of a sentence in this section.</p> <p>Table 8-32</p> <p>If suitable habitat consists of high and moderate suitability, why are four categories used rather than two?</p> <p>Why is the Regional Study Area split perfectly equal amounts? This seems very unlikely looking at the composition of all other study areas within the Bird section.</p> <p>Figure 8-26</p> <p>What reasons might there be for how the habitat suitability model came out? The patterning is very solid with very definitive blobs. It seems odd. Is there clear rationale for the results? Is there any correlation worth noting?</p> <p>Boreal Owl</p> <p>Elaborate on the forest types preferred</p>	<p>habitat suitability is provided in Attachment C of Appendix L.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>by boreal owl and whether there is preference for tree size and understory conditions. Describe the breeding season and preferred nesting and roosting habits for boreal owl. Or provide reference to the location in the appendix. Remove sentence repetition. Table 8-32 Explain why the Regional Study Area is split equally between all four suitability groups. Figure 8-26 Describe and explain the factors that resulting in the habitat suitability model as it is, including its chunky cohesive parceling.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	242	<p>There could be 22 shorebird species in the Project study areas, but 16 of these might only stop there during migration. Eleven shorebird species were found during surveys from 2018 to 2022. [...] Sixteen shorebird species in the study areas are considered priority species in Bird Conservation Region 7 or 8. It is unclear which species are being referred to in the reference to migrant species that do not stay in the area.</p>	<p>A discussion on Shorebirds is provided in Section 5.3 of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document, and Section 5.3 of Attachment B of Appendix L.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1964

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Missing the reference citation for Bird Conservation Region 7 or 8.</p> <p>Specify if any of the representative species are migrants that only stop during migration.</p> <p>Include missing reference for Bird Conservation Region 7 or 8.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	243	<p>Table 8-33 The outputs for the Regional Study Area are odd and too even compared to the other study areas. Figure 8-27 Why is the northeast portion of the study areas poor? Is it a reflection of the bird's range, habitat preferences, or mix / other?</p> <p>Table 8-33 Clarify whether the Regional Study Area is being modelled with the same methodology as the Local Study Area and Construction Development Area. Discuss the outputs of the Regional Study Area in comparison with the other study areas and provide an explanation for why its outputs differ from the others when the figure suggests the same methodology is being used.</p>	<p>A discussion on habitat modelling within the Project study areas is provided in Attachment C of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Information regarding habitat and areas of strong and low influence are outlined in Section 5 of Appendix L.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1965

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Figure 8-27 Discuss the strong reasons behind the poor habitat suitability in the northeast corner of the study areas.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	244	<p>What is the difference between waterfowl and waterbirds? What surveys were carried out between 2018 to 2022 for this subgroup? Is there any historical records or Indigenous Knowledge regarding Black Tern presence in the Project study areas? Why does only one species (Mallard) represent this section unlike the multiple species used to capture the different types of forested or wetland habitats? Why is there not a species for lakes, streams, and rivers; wetland and upland waterbodies; or waterbird versus waterfowl? Table 8-34 Was a proximity to water factor for habitat suitability in this bird category? Should proximity to water be considered? Looking at the model output in the Figure 8-28, proximity to water does not seem to factor into the habitat suitability. This is concerning given the reliance of some species in this bird category on water. If</p>	<p>Descriptions of both waterfowl and waterbirds is provided in Section 5.4 of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Methodology for field surveys is provided in Section 4 of Attachment B of Appendix L.</p> <p>Information shared by interested persons, Indigenous Peoples, including Indigenous Knowledge, and how it informed the bird assessment is provided in Section 3 of Appendix L.</p> <p>Bird Valued Components were selected in consultation with the Canadian Wildlife Service and were determined to be the best species for the assigned habitats.</p> <p>Habitat suitability mapping is provided in Attachment C of Appendix L.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1966

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>proximity to water is not considered, is the model an adequate representation of this bird category? Figure 8-28 Why is there less habitat suitability around the east to west Far North boundary line? Is it because of fire disturbance?</p> <p>Define waterfowl versus waterbirds. Elaborate on what surveys were carried out that targeted this group, or if all data collected was incidental in nature. Or provide reference to location in the appendix. Discuss if information was sought from historical records or Indigenous Knowledge for Black Tern presence in the Project study areas. Elaborate on the selection of only one species to represent this bird subgroup, the reasoning behind the decision and why a multispecies representation was not preferred. Table 8-34 Discuss the factors considered in the habitat suitability model and whether proximity to water was a factor considered. If not, please address why proximity to water was not considered and how water ecosystems were incorporated into habitat suitability in</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>other ways. Figure 8-28 Discuss the factors causing the patch of increased density of low to poor habitat suitability around the east to west stretch of Far North boundary line to the left side of the map.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	245	<p>Bog, fen and other wetland birds' nest in bogs, fens, swamps, or marshes, which are common in Canada's boreal forest. All 15 wetland bird species that might be in the study area were found during surveys from 2018 to 2022. [...] Rusty blackbird and yellow rail are the only federally and provincially listed wetland bird species with potential to occur in the Project study areas. How do these species compare from others such as waterbirds and waterfowl. Are they more terrestrial? What surveys were carried out that targeted this species? What number of sites were the species observed versus total sites deployed? Are there any estimates of abundance? Or were observations more incidental in nature? Were rusty blackbird and yellow rail found in the Project study areas?</p>	<p>Descriptions of both waterfowl and waterbirds is provided in Section 5.4 of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Methodology for field surveys is provided in Section 4 of Attachment B of Appendix L.</p> <p>Waterbirds and waterfowl species identified in the Project study areas is provided in Section 5.4 of Attachment B of Appendix L.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1967

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Elaborate on how wetland bird species differ from other categories in this baseline characterization, such as waterbird and waterfowl. Describe the surveys carried out for wetland bird species. Specify if rusty blackbird or yellow rail were found in the Project study areas. Or provide reference to the location in the appendix.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	246	<p>The vegetation sections (8.2.4.2 and 8.2.4.4) found an availability of wetland habitat at 73% (33% swamp, 2% marsh, 37% fen, 2% bog) in the Local Study Area and 68% (30% swamp, 1% marsh, 25% fen, 13% bog) in the Regional Study Area. Yet the habitat suitability model for Palm warbler (representative species for bog habitat) showed nearly 68% suitable habitat, assuming suitable habitat equates to the high and moderate suitability groupings. How is this drastic difference in habitat availability being addressed and rationalized for this species? How does it compare for the other wetland representative species?</p>	<p>The differences noted in habitat suitability between the vegetation assessment and birds assessment is due to differences in ecosite mapping.</p> <p>A discussion on habitat modelling, habitat suitability and availability is provided in Attachment C of Appendix L.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1968

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Address the differences in habitat suitability for bog-representative species and bog habitat availability on the landscape. Provide rationale and justification with references. Similarly, compare the differences (or similarities) between the habitat suitability of other wetland representative species with the vegetation habitat availability outputs. Provide rationale and justification where needed to support explanation of the relationship between outputs.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	247	<p>Palm warblers were selected to represent species that use bogs. Given the finding that they were more abundant in areas with fewer bogs, should consideration be given to selecting a different species for characterizing use of bog habitat? Should this change the assessment plan for this wetland type? Would this species be a better representative for marsh habitat?</p> <p>Table 8-35</p> <p>How accurate was the model for assessing bog habitat use, given the species' reduced abundance in bog habitats?</p> <p>Why is the Regional Study Area outputs</p>	<p>Bird Valued Components were selected in consultation with the Canadian Wildlife Service and were determined to be the best species for the assigned habitats.</p> <p>Habitat models are provided in Attachment C of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document and include a discussion on model accuracy, habitat suitability, and outputs within the Project study areas.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1969

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>split so cleanly? This seems very unlikely looking at the composition of the other study areas. Figure 8-29 It is disconcerting that the areas with highest bog density do not have the highest suitability rating, given this species is meant to best represent bog habitat use. What factors are drawing the species to the high suitability areas?</p> <p>Address whether palm warbler remains the best species to represent bog habitat use. Explain the reasoning for proceeding with the species and whether these findings trigger additional considerations for the baseline characterization of bog habitat use by birds; or provide a plan and rationale for switching to another species. Table 8-35 Discuss the accuracy of the model for assessing bog habitat use given the reduced abundance of the species in bog habitats. Explain why the Regional Study Area outputs differ so dramatically from the other study areas and why the division of suitability is so clean. Clarify whether the Regional Study Areas is being assessed in the same manner as the Local Study</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Area and Construction Development Area. Figure 8-29 Discuss the implications of the bog representative species having moderate habitat suitability ratings in the areas with highest bog habitat densities. Discuss the factors contributing to certain areas being modeled for the high suitability over other areas of the Project.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	248	<p>Common yellowthroat were most commonly found in water habitats... What classifies water habitats? Why were they not found in the northwest part of the Local Study Area? Is this a reflection of the species range? What was the distribution in the Regional Study Area and how did it compare? Table 8-36 Why are the Regional Study Area outputs for high and poor so clean? This seems odd to have two when compared to the composition of the other study areas and suitability ratings. Does the Regional Study Area use the same suitability model as the others?</p> <p>Define water habitats. Discuss why the species is not found in</p>	<p>Water habitats are described in Sections 5 and 7 of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document and are wetland and aquatic environments used by waterfowl, waterbirds, and wetland-dependent species. Open water habitats include lakes, larger river channels, impounded wetlands.</p> <p>As outlined in Section 7.1 of Appendix L, Common Yellowthroat abundance was highest in swamp and fen habitats and lowest in uplands. Water-associated species, including Common Yellowthroat, were not found in areas where wetland habitat is limited, including in the northwest corner of the Local Study Area</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1970

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>the northwest corner of the Local Study Area and how their distribution compares in the Regional Study Area. Table 8-36 Explain why the Regional Study Area outputs is so clean for high and poor. Clarify whether the Regional Study Areas is being assessed in the same manner as the Local Study Area and Construction Development Area.</p>	<p>The Regional Study Area outputs are perceived as "clean" for high and poor habitat suitability due to homogenous wetland complexes and fewer fragmented marginal habitats regionally.</p> <p>A description on habitat modelling is provided in Attachment C of Appendix L. The same methods were used to assess the Local Study Area and the Regional Study Area.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	249	<p>Table 8-37 Why are the Regional Study Area outputs for all suitability groups so clean? This seems odd to have all four rounded to even numbers (20.0 or 30.0 percent) when compared to the composition of the other study areas. Does the Regional Study Area use the same suitability model as the others? Figure 8-31 The text specifies avoidance of forest edges, but there is not an obvious correspondence with forest habitat modeling. Is that why riparian areas seem to be flagged as high? Why isn't there more of an avoidance of the Canadian shield ecozone in general? Table 8-37 Explain why the Regional Study Area</p>	<p>Table 8-37 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to correct errors in Regional Study Area outputs. Correct values were provided in Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Habitat modelling for all bird Valued Components are described in Attachment C of Appendix L.</p>	Final EA/IS Table 8-37	1971

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>outputs are so clean for all suitability groupings. Clarify whether the Regional Study Areas is being assessed in the same manner as the Local Study Area and Construction Development Area. Figure 8-31 Please discuss how the mapping considers and illustrates forest edge avoidance.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	250	<p>Sora was intended to represent marsh habitat species. However, they were most commonly found in fen habitats. Should consideration be given to selecting a different species for characterizing use of marsh habitat? Should this change the assessment plan for this wetland type? Would Sora be more representative of fen habitats? Would palm warblers better represent marsh habitat? Was there only one survey year? What about 2018 to 2021? Where is Sands Lake? Is it just north of the Ogoki River? Is presence of soras throughout the local study area north of here a reflection of range, disturbance or some other cause?</p> <p>Address whether sora remains the best</p>	<p>Bird Valued Components were selected in consultation with the Canadian Wildlife Service and were determined to be the best species for the assigned habitats.</p> <p>Details on methodology of field surveys is provided in Attachment B of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Details on results of field surveys is provided in Attachment B of Appendix L.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1972

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>species to represent marsh habitat use. Explain the reasoning for proceeding with the species and whether these findings trigger additional considerations for the baseline characterization of marsh habitat use by birds; or provide a plan and rationale for switching to another species.</p> <p>Explain why only one survey year is referenced and why other years are not mentioned.</p> <p>Discuss why survey observations indicated greater distribution of sora north of Sands Lake and provide a bit more context as to the location of Sands Lake on the map.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	251	<p>The following Species at Risk birds represent the Species at Risk group because they are listed as Threatened, Endangered, or Extirpated [...]</p> <p>Please note the list also includes Special Concern Species at Risk. Habitat suitability tables and maps are not provided.</p> <p>Please recognize the list also contains Special Concern Species at Risk. Please provide mapping and habitat suitability information tables for all</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the species list contains a Special Concern Species At Risk.</p> <p>Mapping and habitat suitability information for all known Species at Risk is provided in Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1973

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Species at Risk, addressing the Construction Development Area, Local Study Area and Regional Study Area.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	252	<p>Canada Warbler Canada warblers were found throughout the Local Study Area during field studies, except in the northwestern part. What is the cause for the lack of presence in the northwestern part? Is this partially a reflection of range?</p> <p>Evening Grosbeak Did surveys target the appropriate timing to observe the species in the area? Are there any historical records or Indigenous Knowledge of presence?</p> <p>Barn Swallow Are there future mitigation considerations with the proposed infrastructure for this species? Is the Project in their breeding range?</p> <p>Canada Warbler Discuss the lack of presence in the northwestern part and the probable causes.</p> <p>Evening Grosbeak Elaborate on whether the completed surveys met the best timing window to survey for Evening grosbeak in this area.</p>	<p>Information related to Canada Warbler observations is provided in Sections 5.1 and 6.6.1 of Attachment B of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Information related to Evening Grosbeak surveys is provided in Sections 5.1 and 6.6.2 of Attachment B of Appendix L.</p> <p>Information related to Barn Swallow is provided in Sections 5.6 and 6.6.12 of Attachment B of Appendix L.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1974

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Barn Swallow Elaborate on whether there are future mitigation measures being considered for the proposed infrastructure into the construction and operational phase. Discuss whether the Project falls within the typical breeding range of Barn swallow.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	253	<p>Common Nighthawk What contributes to the large suitable habitat patch in the southern part of the Local Study Area? Is it fire disturbance? Why is habitat fragmentation not likely to affect them? Common nighthawks are crepuscular. However, the last two sentences contradict each other by saying common nighthawk was recorded in the Construction Development Area in the first and that no observations were recorded in this area in the second. Which statement is correct?</p> <p>Common Nighthawk Discuss what is contributing to the large patch of suitable habitat in the southern part of the Local Study Area. Elaborate on why habitat fragmentation is not likely to affect Common Nighthawk</p>	<p>Information related to Common Nighthawk habitat is provided in Section 5.6.4 of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Information related to field survey results for Common Nighthawk is provided in Attachment B of Appendix L.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1975

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>and include references. Specify whether timing may have explained the absence of observations during point count surveys. Clarify which statement is correct and remove the contradiction between statements regarding survey outcomes in the Construction Development Area.</p> <p>A - Required for EA C - Editorial</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	254	<p>Eastern whip-poor-will Transmission line rights-of-way and road corridors may provide good foraging areas for them. [...] The nearest critical habitat for them is about 250 km southwest of the Regional Study Area. Are there any studies or examples of this that the Project could reference? Please provide the reference. Have the Project study areas been assessed for critical habitat before? Why is habitat fragmentation not likely to affect them? Eastern whip-poor-will are crepuscular. Did point count surveys target this timing window? If not, would this explain the absence of observations if surveys were completed outside of dawn and dusk? Eastern wood-pewee Was their presence in coniferous forests</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that Eastern whip-poor-will was down-listed to Special Concern in January 2025.</p> <p>Critical habitat was assessed for species as part of the Values Components.</p> <p>Discussion on Project effects to habitat fragmentation is provided in Sections 7 and 8 of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Information related to field survey results for Eastern whip-poor-will is provided in Attachment B of Appendix L.</p> <p>A discussion of field survey results for Eastern wood-pewee is provided in Attachment B of Appendix L.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1976

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>and bogs expected? What are their preferred nesting and foraging grounds? Were they not historically seen north of Lake Nipigon because it was outside of their range, a lack of surveying or some other cause?</p> <p>Eastern whip-poor-will Please note this species was downlisted to Special Concern in January 2025. Provide studies or examples that suggest or show evidence of transmission line rights-of-way and road corridors providing good foraging habitat for Eastern whip-poor-will. Provide the reference for the specified critical habitat and elaborate on whether the Project study areas have been assessed for critical habitat before. Elaborate on why habitat fragmentation is not likely to affect the species and provide studies and examples to support this statement. Specify whether timing may have explained the absence of observations during point count surveys.</p> <p>Eastern wood-pewee Discuss whether the presence of Eastern wood-pewee in coniferous forest and bogs was expected. Elaborate on what the preferred nesting and foraging grounds are for the species.</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Explain why the species was not historically seen north of Lake Nipigon.</p> <p>A - Required for EA C - Editorial</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	255	<p>Olive-sided flycatcher They were most commonly seen in fen and swamp habitats in the Construction Disturbance Area, bog and marsh habitats in the Local Study Area, and swamp and early successional sparse treed habitats in the Regional Study Area. During surveys, they were mostly detected in fen habitats, followed by swamp habitats. The last statement semi-contradicts the earlier statement as written. Is the second statement for all areas combined? Bald eagle At what density were Bald Eagle observed? Is appropriate nesting habitat readily available? Perhaps it would be advantageous to shift this species and its assessment to the raptors section. Peregrine falcon Are any steep slope areas proposed for development within the study areas? Would the species migrate through versus nesting to breed along the coasts</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that Bald Eagle was down-listed to Not at Risk in Ontario as of May 2023.</p> <p>Bald Eagle assessment is included under raptors in Section 5.2 of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document.</p> <p>Discussion on terrain features to be disturbed as part of the Construction Disturbance Area are outlined in Appendix N Physiography, Terrain and Soils Technical Support Document. Discussion on Peregrine Falcon habitat related to steep slopes is provided in Section 5.6.8 of Appendix L.</p> <p>Information shared by interested persons, Indigenous Peoples, including Indigenous Knowledge, and how it informed the bird assessment is provided in Section 3 of Appendix L.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1977

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>to the north? Are there any historical accounts or Indigenous Knowledge of their presence?</p> <p>Olive-sided flycatcher Clarify the text to remove the contradiction so the information can be interpreted correctly.</p> <p>Bald Eagle Please note this species was delisted to Not at Risk in Ontario as of May 2023. MNR recommends moving the Bald eagle assessment into the raptors section, given it is no longer considered a species at risk. Its addition to the raptors section would make that portion of the EA/IS more robust as well. Similarly, please update the reference to species at risk status in the Wildlife Study Plan (Page 5) within Appendix K.</p> <p>Peregrine Falcon Specify whether any steep slope areas are proposed for development within the Project study areas. Elaborate on whether the species would migrate straight through to the northern coast or would most likely breed and nest in the study area. Discuss if information was sought from historical records or Indigenous Knowledge for Peregrine falcon presence</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>in the Project study areas.</p> <p>A - Required for EA B - Recommended for EA C - Editorial</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	256	<p>Black tern Was this species specifically targeted during field surveys of the Community Access Road?</p> <p>Rusty blackbird Are they migratory or are they breeding, nesting and foraging in the area? Why might they be more sensitive to habitat fragmentation?</p> <p>Yellow rail What type of station was the detection made at in 2022? Why are they thought to be adaptable and resilient to human disturbances when the statement above says they are susceptible?</p> <p>Black Tern Clarify if this species was specifically targeted during field surveys or if observations were incidentally collected.</p> <p>Rusty blackbird Discuss whether this species is migrants passing through or are breeding and nesting in the area. Elaborate on why the species is</p>	<p>Discussion on Black Tern field survey results is provided in Section 6.6.13 of Attachment B of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document. No observations of black tern were made during field surveys from 2018 to 2022 in the Project study areas. A black tern observation was made along the Ogoki River, outside of the Regional Study Area, in 2004 (eBird, 2023; MNRF, 2023b).</p> <p>Discussion on Rusty Blackbird field survey results and a discussion on habitat fragmentation is provided in Section 6.6.1.5 of Appendix L.</p> <p>Discussion on Yellow Rail field surveys is provided in Section 6.6.16 of Attachment B of Appendix L. "Station" refers to an autonomous recording unit.</p> <p>Discussion on Yellow Rail adaptability is provided in Section 8.2.23 of Appendix L.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1978

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>considered more sensitive to habitat fragmentation, including available references. Yellow rail Clarify what type of station is referred to for the 2022 detection. Elaborate on why the species is considered adaptable and resilient to human disturbances when previously referred to as susceptible, including references.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	257	<p>The bird habitat characterization section does not speak to the protection of some species, their nests and eggs under the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997.</p> <p>Ensure the EA/IA recognizes that some species, nests and eggs are protected under the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act.</p> <p>A - Required for EA D - Permitting Related, Not Required for EA</p>	Table 9-2 of Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document has been updated to include the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997.	Appendix L Table 9-2	1979
Ministry of Natural Resources	258	There is a lack of tie back to ecosite codes and an absence of modeling for candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH). SWH can help identify areas for	The Terms of Reference did not require identification of candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH), but existing records in provincial datasets were used	Comment noted; see response for details.	1980

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>specialize habitat, rare vegetation communities, seasonal concentration areas, movement corridors and habitat for species of conservation concern.</p> <p>MNR would like to see modeling of candidate SWH as a component of vegetation baseline characterization.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>in the assessment. There is no Ecoregion Criteria Schedule available for identifying candidate SWH in the ecoregion where the Community Access Road occurs (Significant wildlife habitat ecoregions ontario.ca). However, the alternative modelling approaches (i.e., Habitat Suitability Index models) to identify highly suitable habitat were used.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	259	<p>There are many instances where the main report of the draft EA/IS simplifies to such a degree that the connection between methodology, survey efforts, analysis and results is lost, resulting in a lack of understanding or uncertainty in the baseline characterization.</p> <p>MNR is aware additional information may be provided within the Supporting Technical Documents; however, the main report should still provide a cohesive and easy to follow summary of the methods, efforts, analysis and findings with sufficient background detail to allow for confidence in the material provided. Sufficient rationale and discussion need to be provided to explain the decisions and outcomes as well.</p> <p>Where the material must be left to the Support Technical Document due to its</p>	<p>The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Sections 8.2.4, 8.2.5, 8.2.6, 8.2.7 of the Final EA/IS provides a high-level summary of vegetation, wildlife, birds and ungulate assessments. Refer to Appendix J Vegetation Technical Support Document, Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document, Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document and Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document for detailed assessments completed for the Community Access Road.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1981

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>complexity, specific reference to applicable sections within the appendices should be provided.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	260	<p>While habitat suitability models are very useful for predicting the potential distribution of a species, they are not always a reliable predictor of species abundance. There could be a variety of ecological factors for why a “suitable” habitat may not be used by a species, such as competition, predation, disease, or resource availability. What risks does this pose to the assessment of impact? How does this effect the use of suitability models in the effects assessment? Are they sufficient to assess impact alone?</p> <p>In each section, discuss how this potential shortcoming will be addressed or considered given the focus on habitat suitability throughout the baseline characterization in the EA/IS. Please address how habitat suitability compares to use and how species abundance is being determined in each section as well.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>While habitat suitability models are not the only available approach for characterizing existing conditions, they represent a well established, scientifically defensible, and widely used method in environmental assessments. These models allow for consistent, transparent, and repeatable evaluation of landscape level habitat patterns across large and remote areas where comprehensive species abundance data are often not feasible to collect. In the context of this EA/IS, habitat suitability modelling is used alongside field data, Indigenous Knowledge, and existing literature to inform an integrated assessment of potential effects. In many cases, species specific surveys for the Project allowed for the collection of quantifiable measures (i.e. abundance, diversity, relative activity levels, density) which are used to assess impacts on Valued Components as well as validate habitat suitability models developed for Valued Components assessments. The approach is therefore considered</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1982

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			appropriate and sufficient for supporting the effects assessment, recognizing that suitability models inform potential habitat use rather than serving as direct measures of species abundance.		
Ministry of Natural Resources	261	<p>Anthropogenic Disturbance in the Caribou Regional Study Area during the Cumulative Effects Assessment Map omits all anthropogenic disturbances associated with mining and mining exploration and with permitting relating to this EA/IS.</p> <p>Add data that reflects anthropogenic disturbances from mining-related activities (e.g. staking, drill pad clearing, exploration drilling, etc.) and from EA/IS-related activities (e.g. geotechnical drilling, tree clearing, etc.).</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	The disturbance layer for the ungulates assessment was determined using point features including mines, drill holes, communities, and recreation areas (access points, boat caches and campgrounds), cottage sites, and linear features including roads, forest service roads, railways, utility lines, and trails, were obtained from either Geospatial Ontario or Geology Ontario as outlined in Section 4.3.4 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1983
Ministry of Natural Resources	262	<p>Appendix K does not use consecutive page numbers throughout the document because of adding multiple documents together under one appendix. It makes it very challenging to reference sections or page numbers as a result.</p> <p>Please ensure appendices have one set of consecutive page numbers shown</p>	The Attachments within Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document are intentionally maintained as standalone technical documents, each with its own sequential page numbering. This structure preserves the integrity of the original documents, which were finalized at different times, and may be subject to separate updates or regulatory review.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1984

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>throughout the document to enable easier reference.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>No revision to the page numbering of Appendix K and its Attachments are warranted.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	263	<p>Map does not consider recent anthropogenic disturbances associated with mining exploration in the area or those stemming from permitted work supporting this Project to date.</p> <p>Please consider adding all data that reflects current anthropogenic disturbances from mining-related activities (e.g., staking, drill pad clearing, exploration drilling, etc.) and from EA-related activities (e.g., geotechnical drilling, tree clearing, etc.) for accuracy.</p> <p>B - Recommended for EA</p>	<p>The disturbance layer for the ungulates assessment was determined using point features including mines, drill holes, communities, and recreation areas (access points, boat caches and campgrounds), cottage sites, and linear features including roads, forest service roads, railways, utility lines, and trails, were obtained from either Geospatial Ontario or Geology Ontario as outlined in Section 4.3.4 of Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1985
Ministry of Natural Resources	264	<p>Unable to locate any reference to Baitfish Harvest Areas (BHAs), Bait Management Zones, or a description of potential impacts to these areas.</p> <p>The start of the preferred route in MNR's Nipigon/Geraldton District overlaps with BHAs NI5243, NI5244, NI5264, and NI5265; all of which are currently vacant due to lack of access. Improved access afforded by the Project may increase interest in bait harvesting in the area.</p>	<p>Bait harvest areas are considered in Appendix U Land and Resource Use Technical Support Document of the Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement.</p> <p>There is the potential that the Project could result in access to bait harvest areas that are currently vacant. Similar to recreational fishing, potential changes in baitfish harvesting would be managed by</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1986

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Please consider Baitfish Harvest Areas and the potential impacts on baitfish operations.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>the Ministry of Natural Resources through the commercial bait licensing process.</p> <p>Effects on fish survival and reproduction from changes to public access to bait fishing are similar to those for recreational fishing (Section 7.3.2.8 of Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document), and would be expected to result in minor residual effects on fish populations with mitigation and management measures, including those implemented through the Ministry of Natural Resources. There may be a decrease in productivity, but it is not likely to disrupt overall population dynamics, and the populations of baitfish species would be anticipated to remain functional, self sustaining, and ecologically effective.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	265	<p>Increase in public access: The report states: “Potential changes in hunter and angler pressure, and fish and bird harvest during Project Operation and Maintenance will continue to be managed by Environment and Climate Change Canada, Ministry of Natural Resources, and Fisheries and Oceans Canada.” This is unclear and does not describe</p>	<p>Discussions on residual effects to wildlife and fish from potential hunting or fishing, including mitigation measures have been provided in Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document, Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document, Appendix L Birds Technical Support Document and Appendix M Ungulates Technical Support Document.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1987

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>how the potential impact from the Project will be mitigated.</p> <p>Please describe potential level of impact to which species and what legislations may (or may not) apply with respect to hunting and fishing. Furthermore, detail any mitigation measures that would be implemented within the area (e.g., reducing pervasive access to adjacent lands).</p> <p>B - Recommended for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	266	<p>Increased public access during road operation phase (Moose)</p> <p>Please state whether mitigation of impacts was considered during route planning and how additional enhancements could be sought, for example: Constructing roads farther away from waterbodies reduces likelihood of public having the ability to launch watercraft and access areas that moose frequent. Mobilizing physical barriers at crossings at larger water crossings and/or navigable waters to discourage access.</p> <p>B - Recommended for EA</p>	<p>Mitigations for increased public access have not been proposed as part of the Final EA/IS.</p> <p>As outlined in Section 4.4.1 of the Final EA/IS, the Preferred Route has the least number of water crossings and narrower water crossings.</p> <p>Access and ownership including physical barriers at crossings and/or navigable water are 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>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1988

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Natural Resources	267	<p>The following is listed as a mitigation measure: “Implement an Environmental Protection Plan that includes measures to minimize [...]” (Operation/Maintenance). Will the Plan be available for review and approval with the submission of the Final EA/IS? Otherwise, the mitigation measures are unable to be evaluated for applicability and appropriateness.</p> <p>The following is listed as a mitigation and enhancement measure: 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. Need clarity on which of those are expected and what Best Management Practices (BMPs), permits, or authorizations may apply.</p> <p>A mitigation measure is to “Maintain buffer zones of 30 meters around waterbodies”. What activities would and would not be allowed within this buffer? What is defined as a “waterbody”? Watercourses also provide significant habitat value for many species, and maintaining vegetation within a similar</p>	<p>The Environmental Protection Plan (EPP) will be developed during detail design by the Owner/Operator. The EPP will contain mitigation measures including but not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction activity timing restrictions within wildlife habitat during sensitive time periods (e.g., wolverine denning period, bat maternity roosting period) • Buffers and disturbance minimization. • Habitat retention and restoration. • Implementation of employee and contractor wildlife awareness training. • Implementation of wildlife best management practices (BMPs; e.g., Environmental Guide for Mitigating Road Impacts to Wildlife (MTO 2017)). <p>Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document provides references for the BMPs that will be incorporated into the EPP and construction and operations.</p> <p>The 30 m buffer around water is intended to protect aquatic habitat and maintain wildlife habitat connectivity. The following commitment is provided in Appendix K: - Maintain buffer zones of 30 m minimum around waterbodies; clearing of riparian vegetation will be limited to the extent practicable and to the requirement of the</p>	Appendix AB	1989

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>buffer would help to preserve the function (e.g., shade – thermal characteristics, sediment filtration). How will the 30m be measured (e.g., from the edge of vegetation that is capable of filtering sediment, high-water mark)? Has any thought been put into mitigating some of the Project’s potential impacts by providing wildlife habitat opportunities through the decommissioning of ancillary infrastructure and / or roads? For example, repurposing cleared trees to create mustelid denning habitat, gathering rocks for snake hibernacula, or creating suitable nesting substrate for turtles in areas away from the travelled portion of the ROW.</p> <p>Please clarify (or imbed) what the Environmental Protection Plan is to include in terms of mitigation. Please limit mitigation to design / construction solutions without encumbering MNR decision making / operation. Provide clarification of what BMPs, permits, or authorizations would apply and what is expected to be included as required mitigation measures. Please describe the intention of the 30m buffer and how it will be implemented. Additionally, consider extending a similar</p>	<p>access road and alignment clearing width only.</p> <p>Regarding the recommendation to consider mitigating the effects of the Project on wildlife through the decommissioning of ancillary roads and infrastructure and the creation of wildlife habitat such as mustelid denning structure. As described in Appendix K, Project mitigation includes reclamation of temporary disturbance areas such as access roads and trails, construction camps, turnaround areas, laydown areas and temporary waterbody crossings at the end of construction. Additionally, the Draft Terrestrial Biodiversity Offset Plan as been included as Appendix AB and will be finalized in consultation with Indigenous communities and regulators during detail design.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>protection to watercourses and define these values for better clarity. Please provide feedback on how habitat creation may or may not have been considered, and what the feasibility and/or efficacy may be with respect to the Project.</p> <p>A - Required for EA B - Recommended for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	268	<p>This section does not clearly differentiate between commercial trapping (Registered Trapline Areas) versus subsistence trapping, an inherent Section 35 right for Indigenous people (traditional trapline areas).</p> <p>Clearly distinguish and differentiate between commercial trapping (Registered Trapline Areas) and subsistence trapping (traditional trapping areas) for greater clarity.</p> <p>B - Recommended for EA</p>	Section 8.3.9.6 of the Final EA/IS acknowledges the trapping is not a commercial activity, however, commercial trapping/harvesting sites have been identified within the Project study areas including those of Aroland First Nation and Ginoogaming First Nation.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1990
Ministry of Natural Resources	269	The document states that the only snake species known to occur in the area is Eastern Gartersnake (<i>Thamnophis sirtalis sirtalis</i>); however, Red-sided Gartersnake (<i>Thamnophis sirtalis parietalis</i>) is also likely found in the area.	Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document has been updated to reflect the two subspecies of Common Gartersnake that could be present within the Project study areas.	Appendix K	1991

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Both are subspecies of the Common Gartersnake (<i>Thamnophis sirtalis</i>). The latter is referenced as regionally significant in the Terms of Reference. Further, snakes were not separately evaluated for existing baseline conditions and effects. They have specific habitat requirements that potentially would not be captured through assessments for amphibians (e.g., hibernacula).</p> <p>To improve accuracy, please revise the document to describe species that are potentially present and provide an assessment of existing conditions baseline habitat characterization and anticipated impacts.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	270	<p>Appendix K states that no turtle species are found within the study area (Section 5.7.3); however, Wildlife Study Plan Section 7.2.2 (also in Appendix K) suggests Western Painted Turtle and Snapping Turtle have potential to exist within the Regional Study Area. Turtles are also referred to throughout various sections for mitigation, such as Section 7.3.1.6.4.2 Mitigation and Enhancement Measures (Page 254) state “[s]afe handling practices will be</p>	<p>Based on the information received from Aroland First Nation, Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document has been updated to include the acknowledgement that the northern extent of the ranges of Snapping Turtle and Western Painted Turtle are uncertain and may extend into the wildlife Regional Study Area. Appendix K has also be updated to include the Aroland First Nations observations of turtles along the Anaconda and Painter Lake Roads.</p>	Appendix K	1992

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>used to move turtles, snakes, [...]” Section 8.2.6.1.1.2 Distribution (Page 405) Indigenous Engagement Table 3-2 (Page 17)</p> <p>The background information and Indigenous Knowledge suggest there is potential for turtles in the Project area. Please ensure project effects on turtles and their unique habitats (e.g., nesting) are considered during existing conditions baseline habitat characterization and for potential impacts.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	271	<p>Certain species have been selected as “proxy” to represent all species that fall within a certain category; however, many of these groupings are not appropriate due to the vast differences in habitat requirements and behaviours, which will lead to an inaccurate assessment with underestimations. Examples: The report considers grey wolf, black bear, lynx, wolverine, marten, fisher, river otter, and snowshoe hare as furbearers but only marten, beaver, and wolverine are being assessed (as proxy) for existing conditions and effects. Black bears do not have similar habitat or</p>	<p>The species selected as representative species for the Valued Components (VCs) are considered appropriate and suitable for representing the broader wildlife groupings. Each VC chosen represents a larger group of species with similar characteristics such as feeding guild or trophic level, habitat association, ecological relevance, and their ability to act as effective indicators for assessing potential project related effects on similar species within the same functional group. It is important to select species wherein there are data available and also to consider species that have regulatory</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1993

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>behaviour to any of the proxy species, and are also a game animal with specific population management targets and policies; resident and nonresident harvest allocations; human-caused mortality thresholds, and hunting regulations that should be considered in the EA/IS.</p> <p>The report uses osprey as a proxy for all diurnal raptors; however, they require very specific habitat types (as referred to in the document) that are not consistent with any other diurnal raptors referred to in the area.</p> <p>Muskrat is specifically referenced by Marten Falls First Nation as being in decline, likely due to change in water levels; however, beaver numbers had been increasing (the chosen proxy species), demonstrating a differing numerical response to the same biological stressor – rendering that species inadequate to act as a proxy.</p> <p>There is also a significant relationship not being described with respect to wolves and their prey – mainly caribou, moose, beavers, and snowshoe hare. Linear features introduce opportunities for increased wolf efficiency and encounter rates, leading to higher levels of predation.</p>	<p>considerations.</p> <p>The proxy species used in the assessment reflect well established Environmental Assessment (EA) practice and are supported by the following rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ecological Representativeness: Selected species share habitat types, sensitivities, or ecological pathways with other species in their grouping, enabling them to reliably represent broader responses to project stressors. - Regulatory and Guidance Alignment: The chosen VCs align with provincial and federal EA guidance, which supports the use of representative species, particularly where comprehensive assessment of all species is not feasible. - Availability of Reliable Data and Models: For selected VCs (e.g., American marten, wolverine, beaver, little brown myotis and northern myotis), robust habitat models, field survey data, Indigenous Knowledge, and existing literature provide a strong foundation for defensible effects assessment. - Assessment Efficiency Without Loss of 		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Reconsider the use of proxies, and only use them where it can be demonstrated and supported that doing so enhances the assessment of existing conditions baseline habitat characterization and effects assessment. Detailed rationale for proxies used going forward (if any) should also be included in the EA/IS. All other species should be individually assessed and described.</p> <p>A similar comment was made previously by other regulators in 2021.</p> <p>B - Recommended for EA</p>	<p>Rigor: Using proxy species allows the EA to focus on species most likely to exhibit measurable responses, ensuring the assessment remains comprehensive while avoiding speculative conclusions for species with limited data.</p> <p>For these reasons, the current suite of wildlife VCs and proxy species is considered suitable and sufficient for characterizing baseline conditions and assessing potential effects. Additional species specific details for non VC species are included where relevant in Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document and its supporting attachments.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	272	<p>Bat acoustic surveys were performed with quite low coverage rates; however, they are still being used to inform interpretations of bat species prevalence, distribution, and habitat presence/absence. Seventeen ARU stations with an approximate coverage of 30-100m in radius (as per Wildlife Acoustics) = ~ 4.8 – 53.4 ha of surveyed area, representing ~ 0.20 to 2.8% of the total area within the right-of-way (assuming 100m wide x 190-230km). Bat species focused on as being present are restricted to northern myotis and little</p>	<p>The methods and results of the bat study are provided in Attachment B of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document. The bat study included all species of bats observed. Indigenous Knowledge the informed the wildlife assessment is provided in Section 3 of Appendix K.</p> <p>A description of the desktop review and field surveys completed to determine the absence of bat hibernacula are provided in Attachment B of Appendix K.</p> <p>Avoidance of disturbance or removal of</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1994

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>brown myotis; however, data published from the Far North Biodiversity Project (Layng et al., 2019) shows that big brown bats, hoary bats, eastern red bats, silver-haired bats, little brown myotis, northern myotis, and tri-coloured bats were all detected within reasonable proximity to the Regional Study Area.</p> <p>The document references that little brown myotis and northern myotis hibernate in caves and abandoned mining infrastructure, and due to the lack of these features present on the land base, it has been determined that no hibernacula are present within the Regional Study Area.</p> <p>However, hibernacula suitability is not limited to only those feature types and may be present on the landscape in natural rock outcrops and cliffs, such as those referred to by Neskantaga First Nation in 2021.</p> <p>It appears aerial reconnaissance surveys were carried out in 2019 to visually search the Local Study Area for features capable of supporting hibernating bats (Appendix K), but more detail is required. Section 8.2.2.1.2.2 Distribution (Page 351) states that “[...] given that bats are highly mobile and social animals, they are expected to find new roosting habitat within the wildlife effects assessment</p>	<p>potential bat roosts is included in the mitigation for the Project and includes the period when pups are not volant. A detailed discussion of the effects of habitat loss and alternation on little brown myotis and northern myotis is provided in Section 7.3.1.2 of Appendix K with supporting literature cited.</p>		

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>Regional Study Area.” This statement is overly vague and does not include supporting rationale.</p> <p>.</p> <p>Please provide a reference to the location in the appendices in the main EA document. Or include detail on limitations of the data collected for bats and provide references to literature, protocols, survey details and/or Indigenous Knowledge that support determinations of species presence, prevalence, and/or habitat availability to ensure the statements around existing conditions and effects are as accurate as possible.</p> <p>Please also provide the same detail for all species.</p> <p>Please provide a summary of field surveys completed to determine absence of hibernacula, as well as reference all of the databases that were reviewed in screening potential features to function as bat hibernacula in the Construction Development Area, Local Study Area and Regional Study Area.</p> <p>Depending on the time of year that clearing/construction occurs, bats could have pups that are not yet volant. Please provide reference to literature supporting that the bats will use other habitat without residual effects.</p>			

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		A - Required for EA			
Ministry of Natural Resources	273	<p>The report states American marten habitat suitability was estimated using the NE Regional model. This model was developed to support forest management planning within ecoregions 3E, 4E, and 5E; whereas the Project falls within ecoregions 2W and 2E.</p> <p>Within Section 5.2.2.3 (Page 103), details around current levels of harvest from trappers (commercial and subsistence) is lacking. Additional information is needed to support claims made about how that is expected to change.</p> <p>Please describe the limitations to this approach with consideration for the contrast between the ecoregional landscapes and provide rationale for how it was determined this model was appropriate and would accurately describe the existing condition and impacts.</p> <p>Please provide clarity on current American marten harvest levels.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>Since no eco-regional criteria schedules exist for ecoregions 2W and 2E, the habitat suitability model was informed by information from the nearest ecoregions (i.e., NE Regional model) and is supported by literature.</p> <p>Trapping impact on American marten are discussed in Section 5.2.2.3 of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1995
Ministry of	274	Under the mitigation, protection,	Industry-standard best practices for	Comment	1996

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Natural Resources		<p>monitoring, and study commitments to be carried forward to: detailed design, the text reads “Detailed Design planning will incorporate industry best practices used for blasting activities”. It is unclear what best practices are being referenced. construction/operation, the text says any periodic blasting will be completed outside of the denning period (February 1 to May 1), with considerations for sensory disturbance during this time. However, there is no consideration for other species-specific sensitive time periods and how sensory disturbance could impact other wildlife. The provided reproductive periods should be confirmed, as some appear to be incorrect (e.g., wolverine).</p> <p>Please provide detailed description of best practices to be implemented, as well as reference material to support that these are adequate mitigation measures for this activity.</p> <p>Please expand the potential impacts of all construction, implementation, and maintenance activities to all species’ sensitive timing with explanation of sensitivities and intolerance from species and habitat. Ensure the proper denning period date range is used for each</p>	<p>blasting will be incorporated during detail design. These practices include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - controlling blast timing to reduce noise and vibration exposure - implementing setback distances from sensitive wildlife features - using appropriate charge sizes - adhering to regulatory guidance intended to minimize sensory disturbance to wildlife. <p>These measures are consistent with provincial and federal expectations for minimizing environmental effects during blasting activities.</p> <p>With respect to sensitive periods, the Project will avoid blasting within 4 km of known or suspected wolverine denning areas during the wolverine denning period of January 15 to May 31, as indicated in Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document. Additional sensitive periods for other species are already considered through mitigation such as timing restrictions on activities for migratory birds, bat maternity roosting, and other wildlife features identified during pre-construction surveys. These timing considerations ensure that potential sensory disturbances are</p>	noted; see response for details.	

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>species throughout the documents.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>minimized across species groups. The mitigation measures outlined in Appendix K therefore remain appropriate, and no revisions to the report are required.</p>		
<p>Ministry of Natural Resources</p>	<p>275</p>	<p>Fugitive dust emissions are identified as a potential concern, however, there is no consideration for impacts to foraging habitat by birds and bats.</p> <p>Please expand on potential implications for air quality and deposition during phases of the Project (leading to impacts to prey availability) and how this may change over time or become more significant with climate change scenarios.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>The effects of fugitive dust emissions on wildlife including foraging habitat are discussed in Sections 7.3.1.1.3 and 8.2.1.1.1 of Appendix K Wildlife Technical Support Document. Section 8.2.1.1.3 of Appendix K has been updated to discuss how climate change may influence the effect of fugitive dust emissions in the future. Although mitigations will be implemented to reduce dust emissions, dust deposition during Construction and Operations are predicted to degrade vegetation immediately adjacent to the Project and dust deposition is expected over the life of the Project. Dust deposition, particularly during Operations, is predicted to result in negligible but certain changes to wildlife habitat availability including foraging habitat for birds and bats in the effects assessment Local Study Area. However, effects from dust emissions on the ability of the wildlife populations in the wildlife effects assessment Regional Study Area to remain self-sustaining and ecologically functional are anticipated to be negative and negligible in magnitude.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	<p>1997</p>

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Natural Resources	276	<p>The text states “excavation within identified permafrost areas will be avoided, whenever possible”.</p> <p>Please describe scenarios where excavation may be required and what mitigative measures will be implemented to minimize potential impacts. Additionally, a map of potential permafrost locations inserted into this section would be beneficial.</p> <p>A - Required for EA C - Editorial</p>	<p>Excavation within identified permafrost areas will be avoided, whenever possible, as cutting into surface vegetation can disturb the permafrost regime resulting in thaw and unstable ground. Detail design will primarily use fill along access roads to minimize any permafrost degradation. Should excavation within permafrost be unavoidable, excavation will follow the recommendations outlined in a Permafrost Management Plan which will be developed during detail design.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1998
Ministry of Natural Resources	277	<p>Detail is lacking on mitigation measures to implement while removing snow along the corridor.</p> <p>“Native seed mix” is referenced, but no details are provided. Will it be premade or a custom mix? Will the composition change depending on whether the replanting needs to occur in the Shield vs the lowlands?</p> <p>For clarity, please provide proposed mitigation measures for during snow removal (e.g., no piling of snow near water courses, no pushing dust/aggregate into watercourses below bridges, etc.).</p> <p>Please provide details on the seed mix</p>	<p>Mitigation measures for during snow removal will be included in the Environmental Protection Plan which will be developed by the Owner/Operator during detail design phase.</p> <p>The seed mix to be used for revegetation will be determined during detail design and included in the Environmental Protection Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1999

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>that will be used, including species seed list and whether the species composition with change depending upon location (e.g., Canadian Shield versus Hudson Bay Lowlands).</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	278	<p>There are likely indirect effects to wildlife because of changes in other disciplines not identified (i.e., social; economy; human, health and community safety; visual aesthetics; archeological, and cultural heritage). How were these considered?</p> <p>Please discuss where indirect effects were determined and provide rationale when other disciplines are not identified to not have an indirect effect on wildlife.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>A pathway based analysis was used to determine where other disciplines could plausibly influence wildlife, and no credible mechanisms were identified linking the social, economic, human health, community safety, visual, archaeological, or cultural heritage disciplines to wildlife effects. Including disciplines without a defensible cause and effect pathway would add speculation rather than improving the assessment. Therefore, no changes to the indirect effects analysis are proposed.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	2000
Ministry of Natural Resources	279	<p>The significance of effects was predicted as a binary response (i.e., significant or not significant). This may embellish the certainty of the significance in either direction as there is higher threshold for confidence in the assignment. The rationale and supporting information for how significance was determined would</p>	<p>A binary determination of significance is appropriate for this EA/IS because it aligns with both provincial and federal environmental assessment guidance, which requires identifying whether predicted residual effects are significant or not significant based on defined criteria. The assessment framework applied in this EA/IS incorporates</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	2001

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>require a high level of certainty to deem something “not significant”; however, many adverse residual effects on wildlife valued components are assigned as such.</p> <p>MNR recommends that an “unknown” significance class is included to be more representative of the current state of awareness and knowledge on potential adverse residual effects. Considering the low survey effort that has been completed for some species, potential uncertainty and lack of reliability in the results should be considered.</p> <p>A - Required for EA</p>	<p>magnitude, geographic extent, duration, frequency, reversibility, ecological context, and prediction confidence to inform this determination, clarifying that uncertainty and data limitations are already accounted for within the significance evaluation process. Introducing an additional “unknown” category would not change the underlying analysis and could reduce clarity for decision makers, whereas the current approach provides a transparent, defensible, and widely used method for communicating residual effects in environmental assessments.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	280	<p>Table only references feedback from Marten Falls FN on ATRI, but does not include reference to any of the other FNs scoped in. It is unclear whether the associated metrics to develop the route alternative evaluation are based solely on MFFN’s ATRI information, or if these have been developed with consideration for the ATRI information of other Indigenous communities.</p> <p>Recommend that the EA clarify whether the metrics to identify a preferred route also included community feedback/IK of</p>	<p>Table 4.3-3 (formerly Table 4-4) of the Final EA/IS includes information received through various consultation and engagement opportunities from November 2, 2022 to July 18, 2024. It includes information and feedback received from MFFN, as well as from Aroland, Long Lake #58, Nibinamik and Weenusk First Nations. Comments from the Indigenous community members and the general public were also sought at PIC #4 and PIC #5, at ATRI Forum #2 and through a webinar on Route Selection. This information was</p>	Comment noted; see response for details	1600

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		other Indigenous communities. If so, please update the table to reflect this.	considered in the evaluation of the Route Alternatives.		
Ministry of Natural Resources	281	Many entries in the table lack sufficient information/detail to understand the nature of feedback provided, and any responses to such feedback, including project updates/changes. Where public feedback was provided, please include additional detail (either in the table or reflected elsewhere in the document, with a reference to where this information is found) to describe the feedback received and any subsequent updates/changes in response to that feedback.	Table 4-4 of the Final EA/IS was prepared to provide the reviewer a summary of consultation activities, feedback received and changes to the route selection. Detailed information can be found in the Record of Consultation and Engagement Progress Report 3: Identification of the Preferred Alternatives Milestone.	Comment noted; see response for details	1598
Ministry of Natural Resources	282	<p>The section discusses several meetings between the proponent and Aroland First Nation without providing details of these meetings.</p> <p>Recommend adding a reference to an appendix that contains the details so that reviewers can cross-reference the feedback.</p>	A reference to the Record of Consultation and Engagement Progress Report 3: Identification of the Preferred Alternatives Milestone – Aroland First Nation November 2024 has been added to Section 4.4.1 of the Final EA/IS.	Final EA/IS Section 4.4.1	1597
Ministry of Natural Resources	283	No sub-bullets are provided for “Provided Indigenous Knowledge [...]” but there are sub-bullets for “Based on western scientific analysis”.	Appendix A includes the metrics used to help identify a Preferred Route. The first factor under each segment considered is Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests (ATRI). The indicator and	Comment noted; see response for details	1596

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		Please provide information on how the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge influenced the decision to select Alternative 1, and how it contributed to the overall benefits of this alternative.	measures columns provide information on how the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge influenced the decision on the Preferred Route.		
Ministry of Natural Resources	284	The Acts and regulations adhered to are not clearly listed. For each bullet add the source of the regulatory requirement (e.g. ToR under the EA Act).	A table, similar to Table 13-1 of the Terms of Reference, has been inserted into Appendix AA. The table lists the potential permits and approvals which may be required following the EA process.	Appendix AA	1594
Ministry of Natural Resources	285	There is no definition for “Indigenous knowledge” included in the Draft EA/IS Report. Please consider adding the definition for Indigenous knowledge in the main EA document or point the reader to where it can be found in the appendix.	Section 6.1 of the Final EA/IS provides a definition of Indigenous Knowledge. It should be noted that this section was updated based on feedback from Indigenous communities, including Weenusk and Kashechewan First Nations.	Comment noted; see response for details	1593
Ministry of Natural Resources	286	<p>In referring to the spatial boundaries of the project, there is no mention of how the “People” (People/Land/Water) aspect of project influences or affects the boundaries of the project and the considerations for the valued components.</p> <p>Include a section describing how the “People” aspect of the analysis influenced the boundaries.</p>	The spatial boundaries section has not been updated in the Final EA/IS as this comment is considered recommended (comment Type B) rather than required for EA (comment Type A). The people spatial boundaries are described in the Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests Technical Support Document (Appendix O) and the Community Well Being Technical Support Document (Appendix T).	Comment noted; see response for details	1592

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Natural Resources	287	<p>No mention of impacts on or residual impacts on Sec. 35 rights.</p> <p>Ensure that the Preliminary ATRI Existing Conditions and Impact Assessment Report include potential impacts and residual impacts on Sec 35 rights or alternatively, describe how other impact and mitigation considerations address Sec 35 rights concerns.</p>	<p>Appendix O Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests (ATRI) Technical Support Document outlines the methods used to assess effects to ATRI and section 35 rights. Residual and cumulative effects related to ATRI and section 35 rights are detailed in the community-specific ATRI reports which have been provided directly to the communities and are considered confidential.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1590
Ministry of Natural Resources	288	<p>How will impacts on the “people”/Sec 35 rights be monitored?</p> <p>Please ensure that the monitoring programs described also include monitoring impacts to Sec 35 Rights.</p>	<p>Proposed mitigation measures include the collaboration with local existing environmental advisory committees to support the development and implementation of all environmental monitoring programs. The objective is to include Indigenous interests and perspectives, particularly concerning resources utilized for rights-based purposes. In the absence of an existing advisory committee with an aligned mandate to Marten Falls First Nation, work with relevant agencies and Indigenous Peoples to establish a Terms of Reference for one.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1589
Ministry of Natural Resources	289	<p>Table includes concerns identified by Marten Falls First Nation and Aroland First Nation but does not include any concerns from other Indigenous</p>	<p>At the time of submission of the Draft EA/IS, only Indigenous Knowledge from Marten Falls First Nations and Aroland First Nations had been provided. The</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1588

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>communities being consulted on the Project. The MNR is aware of concerns from other Indigenous communities related to listed topics (contained within table) that have been brought forward.</p> <p>Please ensure that the table is inclusive/reflective of all Indigenous communities that have shared information related to the topics included in the table.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS has been updated to include additional Indigenous Knowledge and feedback received and is presented in Table 8.1-1.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	290	<p>Indicators, Rationale for selection and measure of change omit potential impacts on Sec 35.</p> <p>Please consider impacts on Sec 35 rights and reflect in information contained in table.</p>	<p>Details about the selection of valued components and indicators for surface water are presented in Section 4.2.2 of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document.</p> <p>The determination of valued components considered factors including the extent to which the valued component is linked to the interests or exercise of Aboriginal and Treaty Rights of Indigenous Peoples and whether an Indigenous group has requested the valued component. Information and/or concerns shared by Indigenous Peoples and other interested persons which informed the surface water assessment are outlined in Tables 3-2 and 3-3 of Appendix F.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1586
Ministry of	291	Table doesn't indicate current levels of	Information shared by Indigenous	Comment	1583

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Natural Resources		use by area First Nations. Include additional detail or provide specific reference to appendix/location where this information is contained.	Peoples and Communities is summarized in Section 3 of Appendix G Fish and Fish Habitat Technical Support Document. Available information from a Geographic Information Systems database that summarized Indigenous Knowledge was also included in Attachment B of Appendix G. Note that the information was primarily for named waterbodies, such as the Albany River, Ogoki River, and Wabassi River.	noted; see response for details.	
Ministry of Natural Resources	292	Comments made by MFFN regarding human-induced environmental issues as a legacy of commercial fur trade, but no examples of what is meant by this (e.g., reduced populations?) Please include additional detail for clarity.	No examples of human-induced environmental issues as a legacy of commercial fur trade were provided by Marten Falls First Nations.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1582
Ministry of Natural Resources	293	Last row – mentions mitigation measures related to pollution impacts provided by Marten Falls First Nation but doesn't list any. Please add suggested mitigation measures.	Marten Falls First Nation provided Indigenous Knowledge and suggested mitigation measures regarding impacts of pollution which have been included in the mitigation measures presented for each Valued Component Discipline in Section 9 of the Final EA/IS.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1581
Ministry of Natural	294	Some valued components are described very generally (e.g. "Upland Ecosystem")	Valued Components (VCs) presented in Table 8.2-2 (formerly Table 8-14) of the	Comment noted; see	1580

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Resources		<p>while other components are mentioned specifically (e.g. species listed).</p> <p>“Rationale for Selection” lists “cultural” but should distinguish between “cultural” vs impacts to Sec 35 rights.</p> <p>Consider describing/defining valued components more specifically.</p> <p>Please differentiate between values that are strictly cultural and values that are rights-based.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS are derived from the discipline specific Technical Support Documents. Rationale for selection of VCs is described in Section 4 of the Technical Support Document appendices. The requested edit has not been completed as this comment is considered recommended.</p>	<p>response for details.</p>	
Ministry of Natural Resources	295	<p>Typo – COSEWIC, not COSWEIC.</p> <p>First row – Project name reads “Lac Suel...”, should be “Lac Seul...”. Please correct.</p>	<p>Table 10.1-1 (formerly Table 10-1) of the Final EA/IS has been corrected to "Lac Seul First Nation".</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Table 10.1-1</p>	1578
Ministry of Natural Resources	296	<p>Description of importance of moose and caribou to First Nations lacks mention of Sec 35 rights.</p> <p>Please further describe the importance of ungulates to First Nations as it relates to potential impacts to Sec. 35 rights.</p>	<p>The importance of ungulates to First Nations in relation to Section 35 Rights are described in the community-specific Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests Reports.</p>	<p>Comment noted; see response for details.</p>	1577
Ministry of Natural Resources	297	<p>The section could also include information on the cultural importance and archaeological potential of eskers.</p>	<p>Section 8.2.8.6.2 of the Final EA/IS has been updated to clarify the importance of eskers for lichen growth that support caribou.</p>	<p>Final EA/IS Section 8.2.8.6.2</p>	1576

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		Consider expanding section to include a sentence or two on the historic use and importance of eskers to first nations in the area.			
Ministry of Natural Resources	298	<p>It will be important for MNR to see and review the ATRI report to get a better understanding of the level and scope of engagement that has occurred.</p> <p>Please share the ATRI report when it is complete and ensure all details referred to in the main document are present in completed appendices/ATRI Report.</p>	<p>The Final EA/IS has been updated to include the Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interest (ATRI) information. Marten Falls First Nation prepared Preliminary Existing Conditions Report as well as Draft ATRI reports for each Indigenous community and group; and updated these based on feedback received. As discussed with the Ministry of Energy and Mines and Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks Marten, Falls First Nation will share redacted Final ATRI reports with the Province and the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada. This will be done to protect sensitive / confidential information. Marten Falls First Nation plans to redact any non-publicly available content, if applicable, before the Final ATRI reports are released to the regulators.</p>	Final EA/IS Section 8.3.4, 9.5.2 and 10.4.2.	1575
Ministry of Natural Resources	299	Proponent states that locations where cultural heritage values are likely to exist will be identified through community engagement and IK program with Marten Falls First Nation. This approach does	Proposed mitigation measures include the collaboration with local existing environmental advisory committees to support the development and implementation of environmental	Comment noted; see response for details.	1574

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>not appear to provide consideration of IK from other Indigenous communities with shared/overlapping use/interests within the Local Study Area.</p> <p>Please ensure opportunities for involvement by other Indigenous communities with overlapping/shared areas is provided.</p> <p>Will support more fulsome consideration of Indigenous Land Use and Indigenous Knowledge within the Local Study Area.</p>	<p>monitoring programs. The objective is to include Indigenous interests and perspectives, particularly concerning resources utilized for rights-based purposes. In the absence of an existing advisory committee with an aligned mandate to Marten Falls First Nation, work with relevant agencies and Indigenous Peoples to establish a Terms of Reference for one.</p>		
Ministry of Natural Resources	300	<p>The Surface Water Effects Assessment, states that the 'social context of the effect...includes Indigenous Knowledge where available'. From the information provided, it is unclear where or how IK has been provided/considered in this assessment.</p> <p>Where the EA identifies the inclusion of IK in effects assessments, please provide additional detail/information that demonstrates how it was considered and incorporated.</p>	<p>Section 8.1.1 of the Final EA/IS outlines feedback provided by interested parties, and Indigenous communities, including Indigenous Knowledge and how it informed the EA/IS. Section 3 of Appendix F Surface Water Technical Support Document outlines feedback provided by interested parties, and Indigenous communities, including Indigenous Knowledge related specifically to surface water and how the shared information was used to inform the surface water assessment.</p> <p>Table 3.1 and Table 3.2 of Appendix F provide a summary of shared information and concerns, and reference numbers of sections where the shared information was used to inform this reporting.</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1573

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
			Discussion about ecological and social context is provided in Section 4.4.2.5.1 of Appendix F.		
Ministry of Natural Resources	301	<p>Section describes the nature of community meetings but doesn't include any feedback from those meetings.</p> <p>Please include community feedback or indicate where community feedback will be included.</p>	Section 6.1 of the Final EA/IS outlines how feedback was gathered from communities. Section 3 in each Technical Support Document outlines information provided related to each discipline.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1571
Ministry of Natural Resources	302	<p>It is not clear where and how Indigenous Knowledge/input has been incorporated into the Draft EA/IS. For example, pg. 840 identifies that feedback from Marten Falls First Nation community members helped to refine the preliminary preferred route, but limited information provided to explain/describe what the feedback was and the subsequent changes that may have been made in response to that feedback.</p> <p>For the final EA/IS please include more detailed information about where and how IK and feedback has been incorporated/considered into baseline conditions/current state, identified mitigation, etc. Please include evidence/supporting detail rather than just high-level statements.</p>	Section 11 of the Final EA/IS outlines how Indigenous Knowledge and feedback was collected and how it informed the EA/IS. In addition, each Technical Support Document includes Section 3 which outlines what was shared by interested persons, and Indigenous communities, including Indigenous Knowledge, and how it informed each of the assessments.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1569

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
Ministry of Natural Resources	303	<p>Comment: The Draft EA/IS lacks sufficient detail for the Crown to make an assessment regarding the sufficiency of consultation or to understand where feedback has been provided/concerns identified and whether/how these have been considered/addressed.</p> <p>Proposed Action/Solution: A comprehensive consultation record is imperative to the Crown's assessment of the duty to consult. This record should provide a fulsome and detailed summary of the consultation with each of the identified Indigenous communities, including any feedback/concerns received, where/how these have been responded to including any proposed mitigation measures, etc.</p> <p>Type of comment: A. Required for EA (per ministry mandate/policy/legislation)</p>	A detailed record of consultation is available in Appendix X Record of Consultation.	Appendix X	2005
Ministry of Natural Resources	303	The Draft EA/IS lacks sufficient detail for the Crown to make an assessment regarding the sufficiency of consultation or to understand where feedback has been provided/concerns identified and whether/how these have been considered/addressed.	A detailed record of consultation is included in Appendix X Record of Consultation.	Comment noted; see response for details.	1568

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>A comprehensive consultation record is imperative to the Crown’s assessment of the duty to consult. This record should provide a fulsome and detailed summary of the consultation with each of the identified Indigenous communities, including any feedback/concerns received, where/how these have been responded to including any proposed mitigation measures, etc.</p>			
Ministry of Natural Resources	304	<p>It is stated that details on how the road will be built and operated are conceptual and presented at a high level in the Draft EA/IS. Conceptual/high-level presentation likely does not provide sufficient information for Indigenous communities to fully understand and identify potential impacts from the Project. To the extent that detailed design and permitting for the Project are dealt with post-EA, additional Indigenous consultation for MNR permits and authorizations may be required.</p> <p>Final EA/IS should include detailed project information related to the design and operation/use of the road to the greatest extent possible to ensure sufficient information to identify project impacts, appropriate mitigation</p>	<p>A Band Council Resolution for the Community Access Road Preferred Route was issued in August 2024 and geotechnical work could not commence until the winter of 2025. These are key inputs required to be able to advance the design of the Community Access Road, including the location and number of access roads.</p> <p>The Final EA / IS was conducted on the Project Study Area as shown on Figure ES 4-1 of the Final EA/IS and which is the most up to date footprint. As stated in Section 6.5.2 of the Final EA/IS, the Project Study Area consists of a corridor area 2.5 km from the centreline. Minor adjustments within the area are generally permissible during detail design. However, any significant deviation</p>	Comment noted; see response for details.	1565

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

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Addressed in the EA / IS	Internal ID
		<p>measures, permitting/authorization requirements, etc. For example, the Final EA/IS should clearly identify the location and number of temporary access roads, decommissioning/reclamation strategies, etc.</p>	<p>beyond it may require additional assessment and regulatory review. It should be noted that there are currently no plans for the Preferred Route to be outside the Project Study Area.</p>		