

Identifier	Topic	Reference to EIS/EA Report	Summary of Previous Comment	Proponent's Response to Previous Comment	Follow-up comment/ Request for Information	New Proponent Response	Subsequent Comment
			<i>Date: August 2015</i> MNRF-1	<i>Date: September 2015</i>	<i>Date: April 2017</i>	<i>Date: June 2017</i>	
MNRF-1B	Transmission lines	EIS/EA 4.2.8, 5.2.8.2	<p>The amended AAR did include two additional comparisons which were length of the road and number of water crossings for each alternative, but no other comparatives were used such as presence or absences of wetlands, sensitive nesting sites, spawning sites etc.</p> <p>With the information provided, the proponent has prematurely concluded 'the alternatives are not anticipated to affect water quality, air quality, stream flows, or ground water. It is well recognized that there are potential environmental impacts with construction and maintenance of transmission lines. Activities that are often associated with transmission lines include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access. There will need to be new access to much of the proposed corridor area to allow construction of the line. - Tree clearing and vegetation clearing. - Blasting may be required for foundation construction. - Excavation of overburden. <p>All of these activities have some potential for environmental effect. It is expected the assessment of alternatives would consider these types of potential effects in the assessment as well as social/aesthetic concern and have them presented on the <u>Comparisons Evaluation Table</u>.</p> <p>The alternative that crosses Sawbill bay was added after the baseline studies were done and there are data gaps. As well, there has been no data collected on the Alternative 2 (Raft Lake Road), which has been excluded in the study area.</p> <p>An alternative of a submarine option was not considered.</p> <p>The information in the No Net Loss Plan is not adequate for the water crossings. There are a limited number of crossings described. And it is likely that most of the crossings will be considered under the <i>Public Lands Act</i>, not the <i>LRIA</i>, for which there has not been adequate EA coverage.</p> <p>Water crossing information is important for evaluation and assessment purposes for both the transmission line and road corridors. Not only from an environmental aspect (the number, the type (culvert vs bridge), the disturbance required, the sensitivity of the site, etc, but also from an economic and social impact aspect.</p> <p>Fig. 1-3, Fig 2-1, Fig 2-2 and Fig 2-3 do not show the three alternatives.</p> <p>Regarding more information about how the proponent plans to cross Sawbill Bay, the addendum continues to lack information. Information provided at the face to face meeting of July 8, 2014 showed proposed locations of the towers, as drawings of the tower designs. The steel tower structure in those drawings are shown to be 52-63m tall. In discussions with Hydro One, structures to span these distances will need to be very tall (i.e. likely greater than >100m) and will likely require additional requirements such as aviation lighting.</p>	Additional information provided in draft report: <i>Supplemental Assessment of Access Road and Transmission Line Routing Alternatives; Amec Foster Wheeler (2017)</i> .	<p>Section 1.2 Page 5 (final paragraph): MNRF requests that references related to Individual EA vs Class EA be clarified. Suggested wording is as follows : "This document provides the required additional information to support the Individual EA stage, recognizing that some of the detail referenced in the May 25, 2016 letter to the MOECC relates more to the environmental permits and approvals stage for the transmission line construction, rather than to providing the information necessary to select preferred alignments at the EA stage of investigation. It is important to distinguish between the level of detail considered at the Individual EA stage, and level of detail to be provided at the permitting and approvals stage. Further engineering and other details will be provided at the environmental permitting and approvals stage once final alignments for the access road and the transmission line have been defined through the Individual EA Stage."</p> <p>Section 4.3 Page 18 - Please clarify in text what type of water crossings will be constructed in order to provide access to the locations for the construction of the tower sites, acknowledging that permitting and approvals stage may require further data and review/approval of other permitting authorities, such as DFO.</p> <p>Sec. 7.3.1 Reference to the FMP Guide for Biodiversity is not applicable to this project, therefore reference to it requires removal</p> <p>Decommissioning plan for the Transmission Line is to be included in the Closure Plan. MNRF's concern here is about post-closure liability.</p>	<p>The revisions requested had been made in final report: Supplemental Assessment of Access Road and Transmission Line Routing Alternatives , submitted as Part 5 of the Version 3 Alternatives Assessment TSD.</p> <p>Decommissioning of the Transmission Line will be a component of the Certified Closure Plan to be submitted to the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines.</p>	N/A