

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-3		<i>Date: April 2017</i>	<i>Date: June 2017</i>	
MNRF-3B	Access Roads		<p>The additional information provided and the missing information needs to be included in a revised Table 3-8 of the TSD). Activities for both alternatives need to be weighed against one another for all of the potential impacts (i.e. technical, feasibility, environmental, etc.). And any mitigation measures which are considered in the comparison.</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 in the NNLP. And it is likely that most of the crossings will be considered under the Public Lands Act over the LRIA, 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 but also from an economic and social impact aspect (the number, the type (culvert vs bridge), the disturbance required, the sensitivity of the site, etc.). New and upgraded water crossings are expensive. It is not clear how 7 water crossings are more costly than 14. A brief description of the crossings is needed and identification if they are new, upgraded or existing. For example; there are areas on both alternatives that will need significant crossing structures.</p> <p>The two alternatives were brought forward in the EA. The proponent should identify and consider the potential effects of <u>each</u> alternative with aspects of the environment. The Raft Lake road, was not included in the study area, no baseline work was done and the EA did not present the potential effects and the disadvantages and advantages (as described in our earlier comments). This also includes the feasibility comparison. This demonstrates there has not been an extensive evaluation.</p> <p>Additional information (length of road and water crossings) and the plans for realignments on the Sawbill Rd (Figure MNR 1) is appreciated. However more information and further planning regarding specific works (i.e. lake infilling, blasting, etc.) will be needed at permitting. These activities may also be subject to other permitting requirements from other agencies. These requirements will likely add time to obtaining approvals.</p>	Additional information provided in: Supplemental Assessment of Access Road and Transmission Line Routing Alternatives in Part 4 of the Alternatives Assessment TSD	Specific details and documentation will be required at permitting and approvals stage related to the widening of the Sawbill Road at water crossings and the infilling of waterbodies in order to perform this work. New water crossings will require detailed planning at permits and approvals stage as well. These activities may require other permitting from other agencies as well. Acknowledgement of the additional information required should be included in the text.	CMC acknowledges that additional information related to the widening of the Sawbill Road and associated water crossings will be required at the permitting and approvals stage. The required information will be provided when the permit applications are submitted.	N/A