

Identifier	Topic	Reference to EIS/EA Report	Summary of Comment	Proponent's Response	Subsequent Comment
			<i>Date: March 2014</i>	<i>Date: June 2015</i>	
MNR-Documentation	General overall comments on presentation and alternatives		<p>Formatting – Floods and Droughts are noted at end of section 6.5.1 but should be in separate heading.</p> <p>As identified earlier, the glossary provided in the EA uses unacceptable sources for definitions. Definitions are very important in achieving a good understanding of the project at planning and at implementation. The glossary has not been revised.</p> <p>Because the EA was not amended from the draft, there are a number of MNR concerns that remain outstanding. Either the commitment provided from the proponent was not followed through, or comments were never addressed. For this reason, the table provided in December, has been submitted to accompany this table.</p> <p>Correction to the alternatives assessment workshop provided. The corrected details need to be provided in the ER (section 4 and TSDs). It should be noted that only EC, DFO, NRCan and MNM agencies attended.</p> <p>MNR does not disagree there has been engagement with agencies throughout the EA. Only one of the listed meetings was specifically scheduled to discuss alternatives, and most of CEAC was not in attendance. The statement in the AAR TSD needs to be amended so that it is not understood agencies were satisfied with the alternatives selected and assessed.</p> <p>Please present location alternatives in the EA report.</p> <p>Please provide the descriptions provided in the response in the EA (descriptions of LSA and RSA)</p> <p>Response does not satisfy the request. The request was for a map that shows all of the project components together and on a scale that clearly shows all the components. Additionally, the location or alternative locations for the water supply pipeline and the communications tower should be identified in the EA. (MNR 11)</p> <p>Fig 5-1 does not meet satisfy the request for an overall map that shows the entire planned project, at a scale of 1:30,000 (as in Figure 4-6) with all project components i.e., the linear corridors, crossings, communications tower, water pipeline etc. See above comments regarding presentation of alternatives. The main issue with how they are currently presented, is that there is no clear summary of ALL of the alternatives that were considered from the early planning stages, the ToR and then the EA. The reader should not be expected to scout through previous documents and correspondence to get a clear picture of all the alternatives considered.</p> <p>Provide description and map with these details.</p> <p>MNR disagrees. One map showing the ecosites overall should be included in the main document, with more detail in the TSD. The EA is not an easy document to follow. The number of times the reader has to cross reference to the TSDs, appendices or other sections to get the full story is not a good delivery of the work that has been done.</p> <p>The first part of the comment has not been addressed (i.e., correction to cottage lots and seasonal homes.</p> <p>These protected areas are within the RSA and should be acknowledged in the EA report.</p>	<p>Formatting and documentation comments are noted and have been accommodated where possible.</p>	