

Webequie First Nation
Comments and Clarifications from Review of Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines for the Webequie Supply Road

Table A – Comments/Questions Related to Draft Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (TISG)

Section	Item	Issue / Excerpt	Comment / Question / Request
3.2.1 Site preparation and construction	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> water management, including water diversions, dewatering or deposition activities, stormwater management required (location, methods, timing), potable water, water use requirements, and wastewater if applicable, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> site plans showing all project components, such as, water management infrastructures, location of all material stockpiles, location of all release points to the receiving environment, location of all major water crossings, location of all relevant waterbodies, and any other components or infrastructures relevant to the project; 	Given the coordinated nature of the EA/IA, with the level of design detail for the provincial EA being in the order of 30% (Preliminary Design), it is likely that the level of design required for the preparation of site plans cited in the draft TISG (60-90% - Detail Design) will not be available. It may be possible to provide high level/general/typical site plans.
3.2.2 Operation	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> description of any road access controls, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> access to and use of adjacent lands for traditional uses or other activities (e.g., mineral exploration, outfitters, etc.); vehicle and operator licensing requirements; insurance coverage requirements and general liability; and enforcement/policing responsibility. 	Ownership and control of the Webequie Supply Road requires further discussion between Webequie First Nation and Ontario. Details related to cited access controls (if any) will be determined at some point after the EA/IA has been completed and will not be available for inclusion in the Impact Statement.
3.2.3 Suspension, abandonment or decommissioning	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the ownership, transfer and control of the different project components; 	WFN is the proponent for the EA/IA. Further discussions between WFN and Ontario are necessary to establish ownership, administrative/operational controls; these details will not be available for inclusion in the Impact Statement.
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> final site restoration; 	Final site restoration plans will not be prepared until the Detail Design phase (after completion of the EA/IA). The Impact Statement will include a commitment to prepare such plans.
4.4 Alternative means of carrying out the project	1	<p>In its alternative means analysis, the proponent must address all project elements, including, but not limited to, the following project elements and components, where relevant to the project activities and design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> route or corridor and means options for electrical transmission lines; 	Alternatives assessment for electrical transmission lines can be removed from the scope. As indicated in Section 1.1 of the Detailed Project Description "In the future, the road corridor could also be used to accommodate power transmission lines and broadband infrastructure. However, given the current uncertainty as to how and when power and communications infrastructure will be extended into the project area, these components have not been included in the scope of the Project.", and temporary power sources are covered elsewhere in this section of the draft TISG.
5 Description of Public Participation and Views	1	<p>In addition to its own engagement activities, the proponent is expected to participate meaningfully in engagement activities outlined in the Public Participation Plan. The Agency will organize meetings, as per the Public Participation Plan, The proponent is expected to take into consideration the feedback received during these meetings as well as community knowledge in the development of the Impact Statement.</p>	<p>The requirement for the proponent to participate in Agency engagement activities, in addition to its own engagement activities, has significant budget and timing implications, since these activities are not currently included in the Webequie Project Team's planned work scope or schedule. To facilitate our current budget reforecasting activities, kindly provide the Webequie Project Team with an estimate of the number of such activities during the Impact Statement phase, as well as the general timing, if possible, at your earliest convenience.</p>
5.1 Analysis and response to questions, comments, and issues raised		<p>The Impact Statement and the analysis must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> issues, questions and comments raised by local communities and other stakeholders (associations, non-government organizations, academics, industry and public) during the engagement activities, by the proponent and when participating in Agency led engagement activities, and the proponent's responses, including how matters have been addressed in the Impact Statement, or will be addressed through the impact assessment process; 	
6 Description of Engagement with Indigenous Groups	1	<p>In addition, the Agency will organize a series of meetings, as per the Indigenous Engagement and Partnership Plan, in coordination with the proponent, to discuss technical matters as it progresses through its baseline data collection, effects assessment, impacts on the exercise of Aboriginal and Treaty rights, and mitigation and follow-up development. After each stage of this process, the proponent will participate in meetings with the Agency, federal authorities and Indigenous groups to discuss technical matters..... The proponent is expected to take into consideration the feedback received during these meetings in the development of the Impact Statement.</p>	<p>The requirement for the proponent to participate in Agency-led IEPP technical meetings has significant budget and timing implications, since these meetings are not currently included in the Webequie Project Team's planned work scope or schedule. To facilitate our current budget reforecasting activities, kindly provide the Webequie Project Team with an estimate of the number of such meetings during the Impact Statement phase, as well as the general timing, if possible, at your earliest convenience.</p> <p>Since these are Agency-led meetings, WFN expects that the Agency will fully document meeting results and share that documentation with the Webequie Project Team in a timely manner to facilitate proponent consideration of the feedback received and its inclusion in the Impact Statement and Record of Consultation. Please confirm that this will be the case.</p>
7.3 Consideration and methodology in selecting VCs	1	<p>Species at Risk should each individually be considered a VC (including but not limited to Barn Swallow, Canada Warbler, Chimney Swift, Common Nighthawk, Eastern Whip-poor-will, Olive-sided Flycatcher, Short-eared Owl, Yellow Rail, Wolverine, boreal caribou, Little Brown Myotis, and Northern Myotis).</p>	<p>This list differs from the one in Section 15.4 Species at Risk and their habitat under Effects to Valued Components and is more prescriptive than the approach provided in Section 8.12 Species at Risk under Biophysical Baseline Conditions, which allows the proponent to develop the initial list of provincial and federal SAR that may be directly or indirectly affected. Note that from the preliminary presence/absence determination by the proponent and input received from the</p>



Webequie First Nation
Comments and Clarifications from Review of Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines for the Webequie Supply Road

Table A – Comments/Questions Related to Draft Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (TISG)

Section	Item	Issue / Excerpt	Comment / Question / Request
			<p>Ontario Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks on the Draft Terms of Reference for the provincial EA, the following provincially and/or federally listed Species at Risk could potentially be found in the project area: Bald Eagle; Barn Swallow; Bank Swallow; Canada Warbler; Yellow Rail; Common Nighthawk; Rusty Blackbird; Olive-sided Flycatcher; Wolverine; Caribou (Boreal population and Eastern Migratory population); Little Brown Myotis; Lake Sturgeon.</p> <p>Additionally, it is our understanding that VCs are identified based on the potential for residual environmental effects from a designated project. Species at Risk will each be assessed through the scoping for the cumulative effects assessment and will either be included for the cumulative effects assessment or not included (with rationale documented). Furthermore, VCs will not be carried forward to analysis unless it is determined that the VC is likely to be affected by other past, present, or future physical activities within the individualized spatial and temporal boundaries.</p> <p>The Agency is requested to provide clarification.</p>
7.4 Spatial and temporal boundaries	1	<p>For VCs related to Wetlands, Eskers, Birds, Wildlife, and Species at Risk, establish three study area spatial boundaries to assess impacts to each VC:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Project Study Area (PSA): defined as the project footprint for each alternative route; 2) Local Study Area (LSA): defined for each VC – see below; 3) Regional Study Area (RSA): defined for each VC – see below 	<p>To avoid confusion with nomenclature related to the broader project area, the Webequie Project Team has elected not to use the term “Project Study Area”. The study area for assessment of effects within the immediate proximity of the alternative road corridors and the selected road corridor will be referred to as the “Project Footprint”, as defined in the Detailed Project Description – established to identify areas of direct disturbance (i.e., the physical area required for construction and operation of the Project). The project footprint is the 35 m right-of-way width and temporary or permanent areas needed to support the Project that include laydown yards, storage yards, construction camps, access roads and aggregate extraction sites. This is also consistent with the language used in the provincial Terms of Reference.</p>
	2	<p>For Species VCs: The LSA should correspond to the PSA plus a buffer defined with objectives a-c above. Use simulation modeling to help define a buffer that captures objectives a-c for each species or species group.</p> <p>Contact provincial and/or local government authorities to verify appropriate boundaries for wildlife species.</p> <p>For Wolverine: The LSA should be at a minimum: PSA plus a 10-kilometre buffer. Simulation modeling may indicate a larger buffer.</p> <p>For Bats: The LSA should be at a minimum: PSA plus a 1-kilometre buffer. Simulation modelling may indicate a larger buffer.</p> <p>For Caribou: the LSA should be at a minimum: PSA plus a 10-40-kilometre buffer. Simulation modeling may indicate a larger buffer. In addition to assessing project and cumulative effects at the scale of the three study areas defined above, also assess at the scale of the implicated Ontario caribou ranges (Missisa and Ozhiski), and the federal Far North caribou range.</p>	<p>Although we have no specific concerns with LSAs for Wolverine, Bats and Caribou, we suggest that the specific spatial boundaries for Species VCs and other VCs not be specified in the TISG, as this will be determined as part of the IA/EA process through further consultation and engagement with federal/provincial agencies having jurisdiction, including Indigenous communities, the public and stakeholders.</p>
8.1 Atmospheric, acoustic, and visual environment baseline	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide current ambient noise levels at key receptor points to traditional land users and sensitive human receptors, including the results of a baseline ambient noise survey and permissible sound levels for each receptor. Information on typical sound sources, geographic extent and temporal variations will be included. Ensure baseline data is representative of project site conditions. If surrogate data from reference sites is used rather than site-specific surveys, demonstrate how the data is representative of site conditions; 	<p>Please clarify the expectation with respect to ambient noise levels. It is anticipated that baseline ambient levels could be surveyed for sensitive receivers normally subject to noise and vibration assessment protocols (residences). It is assumed that “key receptor points to traditional land users” will normally apply to remote locations in the bush (i.e., outside the built-up residential community of Webequie), and recognized typical ambient noise levels, rather than the results of field surveys/measurements, for such areas can be used in the assessment.</p>
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for the aquatic environment, provide current underwater soundscape and vibration descriptions of the study area and at the project site from various sources based on acoustic measurements. Provide information on vibration and sound sources, geographic extent and spatial and temporal variations within the water column; 	<p>Please clarify the applicability of/need to characterize the underwater soundscape and vibration environment (based on acoustic measurements) and provide information on acoustic variations in the water column on this linear road project.</p>
8.5 Riparian and wetland environments	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • quantify, delineate and describe wetlands (fens, marshes, peat lands, bogs, etc.) within the local study area potentially directly, indirectly and/or cumulatively affected by the project in the context of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ wetland class, ecological community type and conservation status; 	<p>Clarification is requested: Does this statement refer to an official conservation status of the wetland in question, or the conservation status of species found within as discussed in Section 8.8 ?. Given the extensive nature of the wetlands in the project area, due to its’ location within the James Bay Lowlands, it will be extremely problematic to determine conservation status of wetlands within the study area. Land Information Ontario (LIO) lists all wetlands within the study</p>

Webequie First Nation
Comments and Clarifications from Review of Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines for the Webequie Supply Road

Table A – Comments/Questions Related to Draft Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (TISG)

Section	Item	Issue / Excerpt	Comment / Question / Request
			area as unevaluated, and The Ontario Far North Wetland Evaluation system states that it is not applicable to the James Bay Lowland (Wetland Boundaries Section, pg. 27).
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide a wetland functions assessment in accordance with the guiding principles of Wetland Ecological Functions Assessment: An Overview of Approaches or any subsequent approved guidelines by which to determine the most appropriate functions assessment methodology to use (see Appendix 1): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ complete this assessment prior to the start of Project construction for all wetlands that the Project would directly impact and for any wetland(s) that are hydrologically connected. In conducting this assessment, the Proponent should ensure that wetlands are considered in the context of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the larger watersheds of which they are a part; ii. adjacent land use with a focus on hydrological and other functions; and iii. landscape and/or watershed considering topography, soil types and hydrological linkages. ○ this assessment should be quantitative and include the collection of site-specific baseline information on wetland functions, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Surveys to assess for the presence, abundance, density, and distribution of migratory birds and federally listed species at risk, provincially listed species at risk, and species assessed by COSEWIC as at-risk in relation to potentially impacted wetlands and associated riparian areas. Surveys should meet appropriate standards (see sections 8.10, 8.11, and 8.12), be species or bird group specific as appropriate, and be conducted during the appropriate times of the year as specified in section 8.10-12 of this document. Surveys for species at risk should assess species individually where possible (typically an indicator approach is not appropriate for species at risk). Surveys should not be limited to species or groups of species that are wetland-obligate, but rather should include any species known to use wetland habitats as part of its lifecycle. Data should be sufficiently robust to identify which wetland classes are important to which species (and for how many). ii. The spatial location and a description of the biological characteristics of each potentially impacted wetland and the ecological services and functions (hydrology, biochemical cycling, habitat, climate) they provide. The functions assessment should be as specific as possible to the biological characteristics of the wetland and to the ecological services and functions it provides. 	<p>As discussed above in comment 8.5 – Item 1, given the extensive presence and remote nature of the wetlands in the project area due to its' location within the James Bay Lowlands, it will be extremely problematic to perform a Wetlands Functions Assessment on each wetland to derive the data required for Wetland function scores, used for comparisons as outlined in The Wetland Ecological Functions Assessment: An Overview of Approaches and subsequent suggested methodologies (e.g., Minnesota Routine Assessment Method (MnRAM)). The project area is composed of approximately 90% wetland along its 107km length, and all of these wetlands are intricately complexed to each other and the broader James Bay Lowlands Wetland. The Ontario Far North Wetland Evaluation system itself, states that it is not applicable to the James Bay Lowland (Wetland Boundaries Section, pg. 27).</p> <p>The wetland function methodologies currently developed are designed for areas with more limited wetland prevalence, greater number wetland/upland interfaces, more defined wetland boundaries, and more intense anthropomorphic pressure/use than those within the proposed project study area.</p> <p>The current methodology we are employing is to delineate the wetlands based on Ontario Land Information (LIO) wetland, and Ontario Land Classification Data. We will then refine these wetland delineations and develop an initial classification of each wetland polygon based on the Canadian Wetland Classification System (CWCS) based on Satellite Imagery and Lidar Imagery flown in 2018, followed by selective field sampling via helicopter to ground truth CWCS assumptions within the wider Local and Regional study areas (LSA and RSA). The sampling program will also be used to develop ELC level resolution at sampling locations within the Project Study Area (PSA) which would be extrapolated out to other PSA areas. Vegetative composition and SAR related studies would be part of this process. Would an aggregated approach of developing wetland functions by wetland class/ELC be acceptable in place of individual wetland specific functional assessments.</p> <p>The Agency is requested to provide clarification based on the above comments.</p>
8.6 Groundwater and surface water	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide complete hydrometeorological (temperature, precipitation, evapotranspiration) information based on data from nearby weather stations or from a weather station on site; • provide flow hydrographs for nearby streams and rivers showing the full range of seasonal and inter-annual variations; they may be based on data from nearby gauging stations or from gauging stations on site; 	Clarification is requested: Would the existing government stations (WSC and EC stations) in the general project area be acceptable or would they be considered too far from the project? Is the expectation that the Project establish a site-specific hydrometric monitoring network?
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop a quantitative surface water balance for the local or regional watershed(s) containing the project 	Clarification is requested: Is a water balance required for the road itself or for also supportive infrastructure components such as quarry/ aggregate extraction areas and construction camps ?. Given that the Project consists of a proposed gravel road with minimal stormwater management implications (i.e. there are no proposed stormwater management ponds/containment structures/ sewer systems; only localized ditches and culverts) the anticipated change to flow patterns and infiltration is expected to be minimal. If a water balance is required, can you please clarify the objectives and purpose.
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide baseline groundwater quality data for physicochemical parameters (temperature, pH, electrical conductivity, dissolved oxygen, turbidity) and relevant chemical constituents (major and minor ions, trace metals, radionuclides, nutrients, and organic compounds, including those of potential concern); the data should illustrate the seasonal and interannual variability in baseline groundwater quality, including possible changes due to groundwater–surface water interactions; • provide baseline surface water quality data, for a minimum of two years, for physicochemical parameters (temperature, pH, electrical conductivity, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, suspended solids) and relevant chemical constituents (major and minor ions, trace metals, radionuclides, 	<p>Radionuclides need to be further defined and clarified by the Agency with respect to baseline data collection requirements. There are 14 natural and 64 artificial radionuclides listed in the Ontario drinking water quality standards. We propose to do only common natural radionuclides in water including Radium and/or Uranium.</p> <p>It is recommended the organic compounds be specified and defined. Considering road construction and operation and potential contaminants of concern from these activities, it is suggested that volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and petroleum hydrocarbons (PHCs) be included in the groundwater sampling program.</p>

Webequie First Nation
Comments and Clarifications from Review of Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines for the Webequie Supply Road

Table A – Comments/Questions Related to Draft Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (TISG)

Section	Item	Issue / Excerpt	Comment / Question / Request
		nutrients, and organic compounds, including those of potential concern); the data should illustrate the seasonal and inter-annual variability in baseline surface water quality, including possible changes due to groundwater–surface water interactions;	Seasonal surface and groundwater quality variations could be achieved by conducting multiple water sampling events in a year, i.e., spring (May/June), summer (July/August) and fall (October/November). However, considering the remote nature of the site (helicopter access only), logistical challenges and associated cost of a multi-seasonal the water sampling program, it is recommended water sampling be conducted once a year in summer (July/August). The scale and magnitude of seasonal variations could be referenced from the previous seasonal sampling results reported by others in the project area (i.e. Noront’s Eagle’s Nest Mine site). It is suggested that the Agency consider consistency for the frequency and parameters for surface and groundwater sampling from the perspective of efficiency, cost for the proponent to implement and to overall have a better understanding of groundwater and surface water interactions for the IA.
	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide stage hydrographs for nearby lakes showing the full range of seasonal and inter-annual water level variations; provide the timing of freeze/thaw cycles, ice cover, and ice conditions for surface water bodies in the project area; 	While a monitoring program could be established, it is unlikely that the length of the data set will be sufficient to demonstrate the typical behaviors of the water levels and ice conditions from a historical perspective. A monitoring program would provide a “snapshot” of the lake conditions; however, it will be uncertain if this period is representative of normal conditions. As well, the effort to complete such as program for data collection is considered cost prohibitive. It is suggested that the Agency reconsider this requirement and better define data collection requirements. Antidotal evidence (Indigenous Knowledge) from community members may be a more appropriate and valuable to determine lake levels, freeze/thaw timing and ice conditions for a typical year at select waterbody crossings. Since the community members use these watercourses both recreationally and as part of their livelihood (traditional land use activities), their years of observation and experience will likely provide a more complete assessment.
8.9 Fish and Fish Habitat	1	Provide a characterization of fish (as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Fisheries Act) and other aquatic species on the basis of resident and migratory species, food webs and trophic levels, structural and functional linkages, life history and population dynamics, such as dispersion, fertility, recruitment, mortality rates, re-colonization, age structure, sex ratios, population regulation, stability, distribution (communities, stocks, subpopulations, metapopulations), movements, migratory patterns, routes and preferred corridor, seasonal and annual trends in abundance, sensitive habitats and periods in relation to the study area, behavioural habitat selection, mating strategies, social interactions, predator-prey interactions at multiple spatial and temporal scales, which are critical to identifying effects to population persistence and ecological processes	The proponent’s approach to provide characterizations of fish and other aquatic species for the factors listed will be completed based on a review of available background information sources (desktop exercise), Indigenous Knowledge where provided, and from two seasons of field aquatic investigations that will collect data for select factors. The characterization of fish and fish habitat is intended to focus on those indicator species to be identified in the IA that are of greatest importance to Indigenous communities for recreation, commercial and/or food source (country food) purposes. The Agency is requested to clarify if the above approach is considered to meet their expectations.
	2	Provide a description of the biodiversity within the freshwater environment, including; trophic state, periphyton, phytoplankton, zooplankton, fish and the interactions and relative significance of each species with the identified food chains.	Similar to the above comment, the description of the biodiversity within the freshwater environment is proposed to be provided by the proponent from the review of available literature for similar systems and similar habitats. No specific field investigations are proposed to support the description and characterization of biodiversity within the freshwater environment.
	3	Provide a description and location of critical habitats for aquatic species at risk that are known to be present within the study area.	Aquatic species at risk habitat within the study area will be described, including the locations from review of secondary sources. No specific aquatic species at risk surveys are proposed by the proponent, for the only currently known species in the project area (Lake Sturgeon). While critical habitat for Lake Sturgeon has been identified on the Department of Fisheries and Oceans aquatic species at risk mapping at Winisk Lake, Winisk River and the Muketei River the identification, description and assessment of “critical habitat” will be limited to the habitat that is necessary for the survival or recovery of listed extirpated, endangered, or threatened species, and that has been identified as Critical Habitat in a recovery strategy or action plan.
8.10 Birds, migratory birds and their habitat	1	Collect explanatory (i.e. covariate) data necessary for modelling in such a way as to adequately represent the following spatial sources of variation...inter- and intra-annual climatic variability.	It is not clear how a meaningful comparison of intra-annual climatic variability can be conducted in the time-frame available for the IA. Can the Agency provide clarification as to the expectation and purpose of this data collection/modelling specific to the Project and where feasible provide an example of what is expected for the modeling ?
	2	Species communities should not be collapsed into diversity metrics or the focus narrowed to indicator species.	It is requested that the Agency clarify and elaborate on the statement that “species communities should not be collapsed into diversity metrics or the focus narrowed to indicator species.”
	3	Generate measures of abundance and distribution using spatially balanced, randomly-selected sample locations.	While well-intentioned, this recommendation is considered will be difficult to implement as study site selection is often based on helicopter access points and the ability of a survey crew to navigate the remote landscape (bogs/fens) that present health and safety challenges. The draft guidelines mention a number of particular habitat features/types (i.e.



Table A – Comments/Questions Related to Draft Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (TISG)

Section	Item	Issue / Excerpt	Comment / Question / Request
			<p>eskers, river riparian corridors) that should be targeted. Based on past field surveys for the Project, it is clear that very detailed selection of survey sites is required to ensure that the field team is not exposed to hazards and that field hours are best utilized within desired habitat in order to maximize data collection and qualify within the scope of a stratified study design. It should be noted that many land features that provide uncommon habitat types within the study area (i.e. eskers, string bogs, river edges) are present as narrow bands, within which precise survey point location is required in order to prevent frequent survey overlap with more common habitat types (i.e. treed bog).</p> <p>Based on the above response, it is requested that the Agency clarify the expectations regarding the requirement to generate measures of abundance and distribution using spatially balanced, randomly-selected sample locations.</p>
	4	Where important habitat edges are identified, sampling should be designed so that it is possible to describe the importance of not only the habitat types, but also of the edges between habitat types.	<p>The level of detail described in this statement appears excessive, given the extent to which a survey stratification is described in previous guideline points and to which data is requested for specific bird families/guilds. Given the large scale of the study area for the Project, identification of individual edge habitats of importance would require a vast amount of resources, without any standardized criteria that rate the importance or value of edge habitats.</p> <p>It is requested that the Agency reconsider this requirement and/or provide further clarification as to expectation on data collection and overall purpose and context relative to the Project.</p>
8.12 Species at Risk	1	Locate and confirm use of high value habitat features such as roosts.	<p>From discussions between the Webequie Project Team and the Ontario Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP, Michelle Karam) it has been agreed that that searches for maternity roosts are not required to satisfy provincial requirements for bat SAR, as searches are generally unsuccessful and provide relatively little useful data regarding the importance of habitat for SAR bats.</p> <p>As we recognize that SAR is an overlapping are of interest and assessment in the coordinated IA/EA, can the Agency please clarify if tree cavity searches are required to identify potential maternity roosts.</p>
	2	Locate and assess potential hibernacula and roosts for use by bats, accounting for inter-annual and within-season variability in use	<p>Beyond identification of use of these features by bats, it is not clear why accounting for inter-annual variability in use is a requirement. Such features, once identified would be avoided or impacts would be mitigated. Assessment of inter-annual use would require an un-due level of survey effort.</p> <p>The Agency is requested to clarify and confirm the data requirements to assess potential hibernacula and roosts for use by bats.</p>
10.0 Baseline Conditions – Social 11.0 Baseline Conditions – Economic 12.0 Baseline Conditions – Indigenous Peoples	1	Scope of baseline data required.as stipulated in the TISG.	<p>The proposed approach for the socio-economic baseline study will include baseline data for the 9 First Nation communities in the Agency’s list of Indigenous Communities to consult with. Baseline data collection will be completed on two levels: 1) Information available through published sources (i.e., 2016 Census, available studies, etc.). Targeting regional/provincial and cultural and historical characteristics. 2) Community specific characteristics through key informant surveys, as well as any published information obtained through census, community land use planning, Indigenous Knowledge, and other studies, etc. Where there is an information gap or where information cannot be obtained from an Indigenous community, it will be not part of the impact assessment analysis due to the lack of information.</p> <p>The Agency is requested to clarify if this approach meets baseline and impact analysis expectations.</p>
12.4 Conditions Related to the Rights of Indigenous Peoples	1	“The impact statement should document the nature and extent of the exercise of rights of Indigenous peoples, potentially impacted by the project, as identified by the Indigenous group(s).”	<p>Determining the nature and extent of the exercise of rights of Indigenous peoples, potentially directly or indirectly affected by the project will be dependent on the information provided by participating communities and community members. In general terms, where a community member has identified the use of land and resources, it will be assumed that the community member’s Indigenous and/or Treaty right to continue to use that land as they have traditionally, must be protected. Where impacts could potentially occur as a result of the project on a community member’s rights the proponent will work with impacted families to identify opportunities for mitigation and/or accommodation to minimize project impacts and effects on their rights.</p>



Webequie First Nation
Comments and Clarifications from Review of Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines for the Webequie Supply Road

Table A – Comments/Questions Related to Draft Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (TISG)

Section	Item	Issue / Excerpt	Comment / Question / Request
14.2 Changes to groundwater and surface water	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> describe any applicable water quality treatment measures and provide evidence supporting the effectiveness of these measures; 	It would be difficult to provide any evidence for treatment effectiveness during the EA phase if it refers to any water quality testing before and after the treatment system. The effectiveness of the applicable water quality treatment measures normally comes from the design specifications of the treatment system from the suppliers.
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide an assessment for off-site migration pathways for impacted groundwater, and an analysis of contaminant attenuation capacities within the hydrogeological units of the project study area; 	The analysis of contaminant attenuation capacities will be based on the above-mentioned baseline hydrogeological settings and groundwater qualities. No specifically designed extensive groundwater quality sampling program is required for the purpose of contaminant attenuation capacity analysis.
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide a project-specific water use assessment identifying and describing the quantity and quality of water resources potentially affected by the project, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> any withdrawal of groundwater or surface water; changes to the groundwater recharge/discharge areas; temporal and spatial changes in groundwater quantity, quality and low (e.g., long-term changes in water levels), including how these changes may relate to domestic, communal or municipal water supply wells; the flow or volume of water available in the water bodies; and how and where any waste waters or dewatering water would be discharged. 	<p>Clarification: Is a specific water use assessment required for the road itself or the potential quarry/ aggregate sources? Is the intent to quantify the water anticipated to be used during construction of the gravel road or that may be required during operations and maintenance?</p> <p>At this stage, the construction methodology has not been finalized. While water will likely be withdrawn during construction, the volume/rates, timing and withdrawal/discharge location(s) have not been assessed. It is envisioned that water required for the project would be governed by O. Reg. 387/04: Water Taking or Transfer under <u>Ontario Water Resources Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.40.</u> and would be assessed accordingly at a later stage in the project.</p>
	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> present any applicable water management plan, including for any aggregate sources and stockpiles; present estimates of surface water runoff rates for major project components, including aggregate and overburden stockpiles. 	At this stage, the construction methodology, staging and stockpile locations have not been assessed. Water management plans and surface water runoff rates for major project components, including for any aggregate sources and stockpiles as well as erosion and sediment control plans will be developed as required, as the technical details of the project are developed.
	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> present an integrated site water balance model incorporating surface and groundwater fluxes to or from all major project components, for the construction, operation and decommissioning and abandonment periods; 	Clarification: Similar to Section 8.6 Groundwater and Surface water Point 9, is a water balance required for the road itself or the potential quarry/ aggregate sources? It is unclear what is meant by “decommissioning and abandonment periods” with respect to the road. Is this intended to be applicable to potential quarry locations only?
	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> describe the quantity and quality of all effluent streams released from the site to the receiving environment, including surface runoff from aggregate and overburden stockpiles, and dewatering discharge; compare the quality of all effluent streams to the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME) Water Quality Guidelines for the Protection of Aquatic Life, and to provincial water quality objectives for contaminants of concern that do not have CCME guidelines. 	Details of construction methodology, staging and stockpile locations, along with quarry specifics will not be available until after the IA has been completed (they will be developed during the Detail Design phase). The assessment of quantity and quality of all effluent streams will also be assessed during Detail Design, and appropriate mitigation techniques will be developed committed to for implementation during construction. This is expected to include the monitoring and comparison of effluent quality with established federal and provincial guidelines.
	7	<p><u>Water Quality Resulting from Acid Rock Drainage and/or Metal Leaching</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide estimates of the potential for mined aggregate materials to be sources of acid rock drainage or metal leaching; including estimates of potential time to the onset of acid rock drainage or metal leaching; describe the types of method used to predict acid rock drainage and/or metal leaching for construction materials; provide estimates of surface and seepage water quality from the aggregate and overburden stockpiles and project infrastructure during construction, and operation and post-closure periods, decommissioning and abandonment; provide aggregate volumes and tonnage, and construction methods; describe methods to prevent or control acid rock drainage and metal leaching during construction, operation and decommissioning and abandonment; and describe contingency plans, monitoring during operation and decommissioning and abandonment, and maintenance plans. 	At this stage, preliminary aggregate sources have been identified; however, the construction methodology, staging and stockpile locations have not been assessed. The volume of aggregate material required will be refined once the design progresses and material take-offs are available. Geochemical testing will be carried out on potential aggregate sources to assess their acid rock drainage and/or metal leaching potential. The exact testing methodology has not been developed; however, it will follow industry standards. The results of the testing will be used to develop the project, including construction techniques, monitoring requirements and contingencies.
15.4 Species at risk and their habitat	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> describe the potential direct, incidental and cumulative adverse effects of the designated project on species at risk listed under Schedule 1 of the Species at Risk Act and, where applicable, its critical habitat (including its extent, availability and presence of biophysical attributes). Species at risk which may inhabit the project area include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lake sturgeon; Northern Myotis; Brown Myotis; Caribou (Missisa and Ozhiski); 	Please refer to commentary under 7.3 regarding the discrepancies between SAR lists.



Webequie First Nation
Comments and Clarifications from Review of Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines for the Webequie Supply Road

Table A – Comments/Questions Related to Draft Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (TISG)

Section	Item	Issue / Excerpt	Comment / Question / Request
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rusty Blackbird; ○ Barn Swallow; ○ Canada Warbler; ○ Common Nighthawk; ○ Olive-sided fly-catcher; and ○ Wolverine; 	
	2	<p>In relation to describing effects on Caribou (Habitat Protection) on pg. 73, the following factors must be addressed for Category 1: High Use Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nursery Areas - Winter Use Areas - Travel Corridors <p>There are a number of indicators identified under each factor.</p>	<p>We understand that the factors and indicators originated from the Ontario MECP Species at Risk Branch. It appears that the indicators for “Nursery Areas” have been repeated verbatim under “Winter Use Areas” and under “Travel Corridors”. Please clarify whether this was intentional, or whether other, discrete indicators under the latter two factors should replace those for Nursery Areas.</p>
17.0 Effects to Valued Components – Social	1	<p>“The assessment must illustrate an understanding of linkages and effect pathways, so that when a change in one domain (health, social and/or economic) is predicted, there is an understanding of what other effects of consequences may be felt across the other domains.”</p>	<p>The significance, magnitude, duration, etc. of any predicted direct or indirect impact (positive and negative) in any domain will be determined using an effect pathways approach. Effects or consequences felt across other domains will be examined and addressed.</p>
18.0 Effects to Valued Components – Economic			
18.5 Public Finances	1	<p>“Describe the project’s effect on local/municipal, provincial/territorial, federal, and Indigenous group public finances...”</p>	<p>Our ability to assess potential impacts on Indigenous group public finances will depend on the availability of data and the willingness of community leadership to publicize such data.</p>
19.2 Impact to the Exercise of Aboriginal and Treaty Rights of Indigenous Peoples	1	<p>“Proponents are encouraged to work together with Indigenous groups to find mutually agreeable solutions to concerns raised about a proposed project, especially for those concerns raised by Indigenous peoples about impacts on the exercise of their rights.”</p>	<p>Determining the nature and extent of the exercise of rights of Indigenous peoples, potentially directly or indirectly affected by the project will be dependent on the information provided by participating communities and community members. In general terms, where a community member has identified the use of land and resources, it will be assumed that the community member’s Indigenous and/or Treaty right to continue to use that land as they have traditionally, must be protected. Where impacts could potentially occur as a result of the project on a community member’s rights the proponent will work with impacted community members to identify opportunities for mitigation and/or accommodation to minimize project impacts and effects on their rights.</p>
21 Residual effects	1	<p>Severity: Within the scope, the level of damage to the VC from the impact that can reasonably be expected. For ecosystems and ecological communities, typically measured as the degree of destruction or degradation of the VC within the scope. For species, usually measured as the degree of reduction of the VC population within the scope.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extreme: Within the scope, the impact is likely to destroy or eliminate the VC, or reduce its population by 71 to 100 percent within ten years or three generations. • Serious: Within the scope, the impact is likely to seriously degrade/reduce the VC or reduce its population by 31 to 70 percent within ten years or three generations. • Moderate: Within the scope, the impact is likely to moderately degrade/reduce the VC or reduce its population by 11 to 30 percent within ten years or three generations. • Slight: Within the scope, the impact is likely to only slightly degrade/reduce the VC or reduce its population by 1 to 10 percent within ten years or three generations. 	<p>The measure for degree of severity implies that a quantitative calculation method or modeling exercise would be required to assess a reduction/effect to a VC population over temporal periods. Can the Agency please clarify and/or provide an example of any assessment methodology for a VC that would meet their expectations.</p>
22 Cumulative Effects Assessment	1	<p>The cumulative effects assessment must include consideration of cumulative effects to rights of Indigenous peoples and cultures, for all potentially impacted groups including those located in the Greenstone mineral belt which will be impacted by increased access to the region by exploration and mineral development projects.</p>	<p>Determining the nature and extent of the exercise of rights of Indigenous peoples, potentially directly or indirectly affected by the project will be dependent on the information provided by participating communities and community members. In general terms, where a community member has identified the use of land and resources, it will be assumed that the community member’s Indigenous and/or Treaty right to continue to use that land as they have traditionally, must be protected. Where impacts could potentially occur as a result of the project on a community</p>



Webequie First Nation
 Comments and Clarifications from Review of Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines for the Webequie Supply Road

Table A – Comments/Questions Related to Draft Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (TISG)

Section	Item	Issue / Excerpt	Comment / Question / Request
			<p>member's rights the proponent will work with impacted families to identify opportunities for mitigation and/or accommodation to minimize project impacts and effects on their rights.</p> <p>Use of the term "Greenstone mineral belt" appears to be a misnomer (why is "Greenstone" title case?) and we are unable to find a reference to it elsewhere. The geographic location and extent of the area referred to are unclear. The term "greenstone belt" has global usage, referring to "zones of variably metamorphosed mafic to ultramafic volcanic sequences with associated sedimentary rocks that occur within Archaean and Proterozoic cratons between granite and gneiss bodies." Presumably, its use here is not related to the amalgamated Municipality of Greenstone; there appears to be no direct relationship between the municipality and a defined mineral belt. The Abitibi greenstone belt is in the area, but this would not entirely make sense due to its size. Please clarify with mapping.</p>