

Enclosure 1: Provincial Authority Advice Record – New Nuclear at Wesleyville Project

Registry No. 89802

Please submit the completed form by February 11, 2026, via email to wesleyville@iaac-aeic.gc.ca.¹

Department/Agency Contact Information

Submission Date	March 3, 2026
Department/Agency	Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks
Lead Contact, Title, Work Unit	May Lyn Trudelle, Senior Program Support Coordinator, Environmental Assessment Branch
Email, Phone	MayLyn.Trudelle@ontario.ca
Alternate Contact, Title, Work Unit	Nick Colella, Supervisor, Environmental Assessment Branch
Email, Phone	Nick.Colella@ontario.ca

Review the draft Initial Project Description and answer the following questions:

1. Will your department or agency exercise a **power, perform a duty or function**, or provide **financial assistance**, related to the project to enable it to be carried out in whole or in part?

As relevant,

- a) Specify the power, duty or function, or financial assistance, and the likelihood that it will be required to construct the project, as either Required, Potential, Likely, Unlikely or Not Required

MECP Response

The table below, adapted from Annex C of the Initial Project Description (IPD), identifies Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) approvals/authorizations that are potentially applicable to the New Nuclear at Wesleyville project (NNW project). The proponent is encouraged to engage MECP directly to confirm the applicability of the below-noted processes, approvals and authorizations.

Legislative / Policy Context and Permits, Licences, Approvals or Authorizations Required

Environmental Protection Act (EPA)

- Potential for project activities to meet regulatory requirements for:
 - Disposal of contaminated soils under Regulation 347, General – Waste Management;
 - Excess soil management under Ontario Regulation 406/19, On-Site and Excess Soil Management and MECP document [Rules for soil management and excess soil quality standards | ontario.ca](#);
 - Requirements for managing potential spills/pollutants under Part X, section 92;
 - Transportation of non-nuclear waste under:
 - Part V (Waste Management)
 - Regulation 347, General – Waste Management
 - Ontario Regulation 119/25, Registrations Under Part II.2 of the Act – Waste Transportation Systems
 - Any building demolition, if the total floor area of the building is 2,000 square metres, or greater requires a waste audit beforehand, in accordance with Ontario Regulation 102/94.
- The requirement for an environmental compliance approval (ECA) is set out under Part II.1. The following sections further specify the types of activities that require an ECA under the EPA:

¹ Please note that advice provided to IAAC may be posted on the Canadian Impact Assessment Registry Internet Site or otherwise made available to the public.

New Nuclear at Wesleyville Project

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section 9 - for facilities or equipment discharging contaminants to air, noise, or causing vibration; ○ Section 27 - for the transportation, management, processing, or disposal of certain types of waste. ● The requirement to register certain activities in the Environmental Activity and Sector Registry (EASR) is established in Part II.2, section 20.21. This section requires registration for activities prescribed in a regulation—meaning if an activity is listed in the regulations made under the EPA (such as Ontario Regulation 119/25), the activity must be registered on the EASR rather than obtaining an ECA.
<p>Ontario Water Resources Act (OWRA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Water takings that exceed 50,000 litres per day are regulated under section 34 and require either a permit to take water (PTTW) or registration on the EASR. ● An ECA may be required under section 53 for works that involve collecting, transmitting, treating or disposing of sewage e.g. stormwater management facilities, the discharge of treated effluent to surface or groundwater.
<p>Endangered Species Act, 2007 (ESA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Authorizations may be required if there is potential to kill, harm, capture, possess transport and/or damage or destroy habitat of species listed under Ontario Regulation 230/08 (Species at Risk in Ontario List) which are classified as extirpated, endangered, or threatened in Ontario. ● Please note that on June 5, 2025, the Province of Ontario passed Bill 5: Protecting Ontario by Unleashing our Economy Act, 2025 which included amendments to the <i>Endangered Species Act, 2007</i> that are now in force, and the creation of the <i>Species Conservation Act, 2025</i> which is not yet in effect. These changes are intended to streamline permit applications and approvals and help projects proceed faster while continuing to provide important protections for species at risk and their habitats. ● The proposal for the regulations to support the <i>Species Conservation Act, 2025</i> and the new framework for species at risk authorizations has been posted to the Environmental Registry of Ontario at: https://ero.ontario.ca/index.php/notice/025-0908 https://ero.ontario.ca/index.php/notice/025-0909 ● In time, once new supporting regulations are created, the <i>Endangered Species Act, 2007</i>, will be replaced by the new <i>Species Conservation Act, 2025</i> which will enable a new Species Conservation Registry to allow for faster, online registration of eligible activities impacting protected species. Additionally, under the <i>Species Conservation Act, 2025</i>, provincial authorization for migratory birds and aquatic species (fish and mussels) listed on Schedule 1 of the federal <i>Species at Risk Act</i> would not be required. ● MECP is not able to provide precise timing on the changes. Until the <i>Species Conservation Act, 2025</i> is enacted, the amended <i>Endangered Species Act, 2007</i> continues to apply and any applications and information shared with MECP at this time will be assessed under the current legislation.
<p>Environmental Assessment Act (EAA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Details about transmission infrastructure necessary for the project are not provided in the Initial Project Description (IPD). Transmission lines that are $\geq 115\text{kV}$ and $> 2\text{km}$ in length and transmission stations that are $\geq 115\text{kV}$ may trigger the Transmission Facilities Class Environmental Assessment. ● The IPD discusses certain waterfront projects (shoreline works and infilling). Per section 26 of O. Reg. 50/24, waterfront projects in Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River System may trigger comprehensive environmental assessment requirements if the project involves: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Altering at least 1 km of shoreline; and ○ Filling at least 4 ha of lakebed or riverbed ● The Class EA for MNR Resource Stewardship and Facility Development Projects may be triggered for any applicable dispositions by MNR of rights to Crown resources. ● Certain waste management activities may trigger the Environmental Screening Process for Waste Management Projects or comprehensive environmental assessment requirements depending on factors such as the waste type, waste disposal volume, and daily tonnage of

New Nuclear at Wesleyville Project

waste transferred from the site for final disposal, as applicable.

- b) Describe any associated Indigenous or public consultation, including timelines, and elaborate on any potential opportunities for consultation coordination with the impact assessment process, if an impact assessment is required

MECP Response:

Projects/activities subject to provincial environmental assessment (EA) processes such as the comprehensive EA process or the Class EA for Transmission Facilities generally have public and Indigenous consultation requirements that the proponent must fulfill. Additional details can be found by reviewing the relevant links provided in response to question 2(d) below.

Crown decisions such as issuing permits/approvals under the *Environmental Protection Act*, *Ontario Water Resources Act*, and *Endangered Species Act* may trigger the Crown's duty to consult with Indigenous communities when the decisions have the potential to adversely affect Aboriginal and/or treaty rights. When the Crown's duty to consult is triggered, the procedural aspects of consultation may be delegated to the proponent.

Certain permits/approvals under MECP legislation require public consultation through the Environmental Registry of Ontario (typically minimum 30-day comment period) per the *Environmental Bill of Rights, 1993* (EBR). Certain exceptions from this consultation requirement may apply (e.g. per sections 29-33 of the EBR).

There may be opportunities to coordinate consultation for provincial regulatory processes with the federal impact assessment, depending on the proponent's timelines and readiness to begin provincial processes during the federal impact assessment process.

- c) Describe any associated information requirements (e.g., alternative means assessment, habitat offsetting), and specify those that may be coordinated with the impact assessment process, if an impact assessment is required

MECP Response:

Environmental Assessment Act (EAA)

Projects/activities subject to environmental assessment (EA) processes under the EAA generally have requirements to assess environmental effects and may be required to assess alternatives (e.g. 'alternatives to' an undertaking and 'alternative methods' of carrying out an undertaking), depending on the applicable EA process. Additional details can be found by reviewing the relevant links provided in response to question 2(d) below. There may be opportunities for a proponent to coordinate this assessment work with the federal impact assessment if any provincial EA work is required, which is unclear at this time (see EA section in answer to q1, above).

Endangered Species Act

Additional project details are required to understand potential impacts to species at risk and the mitigations that may be utilized. Information about species at risk impacts and mitigations may contribute to the impact assessment process.

- d) Identify any associated project-specific guidance or issues of which the proponent should be aware, or information the proponent should provide

MECP Response:

Environmental Assessment Act (EAA)

The following resources may be helpful to the proponent in determining applicable requirements under the EAA:

New Nuclear at Wesleyville Project

[Environmental assessments | ontario.ca](#)
[Class EA for Transmission Facilities](#)
[Class EA for MNR Resource Stewardship and Facility Development Projects](#)
[Guide to Environmental Assessment Requirements for Waste Management Projects](#)
[Guide to Environmental Assessment Requirements for Electricity Projects](#)

Endangered Species Act (ESA)

Seeking an ESA authorization is an applicant-led process, meaning individuals conducting activities are responsible for determining the presence of species at risk (SAR) and their habitat, understanding the potential impacts of their project activities on SAR and their habitat by conducting proper due diligence, and ensuring their actions comply with the ESA.

Up-to-date and accurate information is required to determine impacts and provide support on potential mitigations. Please see Table 1 for additional information.

Ontario Water Resources Act (OWRA) – Permit to Take Water (PTTW)

PTTW is not explicitly named in the document, but large-scale water takings are clearly integral to the project, and PTTW will almost certainly be required.

There are multiple triggers for MECP interest and comment, particularly around:

- cooling water withdrawals from Lake Ontario
- potential groundwater takings (construction dewatering)
- impacts to Highly Vulnerable Aquifers (HVA) and Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas (SGRA)
- thermal and water quality effects on receiving waters
- cumulative effects and Indigenous water interests

PTTW approvals will be required for:

- cooling water withdrawals from Lake Ontario (high volumes may trigger Great Lake Charter)
- any groundwater takings for construction dewatering (EASR eligible)

Future submissions should clearly address:

- proposed maximum daily and annual taking volumes
- source-specific impacts (Lake Ontario vs. groundwater)
- thermal plume modelling
- interaction with HVA and SGRA

Cumulative effects of water takings (existing + proposed + climate change) need to be assessed explicitly.

Regional Considerations

For the proponent's awareness, below is a list of current MECP permissions within the proposed site area:

- Bromley Fabricators (992145 Ontario Inc.) is a metal fabrication facility operating under an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) - Air.
- Peterborough Equipment Trailers is an automotive facility registered on the Environmental Activity and Sector Registry.
- The existing site is currently operating as a multi-use facility, which includes a training venue for fire fighting operations. The site operates under an ECA - Industrial Sewage Works and was also approved to operate a non-hazardous waste disposal site.

New Nuclear at Wesleyville Project

- e) Indicate whether your department or agency has identified any power that it will be unable, or may be unable, to exercise to allow the project to proceed, in whole or in part as currently planned, with reasons; if unsure, explain what must be resolved to increase confidence

MECP Response:

Endangered Species Act (ESA)

Additional information is required to determine if activities conducted by New Nuclear Wesleyville Project would require authorization for impacts to species at risk under the amended ESA.

2. **Using Table 1**, identify project- and context-specific **key issues** based on the expertise within your mandate and the information in your possession. Available information may include your access to databases and corporate knowledge, the draft Initial Project Description, any exchanges with the proponent or others related to the project and known means to address the effects.

For each key issue:

- a) Specify the key issue (e.g., specific species and location)
- b) Specify the project component or activity linked to the key issue
- c) Explain why it is a key issue based on:
 - i. biophysical effect pathway(s) from the specific project component or activity
 - ii. concerns unique to the project or a priority within your mandate
 - iii. the issue being material² to decision-making under the *Impact Assessment Act*
- d) Potential pathways from key issues that could lead to an impact on Indigenous Peoples and their rights
- e) Identify how the issue could be resolved, including through other means than an impact assessment (e.g., other regulatory oversight)
- f) Identify additional information the proponent could provide to build confidence about how the issue could be addressed through other means

IAAC has prepared a preliminary list of potential effects that are likely to be key issues for the impact assessment.³ While completing **Table 1**, IAAC requests that, as appropriate based on your department or agency's mandate and expertise, you validate this list, add precision or rationale where appropriate, and recommend any additional key issues for consideration. For a federal work or undertaking, such as nuclear energy works, a broader range of effects are within federal jurisdiction, including socio-economic effects.

IAAC has identified the following topics as **potential key issues** for the impact assessment:

- Effects to Biological Environment: vegetation (terrestrial, riparian and wetland environments), wildlife, reptiles and amphibians, fish and fish habitat, birds, species at risk
- Effects to Physical Environment: geology and geochemistry, soils and sediment, ambient radioactivity, air quality/emissions, surface water quality/quantity, groundwater quality/quantity, effects to Lake Ontario
- Accidents and malfunctions and effects of the environment on the project
- Impacts to Indigenous rights, current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes, physical and cultural heritage of Indigenous peoples and sites of archaeological importance, with a focus on potential archaeological resources on land or water, and species of cultural importance
- Effects to the health, social and economic conditions and the positive and negative consequences of these changes that are likely to be caused by the carrying out of the designated project

² An issue is material to decision making if its analysis is anticipated to affect the conclusions on (1) whether adverse effects within federal jurisdiction or direct and incidental adverse effects (collectively adverse federal effects) are likely not significant, or of low, medium or high significance; (2) appropriate mitigation measures for significant adverse federal effects; or (3) justification in the public interest.

³ IAAC has prepared this list based on limited information prior to receipt of the draft Initial Project Description. It may change based on input received from federal and provincial authorities, Indigenous communities, and the public.

New Nuclear at Wesleyville Project

Nick Colella, Supervisor,
Environmental Assessment Branch,
Ministry of the Environment,
Conservation and Parks

Name and title of Departmental /
Agency Responder

March 3, 2026

Date

New Nuclear at Wesleyville Project

Table 1: Key Issues to inform the impact assessment process

This table should outline key issues to inform the impact assessment process, including whether an impact assessment is required and, if so, the scope of the assessment and tailoring of the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines.

Key issues are the major concerns directly related to a project component or activity, the analysis of which is anticipated to be material to decision-making under the *Impact Assessment Act*.

Provincial authorities' advice should be guided by the identification and resolution of key issues. If an impact assessment is required, it will be focused on key issues.

Comment ID	a) Key issue	b) Project component or activity	c)(i) Biophysical effect pathway(s)	c)(ii) Concern unique to the project or a priority within your mandate	c)(iii) Material to federal decision-making	d) Impacts on Indigenous Peoples and their rights	e) Means for issue resolution	f) Additional information from the proponent
<p>Identify each comment by your organization's acronym and a sequential comment number.</p> <p>e.g.: IAAC-01</p>	<p>Specify each key issue (e.g., specific species and location).</p>	<p>Identify the project component or activity linked to the key issue.</p> <p>Be specific about the nature, scale, novelty and complexity of the component or activity.</p>	<p>Identify the specific effect pathway between the project component or activity and the affected environmental or human receptor (including Indigenous Peoples).</p>	<p>Describe why it's a key issue within the mandate of your department or agency, including in terms of priorities of the federal government and in terms of anticipated likelihood, severity or uncertainty of effects.</p> <p>Identify if the key issue is common for project activities of this nature or in this sector, or whether it is unique to this project due to the project's complexity, size or novelty; a sensitive or rare receiving environment; and/or proximity of sensitive environmental or human receptors (including Indigenous Peoples).</p>	<p>Describe why the key issue is material to decision-making as either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an adverse effect within federal jurisdiction, or a direct or incidental adverse effect, that may be significant based on available evidence including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provincial experts' knowledge and experience with past project assessments; presence of sensitive species, habitats or human receptors (including Indigenous Peoples); novel or complex project activities, components or technologies; high uncertainties in effects or in the effectiveness of mitigation measures; unknown or unproven mitigation; or a factor for the justification in the public interest anticipated to be material to decision-making such as a likely positive effect contributing to sustainability, to Canada's environmental obligations or climate change commitments or in supporting governmental priorities, such as reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples. 	<p>Describe how key issues you have identified within your mandate and expertise may lead to impacts on Indigenous Peoples and their rights.</p> <p>This advice must be informed by knowledge and input from Indigenous Nations and communities during the comment period, or within the Initial Project Description to support a more accurate, respectful and collaborative assessment.</p>	<p>Describe how the key issue could be resolved or addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any means, including powers, duties, functions, frameworks, policies or guidance for which your department or agency is responsible; Any means, including powers, duties, functions, frameworks, policies or guidance from another jurisdiction, including the province; Common, proven, well-understood or standard mitigation measures to mitigate the effect or effect pathway(s); or Commitments made by the proponent (e.g., in the Initial Project Description). 	<p>Describe information the proponent could provide, or commitments the proponent could make, that would provide confidence that the issue can be resolved by existing means (to be considered for the final Initial Project Description, future Summary of Issues and response, or (potential) Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines).</p> <p>Consider whether information, studies, analyses or collaborative work with other authorities would be required to address the issue beyond existing means.</p>
MECP-SARB-001	<p>Clearing of forested areas on the NNW site potentially impacting species at risk. Species at risk that may be in this area based on the information provided at the time of review</p> <p>Eastern Small-footed Myotis Northern Myotis Little Brown Myotis Tri-coloured Bat Eastern Red Bat Hoary Bat Silver-haired Bat</p>	<p>Removal of treed habitat was mentioned in the IPD.</p> <p>The nature, scale and complexity of the tree removals was unclear from the IPD or has yet to be confirmed.</p>	<p>Forested habitats have the potential to provide a range of habitat functions for species at risk, so their removal poses a risk of harm.</p> <p>The clearing of forest has the potential to kill or harm Butternut or Black Ash trees</p>	<p>The anticipated likelihood is that some impacts to species at risk and species at risk habitat would occur.</p> <p>The degree of impact at this time is unknown as field surveys are yet to be completed.</p> <p>MECP encourages an avoidance first approach to avoid or reduce impacts to species at risk. Working within non-sensitive timing windows for species at risk bats and birds are encouraged during tree removal.</p> <p>Trees and the surrounding critical rozone are sensitive to certain activities for example, land conversions, soil</p>	<p>Adverse effects to species at risk may be both direct and indirect.</p> <p>More information about the project is required to make assessments of impacts to species at risk.</p>	<p>If a permit under the ESA is to be pursued, the Crown has duty to consult with potentially affected Indigenous communities prior to making a decision on a permit, when it has knowledge of existing or credibly asserted Aboriginal or treaty rights and is contemplating conduct that has the potential to adversely impact those rights.</p> <p>During the permitting process, the ministry will assess how the proposed activities may impact Aboriginal or treaty rights and determine whether consultation is needed.</p>	<p>Conduct acoustic surveys and candidate roost trees surveys to support a complete understanding of habitat function for species at risk bats.</p> <p>Conduct breeding bird surveys during the active season</p> <p>Complete mitigation measures including adhering to timing windows for vegetation removals that can reduce impacts to species at risk bats and birds.</p> <p>Conduct tree surveys onsite to assess the presence of species at risk trees.</p>	<p>The proponent could commit to completing additional field surveys using ministry-approved methodology to determine overall impacts to species at risk.</p> <p>The proponent could consider actions to mitigate the impacts such as alternative designs in areas of high impact, adhering to species timing windows and conducting activities that would offset any residual adverse</p>

New Nuclear at Wesleyville Project

Comment ID	a) Key issue	b) Project component or activity	c)(i) Biophysical effect pathway(s)	c)(ii) Concern unique to the project or a priority within your mandate	c)(iii) Material to federal decision-making	d) Impacts on Indigenous Peoples and their rights	e) Means for issue resolution	f) Additional information from the proponent
	<p>Red-headed Woodpecker Cerulean Warbler</p> <p>Black Ash Butternut</p>			<p>compaction, changes to hydrological systems or groundwater sources.</p>		<p>Depending on project details, there may be potential impacts to species of harvest and species of cultural significance</p>	<p>Butternut Health Assessments should be conducted by a qualified Butternut Health Expert following the assessment guidelines.</p> <p>A Black Ash health assessment should be conducted by a qualified professional following the assessment guidelines.</p>	<p>impacts from the vegetation removal.</p>
<p>MECP-SARB-002</p>	<p>Clearing of fallow field areas and grasslands potentially impacting species at risk.</p> <p>Species at risk bird species that may be present based on the information provided at the time of review:</p> <p>Bobolink Eastern Meadowlark Short-eared Owl</p>	<p>Land clearing and grubbing was mentioned in the IPD.</p> <p>The nature, scale and complexity of the land clearing was unclear from the IPD or has yet to be confirmed.</p>	<p>The clearing or development of fallow fields and grasslands has the potential to kill or harm species at risk and their habitat.</p> <p>The level of authorization under the ESA is dependant on the species present and the size of the impacted area (permit vs registration under the conditional exception)</p>	<p>The anticipated likelihood is that some impacts to species at risk would occur.</p> <p>Grassland birds are known to create ground nests and may be impacted from development or other activities that result in significant alteration or clearing of vegetation or substrate that supports the nest.</p> <p>MECP encourages an avoidance first approach to avoid or reduce impacts to species at risk. Working within non-sensitive timing windows for species at risk bats and birds are encouraged during tree removal.</p>	<p>Adverse effects to species at risk may be both direct and indirect.</p> <p>More information about the project is required to make assessments of impacts to species at risk</p>	<p>If a permit under the ESA is to be pursued, the Crown has duty to consult with potentially affected Indigenous communities prior to making a decision on a permit, when it has knowledge of existing or credibly asserted Aboriginal or treaty rights and is contemplating conduct that has the potential to adversely impact those rights.</p> <p>During the permitting process, the ministry will assess how the proposed activities may impact Aboriginal or treaty rights and determine whether consultation is needed.</p> <p>Depending on project details, there may be potential impacts to species of harvest and species of cultural significance</p>	<p>Conduct surveys onsite to assess the presence of species at risk in these habitats following appropriate survey guidance and seasonality.</p> <p>Conduct grassland bird surveys during the active season.</p> <p>Mitigation measures including adhering to timing windows for grassland removals can reduce impacts to species at risk.</p>	<p>The proponent could commit to completing additional field surveys using ministry-approved methodology to determine overall impacts to species at risk.</p> <p>The proponent could consider actions to mitigate the impacts such as alternative designs in areas of high impact, adhering to species timing windows and conducting activities that would offset any residual adverse impacts from the vegetation removal.</p>
<p>MECP-SARB-003</p>	<p>Conducting activities in and around aquatic habitats: Central marsh, Wesleyville creek that may impact species at risk.</p> <p>Species that may be present based on the information provided at the time of review:</p> <p>Least Bittern Lesser Yellowlegs</p>	<p>Alteration to, or destruction of wetlands from project activities was mentioned in the IPD.</p> <p>The nature, scale and complexity of the wetland alterations or destruction was unclear or has yet to be confirmed.</p>	<p>The infilling, removal or development of wetlands and watercourses has the potential to harm species at risk.</p>	<p>The anticipated likelihood is that some impacts to species at risk would occur.</p> <p>Species at risk birds including Least Bittern and Lesser Yellowlegs may use wetland areas for nesting, which supports breeding and rearing.</p>	<p>Adverse effects to species at risk may be both direct and indirect.</p> <p>More information about the project is required to make assessments of impacts to species at risk</p>	<p>If a permit under the ESA is to be pursued, the Crown has duty to consult with potentially affected Indigenous communities prior to making a decision on a permit, when it has knowledge of existing or credibly asserted Aboriginal or treaty rights and is contemplating conduct that has the potential to adversely impact those rights.</p> <p>During the permitting process, MECP will assess how the proposed activities may impact Aboriginal or treaty rights and determine whether consultation is needed.</p>	<p>Conduct surveys onsite to assess the presence of species at risk in these habitats following appropriate survey guidance and seasonality.</p> <p>Mitigation measures including adhering to timing windows for work in wetlands and watercourses can reduce impacts to species at risk.</p>	<p>The proponent could commit to completing additional field surveys using ministry-approved methodology to determine overall impacts to species at risk.</p> <p>The proponent could consider actions to mitigate the impacts such as alternative designs in areas of high impact, adhering to species timing windows and conducting activities that would offset any residual adverse</p>

New Nuclear at Wesleyville Project

Comment ID	a) Key issue	b) Project component or activity	c)(i) Biophysical effect pathway(s)	c)(ii) Concern unique to the project or a priority within your mandate	c)(iii) Material to federal decision-making	d) Impacts on Indigenous Peoples and their rights	e) Means for issue resolution	f) Additional information from the proponent
								impacts from the vegetation removal.

Please insert additional rows as necessary.