Table 2: Responses to Public Review Comments to the 'Proponent Response to TAC Comments' posted March 14, 2019 in the Public Registry

***NOTE: where text is included as: "*RE: Response to XX1*" this is in reference to numbered 'Issues/Questions Raised' in the 'Proponent Response to Public Comments' posted March 14, 2019 in the Public Registry**

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT				
Geology/Topography	Email: Dennis LeNeveu April 6, 2019	**Geo1** Concern that the clay liner used to contain the pyritic shale in the quarry pit may be subject to acid degradation, the limestone roof may be susceptible to being coated with insoluble calcium salts generated in the neutralization of the acid and the coating will render further neutralization of acid ineffective.	Please refer to the detailed response provided for Public Question Geo3 in the responses to Public review comments to the Environment Act Proposal (EAP) posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019. i.e., *Each annual sand quarry (averaging 5 ha in size, and 10 m to 30 m deep) will be progressively reclaimed each year of operation by returning back to the quarry the silica sand that is not suitable for market, solids left over from the sand wash process (filter cake) and the sandy overburden and topsoil material overlying the extracted sand layer (Section 2.2 'Quarrying' from the EAP). The characteristics of these materials and the non-disturbed materials surrounding the quarry are free draining and will allow for water to continue to flow naturally and not accumulate within the reclaimed quarry.* *The backfilled and reclaimed annual quarry will be revegetated, and the land contoured to return the quarry site landscape to elevations typical to the surrounding area (Section 6.2.1 'Geology/Topography' from the EAP). The reclamation of each annual quarry cell will be done in accordance with a Closure Plan that will require each annual quarry cell to be reclaimed to as close to the original site conditions to the extent feasible (Section 7 'Closure Plan' from the EAP).* The Black Shale isn't expected to be encountered until later in the life of the Project due to the location of the black shale as determined through the geotechnical investigations. Best available control technologies (BACTs) will be used where shale is encountered. In summary, the clay liner and limestone cap method is the environmentally accepted process to both permanently neutralize potential acid forming and metal leaching elements in the minerals as well as isolate the material from the environment. Groundwater monitoring wells will be established surrounding the active quarry where black shale and potential for ARD occurs. Based on geotechnical laboratory results in 2018, pyritic oolite and pyrites do not occur in the raw sand resource. If the sand quarry cell sequence comes in close proximity to the black shale, industry standard practice for sequential selective mining will be employed to sufficiently isolate the potential ARD material which will include excavating a sufficient layer of material both overlying and underlying the black shale layer. These excavated materials will be deposited into the clay-lined pit within the quarry cell, and will be capped with limestone. Excavation of the black shale is not expected to require blasting or ripping. For quarry cells that have a potentially acid-generating black shale layer (i.e. an isolated area that represents approximately 20% of the Project Site Area), a clay-lined pit will be prepared in advance of sand extraction activities adjacent to the location where the black shale layer will be encountered based on geotechnical survey results. As excavation activities advance, the black shale that is encountered will be immediately deposited in the prepared clay-lined pit. If water seepage occurs within the clay-lined pit where black shale is deposited, accumulated water will be pumped from the pit for use in the sand wash facility. Material excavated from the quarry cells, including the black shale layer, is naturally damp and therefore not expected to produce respirable dust during the excavation process. The shale will not be pulverized; it will be excavated and deposited in the clay-lined pit in same form as excavated. The clay-lined pit will be prepared prior to excavation of the potential ARD material so that the material can be directly deposited into the clay-lined pit and covered immediately with limestone. Black shale will not be stockpiled before being deposited into the clay-lined pit.	Please refer to the detailed proposed mitigation summary provided for Public Question Geo3 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e. ***Additional proposed mitigation:*** *ML/ARD (metal leaching / acid rock drainage) mitigation will include:* • *Isolating the black shale during mining;* • *Encapsulating the black shale in a clay lined pit within an active quarry cell;* • *Covering the black shale with a crushed limestone layer for neutralization; and* • *Proceeding with progressive quarry cell reclamation activities as outlined in the Project Closure Plan.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
			The clay and limestone used for potential ARD material isolation will be sourced from licenced quarries that will be determined prior to mitigation of the black shale. The amounts of clay and limestone will be determined though engineering studies prior to mitigation of the black shale. The lifetime of the clay pit / limestone cap is expected to be functional longer than is needed to treat the acid generating material due to the natural percolation of water through the limestone layer, and through the ARD material to the clay liner.	
		Geo2 Proponent to comment on the existence of pyritic oolite and pyrite in the raw sand (ref 2014 NI 43-101 report)	Refer to response for Geo1.	Refer to proposed mitigation for Geo1.
		Geo3 Concern that the clay-lined pit in the active quarry "…*will be subject to a fluctuating water table allowing exposure to air and subsequent generation of acid*." Questions regarding the clay-lined pit relating to ability to contain potential acid generating substances are provided below in Geo2 to Geo10:	Refer to response for Geo1 above regarding potential acid rock generation (ARD) neutralization method. As indicated in the response provided for Public Question GW1 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019: *Water from seepage within the annual quarry is intended to be used for the sand wash process…(Section 2.9 'Water Use' of the EAP).*	Refer to response and proposed mitigation for Geo1.
		Geo4 How will the shale be kept dry or submerged until emplacement in the pit?	Refer to response for Geo1.	Refer to proposed mitigation for Geo1.
		Geo5 How will the shale be separated from the rest of the overburden? How will the remainder of the excavated cell be backfilled?	Refer to response for Geo1.	Refer to proposed mitigation for Geo1.
		Geo6 *"Is the shale too hard to be bulldozed?"*	Refer to response for Geo1.	Refer to proposed mitigation for Geo1.
		Geo7 *"Will blasting be required or specialized rippers?"*	Refer to response for Geo1.	Refer to proposed mitigation for Geo1.
		Geo8 *"Will the shale need to be pulverized to emplace in the clay lined pit?"*	Refer to response for Geo1.	Refer to proposed mitigation for Geo1.
		Geo9 *"What are the respirable dust consequences of shale removal and pit emplacement?"*	As indicated in the revised Air Quality Report provided as Attachment C of the Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019, (and in the TAC response #3 of review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019); *One of contributors to the exceedances are the quarry overburden berms. The proposed mitigation strategy will be for the facility to develop a Dust Management Plan. The Dust Management Plan that is developed for the Project will include dust suppression on the two quarry overburden berms, including the addition of water to the berms to increase dust control efficiency, as needed. The addition of water to the berms would cause aggregation and cementation of fines to the surfaces of larges particles, and the potential for dust emissions would be greatly reduced. This is outlined in United States Environmental Protection Agency, 13.2.4 Aggregate Handling and Storage Piles (AP-42: Compilation of Air Emissions Factors, November 2006), retrieved November 2018 from: https://www3.epa.gov/ttnchie1/ap42/ch13/final/c13s0204.pdf.* *As indicated in Section 8 'Air Quality Monitoring' of the EAP, an Air Quality Monitoring Program will be developed for the Project operation phase and will be submitted to Manitoba Sustainable Development (MBSD), Environmental Assessment Branch for review and comment. If the Air Quality Monitoring Program detects air quality exceedances that require mitigation, an adaptive management approach to address exceedances will be developed and discussed*	Please refer to the detailed proposed mitigation summary provided for TAC Question #3 in the responses to TAC review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e. *EAP, Section 8, Air Quality Monitoring* *EAP, Table 6-5: Air Quality* **Additional proposed mitigation:** Dust suppression activities, such as the use of approved dust control agents, will be undertaken when and where required to sufficiently mitigate airborne particulate matter. CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
			with MBSD. Water applied to quarry overburden berms, as required to control fugitive dust, will be sustainably sourced from a combination of groundwater, water from seepage within the annual open quarry pit, and supplemental water (as required) that will be trucked to the Project site from a licenced source (Section 2.9 'Water Use' in the EAP). Water runoff from the quarry overburden berms will be contained within Project Site ditching that will direct water runoff to a sump pit in the active quarry cell for use in the sand wash plant for process water (Section 6.3.1 'Surface Water Quality' in the EAP).	facility, as required. A draft Environmental Management Program document will be submitted to MBSD for review and comment in April 2019. Environmental management plans proposed to be included within the Environmental Management Program are as follows: • Dust Management Plan • Air Quality Monitoring Plan • **Erosion and Sediment Control Plan*** • **Surface Water Management Plan*** • **Heritage Resources Management Plan*** • Groundwater Monitoring Plan • Revegetation Monitoring Plan • **Emergency Response Plan *** * The plans indicated above in bold will be in place before the start of Project construction, with the other plans in place prior to the start of Project operation. The Environmental Management Program and Plans will be reviewed annually as required, and revised as needed. Required reporting will be provided to MBSD as stipulated in the Environment Act Licence (EAL).
		Geo10 *"Where will the clay and limestone come from and how will it be transported?"*	Refer to response for Geo1.	Refer to proposed mitigation for Geo1.
		Geo11 How much clay and limestone will be required and what are the implications to drainage and reclamation with a large area underlain by clay lined pit with a limestone roof?	Refer to response for Geo1.	Refer to proposed mitigation for Geo1.
		Geo12 *"What is the lifetime of such engineering structure?"*	Refer to response for Geo1.	Refer to proposed mitigation for Geo1.
	Email: Robert Fenton April 6, 2019	**Geo13** Topological disturbance of sand removal must be taken into account and the effect on potential reclamation.	As indicated in the response provided for Public Question Geo1 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019: *The backfilled and reclaimed annual quarry will be revegetated, and the land contoured to return the quarry site landscape to elevations typical to the surrounding area (Section 6.2.1 'Geology/Topography' from the EAP). The reclamation of each annual quarry cell will be done in accordance with a Closure Plan that will require each annual quarry cell to be reclaimed to as close to the original site conditions to the extent feasible (Section 7 'Closure Plan' from the EAP).* A draft Closure Plan was submitted to Mines Branch and MBSD in April, 2019 for review and comment.	EAP, Section 6.2.1, Geology/Topography EAP, Table 6-5: Geology/Topography EAP, Section 7, Closure Plan EAP, Section 8.4, Closure Plan Review
	Report – comments on the CPS Response to the TAC and Public Review of the Project	**Geo14** *"Lack of proper consideration of iron pyrite management in the EAP and proponent response to comments. This process needs*	Refer to response for Geo1.	Refer to proposed mitigation for Geo1.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
	Dennis LeNeveu What the Frack Manitoba Inc. March 31, 2019	*further analysis and expert review by provincial and federal authorities is needed."*		
		Geo15 *"CPS does not mention measures to prevent acid rock drainage in the stockpiled shale awaiting disposal in the clay lined pit."*	Refer to response for Geo1.	Refer to proposed mitigation for Geo1.
		Geo16 *"All the overburden must be analyzed for heavy metal and iron pyrite content."*	CPS will open, operate and close sand quarry cells in accordance with conditions as stipulated in an Environment Act Licence and Closure Plan. A draft Closure Plan was submitted to Mines Branch and MBSD in April, 2019 for review and comment.	N/A
		Geo17 Concern that *"…pyrite impurity in the sand will be removed in the wash plant and be present in the rejected material that will be stockpiled and disposed of on site and thereby subject to acid drainage"* and that this concern has not been thoroughly investigated.	As indicated in the response provided for Public Question Geo2 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019: *Exploratory drilling has confirmed that there is no pyritic shale in the sand resource overburden. There will be no acid rock drainage (ARD) resulting from overburden stockpiles.*	N/A
		Geo18 Concern that presence of pyritic oolite underlying the portion of the sand layer is not properly acknowledged by CPS as per the following referenced figure in the submitted response: Attachment: Figure 1 Illustration of pyritic oolite and shale in the Wanipigow sand deposit, taken from 2014 NI 43-101 (Source Watson, 1985).	Refer to response for Geo1.	Refer to proposed mitigation for Geo1.
		Geo19 *"There is no mentioning of sequestering this source of pyrite in a clay lined pit or any other safe disposal method or even an acknowledgement that this pyritic oolite exists."*	Refer to response for Geo1.	Refer to proposed mitigation for Geo1.
		Geo20 *"Pyritic shale disposal in a clay lined pit in an elevated area surrounded by fish bearing waters is an environmentally risky disposal method. Trucking to a more appropriate site should be required."*	Please refer to the detailed response provided for Public Question SW1 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e., *Surface water runoff associated with Project components and activities is planned to be fully contained within the Project Site Area and is not expected to impact adjacent surface waterbodies such as Lake Winnipeg, Wanipigow River or the Manigotagan River. Mitigation proposed in the EAP for the protection of surface water quality (EAP Section 6.3.1) includes use of ditching to contain water runoff from disturbed areas and directing runoff into a sump-pit for the use in the sand wash plant for process water, and is anticipated to mitigate the potential for adverse effects to local surface water quality. No potentially fish bearing waterbodies occur within or immediately adjacent to the Project Site Area. Therefore, fish bearing waterbodies are not expected to be adversely affected by Project-related activities. Within the Project Site, surface water drainage occurs westwards towards Lake Winnipeg through low drainage areas including bogs. No 'streams' are known to traverse through the Project Site Area. During access road construction, culverts will be installed as required to assist in directing runoff flow and maintaining natural drainage pathways through low areas such as bogs. Low wet areas such as bogs occurring at proposed annual quarry sites will be rehabilitated to the extent feasible in accordance with a Closure Plan for the Project. Each backfilled and rehabilitated annual quarry will be revegetated, and the land contoured to return the quarry site landscape to elevations typical to the surrounding area.* *The residual effects of clearing and construction activities, including culvert installation, are expected to be sufficiently mitigated by environmental monitoring and protection measures proposed with the EAP and within an Environmental*	Please refer to the proposed mitigation summary provided for Public Question SW1 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e.: *EAP, Section 6.3.1, Surface Water Quality* *EAP, Table 6-5: Surface Water Quality* *EAP, Section 6.2.1, Geology/Topography* *EAP, Table 6-5: Geology/Topography* *EAP, Section 7, Closure Plan* *EAP, Section 8.4, Closure Plan Review* **Additional proposed mitigation:** Dust suppression activities, such as the use of approved dust control agents, will be undertaken when and where required to sufficiently mitigate airborne particulate matter. CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
			Management Program that will be prepared for review and approval by MBSD [Manitoba Sustainable Development] *prior to the initiation of Project construction. The Environmental Management Program will include detailed environmental protection plans and programs, such as an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and Environmental Emergency Response Plan (which includes provisions for localized surface water monitoring), with proposed regular monitoring and reporting to MBSD.* Additionally, CPS will open, operate and close sand quarry cells in accordance with conditions as stipulated in an Environment Act Licence and Closure Plan. A draft Closure Plan was submitted to Mines Branch and MBSD in April, 2019 for review and comment.	during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. A draft Environmental Management Program document will be submitted to MBSD for review and comment in April 2019. Environmental management plans proposed to be included within the Environmental Management Program are as follows: • Dust Management Plan • Air Quality Monitoring Plan • **Erosion and Sediment Control Plan*** • **Surface Water Management Plan*** • **Heritage Resources Management Plan*** • Groundwater Monitoring Plan • Revegetation Monitoring Plan • **Emergency Response Plan *** * The plans indicated above in bold will be in place before the start of Project construction, with the other plans in place prior to the start of Project operation. The Environmental Management Program and Plans will be reviewed annually as required, and revised as needed. Required reporting will be provided to MBSD as stipulated in the Environment Act Licence (EAL).
		Geo21 *"The logistics of emplacing the shale in an onsite clay lined pit has not been detailed by CPS."*	Refer to response for Geo1.	Refer to proposed mitigation for Geo1.
Soils	Email: Marvin Koop April 8, 2019 Pelican Inlet Resident	**Soil1** General – concerns of the impacts of erosion on local residents including the cottage development.	Please refer to the detailed response provided for Public Question Soil1 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e., *CPS will be required to implement an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan approved by MBSD that will include standard erosion and sedimentation control methods such those implemented by Manitoba Infrastructure for the construction of provincial roads, highways and associated roadbed material quarries (Section 6.2.2 'Soils' in the EAP).* *The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan will apply to Project Construction, Operation and Closure phases. The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan will be included within an Environmental Management Program for the Project. The Environmental Management Program will require an Environmental Monitor to regularly inspect conditions at the Project Site to monitor the success of required environmental mitigation measures and see that adaptive management and follow-up environmental protection measures are applied as needed, such as during extreme weather (e.g. high wind and rain events).*	Please refer to the detailed proposed mitigation summary provided for Public Question Soil1 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e., *EAP, Section 6.2.2, Soils* *EAP, Table 6-5: Soils* **Additional proposed mitigation:** Dust suppression activities, such as the use of approved dust control agents, will be undertaken when and where required to sufficiently mitigate airborne particulate matter. CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
				during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. A draft Environmental Management Program document will be submitted to MBSD for review and comment in April 2019. Environmental management plans proposed to be included within the Environmental Management Program are as follows: • Dust Management Plan • Air Quality Monitoring Plan • **Erosion and Sediment Control Plan*** • **Surface Water Management Plan*** • **Heritage Resources Management Plan*** • Groundwater Monitoring Plan • Revegetation Monitoring Plan • **Emergency Response Plan *** * The plans indicated above in bold will be in place before the start of Project construction, with the other plans in place prior to the start of Project operation. The Environmental Management Program and Plans will be reviewed annually as required, and revised as needed. Required reporting will be provided to MBSD as stipulated in the Environment Act Licence (EAL).
Groundwater	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet	**GW1** RE: Response to GW1 – "*Pumping is required to keep the excavation dry. This means groundwater levels will rebound without pumping, leaving abandoned extraction cells under water. This does not reconcile with CPS's current plan to revegetate abandoned cells to blend in with the surrounding boreal forest.*"	As indicated in Section 2.9 'Water Use' in the EAP, water that may accumulate within active quarry cells will be pumped to the sand wash facility for use in the sand wash process. CPS will open, operate and close sand quarry cells in accordance with conditions as stipulated in an Environment Act Licence and Closure Plan. A draft Closure Plan was submitted to Mines Branch and MBSD in April, 2019 for review and comment.	N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		GW2 RE: Response to GW3 – "*CPS must submit a copy of these plans* [monitoring, management and control plans under an Environment Management Program] *for public and TAC review and comment prior to a License being issued. I would presume when it comes to groundwater that these plans will include detailed drawings showing how CPS proposes to accomplish their stated goals. I would expect a detailed plan committing to establishing baseline groundwater quality and quantity in all local wells prior to operating and a financial plan to replace/upgrade wells if deleterious effects are observed via regular monitoring."*	Please refer to the detailed response provided for Public Question GW6 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e., *The planned CPS hydrogeological investigations in March 2019 will collect information to enable development of a hydrogeological conceptual model for the site and surrounding area. Combined with water level and aquifer testing data, the conceptual model will be used to determine the potential for groundwater quantity and quality impacts on groundwater users or the ecosystem based on anticipated groundwater extraction rates.* *As indicated in Section 8.2 'Groundwater Monitoring' in the EAP, CPS will also be monitoring groundwater quality and quantity using on-site groundwater test wells during the Project construction and operation phases. As indicated in Section 6.2.3 'Groundwater' in the EAP, process water will be obtained from an alternative licenced water source if on-going water monitoring studies demonstrate an unacceptable risk to groundwater quantity or quality.* Additionally, CPS will construct, operate and close the Project in accordance with conditions as stipulated in an Environment Act Licence and Closure Plan. A draft Closure Plan was submitted to Mines Branch and MBSD in April, 2019 for review and comment.	Please refer to the proposed mitigation summary provided for Public Question GW6 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e., EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
		GW3 RE: Response to GW4 – "*The response refers back to various subsections of Section 6 in the EAP. I believe that many of the effects that have been reported in this section are arbitrary, subjective, unsubstantiated and speculative and this is unacceptable. More, if not all, of the affects assessments in Section 6 need to be science based and updated to reflect analysis results*.""	Refer to response above for GW2.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for GW2.
		GW4 RE: Response to GW5 – "*CPS has updated their well inventory. Although this is a step in the right direction I believe CPS also has an obligation to identify as many actual in-place wells as possible. Baseline groundwater quality and quantity information must also be collected so that they can demonstrate what effects, if any, their operations are having on wells."*	As indicated in the response provided for Public Question GW5 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; *The proposed Groundwater Monitoring Program will confirm the locations of local groundwater wells in the vicinity of the proposed Project that may be potentially affected by Project activities.* As indicated in Section 8.2 'Groundwater Monitoring' in the EAP, a number of groundwater test wells were established during the hydrogeological exploration studies in Q3 2019 to gather adequate information on the potential for Project process water to be sustainably sourced from groundwater. From Section 8.2 of the EAP: *Assuming that preconstruction groundwater testing indicates that some quantity of groundwater can be sustainably used for Project operations, select groundwater test wells will remain in place throughout operation and groundwater quality and quantity will continue to be monitored during the construction and operation phases in accordance with Environment Act Licence requirements.*	Refer to proposed mitigation above for GW2.
		GW5 RE: Responses to GW6, 7 and 8 – "*CPS must submit all technical documents* [geotechnical and hydrogeological studies/reports] *for public and TAC review and comment prior to a License*	CPS will submit technical and monitoring reports to MBSD as stipulated within an Environment Act Licence for the Project.	N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS		KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
			being issued." "These reports must include all supporting information, including by not limited to: - *Detailed test hole logs and plans including identification of what instruments and/or wells were installed with detailed drilling notes;* - *Instrument installation details;* - *Instrument monitoring data and plots;* - *In-situ and laboratory testing data and results on soil (such as blow counts, soil strength, plasticity indices, particle size analysis, etc.)* - *In-situ and laboratory testing data and results on groundwater (such as pump tests, slug tests, lugeon tests, permeability tests, water quality, etc.)* - *Groundwater/aquifer drawdown and flow modelling methods (such as model types, solution methods etc.), inputs and assumptions (such as storativities, transmissivities, specific yields, hydraulic conductivities, boundaries, etc.), and results (such as software outputs, summary plots, tables, sensitivity analyses, etc.)* - *Slope stability modelling methods (such as finite element, limit equilibrium, total or effective stress analysis, etc.), inputs and assumptions (such as boundaries, soil strain, strength and seepage parameters, etc.), and results (such as software outputs, summary plots, tables, sensitivity analyses, etc.)".*		
Email: Marvin Koop April 8, 2019 Pelican Inlet Resident		**GW6**	Concerns about *"…the impact on the water table and the viability of our boreholes for our cabin, and how the province would protect that resource from negative impact by the proposed project; a specific concern and enquiry would be to how the province could issue a license to proceed without sufficient hydrogeological studies being carried out and the results being provided to the stakeholders that would also include the issue of impact on existing potable water boreholes as well as those which would be constructed in the future for further cottage development in our community?"*	Refer to responses above for GW4 and GW5.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for GW2.
Email: Robert Fenton March 16, 2019		**GW7**	Concerned about the plan to "*capture and use surface water that maybe essential to the groundwater recharge at our well."* Groundwater model should be developed and tested to	Refer to response above for GW4. A groundwater model will be developed as part of the hydrogeological exploration studies in Q3 2019 to gather adequate information on the potential for Project process water to be sustainably sourced from groundwater. CPS will	Refer to proposed mitigation above for GW2.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		address the extent of water percolating through granite to the cottage owners well.	submit technical and monitoring reporting to MBSD as stipulated within an Environment Act Licence for the Project.	
	Email: Robert Fenton April 6, 2019	**GW8** Concern that a complete hydrogeological technical report is not planned until after the environmental assessment and permitting is finished.	Refer to response above for GW7. As indicated in Section 6.2.3 'Groundwater' in the EAP, process water will be obtained from an alternative licenced water source if on-going water monitoring studies demonstrate an unacceptable risk to groundwater quantity or quality.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for GW2.
		GW9 Concern that private wells located downhill from the Project site (elevated peninsula) will receive most of the drainage from the Project.	As indicated in the response provided for Public Question SW2 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; *Surface drainage at the Project Site will be managed in accordance with an Environmental Management Program that will include detailed environmental protection plans and programs, such as a Surface Water Management Plan, with proposed regular localized monitoring and reporting to MBSD.* *Changes to surface drainage patterns will largely be contained within the Project Site area through ditching, and installation of culverts during access road construction, as required, to direct runoff flow and maintain natural drainage pathways through low areas such as bogs.*	Please refer to the proposed mitigation summary provided for Public Question SW2 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e., *EAP, Section 6.3.1, Surface Water Quality* *EAP, Table 6-5: Surface Water Quality* **Additional proposed mitigation:** Dust suppression activities, such as the use of approved dust control agents, will be undertaken when and where required to sufficiently mitigate airborne particulate matter. CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. A draft Environmental Management Program document will be submitted to MBSD for review and comment in April 2019. Environmental management plans proposed to be included within the Environmental Management Program are as follows: • Dust Management Plan • Air Quality Monitoring Plan • **Erosion and Sediment Control Plan*** • **Surface Water Management Plan*** • **Heritage Resources Management Plan*** • Groundwater Monitoring Plan • Revegetation Monitoring Plan • **Emergency Response Plan *** * The plans indicated above in bold will be in place before the start of Project construction, with the other plans in place prior to the start of Project operation. The Environmental Management Program and Plans will be reviewed annually as required, and revised as

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
				needed. Required reporting will be provided to MBSD as stipulated in the Environment Act Licence (EAL).
		GW10 *Hydro-geo assessment must include studies for sediment discharge to the two unnamed creeks south of the project and to Manigotagan, Wanipigow Rivers and Lake Winnipeg. The effect of site drainage on run off and sediment discharge and the effect on local wells and water table must be evaluated.*	As indicated in the response provided for Public Question SW7 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e., *An Environmental Management Program will be prepared for review and approval by MBSD prior to the initiation of Project construction. The content of proposed monitoring plans required for Project operation will be outlined in the Environmental Management Program. An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and Surface Water Management Plan will be included in the Environmental Management Program that will detail measures that will be used to mitigate the potential for adverse effects to surface water.*	Refer to proposed mitigation above for GW9.
AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT				
Surface Water	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet	**SW1** RE: Responses to SW1 to 4 – *CPS must submit a copy of these plans* [monitoring, management and control plans under an Environment Management Program] *for public and TAC review and comment prior to a License being issued.* [for surface water], *these plans will include detailed drawings showing how CPS proposes to accomplish their stated goals.*	CPS will submit technical and monitoring reports to MBSD as stipulated within an Environment Act Licence for the Project.	N/A
		SW2 *Imperative that all the overburden and rejects from the wash plant be analyzed for the presence of heavy metal and sulphide as part of the environmental assessment.*	CPS will submit technical and monitoring reports to MBSD as stipulated within an Environment Act Licence for the Project.	N/A
		SW3 Concern that low areas drain into the waters of Lake Winnipeg, Manitotagan Mouth or the Wanipigow River, causing impacts on fish bearing waters.	As indicated in the response provided for Public Question SW1 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; *Surface water runoff associated with Project components and activities is planned to be fully contained within the Project Site Area and is not expected to impact adjacent surface waterbodies such as Lake Winnipeg, Wanipigow River or the Manigotagan River. Mitigation proposed in the EAP for the protection of surface water quality (EAP Section 6.3.1) includes use of ditching to contain water runoff from disturbed areas and directing runoff into a sump-pit for the use in the sand wash plant for process water, and is anticipated to mitigate the potential for adverse effects to local surface water quality. No potentially fish bearing waterbodies occur within or immediately adjacent to the Project Site Area. Therefore, fish bearing waterbodies are not expected to be adversely affected by Project-related activities. Within the Project Site, surface water drainage occurs westwards towards Lake Winnipeg through low drainage areas including bogs. No 'streams' are known to traverse through the Project Site Area. During access road construction, culverts will be installed as required to assist in directing runoff flow and maintaining natural drainage pathways through low areas such as bogs. Low wet areas such as bogs occurring at proposed annual quarry sites will be rehabilitated to the extent feasible in accordance with a Closure Plan for the Project. Each backfilled and rehabilitated annual quarry will be revegetated, and the land contoured to return the quarry site landscape to elevations typical to the surrounding area.* *The residual effects of clearing and construction activities, including culvert installation, are expected to be sufficiently mitigated by environmental monitoring and protection measures proposed with the EAP and within an Environmental Management Program that will be prepared for review and approval by MBSD prior to the initiation of Project construction. The Environmental Management Program will include detailed environmental protection plans and programs, such as an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and Environmental Emergency Response Plan (which includes provisions for localized surface water monitoring), with proposed regular monitoring and reporting to MBSD.*	Please refer to the proposed mitigation summary provided for Public Question SW2 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e., *EAP, Section 6.3.1, Surface Water Quality* *EAP, Table 6-5: Surface Water Quality* **Additional proposed mitigation:** Dust suppression activities, such as the use of approved dust control agents, will be undertaken when and where required to sufficiently mitigate airborne particulate matter. CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. A draft Environmental Management Program document will be submitted to MBSD for review and comment in April 2019. Environmental management plans proposed to be included within the Environmental Management Program are as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
			As indicated in the response provided for Public Question SW2 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; *Surface drainage at the Project Site will be managed in accordance with an Environmental Management Program that will include detailed environmental protection plans and programs, such as a Surface Water Management Plan, with proposed regular localized monitoring and reporting to MBSD. Changes to surface drainage patterns will largely be contained within the Project Site area through ditching, and installation of culverts during access road construction, as required, to direct runoff flow and maintain natural drainage pathways through low areas such as bogs.*	• Dust Management Plan • Air Quality Monitoring Plan • **Erosion and Sediment Control Plan*** • **Surface Water Management Plan*** • **Heritage Resources Management Plan*** • Groundwater Monitoring Plan • Revegetation Monitoring Plan • **Emergency Response Plan *** * The plans indicated above in bold will be in place before the start of Project construction, with the other plans in place prior to the start of Project operation. The Environmental Management Program and Plans will be reviewed annually as required, and revised as needed. Required reporting will be provided to MBSD as stipulated in the Environment Act Licence (EAL).
	Email: Robert Fenton April 6, 2019	**SW4** General – concern over detrimental effects to Lake Winnipeg. "*The potential for those effects (significant detrimental effects to Lake [*Winnipeg*]) liley* [likely] *warrants a federal review process."*	Refer to response above for SW3.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for SW3.
	Report – comments on the CPS Response to the TAC and Public Review of the Project Dennis LeNeveu What the Frack Manitoba Inc March 31, 2019	**SW5** Concern: contradictory information regarding settling ponds. *The process flow chart in the EAP shows a water pond even though CPS in its reply to What The Frack Manitoba comments state there are will be no settling ponds*.	Figure 2-1 'Silica Sand Process Flow Diagram' in the EAP does not show a water/settling pond. If the sand wash and dry facility requires a settling pond, a Notice of Alteration will be submitted to MBSD for review and approval.	N/A
		SW6 Concern – contradictions to industry practice. "*…CPS states the wash plant will be run all winter even though this is contrary to industry practice in Minnesota and Wisconsin and there will be no raw sand feed from the quarry that is below the water table preventing winter extraction."*	CPS has designed the entire facility and operation of the sand wash plant to be completely functional during the winter. Similar facilities in Minnesota and Wisconsin are not designed to operate during the winter months. CPS will construct, operate and close the Project in accordance with conditions as stipulated in an Environment Act Licence. As indicated in the response provided for Public Question AM&S1 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; *The plant will be designed in accordance with engineering standards. This will include safe guards which will shut down the system in the event of malfunctions.*	As indicated in the response provided for Public Question AM&S1 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; *The plant will be designed in accordance with engineering standards. This will include safe guards which will shut down the system in the event of malfunctions.*
		SW7 *Winter operation information is critical to evaluate water requirements and the local hydrogeology. It is also necessary to determine the fate of process water during winter shut down of the wash plant and requirements for wash plant recharge if in fact it is shutdown which still cannot be determined conclusively*	The sand wash plant will operate during winter and will not shut down except in the event of a malfunction (refer to response above for SW6). Process water will not be discharged to the environment, including during a shutdown in the event of a malfunction.	N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		despite CPS statements.		
		SW8 Unsubstantiated response to previous question. *A comment by John Neufeld that the remediated area will become an undrained slew was answered by CPS as follows, "The characteristics of these materials and the non-disturbed materials surrounding the quarry are free draining and will allow for water to continue to flow naturally and not accumulate within the reclaimed Quarry". This statement is unsubstantiated and must be supported by a hydro-geological study to be credible."*	CPS will submit technical and monitoring reports to MBSD as stipulated within an Environment Act Licence for the Project. Also refer to response for Geo4.	Mitigation is explained in response to Geo4.
Fish and Fish Habitat	Letter: M.J. McCarron April 3, 2019	**FFH1** *"… The Department of Fisheries and Oceans needs to be involved to study potential contamination and sediment migration. The risk to the commercial fishery and developing sport fishery is too important to ignore. To keep claiming there are no protective measures in place because no fish bearing streams are on the company site and there will be no spills, leaching, or run-off is misleading and ludicrous. While the surface area of the streams and creeks in question do begin just outside the border of the proposed site, the groundwater originates within the site and so any contamination of the creeks leading to the rivers will be connected to mining activities."*	Refer to responses above for SW3, Geo1 and Geo3.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for SW3 and Geo1.
	Letter: Dreyson Smith April 8, 2019 Wanipigow, MB	**FFH2** *"My main concern is that the headwater bog IS fish bearing habitat as CPS has only assumed that it is not fish bearing without a proper assessment. CPS has not done a Fish and Fish Habitat Assessment under the DFO Fisheries Protection Program and they should be required to do so given the headwater bog's connectivity to Lake Winnipeg and the Wanipigow River (fish bearing and critical habitat for a legally protected Endangered Species)."*	Based on an examination of satellite imagery of the Project Site area, the low wet areas / bogs within the Project Site Area shows no evidence of sufficient connectivity with streams or other fish-bearing waterways in the vicinity of the Project Site Area that would provide adequate depth, flow and otherwise unobstructed passage for fish. As indicated in the response provided for Public Question FFH7 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; *During access road construction, culverts will be installed as required to assist in directing runoff flow and maintaining natural drainage pathways through low areas such as bogs. Culverts will be installed in accordance with MBSD requirements and applicable guidelines.* Therefore, serious harm to fish that are part of a commercial, recreational or Aboriginal fishery, or that support such a fishery, is not anticipated.	*EAP, Section 6.3.1, Surface Water Quality* *EAP, Table 6-5: Surface Water Quality*
	Email: Robert Fenton April 6, 2019	**FFH3** Concern over the statement that fish bearing waterbodies are not expected to be adversely affected by the Project. *The entire project area is an elevated peninsula that will drain to the water bodies on three sides that are fish bearing.*	Refer to responses above for FFH2, SW3, Geo1 and Geo3.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for SW3 and Geo1.
	Report – comments on the CPS Response to the TAC and Public Review of the Project Dennis LeNeveu	**FFH4** Fishing rights are not properly assessed. *Little Black River, Sagkeeng and Bloodvein First Nations all exercise fishing rights on Lake Winnipeg that*	Refer to responses above for FFH2, SW3, Geo1 and Geo3.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for SW3 and Geo1.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
	What the Frack Manitoba Inc March 31, 2019	*could be affected by the Project. Fish are mobile and not restricted to the local waters around Wanipigow.*		
		FFH5 Concerns over insufficient risk assessment of effects of acid leaching and sediment migration on fishery.	Refer to responses above for FFH2, SW3, Geo1 and Geo3.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for SW3 and Geo1.
TERRESTRIAL ENVIRONMENT				
Vegetation	Letter: M.J. McCarron April 3, 2019	**VEG1** *"…there is concern with the improper stacking of trees when roads and exploratory areas are pushed. Also, large berms with deep trenches have been placed on various access roads. My only comment is that the deep trenches are dangerous for all mammals."*	The timber clearing activity is being done under Hollow Water First Nation's Timber Sale Agreement numbers 5037 and 5038. The Work Permit #2019-05-66-001 was issued to Hollow Water First Nation for this activity on April 2, 2019. When the timber harvesting program is completed, timber harvesting and harvested site will meet the requirements in the Hollow Water First Nation Timber Sales Agreement and associated Work Permit which specifics the quantity of timber and area permitted to be harvested.	
	Letter: Dreyson Smith April 8, 2019 Wanipigow, MB	**VEG2** General – concerns about the current clearing activities and land disturbance in accordance with current/existing permits (i.e Work Permit).	Refer to response above to VEG1 above.	
	Email: Marvin Koop April 8, 2019 Pelican Inlet Resident	**VEG3** *"It does appear that the current removal of forest vegetation and mature trees is very very much in excess of what was presented as the minimal required for access roads and outlines to carry out the technical investigations."*	Refer to response above to VEG1 above.	
Wildlife	Letter: Alex Nisbet, Myers LLP on half of Sagkeeng First Nation (SFN) April 8, 2019	**Wild1** RE: Response to Wild5 – *"…SFN* [Sagkeeng First Nation] *has not been contacted to provide TEK* [Traditional Ecological Knowledge] *on issues such as moose population in the Project Site Area or along the Project truck corridor that is adjacent to the SFN Reserve. The EAP states that there will be "moderate adverse effects to wildlife" due to the Project. SFN and its members must be able to understand how the Project affects their Aboriginal and Treaty Rights and provide input on those Rights as well."*	SFN was provided with the opportunity to share TEK information regarding the Project Site Area and regional area through attending the Public Information Session held on November 28, 2018 and as advertised in the Winnipeg Free Press and Public Registry, and also by contacting CPS directly through their website: https://www.canadianpremiumsand.com/ As indicated in Section 6.6.6 'Effects on Indigenous and Treaty Rights' in the EAP; *The Project Site is not within a Traditional Territory of any other Regional Project Area First Nation including the Little Black River, Sagkeeng and Bloodvein First Nations. Considering this Project does not utilize water from, or discharge water to, Lake Winnipeg, resources associated with Lake Winnipeg that First Nations depend on, those identified First Nations within the Regional Project Area (Little Black River, Sagkeeng and Bloodvein First Nations) will not be affected.* Due to the limited extent of the Project Site Area and information regarding hunting and other land resource use from the Project TEK session (information shared by Hollow Water First Nation Elders with knowledge of the Project Site Area and regional area land use) and the regional TEK study (Appendices G1 and G2 in the EAP), the EAP has concluded that the Project Site Area has a low frequency of use for hunting as compared with other locations in the Regional Project Area. Although increased truck traffic along the sand transport corridor will increase the risk of collisions with moose along the transport route, moose hunting is expected to have a greater influence on regional moose populations. Moose hunting is managed by MBSD through the use of regulations such as the implementation of Moose Conservation Zones where licenced moose hunting is prohibited, such as in Game Hunting Area (GHA) 26 which is within the Regional Project Area. In areas where moose populations are very low and require a hunting ban such as GHA 26, the probability of moose collisions on the sand truck transport route are reduced due to the scarcity of moose in that area. Within the Project Site Area, wildlife protection measures such as appropriate speed limits posted throughout the Project Site will minimize the potential for wildlife collisions (EAP, Section 6.4.2 'Wildlife').	Please refer to the proposed mitigation summary provided for Public Question Wild4 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e., *EAP, Section 6.4.2, Wildlife* *EAP, Table 6-5: Wildlife*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
	Email: Marvin Koop April 8, 2019 Pelican Inlet Resident	**Wild2** General – concern about the already negative impacts that the project has on the local wildlife. For example, *"…a number of bald eagle couples had returned to their normal home and nesting locations, and were regularly spotted overhead and on the lake. However, they are no longer visible in our community and I believe that is likely due to the noise levels of the construction equipment and the widespread destruction of the trees that is being carried out in the proposed project area ahead of the license being granted*."	Timber clearing activities being conducted within the Project Site area under a Hollow Water First Nation Timber Sales Agreement and associated Work Permit. As indicated in the EAP, Section 6.4.2 'Wildlife', noise generated during Project construction, operation and closure phases will contribute to a temporary decline in wildlife populations within the Project Site area due to noise disturbance effects on animal behaviour. With the application of the mitigation measures proposed in Section 6.4.2 of the EAP, Project impacts to the Regional Project Area wildlife populations are assessed as moderate. The Project is not anticipated to have a measurable effect on wildlife populations within the Lac Seul Upland Ecoregion. Suitable habitat for nesting Bald Eagles is abundance (not limited) in the Regional Project Area. Bald Eagles that may have previously nested within the Project Site Area, which is being cleared outside of the peak sensitive breeding season for migratory birds, will select an alternative nesting site in available suitable habitat within the regional area.	Please refer to the proposed mitigation summary provided for Public Question Wild4 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e., *EAP, Section 6.4.2, Wildlife* *EAP, Table 6-5: Wildlife*
	Email Marvin Koop March 14, 2019	**Wild3** General - concern that the magnitude of negative impact on the bird population was overlooked due to many large and smaller trees being bulldozed including the noise of construction.	Refer to response above for Wild2.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for Wild2.
ATMOSPHERIC ENVIRONMENT				
Air Quality	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet	**AQ1** RE: Responses to AirQ1 and AirQ2 – "*The revised* [Air Quality] *report still shows exceedances*. *CPS must submit a copy of these plans* [monitoring, management and control plans under an Environment Management Program] *for public and TAC review and comment prior to a License being issued.…when it comes to air quality, these plans will include developing baseline air quality information prior to operating and then a commitment to regularly monitor air quality afterwards to show what effects, if any, are occurring*…" "…*monitoring points in all developments regardless of official zoning. I would also expect a commitment to alter operations if air quality is shown to be deleteriously affected, including but not limited to ceasing operations during certain weather events, wind speeds, wind directions, droughts, etc."*	As indicated in the EAP, Section 8 'Air Quality Monitoring'; during the Project operation phase, CPS will establish air quality monitoring stations within the Project Site and the vicinity of potential receptors closest to the Project activities. Air quality reports will be submitted to MBSD at the frequency required by MBSD. Should air quality issues arise that require mitigation, CPS will engage with Manitoba Sustainable Development to determine appropriate adaptive management to resolve issues as required. As indicated in the revised Air Quality Report provided as Attachment C to the Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; possible predicted 24-hr average concentrations of particulate matter (PM_{10}) is below the MAAQC limit of 50 µg/m^3 with the possible exception of sites within Seymourville and Wanipigow located 3.2 km and 4 km, respectively, from the facility location where PM_{10} may exceed Manitoba Ambient Air Quality Criteria (MAAQC) limit guideline by up to 4.6 µg/m^3 of PM_{10} under worst-case scenario conditions. Further investigation into the results generated by the air dispersion model, indicate that the minor predicted exceedances of PM_{10} in the vicinity of some residences in Seymourville and Wanipigow is from dust that is not 100% Project-activities generated. Approximately 52% to 53% of the PM_{10} predicted exceedance in those communities is attributable to general project activities, and approximately 47% to 48% is attributable to other estimated existing ambient sources, which for this location, would primarily be dust generated from the existing gravel road by Seymourville and Wanipigow. As part of the Dust Management Plan, if and when air quality monitoring stations within the Project Site Area show guideline exceedances of PM_{10}, then CPS will apply approved dust control agents when and where required to sufficiently mitigate airborne particulate matter. Water applied to quarry overburden berms, as required to control fugitive dust, will be sustainably sourced from a combination of groundwater, water from seepage within the annual open quarry pit, and supplemental water (as required) that will be trucked to the Project site from a licenced source (Section 2.9 'Water Use' in the EAP). Water runoff from the quarry overburden berms will be contained within Project Site ditching that will direct water runoff to a sump pit in the active quarry cell for use in the sand wash plant for process water (Section 6.3.1 'Surface Water Quality' in the EAP). The proposed mitigation strategy for the Project will be provided in a Dust Management Plan. The Dust Management	Please refer to the proposed mitigation summary provided for Public Question AirQ1 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e., *EAP, Section 6.5.1, Air Quality* *EAP, Table 6-5: Air Quality* *EAP, Section 8.3, Air Quality Monitoring* **Additional proposed mitigation:** Dust suppression activities, such as the use of approved dust control agents, will be undertaken when and where required to sufficiently mitigate airborne particulate matter. CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. A draft Environmental Management Program document will be submitted to MBSD for review and comment in April 2019. Environmental management plans proposed to be included within the Environmental Management Program are as follows: • Dust Management Plan • Air Quality Monitoring Plan • **Erosion and Sediment Control Plan***

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
			Plan that is developed for the Project by AECOM on behalf of CPS will include dust suppression on any quarry overburden berms, including the addition of water to the berms to increase dust control efficiency, as needed. The addition of water to the berms would cause aggregation and cementation of fines to the surfaces of larges particles, and the potential for dust emissions would be greatly reduced. This is outlined in United States Environmental Protection Agency, 13.2.4 Aggregate Handling and Storage Piles (AP-42: Compilation of Air Emissions Factors, November 2006), retrieved November 2018 from: https://www3.epa.gov/ttnchie1/ap42/ch13/final/c13s0204.pdf. Smaller particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) is of greater concern because these particle sizes are small enough to be inhaled directly into the lungs. The isopleth maps shown in the revised Air Quality Report predict no 24-hr average concentration exceedances beyond MAAQC for $PM_{2.5}$ at sensitive receptors. Air quality monitoring studies in the vicinity of silica sand facilities in Minnesota and Wisconsin have indicated that those facilities do not generate any hazardous levels of $PM_{2.5}$ in the ambient air near these operations (Orr and Krumenacher 2015). The key measures proposed to mitigate fugitive dust, as indicated within the EAP, include: • The silica sand wash and dry facility, including all conveyors and transfer points, will be enclosed and under negative pressure to allow fines to be collected in a bag house fabric filter dust collection system to minimize dust projection • Sand truck transport loads will be completely contained with a waterproof sealed load cover which will mitigate dispersion of silica sand fugitive dust during transport • Sand transport trucks will utilize paved roads rather than gravel roads that can generate dust • The main Project Site access road will be paved, and CPS will pave and maintain the segment of the Hollow Water Main Road leading from the Project Site entrance to PR 304, and the currently unpaved section of PR 304 from Hollow Water Main Road to Manigotagan to the appropriate Manitoba Infrastructure roadway standards, and pending obtaining required permits from Manitoba Infrastructure, to accommodate heavy truck traffic Respirable dust levels and other air quality pollutants will be measured in accordance with an Air Quality Monitoring Plan (Section 8.3 of the EAP) and in accordance with a Project Environment Act Licence conditions. The Air Quality Monitoring Plan will be developed by AECOM on behalf of CPS as part of the Environmental Management Program, and will be submitted to MBSD, Environmental Assessment Branch for review and approval prior to the initiation of Project operation. A draft Environmental Management Program document will be submitted to MBSD for review and comment in April 2019. If Project adverse effects exceed regulatory limits, CPS will contact Manitoba Sustainable Development (MBSD) and will implement required adaptive management measures in discussion with MBSD. CPS will submit technical and monitoring reports to MBSD as stipulated within an Environment Act Licence for the Project.	• **Surface Water Management Plan*** • **Heritage Resources Management Plan*** • Groundwater Monitoring Plan • Revegetation Monitoring Plan • **Emergency Response Plan *** * The plans indicated above in bold will be in place before the start of Project construction, with the other plans in place prior to the start of Project operation. The Environmental Management Program and Plans will be reviewed annually as required, and revised as needed. Required reporting will be provided to MBSD as stipulated in the Environment Act Licence (EAL).
Email: Marvin Koop April 8, 2019 Pelican Inlet Resident	**AQ2**	General – concerns of the impact of dust on local residents including the cottage development.	The revised Air Quality Report provided as Attachment C in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019 indicates that exceedances of particulate matter (dust) are not predicted to occur in the local or regional cottage development area. Also refer to the response above for AQ1.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for AQ1.
	AQ3	*Do the CPS plans for monitoring include locations in our community and other cottage developments who are in close proximity to the proposed extraction? What is the requirement for full transparent and timely disclosure of the monitoring results, by the company, to the public during the construction of the plant infrastructure and the proposed 50 years of operations?*	The Air Quality Monitoring (Section 8 of the EAP) proposed for the operation phase of the Project will include the establishment of air quality monitoring stations at sensitive receptors identified within the revised version of the Air Dispersion Modeling Report provided as Attachment C in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019. The location of 'sensitive receptors' for proposed air quality monitoring were determined based on consideration of factors such as expected local meteorological patterns (e.g. wind speed and direction) which impact the dispersion of air pollutants. The Air Quality Monitoring Plan, including locations of proposed air quality monitoring stations, will be reviewed with MBSD prior to the Project operation phase	Refer to proposed mitigation above for AQ1.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
			and maybe revised based on input from MBSD. CPS will submit technical and monitoring reporting to MBSD as stipulated within an Environment Act Licence for the Project.	
	Email: Robert Fenton March 16, 2019	**AQ4** General - concerns over lack of information regarding air quality, including all sources of silica dust, and potential impacts on cottage residents. *Air quality modelling should include receptor points in the cottage development, as well.*	Sources of dust, including silica dust, were identified within the revised version of the Air Dispersion Modeling Report provided as Attachment C in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019. Also refer to the responses above for AQ1, AQ2 and AQ3.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for AQ1.
	Report – comments on the CPS Response to the TAC and Public Review of the Project Dennis LeNeveu What the Frack Manitoba March 31, 2019	**AQ5** *Revised air dispersion study still indicates exceedances of allowed levels in nearby communities…"*	Refer to the response above for AQ1.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for AQ1.
		AQ6 Concern that there is no emergency preparedness planning for silica dust exceedances.	Results of the Air Dispersion Modeling Report provided as Attachment C in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019 predict no dust exceedances that would constitute an 'emergency' situation. Also refer to the response above for AQ1. To prepare for Project-related emergencies that may arise, environmental emergency response planning will be a component of the proposed Environmental Management Program that will be reviewed by MBSD.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for AQ1.
		AQ7 Concern that the risk of exposure to respirable silica dust has not been properly addressed. *For instance no evidence has been given for efficacy of covering of conveyor belts under negative pressure.*	Respirable silica dust levels will be measured in accordance with an Air Quality Monitoring Plan (Section 8.3 of the EAP) and in accordance with a Project Environment Act Licence conditions. CPS will be using the best available control technology that has been demonstrated to be effective in mitigating fugitive dust emissions in over 100 similar sand processing facilities in the U.S.A.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for AQ1.
		AQ8 *"No detailed plan is given for worker silica dust monitoring and required respiratory protection…"*	As indicated in the response provided for Public Question HH4 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019, and in Section 6.9.1 'Worker Health and Safety' in the EAP; *worker protection in Manitoba is regulated through standards, procedures and training under the Workplace Safety and Health Regulation, M.R. 219/2015. Safety equipment and personal protective equipment will be supplied to employees and workers. All contractors and visitors will be required to receive site specific environmental health and safety orientation for all phases of the Project.*	Refer to proposed mitigation above for AQ1. Also refer to the proposed mitigation summary provided for Public Question HH4 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e., *EAP, Section 6.9.1, Worker Health and Safety* *EAP, Table 6-6: Worker Health and Safety*
		AQ9 *Will air supplied respirators be used? If so, when and where?*	Refer to the response above for AQ8.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for AQ8.
		AQ10 *How will on site silica dust levels be monitored? Will personal air monitor exposure equipment be used?*	Refer to the response above for AQ8.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for AQ8.
		AQ11 *Will there be a health and safety department with a health officer?*	Yes, a Safety, Health and Environment (SH&E) Manager will be retained by CPS for the Project operation phase.	**Additional proposed mitigation:** A Safety, Health and Environment (SH&E) Manager will be retained by CPS for the Project operation phase.
		AQ12 *Will compliance inspections be carried out?*	Yes, compliance inspections will be carried out under the supervision of a Safety, Health and Environment (SH&E) Manager that will be retained by CPS for the Project operation phase.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for AQ11.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		AQ13 *Will supervisors be trained in dust protection?*	All employees will receive appropriate health and safety training as required under the *Workplace Safety and Health Regulation, M.R. 219/2015.*	Refer to the proposed mitigation summary provided for Public Question HH4 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e., *EAP, Section 6.9.1, Worker Health and Safety* *EAP, Table 6-6: Worker Health and Safety*
		AQ14 *Employee and public safety program must be developed.*	CPS will have Safety, Health and Environment program in place for all phases of the Project in accordance with the *Workplace Safety and Health Regulation, M.R. 219/2015.* CPS will construct, operate and close the Project in accordance with conditions as stipulated in an Environment Act Licence and Closure Plan. A draft Closure Plan was submitted to Mines Branch and MBSD in April, 2019 for review and comment.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for AQ13.
Noise	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet	**Noise1** RE: Response to Noise1 – *"A 100 m buffer from residences is unacceptable. Extraction operations, including clearing, must remain a minimum of 1 km from property boundaries and a minimum of 500 m from existing roads. Noise is only one reason among many for selecting these values."*	The nearest known human residences to the Project Site Area Boundary were estimated using GoogleEarth™ satellite imagery and are illustrated in Figure 3-1 of Appendix F 'Noise Impact Assessment' in the EAP, which indicates that the nearest residence is approximately 380 m north of the Project Site Area Boundary. Therefore, quarry operations will be located more than 100 m from permanent residences. Also, results of the Noise Impact Assessment report concluded that with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures, which will be implemented by CPS, *the noise impacts during the overburden stripping and quarrying phases are predicted to meet the Manitoba Guidelines for Sound Pollution limits.* As indicated in the response provided for Public Question Noise1 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019: *Noise complaints will be tracked and investigated, and corrective action will be applied as required. CPS will engage with the local community to determine feasible solutions to adaptively manage noise levels resulting from Project activities should complaints be brought to the attention of CPS.*	Refer to the proposed mitigation summary provided for Public Question Noise1 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e., *EAP, Section 6.5.2, Noise* *EAP, Table 6-5: Noise*
	Email: Marvin Koop April 8, 2019 Pelican Inlet Resident	**Noise2** General - concerns of the impact of noise on local residents including the cottage development.	Refer to the response above for Noise1.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for Noise1.
		Noise3 *"Do the CPS plans for monitoring include locations in our community and other cottage developments who are in close proximity to the proposed extraction? What is the requirement for full transparent and timely disclosure of the monitoring results, by the company, to the public during the construction of the plant infrastructure and the proposed 50 years of operations?"*	Refer to the response above for Noise1.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for Noise1.
	Email: Robert Fenton March 16, 2019	**Noise4** General - concerns potential impacts of noise on cottage residents and the proposed 100 m buffer to mitigate noise.	Refer to the response above for Noise1.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for Noise1.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
Climate/Greenhouse Gases (GHGs)	Report – comments on the CPS Response to the TAC and Public Review of the Project Dennis LeNeveu What the Frack Manitoba March 31, 2019	**GHG1** General - concerns over not considering the sand transport option of barge to Lakeline Railway "… *that would diminish the GHG footprint and greatly reduce death and injury to the public."*	As indicated in the response provided for Public Question GHG1 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019: *Results of an Air Quality Report provided as Appendix E in the EAP, which has now been updated (**Attachment C** of this Table 2 [*in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019*]), indicate that the total greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions over the life of the Project will not substantially contribute to Canada's targeted 2030 GHG emissions.*	N/A
		GHG2 General - concerns over inconsistencies in GHG calculations. *Revised GHG calculations in response to the CEA Agency request are inconsistent with the calculations in the EAP that give much higher emissions attributable to the sand haul trucks. The details of the calculations of emissions from the haul trucks are not given. The reason for reduction of the number of haul trucks from 54 to 24 is not explained.*	Refer to the response above for GHG1. Truck numbers from the original Traffic Report provided as Appendix N in the EMP were updated from the EMP. Even with the higher number of haul trucks (54) as originally assessed in the Air Quality Report provided as Appendix E in the EAP, the contribution of the Project to provincial and national GHG emissions is not significant.	N/A
		GHG3 General – concern that not all sources of GHGs have been considered. *The lack of contribution to emissions from fuel, water and clay or pyrite haul trucks, and plant traffic has still not been addressed.*	Refer to the responses above for GHG1 and GHG2.	N/A
SOCIOECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT				
Labour Force and Employment	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet	**LF&E1** General – *"…if CPS does eventually defer transport to a firm many of the jobs they claim to be creating will vanish quickly."*	At this time, CPS has no plans to defer sand transport to a firm that would not potentially employ local qualified and appropriately experienced drivers. As indicated in the EAP, Section 6.6.1 'Labour Force and Employment, CPS is proposing initiatives to assist the local communities and youth with potential employment on the Project including: • Advertising Project-related employment opportunity positions within local communities; • Initiating a training program, including 'certified' training skills, for interested local community members in advance of Project construction; • Preferentially hiring appropriately-skilled local community members; and • Providing youth at the local Wanipigow School with mentorship opportunities through school visits, site tours, and internships. Additionally, as indicated in the EAP, Section 6.6.5 'Human Health and Well-being', CPS will be initiating Workforce Development plans including: • Mentoring program; • On-going support and coaching for workers; • Worker wellness program; and • Job fair and community workforce inventory, which will start in December 2018 to prepare for training programs to begin in 2019.	EAP, Section 6.6.1, Labour Force and Employment EAP, Table 6-5: Labour Force and Employment EAP, Section 6.6.5, Human Health and Well-being EAP, Section 6-5, Human Health and Well-being
	Letter: M.J. McCarron April 3, 2019	**LF&E2** General – concerned about the very few jobs that will be available to local residents and how the trucking jobs will be contracted out to an outside business therefore leaving very few	Refer to the response above for LF&E1.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for LF&E1.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		minimum wage jobs.		
		LF&E3 *"CPS has stated that they will train individuals as time goes one, but gives no indication of timelines. Are they really going to terminate employment of outside employees within a reasonable time frame?"*	Refer to the response above for LF&E1.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for LF&E1.
	Email: Lisa Raven April 1, 2019 and duplicate Email from Lonny Karlenzig April 1, 2019	**LF&E4** General – concern that the socioeconomic benefits of the Project are unsustainable and that potential job gains "*..are too few when compared to the area's population and have no long term health or financial benefits."*	As with any mining project, the quantity of the minable resource is finite. Therefore, mining projects must end once the minable resource is extracted. This proposed Project has a very long 'lifetime' of 54 years as compared with other mining projects in Manitoba, which will provide substantial long-term employment. As indicated in the EAP, Section 6.6.1 'Labour Force and Employment, employment opportunities will be a positive, moderate and long-term and continuous benefit for the Regional Project Area.	N/A
Infrastructure and Services	Email: Robert Fenton March 16, 2019	**Infra1** *"…more progress on road improvement discussions is needed before a license is granted."*	As indicated in the Traffic Memorandum provided as Attachment D to the Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; *Manitoba Infrastructure Region 1 is responsible for road safety issues along the proposed sand transportation route to Winnipeg. CPS has proposed that they will be available to work with Manitoba Infrastructure to contribute to the upgrading of the roads in the vicinity of the new Project main access road by providing a paved surface on Hollow Water Road and PR 304 from the Project access road turn off to Manigotagan. CPS is in ongoing discussions with Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Infrastructure to confirm the need and scheduling for road upgrades for the portion of the proposed truck route that will be crossing the Pine Falls Generating Station, in addition to other improvements.* CPS will construct, operate and close the Project in accordance with conditions as stipulated in an Environment Act Licence and Closure Plan. A draft Closure Plan was submitted to Mines Branch and MBSD in April, 2019 for review and comment.	Refer to the proposed mitigation summary provided for Public Question Infa1 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e., *EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic* *EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation* *EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents*
	Report – comments on the CPS Response to the TAC and Public Review of the Project Dennis LeNeveu What the Frack Manitoba Inc March 31, 2019	**Infra2** General – concern that the costs and risks of increased road maintenance have not been properly assessed and that an investigation of alternative transport options was not carried out.	As indicated in the response provided for Public Question PD24 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019: *Various sand product transportation options, including barge and rail, were explored. However, truck transport was considered the most feasible option at this time*.	N/A
Land and Resource Use	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet	**L&RU1** *"Little or no acknowledgement of the cottage and recreational developments in the area, namely Mantago Bay, Driftwood Beach, Blueberry Point, Ayers' Cove, and Pelican Inlet. Many of which share property lines with the proposed mine. Although my comment in particular wasn't addressed directly, it can be seen throughout CPS's response that they are trying their very best to not acknowledge the existence of Mantago Bay, Driftwood Beach, Blueberry Point, Ayer's Cove, and Pelican Inlet. When they do have to acknowledge us, they focus on the 'Recreational' zoning of these developments and say that they aren't obligated*	The scope of the environmental assessment is indicated in Section 3 of the EAP. The spatial boundaries of the environmental assessment extend to the cottage development areas that are within 10 km of the Project Site Area boundary (Section 3.2 of the EAP). The 10 km extent of the Regional Project Area is intended to take into account the maximum spatial extent of potential effect of the Project, with the exception of highway traffic related to Project trucks transporting silica sand to purchasers.	N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		to treat us the same as Manigotagan, Seymourville, Hollow Water First Nation, and Aghaming."		
	Letter: Alex Nisbet, Myers LLP on half of Sagkeeng First Nation (SFN) April 8, 2019	**L&RU2** *"SFN exercises traditional hunting rights over the Project Regional Area. SFN is unsure as to how AECOM came to the conclusion that the Project Site is not within a Traditional Territory of SFN as no consultation with SFN or its members has occurred to date."*	Information regarding Indigenous traditional use of the Project Site Area and adjacent potentially affected lands was obtained from TEK studies (Appendix G of the EAP). As indicated in the response to Wild1, SFN was provided with the opportunity to share TEK information regarding the Project Site Area and regional area through attending the Public Information Session held on November 28, 2018 and as advertised in the Winnipeg Free Press and Public Registry, and also by contacting CPS directly through their website: https://www.canadianpremiumsand.com/ Although CPS has engaged and will continue to engage with the public, Indigenous peoples and interested stakeholders (EAP, Section 5 'Engagement Program and Community Outreach'), the 'Duty to Consult' is the responsibility of the Manitoba Government which arises out of the recognition and affirmation of Aboriginal and treaty rights under section 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982* when any proposed provincial law, regulation, decision or action may infringe upon or adversely affect the exercise of an aboriginal right or treaty right of that Aboriginal community.	N/A
		L&RU3 *"SFN is of the view that the Project clearly poses the potential for adverse environmental effects and impacts to SFN's Aboriginal and Treaty rights. Due to the duration and location of the project; further studies, independent expert reports, and adequate consultation are essential for a project of this nature that will have untold long-term effects on the region."*	As indicated in Section 6.6.6 'Effects on Indigenous and Treaty Rights' the proponent respects that the duly elected Council of Hollow Water First Nation is the body that speaks for the communally held rights of its people. Considering the Project Site Area is adjacent to the Hollow Water First Nation, CPS understands through discussions with Council members of Hollow Water First Nation that the Project Site is not within a Traditional Territory of any other Regional Project Area First Nation including the Little Black River, Sagkeeng and Bloodvein First Nations. The potential effects of sand transport truck traffic and proposed mitigation measures are provided in Section 6.7 of the EAP. With the application measures indicated in Section 6.7 of the EAP and implementation of Manitoba Infrastructure determinations for required roadway improvements and traffic redirection, as needed, the potential adverse impacts of increased traffic are anticipated to be mitigated to the extent feasible.	N/A
	Email: Robert Fenton March 16, 2019	**L&RU4** Concern that there is a lack of clarity regarding which residences are considered permanent. *Many farm dwellings, trappers homes and fisher's residencies are not located in areas zoned residential. Those folks would consider their residences permanent.*	As indicated in the response to Noise1, the nearest known human residences to the Project Site Area Boundary were estimated using GoogleEarth™ satellite imagery and are illustrated in Figure 3-1 of Appendix F 'Noise Impact Assessment' in the EAP, which indicates that the nearest residence is approximately 380 m north of the Project Site Area Boundary. As indicated in the response to VEG2 in the Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; Clearing will not be conducted within 100 m of a permanent residence. Therefore, there will be a minimum 100 m natural vegetation buffer between the Project components and permanent residences that may currently occur within the Project Site Area that may have not been previously identified.	Please refer to the proposed mitigation summary provided for Public Question VEG2 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e., ***Additional proposed mitigation:*** *Clearing will not be conducted within 100 m of a permanent residence.*
	Email: Lisa Raven April 1, 2019 and duplicate Email from Lonny Karlenzig April 1, 2019	**L&RU5** Concern - *The project will remove 1 million tons of sand annually from our communal backyard and ship it to oil and gas producing areas to be used in hydraulic fracturing of fossil fuel wells in other people's backyards. Sand is non renewable as are fossil fuels.*	The scope of EAP does not include the final uses of the sand product.	N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
	Report – comments on the CPS Response to the TAC and Public Review of the Project Dennis LeNeveu What the Frack Manitoba Inc. March 31, 2019	**L&RU6** General – concern regarding the effects of increased traffic along PR 304 on hunting activities carried out by Little Black River and Sagkeeng First Nations. Concern that such effects have not been properly addressed.	Refer to the response above for L&RU3 and Wild1.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for L&RU3 and Wild1.
Recreation and Tourism	Email: Robert Fenton March 16, 2019	**R&T1** Concern regarding the extent of recreation and tourism within the Project Site Area indicated within the EAP. *The area to be quarried is used extensively for recreational activities.*	Current land use information for the Project Site Area was obtained through a TEK study (Appendix G1 in the EAP). As indicated in Section 6.6.4 of the EAP, the TEK study with respected Elders did not indicate that the Project Site was frequented for recreation purposes. There will be limited Project development during any given year of the life of the Project within the Project Site Boundary indicated in Figure 1-1 of the EAP considering the sand quarries will be sequentially opened, closed and progressively rehabilitated each year. Therefore, not all areas currently used for recreation within the Project Site Area will be affected by the Project during any given year of the Project. As a result, the Project is not anticipated to have adverse impacts on recreation or tourism in the Local Project Area. The Project will be permitted, constructed and operated in accordance with the Incorporated Community of Seymourville zoning and Conditional Use conditions.	N/A
Human Health and Well-being (Traffic Safety)	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet	**Traffic1** RE: Response to Traffic1 – *"Compared to 2017 traffic volumes, an increase of 32% and 19% (a lesser conservative 28% and 16% is reported because volumes were compared against 2009, not 2017) can be expected once CPS is in full operations. These are not trivial increases, especially considering that this increase will be almost exclusively large transport vehicles. A large increase in liability is associated with this increase in truck traffic, which is a liability that I'm sure CPS would rather defer. I predict that CPS will inevitably end up contracting this service out to transport firms. Safety will ultimately then end up on the contracted firm, not CPS."*	Refer to the response above for LF&E1.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for LF&E1.
	Letter: Alex Nisbet, Myers LLP on half of Sagkeeng First Nation (SFN) April 8, 2019	**Traffic2** "[Concerned about] *the increase in the annual average daily traffic due to the Project on roads that SFN members travel on a daily basis*."	Refer to the response above for Infa1.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for Infra1.
	Email: Dan Garcea April 8, 2019	**Traffic3** General – concerns about the semi-trailer truck traffic that will be created due to this project on the existing PR 304 that is already in poor condition. Who will be upgrading this highway?	Refer to the response above for Infa1.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for Infra1.
	Letter: M.J. McCarron April 3, 2019	**Traffic4** *"Traffic is one of the primary concerns of local residents and our concerns have yet to be addressed with adequate information on our highways."*	Additional information regarding traffic issues was provided in the Traffic Memorandum provided as Attachment D to the Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019. Refer to the response above for Infa1.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for Infra1.
	Email: Robert Fenton March 16, 2019	**Traffic5** Concerns over comparisons of Project traffic to mill in Pine Falls that received 90 trucks a day. "…s*and trucks are all operating on #304*	As indicated in the Traffic Memorandum provided as Attachment D to the Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; the peak hour traffic will increase by 16% along PR 304 north of PTH 11. Manitoba Infrastructure Region 1 is responsible for road safety issues along the proposed sand transportation route.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided as Attachment D to the Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		whereas the logging trucks travel on several roads."	As indicated in the Traffic Memorandum, CPS is in ongoing discussions with Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Infrastructure to confirm the need and scheduling for road upgrades for the portion of the proposed truck route that will be crossing the Pine Falls Generating Station, in addition to other improvements.	March 14, 2019; i.e., *CPS is in ongoing discussions with Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Infrastructure to confirm the need and scheduling for road upgrades for the portion of the proposed truck route that will be crossing the Pine Falls Generating Station, in addition to other improvements.*
	Report – comments on the CPS Response to the TAC and Public Review of the Project Dennis LeNeveu What the Frack Manitoba Inc March 31, 2019	**Traffic6** Concern that traffic hazards have not been properly addressed. "*Traffic memorandum does not include an analysis of increase of injury and death from traffic accidents related to the Project."* *"The March 18, 2109 notice of alteration of CPS to ship sand by truck directly to market rather using rail at transload facility in Winnipeg will result in an increase in truck traffic miles and a subsequent increase in risk of public injury and death. This increase in risk of injury and death should be evaluated and considered by the Provincial Environmental Approvals Branch before acceptance of the alteration of Project plans."*	As indicated in the Traffic Memorandum provided as Attachment D to the Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; Manitoba Infrastructure Region 1 is responsible for road safety issues along the proposed sand transportation route to Winnipeg. CPS has proposed that they will be available to work with Manitoba Infrastructure to contribute to the upgrading of the roads in the vicinity of the new Project main access road by providing a paved surface on Hollow Water Road and PR 304 from the Project access road turn off to Manigotagan. CPS is in ongoing discussions with Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Infrastructure to confirm the need and scheduling for road upgrades for the portion of the proposed truck route that will be crossing the Pine Falls Generating Station, in addition to other improvements.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for Traffic5.
		Traffic7 Would like estimate information regarding the cumulative impact on traffic accidents from increased logging and mining activities.	Refer to the response above for Taffic5. A cumulative impact assessment is not currently a content requirement that is to be included in an EAP as part of the Environment Act Licence application process in Manitoba as per the 'Information Bulletin – Environment Act Proposal Report Guidelines'.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for Traffic5.
		Traffic8 *"Propane, diesel fuel, shale pit clay, and water trucks are not included [*in the traffic memorandum*]."* *"Only the percentage increase in total traffic is given in* *the tables in the traffic memorandum and not the increase in truck traffic."* *"The use of the higher AADT in the southern portion of highway 304 is an attempt to further minimize the adverse effects of Project truck traffic."*	Site generated truck traffic is referenced in Section 1.2.3 of the Traffic Report provided as Appendix N of the EAP. The Traffic Report allowed for up to 26 delivery trucks in each direction during the peak hour. The table below is the traffic estimates table for projected truck traffic on the three count segments along the route. **Count Location** / **Year 2008 (peak hour)** / **Year 2013 (peak hour)** / **Year 2019 (peak hour using 1% annual growth)** / **Year 2020 (under CPS full operation)** **PTH 59 - S of PR 304** 32 15 16 25 **PR 304 – W of PTH 11** 15 17 18 27 **PR 304 – N of PTH 11** 6 8 9 18	N/A
		Traffic9 *An accurate determination of the volume of this truck traffic requires completion of the hydro-geological study to determine truck supplied make up water requirements and the technical NI 43-101 to determine truck transported sand production volume.*	As indicated in the response above for GW4, a number of groundwater test wells were established during the hydrogeological exploration studies in Q3 2019 to gather adequate information on the potential for Project process water to be sustainably sourced from groundwater. Once the hydrogeological report is completed in Q2 of 2019, and estimation of the number of trucks required to transport make-up water to the sand wash facility will be communicated to MBSD on request. CPS will construct, operate and close the Project in accordance with conditions as stipulated in an Environment Act Licence.	N/A
		Traffic10 No response was provided to What the Frack Manitoba comment about the advantages	Refer to the response above for Infa2.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for Infra2.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		and feasibility of transport by barge to the existing Lakeline Railway from Selkirk to Gimli.		
Human Health and Well-being (Human Health)	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet	**HH1** RE: Responses to HH1 and HH2 - *"CPS must submit a copy of these plans* [monitoring, management and control plans under an Environment Management Program] *for public and TAC review and comment prior to a License being issued."*	CPS is preparing a draft Environmental Management Program that will be submitted to MBSD for review and comment in Q2, 2019. CPS will construct, operate and close the Project in accordance with conditions as stipulated in an Environment Act Licence and Closure Plan. A draft Closure Plan was submitted to Mines Branch and MBSD in April, 2019 for review and comment.	Please refer to the proposed mitigation summary provided for Public Question AM&S2 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; i.e., **Additional proposed mitigation:** CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. A draft Environmental Management Program document will be submitted to MBSD for review and comment in April 2019. Environmental management plans proposed to be included within the Environmental Management Program are as follows: • Dust Management Plan • Air Quality Monitoring Plan • **Erosion and Sediment Control Plan*** • **Surface Water Management Plan*** • **Heritage Resources Management Plan*** • Groundwater Monitoring Plan • Revegetation Monitoring Plan • **Emergency Response Plan *** * The plans indicated above in bold will be in place before the start of Project construction, with the other plans in place prior to the start of Project operation. The Environmental Management Program and Plans will be reviewed annually as required, and revised as needed. Required reporting will be provided to MBSD as stipulated in the Environment Act Licence (EAL).
	Letter: Alex Nisbet, Myers LLP on half of Sagkeeng First Nation (SFN) April 8, 2019	**HH2** *"During the operation phase, 3 to 4 trucks per hour will be loading sand at the facility for transportation to Winnipeg for distribution. SFN is located adjacent to PR 304 which appears to be the ideal transport route for the sand. Similar frack sand mines and processing facilities in the United States have been linked to adverse health impacts to individuals working in the mine and processing facility; individuals transporting*	Refer to the response above for Taffic5.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for Traffic5.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		the cargo; individuals living near this type of development; and individuals living near transport routes. The potential health and socioeconomic effects to SFN and I members as a result of the Project are unknown at this time and must be studied further."		
	Letter: M.J. McCarron April 3, 2019	**HH3** *"Dr. Lisa Robinson (HSAL) recommended a population survey and map of the human population in the affected area. It should include population and the distance to the quarry processing plant and trucking routes. CPS provided an analysis of four sites, but did not include any sites from Seymourville all the way along the cottage developments and along the Manigotogan River to the bridge. This section along the waterfront and river comprises about 60 percent of the population in the region. Without showing an accurate relationship of the population to air quality factors, the study is misleading."*	Responses to comments and questions from the Population and Public Health Branch, Manitoba Health, Seniors and Active Living are provided in Table 1: Responses to Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Review Comments to the 'Proponent Response to TAC Comments' posted March 14, 2019 in the Public Registry (which are to be posted in the Public Registry along with this Table 2 - Responses to Public Review Comments to the 'Proponent Response to TAC Comments' posted March 14, 2019 in the Public Registry).	Please refer to the proposed mitigation summary provided for TAC Question #1 in the responses to Table 1: Responses to Technical Advisory Committee Review Comments to the 'Proponent Response to TAC Comments' posted March 14, 2019 in the Public Registry; i.e., *EAP, Section 6.5.1, Air Quality* *EAP, Table 6-5: Air Quality* *EAP, Section 8, Air Quality Monitoring* *EAP, Section 6.5.2 Noise* *EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic* *EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation* **Additional proposed mitigation:** Dust suppression activities, such as the use of approved dust control agents, will be undertaken when and where required to sufficiently mitigate airborne particulate matter. CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. A draft Environmental Management Program document will be submitted to MBSD for review and comment in April 2019. Environmental management plans proposed to be included within the Environmental Management Program are as follows: • Dust Management Plan • Air Quality Monitoring Plan • **Erosion and Sediment Control Plan*** • **Surface Water Management Plan*** • **Heritage Resources Management Plan*** • Groundwater Monitoring Plan • Revegetation Monitoring Plan • **Emergency Response Plan *** * The plans indicated above in bold will be in place before the start of Project construction,

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
				with the other plans in place prior to the start of Project operation. The Environmental Management Program and Plans will be reviewed annually as required, and revised as needed. Required reporting will be provided to MBSD as stipulated in the Environment Act Licence (EAL).
		HH4 *"Please explain how the* [Air Quality] *study made allowances for the likelihood that the climate was not representative of the project site. As there will be summer populations of over 2,000 people within a few km of the site, a comprehensive study of the population needs to be referenced in any air quality studies."*	Regarding the revised Air Quality Report provided as Attachment C of the Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019; the air quality study was completed in accordance with the draft Guidelines for Air Dispersion Modelling in Manitoba. As per the guideline, meteorology was defined using the five most recent, consecutive years of data from the nearest met station with a complete dataset. The dispersion model assesses resulting air quality effects from all the meteorological variations in this dataset (not just the predominant conditions). The projected ambient air quality concentrations are reported at the nearest discrete sensitive receptors, but also as a grid of receptors across the whole study area. The grid receptor results are presented as isopleth maps for the pollutants that have been projected to exceed the ambient air quality criteria. This allows any location to be analyzed in the project study area, including the location of the referenced 2000 person population. For pollutants that have been projected to not exceed the ambient air quality criteria, no isopleth figures have been developed as all receptors in the study area are below the criteria.	N/A
	Report – comments on the CPS Response to the TAC and Public Review of the Project Dennis LeNeveu What the Frack Manitoba Inc March 31, 2019	**HH5** Concern that a health and safety assessment cannot be carried out without the completion of a technical report and hydrogeological study.	Refer to the response above for HH1. CPS will construct, operate and close the Project in accordance with conditions as stipulated in an Environment Act Licence and Closure Plan. A draft Closure Plan was submitted to Mines Branch and MBSD in April, 2019 for review and comment.	Refer to proposed mitigation above for HH1.
OTHER				
Public Engagement	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet	**Eng1** *"CPS has a duty to consult and engage with indigenous communities. Although it would seem that this is ongoing with Hollow Water First Nation, I have not seen any evidence that any other communities, such as Black River, Sagkeeng, and Bloodvein First Nations, among many others, are being meaningfully consulted and engaged. Furthermore, I have also not seen any evidence that CPS has meaningfully consulted or engaged with the Manitoba Metis Federation. In fact, CPS's response doesn't acknowledge a comment on this very issue that was raised by Lynn and Denis Berthelette in the first round of comments from the public."*	Refer to the response above for L&RU2.	N/A
		Eng2 *"I also expect to see more public meetings held along their proposed haul route as well as near or in Winnipeg so that the largest catchment possible is afforded an opportunity to attend."*	CPS has held previously advertised public meetings on the Project at Seymourville Hall on November 28, 2018 (Project Information Session) and April 17, 2019 (Public Meeting to discuss the EAP). The public meetings were held in the Local Project Area because that is the location which represents the area with the majority of potential Project effects are anticipated that CPS is responsible for mitigating. As indicated the above response for Infra1, Manitoba Infrastructure Region 1 is responsible for road safety issues	N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
			along the proposed sand transportation route.	
	Letter: Alex Nisbet, Myers LLP on half of Sagkeeng First Nation (SFN) April 8, 2019	**Eng3** *"We require that CPS, as the proponent, consult and accommodate SFN in a detailed and meaningful manner as soon as possible and that the Project review be carried out with the utmost transparency with multiple opportunities for SFN and its community members to be informed and to provide traditional knowledge."*	Refer to the response above for L&RU2.	N/A
	Email: Lonny Karlenzig April 6, 2019	**Eng4** Concern that the process of public consultation is just a formality and that issues are not being taken into due consideration.	During the CPS presentation at the Public Meeting held at Seymourville Hall on April 17, 2018, CPS explained how public input received influenced the Project design in Slide #14 of the presentation. The text on that slide is the following: ➢ Project water source **NOT** from Lake Winnipeg • To minimize Project Footprint - water sustainably sourced from: o Groundwater o Water drainage into quarries o Other licenced sources (as needed) ➢ Project Site access roads will be **PAVED** • To minimize dust generation ➢ Sand Wash & Dry Facility and sand product transfer points **ENCLOSED** using latest dust filter and design technology • To avoid dust generation This demonstrates that CPS had considered public input in the development of the Project. CPS has both a website (https://www.canadianpremiumsand.com/) and an office presence in Seymourville to facilitate open and continuous communication and dialogue with CPS on the development of the proposed Project.	N/A
	Email: Robert Fenton March 16, 2019	**Eng5** Concern that Project consultation plan and activities are inadequate given the extent of potential adverse effects	At the request of MBSD, CPS held a Public Meeting at Seymourville Hall on April 17, 2018. CPS will continue to engage with the public and invite open communication and dialogue regarding the proposed Project though the CPS website (https://www.canadianpremiumsand.com/) and in person at the CPS office in Seymourville.	N/A
		Eng6 Concern that consultation meetings take place when many stakeholders are unavailable (e.g. meeting in Seymourville) and that a 12-day notice is not adequate.	CPS planned the two public meeting events on November 28, 2018 (Project Information Session) and April 17, 2019 (Public Meeting to discuss the EAP) mid-week during the evening (6 pm to 8 pm) when the majority of the public are not at work to maximize public attendance at the public meetings. Holding these meetings in Seymourville is appropriate given the Project location. Also refer to the response above to Eng2.	N/A
	Email: Walter Keller April 2, 2019	**Eng7** Concern that cottage lot owners did not have the opportunity to attend a "*public hearing*" on the Project, and heard about the Project from third party sources.	The two public meetings on the Project held at Seymourville Hall on November 28, 2018 (Project Information Session) and April 17, 2019 (Public Meeting to discuss the EAP) were advertised on both the MBSD Public Registry and in the Winnipeg Free Press. As indicated in the response to Eng2 above, the public meetings were held in the Local Project Area because that is the location which represents the area with the majority of potential Project effects are anticipated that CPS is responsible for mitigating, which is why the meetings were not held in a more distant location such as Winnipeg.	N/A
		Eng8 Concern that the Proponent is not stating the proposed actions clearly and is avoiding answers to important questions such as those raised in What the Frack Manitoba report of March 19, 2019 submitted to MBSD.	CPS has formally responded to public comments which are available in the MBSD Public Registry (i.e., "Table 2: Responses to Public Review Comments") and were posted on March 14, 2019. This table with responses to public comments will also be posted in the Public Registry by MBSD. CPS's proposed actions related to mitigation for potential adverse effects related to the Project are stated within the EAP and the above-referenced responses to public comments.	N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
Closure Plan	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet	**CP1** RE: Response to CP1 – Does not feel a response was provided. *"…CPS must submit a closure plan as part of their License Proposal."*	The public comment to CP1, as provided for Public Question CP1 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019, was as follows: *Is there a corporate financial set aside for the Closure Plan as part of the license condition?* The response provided for Public Question CP1 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019, was as follows: *CPS will provide financial assurance as required by applicable regulatory departments.* To clarify, the 'financial assurance' or 'bond' is funding set aside by the proponent (CPS) that includes the provision of security to the Crown for performance of rehabilitation work, which is in accordance with Sec. 1 of *The Mines and Mineral Act* regarding the definition of a Closure Plan. As indicated in Section 7 of the EAP, a Closure Plan will be developed and submitted to Manitoba Growth, Enterprise and Trade and MBSD for this Project in accordance with the Manitoba Mine Closure Regulation 67/99 General Closure Plan Guidelines, although this Project is proposed to be licenced under *The Environment Act*. A draft Closure Plan was submitted to Mines Branch and MBSD in April, 2019 for review and comment.	EAP, Section 7, Closure Plan EAP, Section 8.4 Closure Plan Review
		CP2 *"CPS still isn't acknowledging that their reclamation plans will not work. They continue to insist that the area will be reshaped and revegetated to blend in with the surrounding boreal forest."* An example was provided of Reynold's Ponds and how it's currently underwater.	CPS will be required to rehabilitate quarries in accordance with provisions and conditions within and Environment Act Licence for the Project and in accordance with a Closure Plan for the Project. A draft Closure Plan was submitted to Mines Branch and MBSD in April, 2019 for review and comment.	EAP, Section 7, Closure Plan EAP, Section 8.4 Closure Plan Review
	Letter: M.J. McCarron April 3, 2019	**CP3** *"Local knowledge keepers are not satisfied that the area can be restored. They are do not buy the restoration plan and are concerned that water seepage, deep excavation, and corresponding contamination from the pits will continue to threaten fish and water."*	Refer to the response above for CP2	Refer to proposed mitigation above for CP2.
Monitoring Plans	Email: Marvin Koop April 8, 2019 Pelican Inlet Resident	**MO1** *"Do the CPS plans for monitoring include locations in our community and other cottage developments who are in close proximity to the proposed extraction? What is the requirement for full transparent and timely disclosure of the monitoring results, by the company, to the public during the construction of the plant infrastructure and the proposed 50 years of operations?"*	As indicated in Section 8 'Monitoring and Follow-up' in the EAP, CPS is proposing to monitor the success of revegetation efforts, effects to groundwater and effects to air quality during the Project operation phase. The locations of groundwater and air quality monitoring proposed by CPS will be reviewed by MBSD regarding the adequacy of the proposed methods. If MBSD requires additional monitoring locations beyond those proposed in monitoring plans that will be submitted to MBSD, CPS will abide by MBSD requirements. CPS will submit technical and monitoring reports to MBSD as stipulated within an Environment Act Licence for the Project.	N/A
	Letter: Alex Nisbet, Myers LLP on half of Sagkeeng First Nation (SFN) April 8, 2019	**MO2** General – concerned about the project interactions with the environment and the lack of a completed Environmental Management Program to address these concerns. "*…the Environmental Management Program include the following; Dust Management Plan, Air Quality Management Plan, Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, Surface Water Management Plan, Heritage Resources Management Plan, Groundwater Monitoring Plan, Revegetation Monitoring Plan, Emergency Response Plan." "Until the mitigation and monitoring plans listed above are drafted and*	Prior to the issuance of an Environment Act Licence for the Project, CPS will be providing a draft Environmental Management Program document to MBSD in April 2019 for review which will include, but not necessarily be limited to the following: • Dust Management Plan • Air Quality Monitoring Plan • **Erosion and Sediment Control Plan*** • **Surface Water Management Plan*** • **Heritage Resources Management Plan*** • Groundwater Monitoring Plan • Revegetation Monitoring Plan • **Emergency Response Plan ***	N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		can be reviewed by the public, the concerns of SFN regarding air quality, erosion and sediment reaching Lake Winnipeg, and impacts to aquatic and terrestrial animals go unanswered."	* The plans indicated above in bold will be in place before the start of Project construction, with the other plans in place prior to the start of Project operation. CPS assumes that the draft Environmental Management Program document will be reviewed by subject experts within the applicable Manitoba Government departments. Therefore, the draft Environmental Management Program document will not be made public prior to regulatory review of the document and required revisions are made by CPS.	
	Email: Robert Fenton March 16, 2019	**MO3** Concern that insufficient information was provided by CPS on the issue of compliance and adding other interest groups to the Operational Oversight Committee.	Although CPS and Hollow Water First Nation will jointly be establishing the Operational Oversight Committee, as indicated in Section 6.6.8 of the EAP, opportunities for duly-elected representatives from the communities adjacent to the Project Site Area (or their appointees) will be considered who will function to provide constructive input regarding improvements to ongoing Project activities. CPS will construct, operate and close the Project in accordance with conditions as stipulated in an Environment Act Licence and Closure Plan. A draft Closure Plan was submitted to Mines Branch and MBSD in April, 2019 for review and comment.	N/A
Project Description	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet	**PD1** "*In addition to the buffer requirements* [for noise], *extraction must also not be permitted across any existing roads."*	CPS will construct, operate and close the Project in accordance with conditions as stipulated in an Environment Act Licence and Closure Plan. A draft Closure Plan was submitted to Mines Branch and MBSD in April, 2019 for review and comment.	N/A
	Email: Lisa Raven April 1, 2019 and duplicate Email from Lonny Karlenzig April 1, 2019	**PD2** Concern that the proposed Project and activities as described are not sustainable, and concern that there will be permanent alteration of the surface water drainage, groundwater and land.	The EAP for the Project (Section 9, 'Conclusions') has determined that with the application of the proposed mitigation measures and monitoring plans outlined in this report, adverse residual environmental impacts resulting from the Project are anticipated to be sufficiently mitigated.	N/A
	Report – comments on the CPS Response to the TAC and Public Review of the Project Dennis LeNeveu What the Frack Manitoba Inc March 31, 2019	**PD3** Concern that responses by CPS and information in the EAP regarding the Project description (e.g. not shutting down the wet plant during winter and therefore not requiring drainage of process water and recharging of plant process water in the spring) is not consistent with information from the previous (2014) NI 43 -101 technical report.	The most current Project Description for the proposed Project is provided in the EAP and in the MBSD Public Registry, not in previous documentation regarding the Project.	N/A
		PD4 Concern that insufficient Project description information is available to assess the environmental impact of the Project: "…*concern is the environmental impact of the Project cannot be properly assessed without a thorough and complete technical analysis of the Project including engineering specifications on the basic size of the facility and the equipment including all vessels and storage bins in the wet and dry plants and the quarry area.*"	Based on the MBSD Technical Advisory Committee's review comments of the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019, CPS has no reason to believe that the scope of Project Description details provided for the EAP were insufficient as information required to complete an assessment of potential Project impacts.	N/A
Site Reclamation	Email: Marvin Koop April 8, 2019 Pelican Inlet Resident	**SR1** *"I have serious concerns about the validity of the company reclamation proposals, as they indicate there will be excavation to a depth of 10 — 30 meters — and I would expect (hope) that the (draft) reclamation plan would also be a required component of the EAP submission to*	Please refer to the response provided for TAC Question #10 in the responses to TAC review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019: i.e., *A Closure Plan is currently being developed in accordance with applicable regulations.* Update: a draft Closure Plan was submitted to Mines Branch and MBSD in April, 2019 for review and comment. *As indicated in Section 8.4 of the EAP 'Closure Plan Review', the proposed Closure Plan will outline detailed mitigation plans and monitoring activities that will be implemented to rehabilitate the Project Site during the closure*	As per the response provided for TAC Question #10 in the responses to TAC review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019: *EAP, Section 6.4.1, Vegetation*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		be evaluated by experts ahead of a license being granted, and to ensure an competent accountability process was in place, as well as an evaluation of the bond required to ensure that reclamation does not end up being a taxpayer funded program 50 years from now."	*phase of the Project. The Closure Plan will describe the plan for annual reclamation, which will include the submission of annual reclamation reporting to MBSD. The reports will include results of the revegetation monitoring program (with photographs and maps).* *As indicated in Section 8.1 of the EAP 'Success of Revegetation Efforts', a revegetation monitoring program will be implemented to determine the effectiveness of revegetation techniques used on previously disturbed land and to determine if follow-up reseeding or replanting is required* *Annual meetings with MBSD and the CPS Community Oversight Committee to review the rehabilitation progress will be proposed within the Closure Plan.* As indicated in the response provided for Public Question CP1 in the responses to Public review comments to the EAP posted in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019: CPS will provide financial assurance as required by applicable regulatory departments.	*EAP, Table 6-5: Vegetation* *EAP, Section 8.1. Success of Revegetation Efforts* *EAP, Section 7, Closure Plan* *EAP, Section 8.4, Closure Plan Review* ***To be included within the Closure Plan:*** • *Annual reclamation plan and reporting* • *Annual meetings with MBSD and the CPS Community Oversight Committee to review the rehabilitation progress* ***To be included in the annual Revegetation Monitoring Plan reporting:*** *Progress of revegetation including photographs and maps*
	Email: Robert Fenton March 16, 2019	**SR2** General – concern that there is no evidence of long-term commitment to the project area or the province from the project management regarding site restoration (no references to similar projects the project team has completed through the restoration stage).	Refer to response for SR1 above.	Refer to mitigation provided for SR1.
Cumulative Effects	Letter: M.J. McCarron April 3, 2019	**CE1** General: disagreement with conclusions of a Cumulative Environmental Effects Assessment for this Project provided to the federal Canadian Environmental Assessment Branch and included as Attachment C to the Proponent Response to TAC Comments' posted March 14, 2019 in the Public Registry. Concerns include multiple resource extraction projects (Havilah mining, Option License to explore Indigenous-led commercial forestry) and, wildlife (moose).	To the knowledge of AECOM, the most recent, relevant and available information was used to develop the cumulative effects assessment presented as Attachment C Proponent Response to TAC Comments' posted March 14, 2019 in the Public Registry. Please note that a cumulative impact assessment is not currently a content requirement that is to be included in an EAP as part of the Environment Act Licence application process in Manitoba as per the 'Information Bulletin – Environment Act Proposal Report Guidelines'.	N/A
		CE2 *"Cumulative impact as described above* [CE1] *will also be significant on our highways. Those impacts will increase substantially if logging trucks are added to the traffic in addition to whatever mining vehicles are required by Havilah mining."*	Refer to response above for CE1.	N/A
	Report – comments on the CPS Response to the TAC and Public Review of the Project Dennis LeNeveu What the Frack Manitoba Inc March 31, 2019	**CE3** Concern that the cumulative effects analysis submitted as Attachment A to the responses to public comments (filed in the Public Registry on March 14, 2019) did not consider a forestry development plan, "…*increased incidence of injury and death from logging trucks from the proposed first nation logging activities*…", and Bissett mining related activities.	Refer to response above for CE1.	N/A
		CE4 Concern that cumulative effects to traditional activities such as "…*the fisheries and hunting for Little Black River, Sagkeeng and Bloodvein*" were not properly addressed.	Refer to response above for CE1.	N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
	Email: Lonny Karlenzig April 6, 2019	**CE5** Concern that cumulative effects of the Project and the gold mining developments (re: Havilah Mining Corporation recent mining claims in the Manigotagan area) will greatly affect the communities of Manigotagan, Semourville, Hollow Water First Nation, as well as smaller seasonal communities.	Refer to response above for CE1.	N/A

Notes:

- N/A = not applicable
- For 'Key Issue / Question Raised' column, wording in italics is direct wording from the comments submitted. Where wording is not italicized, the comment / question has been summarized for clarity.
- Where there are numerous comments, questions or concerns raised regarding the same issue, a summary is provided preceded by 'General – '.

References:

Krumenacher, M., and Orr, I. 2017. Social Impacts of Industrial Silica Sand (Frac Sand) Mining: Land Use and Value. Policy Study: The Heartland Institute. No.140. February 2016. Accessed at: https://www.heartland.org/_template-assets/documents/publications/02-04-16_orr_and_krumenacher_on_frac_sand_mining_and_land.pdf

Orr, I., and M. Krumenacher. 2015. Environmental Impacts of Industrial Silica Sand (Frac Sand) Mining: Land Use and Value. Policy Study: The Heartland Institute. No.137. May 2015. Accessed at: https://www.heartland.org/_template-assets/documents/publications/05-04-15_orr_and_krumenacher_on_frac_sand_enviro_impacts.pdf