Table 2: Responses to Public Review Comments

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT				
Geology/Topography	Email: John Neufeld February 11, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #1	**Geo1** General – concern that the area will become a non-drainable slew after remediation is complete.	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).	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
	Letter: Don Sullivan on behalf of What The Frack Manitoba Inc. including attached supplemental comments from D.M. LeNeveu (Feb. 4, 2019) and M.J. McCarron (Feb. 6, 2019) February 11, 2019 Public Comments Batch #2	**Geo2** General – Pyritic Shale: concern that the sand resource overburden may contain pryritic shale that will result in acid rock drainage from the overburden stockpiled as berms at the active quarry.	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
		Geo3 General – concern that the sand deposit may contain pyrite susceptible to acid drainage, and additional net acid generation testing and humidity cell testing of the sand resource is suggested. Concern that the reject (waste) material from the sand wash process is a second source for acid drainage and third potential source of acid drainage may be pyrite oolite underlying the sand minable deposit.	Chemical analysis of samples collected from the sand layers confirm that the target sand layer does not contain minerals having the potential to produce ARD. The layer below the sand is the granite bedrock which also contains no acid generating minerals. Exploratory drilling has demonstrated that only the black shale layer, which has been identified in an isolated area that represents approximately 20% of the site, may have the potential to generate ARD. Black shale, when present, is situated within a distinct easily recognizable layer. In the areas where the shale layer is encountered during extraction, the shale will be isolated and extracted separately, placed in a prepared clay lined pit at the floor of the current active extraction area and capped with limestone prior to further containment in the restoration process. This 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. The filter cake contains fines from the silica sand layer only, not the black shale layer, and does not have the potential to produce ARD. A geochemical characterization program will be developed according to industry best practice for metal leaching/ acid rock drainage (ML/ARD) characterization and management under the supervision of a hydrogeologist and geochemist. As part of the ongoing work in 2019, the existing core library (obtained during exploration drilling at the site) and sample inventory was reviewed to collect discrete shale samples for	**Additional proposed mitigation:** ML/ARD 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
			geochemical characterization.	
		Geo4 General - request that an assessment be carried out to determine mitigation measures required to prevent acid drainage from the above potential sources mentioned in **Geo3** above.	Refer to response for **Geo3**.	Refer to mitigation measures proposed for response for **Geo3**.
	Letter: Julie and Steve Belley February 3, 2019 Cottage Lot Holder Public Comments Batch #3	**Geo5** Concern regarding the change in elevation with the rehabilitation of the quarries.	Although the extraction of sand will result in a change in elevation (height relative to sea level), following reclamation, site topography (arrangement of the natural physical features of the area) will remain unchanged to the extent feasible. Visually, this will result in a gradual dip in the landscape where reclaimed quarries are located.	EAP, Section 6.2.1, Geology/Topography EAP, Table 6-5: Geology/Topography
	Letter: Walter Keller & Alexa Hoerster February 5, 2019 Cottage Lot Holder Public Comments Batch #3	**Geo6** General – concerns about the permanent changes to the landscape.	Refer to response for **Geo5**.	Refer to mitigation measures proposed for response for **Geo5**.
	Letter: Adrian De Boer Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #3	**Geo7** General – concerns about the changes to the topography and how it will be returned due to the amount of material taken away.	Refer to response for **Geo5**.	Refer to mitigation measures proposed for response for **Geo5**.
	Email: Dennis LeNeveu December 21, 2018 Public Comments Batch #4	**Geo8** General – concerns about potential for acid mine drainage from iron pyrite in the overburden shale, in the quarried sand and in the underlying oolite.	Refer to response for **Geo3**.	Refer to mitigation measures proposed for response for **Geo3**.
Soils	Email: Lindy Chubb February 11, 2019 Frequent traveller on Hwy 59 Public Comments Batch #1	**Soil1** General - concern about having an erosion and sediment control plan in place.	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).	EAP, Section 6.2.2, Soils EAP, Table 6-5: Soils **Additional proposed mitigation:** CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. 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 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 EAL.
	Letter: Don Sullivan on behalf of What The Frack Manitoba Inc. including attached supplemental comments from D.M. LeNeveu (Feb. 4, 2019) and M.J. McCarron (Feb. 6, 2019)	**Soil2** Regarding potential for soil erosion, 'high wind and rain events' needs to be defined.	Refer to response for **Soil1**.	Refer to mitigation measures proposed for response for **Soil1**.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
	February 11, 2019 Public Comments Batch #2			
Groundwater	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #1	**GW1** RE: groundwater seepage in excavated cells – if the water is not pumped out of the cells, would they [the quarry cells] end up under water?	Water from seepage within the annual quarry is intended to be used for the sand wash process, along with groundwater and licensed supplemental water sources as needed (Section 2.9 'Water Use' of the EAP). Therefore, water accumulating in the active quarry cell will be pumped from the quarry and will not accumulate to an extent that would impede sand excavation activities. Also, see response to **Geo1** regarding natural water drainage with the quarry cells and surrounding topography.	N/A
		GW2 Would replacement of the overburden (material) into these abandoned cells/ponds even be permitted?	The proposed Project will be constructed, operated and closed in accordance with an Environment Act Licence and associated conditions.	N/A
		GW3 What would CPS do if each cell overcame their efforts and became stagnant ponds?	An Environmental Management Program will be prepared for review and approval by MBSD prior to the initiation of Project construction. 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. Also, see response to **Geo1** regarding natural water drainage with the quarry cells and surrounding topography.	**Additional proposed mitigation:** CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. 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 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 EAL.
		GW4 Could surface water end up contaminating the granite aquifer?	CPS does not anticipate impacts to groundwater quality in the granite aquifer resulting from the Project as the Project will not be disturbing the granite aquifer. A Groundwater Monitoring Program proposed in Section 8.2 of the EAP will be developed to monitor groundwater quality. Mitigation proposed in the EAP for the protection of surface water quality (EAP Section 6.3.1) regarding use of ditching to contain surface water runoff from disturbed areas and directing runoff into a sump-pit for the use in the sand wash plant for process water is anticipated to mitigate the potential for adverse effects to local surface water quality. Process water will be obtained from an alternative licensed water source if on-going water monitoring studies demonstrate an unacceptable risk to groundwater quantity or quality (Section 6.2.3 'Groundwater' of the EAP). The potential for surface water contamination will mitigated by best practices as outlined within environmental protection plans to be included within the Environmental Management Program.	EAP, Section 6.3.1, Surface Water Quality EAP, Table 6-5: Surface Water Quality EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring **Additional proposed mitigation:** CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. 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
				• Surface Water Management Plan • Heritage Resources Management Plan • Groundwater Monitoring Plan • Revegetation Monitoring Plan • Emergency Response Plan 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 EAL.
		GW5 General - there are other groundwater wells in Pelican Inlet (as well as other developments) than identified.	An updated groundwater wells map, using the most recent information available from Manitoba Sustainable Development (MBSD), has been provided in Appendix C of a Cumulative Effects Assessment report included as **Attachment A** of this table 2. The MBSD groundwater well database does not have a record of all active groundwater wells in Manitoba. 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.	EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
		GW6 General - what would the drawdown look like for long term groundwater pumping to manage seepage into mineral extraction cells?	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.	EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
		GW7 General - what does the drawdown effect look like after 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 years as excavations and operations spiral outwards towards neighbouring properties?	Refer to response for **GW6**.	EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
		GW8 General - concern of the lack of hydro-geotechnical / hydrogeological investigations; no baseline information on the quantity and quality of groundwater in the area.	Refer to response for **GW6**.	EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
	Email: Lindy Chubb February 11, 2019 Frequent traveller on Hwy 59 Public Comments Batch #1	**GW9** Will the amounts of withdrawals from local aquifers be monitored, gauged and paid for?	CPS will be responsible for monitoring groundwater quality and quantity during the Project construction and operation phases in accordance with Environment Act Licence requirements and a Groundwater Monitoring Plan.	EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
	Email: John Neufeld February 11, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #1	**GW10** General – concerns about the amount of groundwater needed and if the aquifer can handle the quantity that will be withdrawn.	Refer to response for **GW6**.	EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
	Letter: Don Sullivan on behalf of What The Frack Manitoba Inc. including attached supplemental comments from D.M. LeNeveu (Feb. 4, 2019) and M.J. McCarron (Feb. 6, 2019) February 11, 2019 Public Comments Batch #2	**GW11** Provide information about the completed hydrogeological studies and pump tests for groundwater to determine the feasibility and sustainability of groundwater use for Project operations.	Refer to response for **GW6**.	N/A
		GW12 General – concern regarding the potential for the Project to adversely affect groundwater quality.	Refer to response for **GW4**.	EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
		GW13 Opinion that the Project should not go forward until hydrogeological studies have been completed and shared.	Hydrogeological studies supporting the Environment Act Licence application are currently ongoing. Refer to response for **GW6**.	N/A
	Letter: Walter Keller & Alexa Hoerster February 5, 2019 Cottage Lot Holder Public Comments Batch #3	**GW14** General - concerns about the quantity of groundwater needed for operation and how it will affect the groundwater levels in the area.	Refer to response for **GW6**.	EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
	Letter: Julie and Steve Belley February 3, 2019 Cottage Lot Holder Public Comments Batch #3	**GW15** What is the assurance that there will not be significant negative impact on the groundwater source during the long term extraction project?	Refer to response for **GW6**.	EAP, Section 6.3.1, Surface Water Quality EAP, Table 6-5: Surface Water Quality EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
	Email: Elyssa McIvor February 12, 2019 Anishinabe Public Comments Batch #3	**GW16** General – concerns about the amount of water needed to operate and the source of groundwater needed.	Refer to response for **GW6**.	EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
	Letter: Adrian De Boer Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #3	**GW17** General – concerns about the amount of groundwater needed for operation.	Refer to response for **GW6**.	EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
	Email: Marv and Pat Koop January 28, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**GW18** What is the assurance that there will not be significant negative impact on the groundwater source during the long term extraction project?	Refer to response for **GW6**.	EAP, Section 6.3.1, Surface Water Quality EAP, Table 6-5: Surface Water Quality EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
	Email: James Sager February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #4	**GW19** Will the sand plant well water system affect our water supply (water well drilled to 340 feet through granite and have a return of 0.5 gallon per minute)?	Refer to response **GW4** and **GW6**.	EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
	Email: Lonny Karlenzig February 6, 2019 Resident of Manigotagan Public Comments Batch #4	**GW20** How do they know if the groundwater will even sustain their mine if the testing hasn't been done yet? How will sucking up millions of gallons of groundwater not impact private wells down the hill?	Refer to response for **GW6**.	EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
	Letter: Maurice and Deanne O'Rourke January 25, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**GW21** General – concerns about the amount of groundwater needed for operation and indicated that there are 20 deep and 4 shallow (less than 20 feet deep) existing groundwater wells in the development (Pelican Inlet).	Refer to response for **GW6**. An updated groundwater wells map, using the most recent information available from Manitoba Sustainable Development (MBSD), has been provided in Appendix C of a Cumulative Effects Assessment report included as **Attachment A** of this table 2.	EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
	Letter: Richard and Louise Labossiere January 27, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**GW22** General – concerns about the amount of groundwater needed for operation. The continued water quality and quantity testing is needed.	Refer to response for **GW6**.	EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
	Letter: Ian M.C. Dixon January 14, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**GW23** General – concerns about the amount of groundwater needed for the project.	Refer to response for **GW6**.	EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
		GW24 Can the Project proceed over the 54-year projected period with the guarantee that there will be no disturbance in the bedrock aquifers?	Refer to response for **GW4** and **GW6**.	EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
		GW25 Can the applicants assure that the disturbed draw-down from the excavated regions will not affect the aquifers serving the Pelican Inlet cottage site?	Refer to response for **GW6**.	EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
	Email: Lynn Berthelette January 11, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**GW26** General – concerns about the possibility of contamination of drinking water.	Refer to response for **GW4** and **GW6** regarding potable groundwater.	EAP, Section 6.3.1, Surface Water Quality EAP, Table 6-5: Surface Water Quality EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
	Email: Robert Fenton January 10, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**GW27** General – concerns about the potential disruption to groundwater flows due to the project.	Refer to response for **GW6**.	EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
	Email: Dennis LeNeveu December 21, 2018 Public Comments Batch #4	**GW28** General – concerns about leaching of toxic acrylamide likely to be in the waste from the wash plant.	The Safety Data Sheets for the polymers that will be used in the sand washing process are provided in **Attachment B**. As indicated in the 'Ecological Information' (Section 12) of the Safety Data Sheets, these polymers are either not classified as dangerous to the environment, or the effects are rapidly and significantly mitigated by the presence of dissolved organic carbon in the aquatic environment. The polymers do not break-down into polyacrylamide-based components that may have adverse environmental effects. The polymer that will be used in the sand wash process attaches to the fine particles and drops out of the water before it leaves the thickener tank. It is carried with the fine particles to a further stage of dewatering in a plate press. Here, the remaining water is squeezed through a fine filter to capture all of the fine particles and further capture remaining water. The water is pumped to the fresh water tank and the dry particulate matter (filter cake) is transported back to the quarry area to be used in the reclamation process. By this stage in the process, all polymer used in the fines settling is fully contained and inert, does not enter the groundwater and poses no threat to birds, fish, humans or the environment. In fact, the same chemicals used in the polymer are used in food manufacturing throughout the world.	N/A
AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT				
Surface Water	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #1	**SW1** As cells/excavations are completed and work progresses outwards, what will the effect be on surface water?	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	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

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
			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.	**Additional proposed mitigation:** CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. 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 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 EAL.
		SW2 What effect will that have on natural surface drainage patterns and the ecosystem that depends on these patterns?	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. Also refer to response for **SW1**. 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.	EAP, Section 6.3.1, Surface Water Quality EAP, Table 6-5: Surface Water Quality **Additional proposed mitigation:** CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. 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 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 EAL.
		SW3 Could surface water end up contaminating the granite aquifer?	Refer to mitigation measures proposed for response for **GW4.**	Refer to mitigation measures proposed for response to **GW4.**

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		SW4 General – no baseline information on the quantity and quality of surface water in the area.	Although some low bog areas occur within the Project Site area, other surface water bodies such as lakes and streams are not present within the Project Site area such that the quantity of 'water' within the Project Site area is detectable in the Manitoba Land Initiative land cover database (refer to Table 4-1 in the EAP). Due to the lack of fish habitat within and immediately adjacent to the Project Site, application of an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan as indicated in Section 6.2.2.1 of the EAP, and installation of culverts to equalize land drainage for the main Project access road as required, Project related impacts on fish and fish habitats are not anticipated and therefore negated the need for baseline surface water quality data. See response to **SW1** regarding proposed mitigation to avoid or minimize potential adverse effects to surface water, including commitment to a Surface Water Management Plan.	**Additional proposed mitigation:** CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. 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 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 EAL.
	Email: Lindy Chubb February 11, 2019 Frequent traveller on Hwy 59 Public Comments Batch #1	**SW5** Why isn't surface water to be used?	As described in Section 2.9 'Water Use' in the EAP, water for the processing of silica sand 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. Currently, non-permitted sources of surface water are not being considered (e.g. Lake Winnipeg) due to the need for mitigation measures required for the protection of aquatic life, and would result in the need for additional infrastructure (especially pipeline) that would increase the Project footprint resulting in additional impacts to the environment.	N/A
	Letter: Don Sullivan on behalf of What The Frack Manitoba Inc. including attached supplemental comments from D.M. LeNeveu (Feb. 4, 2019) and M.J. McCarron (Feb. 6, 2019) February 11, 2019 Public Comments Batch #2	**SW6** General – concern for adverse effects to adjacent watercourses from overburden removal and stockpiling of rejected material from the sand deposit until vegetative cover has been established.	Refer to response for **SW1**.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **SW1**.
		SW7 General – *'Suspended Sediment':* concern that Project Site drainage will not be effectively controlled through the use of ditching and recovery of runoff water in a sump pit in the active quarry cell. Concern for overflow and leakage from a settling pond resulting in adverse environmental effects to two unnamed creeks, the Wanipigow River and Manigotagan River mouth.	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. A settling pond is not included in the current Project Site plan (EAP Section 2 'Project Description).	**Additional proposed mitigation:** CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. 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

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
				• Revegetation Monitoring Plan • Emergency Response Plan 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 EAL.
		SW8 General – concern regarding the potential for the Project to adversely affect surface water quality.	Refer to response for **SW1**.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **SW1**.
		SW9 *A spring located on the company mine site that elders said they could no longer find was readily located on a map of the area by a seasoned trapper.*	CPS encouraged holders of other Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) to share their additional knowledge of the Project Site Area not previously gathered during the Project TEK Study at the Community Information Session and other previous meetings with community members as described in Section 5 'Engagement Program and Community Outreach' in the EAP. CPS will work collaboratively with local community members, the CPS Community Oversight Committee, and the Elders Committee, with input from MBSD, to determine appropriate measures needed to sufficiently mitigate potential Project effects to valued environmental components and specific resources within the Project Site Area not previously identified within the EAP.	**Additional proposed mitigation:** CPS will work collaboratively with local community members, with input from MBSD, to determine appropriate measures needed to sufficiently mitigate potential Project effects to valued environmental components and heritage resources within the Project Site Area not previously identified within the EAP.
	Email: Elyssa McIvor February 12, 2019 Anishinabe Public Comments Batch #3	**SW10** General – concerns about how the Project will impact Lake Winnipeg.	There are no fish-bearing waterbodies within the Project Site Area (Section 6.3.2 'Fish and Fish Habitat' of the EA). The nearest fish-bearing waterbody/watercourse is Lake Winnipeg, which is located 1 km from the Project Site Area boundary at the closest distance. During all Project phases, erosion and sediment control measures will be applied to minimize potential residual effects on surface water quality. Therefore, potentially silt-laden run-off water will be restricted to the Project Site Area, and the potential for contamination of adjacent Local Project Area waterbodies, such as Lake Winnipeg, will be mitigated. An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan that will be developed for all Project phases will include industry standard erosion and control measures, such as those implemented by Manitoba Infrastructure for the construction of provincial roads, highways, and associated roadbed material quarries (refer to Section 6.2.2 'Soils' in the EAP). These erosion and sediment control measures will include, and not be limited to, installation and monitoring of silt fences on either side of drainage paths intersecting the construction area and land sloping towards adjacent wetland areas. Examples of activities to be included in an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan are: erosion risk identification; erosion and sedimentation management strategy; documentation of both general and specific erosion and sediment control measures; worker education and training; monitoring and maintenance activities; and contingency measures. In the event that some blasting may be required for access road construction, it is anticipated that vibrations and airborne particulates will not result in adverse effects on fish or fish habitat, considering the two proposed access roads are located no closer than 3 km from the nearest fish-bearing waterbody/watercourse (i.e., Lake Winnipeg). Blasting will not be conducted during high-wind events, a precaution that will further mitigate dispersal of airborne pollutants. Results of an updated/revised air quality modeling for the proposed Project (**Attachment C** of this table 2; originally Appendix E of the EAP) estimate the 'worst-case scenario', 24-hr average concentrations of particulate matter (PM_{10}) over fish-bearing waterbodies / watercourses to be below the Manitoba Ambient Air Quality Criteria (MAAQC) limit of 50 µg/m^3.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **SW1**.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
			Also refer to response for **SW1**.	
	Email: Robert Fenton January 10, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**SW11** General - concerns about the potential disruption to surface water flows due to the project.	Refer to response for **SW2**.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **SW2**.
	Email: Dennis LeNeveu December 21, 2018 Public Comments Batch #4	**SW12** General – concerns about leaching of toxic acrylamide likely to be in the waste from the wash plant.	Refer to response for **GW28**.	N/A
Fish and Fish Habitat	Letter: Alex Nisbet, Myers LLP on half of Sagkeeng First Nation (SFN) February 12, 2019 Public Comments Batch #1	**FFH1** General – concerns for the need to further study the possibility of adverse effects to fish and fish habitat due to project runoff and groundwater contamination.	Refer to responses for **SW1** and **SW10** regarding surface water. Refer to response for **GW4** regarding the potential for groundwater contamination.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **SW1** and **SW10**. Refer to mitigation proposed for **GW4**.
	Letter: Don Sullivan on behalf of What The Frack Manitoba Inc. including attached supplemental comments from D.M. LeNeveu (Feb. 4, 2019) and M.J. McCarron (Feb. 6, 2019) February 11, 2019 Public Comments Batch #2	**FFH2** General – concern that the fish and fish habitat in sections of the Wanipigow River, Manigotagan River mouth, Lake Winnipeg and two unnamed creeks may be affected by the Project.	Refer to responses for **SW1** and **SW10**.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **SW1** and **SW10**.
		FFH3 General – concern that two unnamed creeks have not been evaluated for fish and fish habitat and they may be potentially affected by drainage from the Project, and concern that this drainage may potentially contain suspended sediment, acid drainage, and toxic flocculants from the wash plant.	Refer to responses for **SW1** and **SW10**. Although low bog areas occur within the Project Site Area, no potentially fish-bearing creeks are known to occur within or immediately adjacent to the Project Site area that may be potentially affected by drainage from the Project. Refer to response for **GW28** regarding the potential for adverse effects related to the sand wash polymer.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **SW1** and **SW10**.
		FFH4 General – 'Changes to Water Levels in two Unnamed Creeks': concern that the collection of water in quarry pit sumps for use in the Project wash plant will affect the water levels in two unnamed creeks and which may disrupt fish and fish habitat and potential spawning in the creeks.	Refer to responses for **SW1** and **SW10**. Although low bog areas occur within the Project Site Area, no potentially fish-bearing creeks are known to occur within or adjacent to the Project Site area that may be potentially affected by changes in drainage from the Project Site Area.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **SW1** and **SW10**.
		FFH5 General – 'Assessment is required to…' protect fish and fish habitat to evaluate the potential for, and mitigation of, acid leaching, suspended sediment discharge, loss of process water containing toxins and fluctuations of water levels caused by surface water drainage.	Refer to responses for **SW1**, **SW2** and **SW10**. Refer to response for **GW28** regarding the potential for adverse effects related to the sand wash polymer.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **SW1**, **SW2** and **SW10**.
		FFH6 General – concern regarding the effect of the quarry on fish habitat.	Refer to responses for **SW1**, **SW2** and **SW10**.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **SW1**, **SW2** and **SW10**.
	Letter: Dreyson Smith February 12, 2019 Public Comments Batch #3	**FFH7** General – concerns about the construction of the proposed road to the site and about the connectivity of the wetland in that area which drains into the Wanipigow River and Lake Winnipeg and how the project could affect fish/mussel habitat and species at	The proposed alignment for the main Project access road traverses through an approximate 200 m width of low bog area within 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. Culverts will be installed in accordance with MBSD requirements and applicable guidelines.	EAP, Section 6.3.1, Surface Water Quality EAP, Table 6-5: Surface Water Quality **Additional proposed mitigation:** Culverts will be installed in accordance with MBSD

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		risk.	Additionally, 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 Sedimentation Plan will be included in the Environmental Management Program. Therefore, no adverse Project-related effects to fish/mussel habitat and aquatic species at risk are anticipated.	requirements and applicable guidelines. CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. 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 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 EAL.
TERRESTRIAL ENVIRONMENT				
Vegetation	Letter: Julie and Steve Belley February 3, 2019 Cottage Lot Holder Public Comments Batch #3	**VEG1** General – concerned about the amount of forest that is to be cleared and the restoration / rehabilitation efforts to make the area similar to what it was before clearing.	The Project Site Area where the sand wash and dry facility and annual quarries will be located has been previously disturbed to varying extents (e.g. by existing roads and trails, previous wood cutting, quarrying). Vegetation clearing will be minimized to the extent feasible (e.g., through the use of existing roads and trails, and other previously disturbed areas) and will be clearly marked to avoid clearing more than required. The total area to be disturbed over the life of the Project, notwithstanding the annual quarry cell progressive revegetation, will be 353 ha which represents 15% of the 2,289 ha of CPS quarry lease areas, and 0.00002% of the Lac Seul Ecoregion area within which the Project is located. Each annual sand quarry will be limited in size (averaging 5 ha in size, and 10 m to 30 m deep) and will be progressively reclaimed each year of operation. On-going annual progressive rehabilitation of quarry cells will occur in accordance with a regulator-approved Closure Plan and Revegetation Monitoring Program to restore the landscape to native conditions to the extent feasible. The success of the revegetation efforts at each sequentially closed quarry cell and during the Project closure phase for a minimum of six years as recommended in Manitoba Government's General Closure Plan Guidelines to determine if the revegetated areas are self-sufficient. Successful revegetation will be one of the factors considered by Manitoba Sustainable Development to determine when the Project Site has been sufficiently 'closed' in accordance with a Closure Plan. Refer to response for **Geo5** regarding the visual change in the landscape.	EAP, Section 6.4.1, Vegetation EAP, Table 6-5: Vegetation EAP, Section 7, Closure Plan EAP, Section 8.4 Closure Plan Review EAP, Section 8.1, Success of Revegetation Efforts
		VEG2 General – concerned on how close the clearing comes to the cottage community and would like to see a 100 m natural vegetative buffer between the operation and community.	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.	**Additional proposed mitigation:** Clearing will not be conducted within 100 m of a permanent residence.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
	Email: Elyssa McIvor February 12, 2019 Anishinabe Public Comments Batch #3	**VEG3** General – concerned about the wild blueberries.	Although wild blueberries occur within some suitable areas for their growth in the Project Site area, and the results of a Project Site TEK study has indicated that blueberry picking occurs within the Project Site area (Appendix G1 of the EAP), a regional TEK study has indicated that other locations in the Local and Regional Project Area are also frequently used, or more commonly used, for blueberry harvesting (Appendix G2 of the EAP). Regardless, CPS understands the importance of maintaining easily accessible blueberry harvesting areas for the local communities. Therefore, the annual quarry restoration and revegetation activities, and the Closure Plan for the Project, will prioritize methods for re-establishing blueberry harvesting areas to the maximum extent feasible and as recommended by the Community Oversight Committee.	EAP, Section 6.4.1, Vegetation EAP, Table 6-5: Vegetation EAP, Section 7, Closure Plan EAP, Section 8.4 Closure Plan Review EAP, Section 8.1, Success of Revegetation Efforts **Additional proposed mitigation:** The annual quarry restoration and revegetation activities, and the Closure Plan for the Project, will prioritize methods for re-establishing blueberry harvesting areas to the maximum extent feasible.
	Email: Sylvia Lasko February 12, 2019 Public Comments Batch #3	**VEG4** How is it true that "long-term adverse effects to vegetation and regional wildlife populations are not anticipated"?	That statement, as included in both the Executive Summary and Conclusion (Section 9) of the EAP, should be revised and clarified to read as follows (wording revision in bold): *Considering the Project Site does not have rare or particularly sensitive land cover and the existing land cover is common within the Lac Seul Upland Ecoregion within which the Project is located, long-term adverse ~~effects~~* ***impacts*** *to vegetation and regional wildlife populations, including species at risk populations, beyond* ***an acceptable regulatory threshold*** *are not anticipated.*	N/A
	Email: Marv and Pat Koop January 28, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**VEG5** *General – concerned about the amount of forest that is to be cleared and the restoration / rehabilitation efforts to make the area similar to what it was before clearing and the change in elevation.*	Refer to response for **VEG1** regarding amount of clearing required and annual reclamation of the quarry cells, including revegetation. Backfilling of quarry cells with stockpiled excavated materials and filter cake from the sand wash and dry process, and re-contouring of the land to conform with the surrounding area, will mitigate potential changes to Project Site Area elevation (Section 6.2.1 'Geology/Topography' in the EAP). Also refer to response **Geo5** regarding change to the landscape elevation.	EAP, Section 6.4.1, Vegetation EAP, Table 6-5: Vegetation 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 EAP, Section 8.1, Success of Revegetation Efforts
		VEG6 *General – concerned on how close the clearing comes to the cottage community and would like to see a 100 m natural vegetative buffer between the operation and community.*	Refer to response for **VEG2**. 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.	**Additional proposed mitigation:** Clearing will not be conducted within 100 m of a permanent residence.
Wildlife	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #1	**Wild1** General – concerns of project effects on local avian and terrestrial wildlife.	Key mitigation measures to protect local avian and terrestrial wildlife are provided in Section 6.4.2 'Wildlife' of the EAP and include avoiding clearing vegetation between April 30 and August 11 to minimize adverse effects to breeding birds and other wildlife with young during this time period. Annual progressive rehabilitation and revegetation of quarry cells, and restoration of the Project Site Area the end of the Project life, are anticipated to restore disturbed wildlife habitats over time to the maximum extent feasible. A review of existing Manitoba Land Initiative data, on-site terrestrial reconnaissance and information shared by local community members during a Project TEK study have suggested that no land cover or habitats considered rare or unique for the Regional Project Area and larger Lac Seul Upland Ecoregion exist in the Project Site Area. Although there will be some moderate adverse effects to wildlife, regional populations of birds and other wildlife including species at risk are not expected to experience a substantial decrease as a result of Project activities.	EAP, Section 6.4.2, Wildlife EAP, Table 6-5: Wildlife EAP, Section 6.4.1, Vegetation EAP, Table 6-5: Vegetation EAP, Section 7, Closure Plan EAP, Section 8.4 Closure Plan Review EAP, Section 8.1, Success of Revegetation Efforts
	Letter: Don Sullivan on behalf of What The Frack Manitoba Inc. including attached supplemental comments from	**Wild2** General – concern regarding disruptive effects such as noise and Project traffic and machinery on local wildlife populations of the life of the Project.	Moderate adverse effects to wildlife are anticipated as a result of Project activities (Section 6.4.2 'Wildlife' of the EAP). Mitigation measures described in Section 6.4.2 'Wildlife' of the EAP will be applied to avoid or minimize adverse effects to wildlife to	EAP, Section 6.4.2, Wildlife EAP, Table 6-5: Wildlife

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
	D.M. LeNeveu (Feb. 4, 2019) and M.J. McCarron (Feb. 6, 2019) February 11, 2019 Public Comments Batch #2		the extent feasible. With the application of proposed mitigation, regional populations of wildlife including species at risk are not expected to experience a substantial decrease as a result of Project activities.	
		Wild3 General – concern that migratory bird habitat may be disrupted by potential acid mine drainage and water level fluctuations from the Project.	Refer to responses **Geo3** regarding potential for acid mine drainage. Refer to responses to **SW1** and **SW2** regarding surface water and surface water drainage / fluctuations. Mitigation proposed in the above referenced responses includes measures that will avoid or minimize adverse effects to migratory bird habitat.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **Geo3**, **SW1** and **SW2**.
		Wild4 General – Concerns that increased truck traffic will increase moose kills and adversely affect regional moose populations, including the low moose population in Game Hunting Area 26.	Mitigation measures proposed in Section 6.4.2 of the EAP for the protection of wildlife, and the expected on-going moose management efforts of MBSD in the regional Game Hunting Areas, are considered sufficient to mitigate adverse effects to regional moose and other wildlife populations.	EAP, Table 6-5: Wildlife EAP, Section 6.4.2, Wildlife
		Wild5 TEK [Traditional Ecological Knowledge] not previously shared by HWFN residents has identified areas within the proposed mine site as a travel corridor and refuge for moose.	CPS encourages holders of other TEK to share their knowledge of the Project Site Area not previously gathered during the Project TEK Study, the Community Information Session and other previous meetings with community members as described in Section 5 'Engagement Program and Community Outreach' in the EAP. CPS will work collaboratively with local community members, with input from MBSD, to determine appropriate measures needed to sufficiently mitigate potential Project effects to valued environmental components and specific resources within the Project Site Area not previously identified within the EAP.	**Additional proposed mitigation:** CPS will work collaboratively with local community members, with input from MBSD, to determine appropriate measures needed to sufficiently mitigate potential Project effects to valued environmental components and heritage resources within the Project Site Area not previously identified within the EAP.
	Letter: Adrian De Boer Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #3	**Wild6** General – concerns of project effects on local wildlife.	Refer to response for **Wild1**.	EAP, Section 6.4.2, Wildlife EAP, Table 6-5: Wildlife
	Email: Sylvia Lasko February 12, 2019 Public Comments Batch #3	**Wild7** How is it true that "long-term adverse effects to vegetation and regional wildlife populations are not anticipated"?	Refer to response for **VEG4**.	Refer mitigation proposed for **VEG4**.
	Letter: Maurice and Deanne O'Rourke January 25, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**Wild8** General – concerns of project effects on local wildlife.	Refer to response for **Wild1**.	Refer mitigation proposed for **Wild1**.
	Email: Lynn Berthelette January 11, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**Wild9** General – concerns on the increased noise pollution from this project that may interfere with the mating cycle of birds (Mountain Bluebirds, Pine Grossbeak, Nuthatches, Chickadees, Bluejays, Ruff Grouse, Merlin Falcons, Bald Eagles) as they will have difficulties hearing each others mating call.	Noise from Project activities has the potential to adversely affect breeding birds within limited areas in the vicinity of Project construction and operation (quarrying) activities. Refer to responses **Wild1** and **Wild2** for additional response information.	Refer mitigation proposed for **Wild1** and **Wild2.**
Species of Conservation Concern	Letter: Don Sullivan on behalf of What The Frack Manitoba Inc. including attached supplemental comments from D.M. LeNeveu (Feb. 4, 2019) and M.J. McCarron (Feb. 6, 2019) February 11, 2019 Public Comments Batch #2	**SCC1** General – lack of information regarding the prevalence of species of conservation concern in the Project vicinity.	Although surveys were not conducted for species of conservation concern in the Project Site Area and vicinity, it is assumed in the EAP that species of conservation concern may occur in the Project Site Area, and vicinity, where suitable habitat occurs. The measures proposed to protect wildlife in Section 6.4.2 'Wildlife' of the EAP are considered sufficient to mitigate adverse effects to regional populations of species of conservation concern. As indicated in Section 4.3.3 'Species of Conservation Concern' in the EAP, there are no plant Species at Risk that may occur in the area of the Lac Seul Upland Ecoregion within which the Project Site area occurs. Although other plant species that have a provincial conservation status may occur in the Project Site Area, information provided in the EAP (Section 4.3.1 'Vegetation'), as obtained	EAP, Table 6-5: Wildlife EAP, Section 6.4.2, Wildlife EAP, Section 6.4.1, Vegetation EAP, Table 6-5: Vegetation EAP, Section 7, Closure Plan EAP, Section 8.4 Closure Plan Review EAP, Section 8.1, Success of Revegetation Efforts

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
			from the Manitoba Forest Resource Inventory, indicates vegetated land cover within the Project Site Area (within which the Project Footprint is located) consists of cover types and tree species present in the Regional Project Area (up to 10 km beyond the Project Site) and are common within the larger Lac Seul Upland Ecoregion within which the Project Site Area is located. Therefore, unique or isolated locations of plant species of conservation concern within the proposed Project Footprint, which are not present within the larger Lac Seul Upland Ecoregion, are not anticipated. Measures to mitigate adverse effects to vegetation as indicated in Section 6.4.1 of EAP are considered sufficient to protect regional plant species of concern populations. Annual progressive rehabilitation and revegetation of quarry cells, and restoration of the Project Site Area the end of the Project life, are anticipated to restore disturbed areas to the maximum extent feasible to promote the reestablishment of plant species of conservation concern if originally present within the disturbed areas.	
		SCC2 General – 'Assessment is required to…' protect aquatic and bird species at risk to evaluate the potential for, and mitigation of, acid leaching, suspended sediment discharge, loss of process water containing toxins and fluctuations of water levels caused by surface water drainage.	Refer to responses for **SW1** and **SW10** regarding aquatic species. Refer to response for **W1** regarding bird species at risk. Refer to response for **Geo3** regarding potential for mineral leaching / acid drainage. Refer to response **GW28** regarding the characteristics of the polymer used in the sand wash process. Refer to response for **SW2** regarding surface water drainage.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **SW1**, **SW2**, **W1**, **Geo3** and **SW2**.
		SCC3 Two plants located on the mine site that are not medicinal but should be noted because of conservation concerns include: Cypripedium Purple Moccasin S3S4; Cypripedium arietinum Ram's Head Lady's Slipper S2S3	Refer to response **SCC1** regarding species of conservation concern.	EAP, Section 6.4.1, Vegetation EAP, Table 6-5: Vegetation EAP, Section 7, Closure Plan EAP, Section 8.4 Closure Plan Review EAP, Section 8.1, Success of Revegetation Efforts
ATMOSPHERIC ENVIRONMENT				
Air Quality	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #1	**AirQ1** General - concerns about air quality and dust and what monitoring will be in place.	The Air Quality Report (Appendix E of the EAP), which uses updated modeling to estimate the areas of potential Project-related exceedances to air quality guidelines, has been revised and is provided in **Attachment C** of this Table 2. The isopleth maps shown in the revised Air Quality Report (**Attachment C** of this Table 2) show the maximum estimated exceedance extents for various air quality parameters from the sand wash and dry facility under the worst-case scenario condition (extended long, dry, hot weather during non-winter months coupled with high winds). Predicted maximum 24-hr average concentrations of SO_2 and CO were below the associated Manitoba Ambient Air Quality Criteria (MAAQC) across the modelling domain. Predicted concentrations of NO_2 are below MAAQC at sensitive receptors, with possible exceedances estimated to be limited to the immediate vicinity of the emission sources (i.e. internal combustion byproducts of equipment operation). 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 MAAQC limit guideline by up to 4.6 µg/m^3 of PM_{10} under worst-case scenario conditions. 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 (**Attachment C** of this Table 2) 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	EAP, Section 6.5.1, Air Quality EAP, Table 6-5: Air Quality EAP, Section 8.3, Air Quality Monitoring **Additional proposed mitigation:** CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. 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 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 EAL.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
			Wisconsin have indicated that those facilities do not generate any hazardous levels of PM2.5 in the ambient air near these operations (Orr and Krumenacher 2015). 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 with MBSD.	
		AirQ2 How will operations change to prevent air quality exceedances?	As indicated in the response above for response **AirQ1** 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 with MBSD.	EAP, Section 8.3, Air Quality Monitoring
	Email: Lindy Chubb February 11, 2019 Frequent traveller on Hwy 59 Public Comments Batch #1	**AirQ3** Are these trucks environmentally friendly?	Best management practices for the operation of trucks and heavy equipment during all phases of Project activities will include: using the correct size of equipment, performing regular scheduled maintenance of equipment, obeying traffic regulations (e.g. speed), and educating drivers to improve behaviours (e.g. minimizing idling). If feasible, lower-emission vehicles may be used for the activities (e.g. electric or natural-gas powered) to further mitigate these emissions.	EAP, Section 6.5.1, Air Quality EAP, Table 6-5: Air Quality
	Letter: Don Sullivan on behalf of What The Frack Manitoba Inc. including attached supplemental comments from D.M. LeNeveu (Feb. 4, 2019) and M.J. McCarron (Feb. 6, 2019) February 11, 2019 Public Comments Batch #2	**AirQ4** General – concern that not all potential sources of silica dust were considered in Appendix E 'Air Quality Report' in the EAP (e.g. thief hatches on top of sand movers, unloading of sand transport trucks, disposal of dust from the baghouses, sand stockpiles and other outdoor sand processing and crushing procedures).	Potential sources of silica dust were considered and modeled within the Air Quality Report (Appendix E of the EAP) which has now been updated (**Attachment C** of this table 2). The revised version of the Air Quality Report, which uses updated modeling to estimate the areas of potential Project-related exceedances to air quality guidelines, is provided in **Attachment C** of this Table 2.	EAP, Section 6.5.1, Air Quality EAP, Table 6-5: Air Quality
		AirQ5 *Sensitive air quality receptors were not placed around the perimeter of the quarry site.* [reference to Figure 3 of Appendix E 'Air Quality Report' in the EAP] *and the lack of data from the Manigotogan* [Manigotagan] *Bridge to the mouth of the Manigotogan* [Manigotagan] *River and around to Montago Bay and Second Beach are concerning as permanent and summer residences of HWFN members can be found in these locations.*	As indicated in Section 3 of the Air Quality Report (Appendix E of the EAP; now updated and revised – see **Attachment C** of this table 2), the air dispersion model was conducted according to the *Draft Guidelines for Air Quality Dispersion Modelling Manitoba.* In consideration of dispersion modeling guidelines, the model included sensitive receptors which were the nearest residence to the proposed facility, and from the following four communities: Aghaming, Manigotagan, Seymourville and Wanipigow. The isopleth maps shown in Attachment A of the revised Air Quality Report (**Attachment C** of this table 2) show the maximum estimated exceedance	N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
			extents for various air quality parameters from the sand wash and dry facility under the worst-case scenario condition (extended long, dry, hot weather during non-winter months coupled with high winds). As shown in Attachment A the revised Air Quality Report (**Attachment C** of this table 2), air quality guideline exceedances are not predicted to extend as far as Manigotagan Bridge to the mouth of the Manigotagan River and around to Montago Bay and Second Beach.	
		AirQ6 *The air dispersion modeling exercise used data from land locked prairie locations which does not reflect the micro-climate including lake effect winds.*	The AERMOD dispersion model is specified in the MCWS as a refined model that is suitable for predicting the near-field (within 25 km) dispersion of multiple emission sources (refer to the revised Air Quality Report provided in **Attachment C** of this table 2). The meteorological data selected for inclusion in the dispersion model is from James Armstrong Station which was the only meteorological station with complete hourly surface data in the regional area. Although the location of these meteorological data is from a land-locked prairie location, those data represent the most complete representative meteorological data to simulate conditions at the modelling site. The upper air data for the dispersion model was selected from International Falls Minnesota which is next to a large inland body of water, and is assumed to most closely approximate the characteristics of the upper air conditions of the Project Site Area.	N/A
		AirQ7 [The] *company needs to provide a policy specifying under what exact conditions the plant will be closed during weather events*	The Environmental Management Program for the Project will include an Emergency Response Plan to facilitate quick and effective responses to unanticipated emergency situations, such as those resulting from extreme weather events. Other monitoring and management plans provided in the Environmental Management Program will describe methods required to mitigate adverse effects to the environment due to adverse weather events such the potential for increased erosion and sedimentation.	**Additional proposed mitigation:** CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. 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 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 EAL.
Email: Lonny Karlenzig February 1, 2019 Resident of Manigotagan Public Comments Batch #3	**AirQ8**	General – concerns about air quality and the burning of woody debris	Timber will be salvaged for re-use and made available to local communities to the extent feasible. When required, burning will be conducted in accordance with all applicable permits (i.e. Crown Land General Work Permit; Section 1.7.2 'Other Approvals' in the EAP) and will be scheduled during suitable weather conditions.	Timber will be salvaged for re-use and made available to local communities to the extent feasible. When required, burning will be conducted in accordance with all applicable permits (i.e. Crown Land General Work Permit) and will be scheduled during suitable weather conditions.
Letter: Tracy Turner February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**AirQ9**	General – concerns about dust during operation.	Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
	Letter: Vaughn Thibault February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Public Comments Batch #3	**AirQ10** General – concerns about dust during operation.	Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**.
	Email: Martin and Debra Prive February 12, 2019 Driftwood Cottage Association Public Comments Batch #3	**AirQ11** General – concerns about air quality during operation and for air quality to be frequently monitored.	Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**.
	Email: Mike Peacock February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**AirQ12** There will be a lot of fine particles in the air due to the extraction of the sand; is there a plan in place to minimize or manage this and will this be monitored and reported to nearby residents?	Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**.
	Letter: Maurice and Deanne O'Rourke January 25, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**AirQ13** General – concerns about QL-2925 and QL-1276 and the close proximity to Ayer's Cove and Pelican Inlet and the air quality and noise effects during operation.	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. Noise complaints will be tracked and investigated and any 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 response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust.	EAP, Section 6.5.2, Noise EAP, Table 6-5: Noise Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**. **Additional proposed mitigation:** Clearing will not be conducted within 100 m of a permanent residence.
	Letter: Richard and Louise Labossiere January 27, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**AirQ14** General – concerns as to why air quality receptors did not include the cottage/camping area. "*We recommend that air quality receptors be located within these developments so that a complete air quality assessment can take place during the initial stages (and throughout the duration) of the project activities*."	Sensitive receptors were did not include cottages or camping areas as they are not zoned residential. Sensitive receptors are selected based on Air Quality Modeling Guidelines. The modelling domain is 20 km, so while the camping and cottage areas were not selected as sensitive receptors, there are general receptors in those areas. Please refer to a revised Air Quality Report provided in **Attachment C** of this table 2.	N/A
	Email: Lynn Berthelette January 11, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**AirQ15** General – concerns about air quality as a health risk.	Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**.
Noise	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #1	**Noise1** What precautions are in place as operations move outwards towards property limits and the noise generated?	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. 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.	EAP, Section 6.5.2, Noise EAP, Table 6-5: Noise **Additional proposed mitigation:** Clearing will not be conducted within 100 m of a permanent residence.
	Email: John Neufeld February 11, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #1	**Noise2** General – concerns about the noise generated during operation.	Refer to response for **Noise1**.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **Noise1**.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
	Email: Lonny Karlenzig February 1, 2019 Resident of Manigotagan Public Comments Batch #3	**Noise3** General – concerns about the noise generated during operation including truck traffic noise.	Refer to response for **Noise1**.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **Noise1**.
	Letter: Tracy Turner February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**Noise4** General – concerns about the noise generated during operation.	Refer to response for **Noise1**.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **Noise1**.
	Letter: Vaughn Thibault February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**Noise5** General – concerns about the noise generated during operation.	Refer to response for **Noise1**.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **Noise1**.
	Email: Martin and Debra Prive February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**Noise6** General – concerns about noise generation during operation and for it to be frequently monitored.	Refer to response for **Noise1**.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **Noise1**.
	Letter: Adrian De Boer Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #3	**Noise7** General – concerns about noise generation during operation.	Refer to response for **Noise1**.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **Noise1**.
	Letter: Richard and Louise Labossiere January 27, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**Noise8** General – concerns about noise generation from clearing operations, sand extraction activities, quarry reclamation and sand transportation to the processing facility. By conducting actual noise level monitoring at quarry leases further away from the residential areas near the project boundaries at the onset of the project will help identify and potentially help CPS mitigate any noise impacts to the communities, cottage developments and seasonal camping locations.	Refer to response for **Noise1**.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **Noise1**.
	Email: Lynn Berthelette January 11, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**Noise9** General – concerns about the noise as a health risk.	Refer to response for **Noise1**.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **Noise1**.
	Email: Robert Fenton January 10, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**Noise10** General – concerns about the noise this project will generate.	Refer to response for **Noise1**.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **Noise1**.
Climate/Greenhouse Gases (GHGs)	Letter: Don Sullivan on behalf of What The Frack Manitoba Inc. including attached supplemental comments from D.M. LeNeveu (Feb. 4, 2019) and M.J. McCarron (Feb. 6, 2019) February 11, 2019 Public Comments Batch #2	**GHG1** General – concern about the carbon footprint of the Project and suggestion that use of barges to rail would substantially lessen the carbon footprint.	Results of an Air Quality Report provided as Appendix E in the EAP, which has now been updated (**Attachment C** of this Table 2), 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 – concern that not all project components (e.g. water trucks, propane supply trucks, diesel fuel trucks, employee commuter traffic and propane building heating) were taken into account for the GHG effects	Refer to response for **GHG1**.	N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		assessment.		
		GHG3 General – concern that the CO_2 emissions used in the GHG effects assessment are under-represented for the sand dryer.	Refer to response for **GHG1**.	N/A
		GHG4 Request that GHG emissions be reported in reference to the 2017 and 2018 GHG reporting requirements issued by Environment and Climate Change Canada under its GHG Reporting Program.	Refer to response for **GHG1**.	N/A
		GHG5 General – concern that the Project may change all components of the environment due to the effects of climate change associated with the Project.	Results of an Air Quality Report provided as Appendix E in the EAP, which has now been updated (**Attachment C** of this table 2), 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.	EAP, Section 6.5.1, Air Quality EAP, Table 6-5: Air Quality
SOCIOECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT				
Labour Force and Employment	Letter: Don Sullivan on behalf of What The Frack Manitoba Inc. including attached supplemental comments from D.M. LeNeveu (Feb. 4, 2019) and M.J. McCarron (Feb. 6, 2019) February 11, 2019 Public Comments Batch #2	**LF&E1** General – concern that the influx of workers and truckers to the community from the Project may have some detrimental effects on socio-economic conditions.	Refer to Project Description (Section 2 of the EAP) for information on employees.	EAP, Section 2.8
		LF&E2 General – concern that sand truck traffic may have detrimental effect on the Brokenhead Reserve South Beach Casino business.	Environmental assessment information included within EAPs for proposed Projects in Manitoba are typically not scoped to include all highway and road routes proposed to be used, and that may potentially be used. Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for more information regarding Project-related traffic. The spatial boundaries of the environmental assessment for this Project are defined in Section 3.3 of the EAP.	N/A
		LF&E3 The daily influx of workers resident in outside communities such as Pine Falls may strain the local character of the community. Outside workers could benefit from cultural sensitivity training.	Refer to Project Description (Section 2 of the EAP) for information on employees.	N/A
Infrastructure and Services	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #1	**Infra1** What is CPS' obligation for maintaining infrastructure [traffic] that they will be impacting?	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Letter: George and Roger Rempel February 7, 2019 Public Comments Batch #3	**Infra2** *Our concerns relate chiefly to the very limited Regional Study Area applied in this assessment, especially regarding the very significant increase in heavy transport truck traffic planned for this project.*	Environmental assessment information included within EAPs for proposed Projects in Manitoba are typically not scoped to include all highway and road routes proposed to be used, and that may potentially be used, by Project-related traffic to transport resource products (e.g., forestry operations; mineral mining developments). Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for more information regarding Project-related traffic. The spatial boundaries of the environmental assessment for this Project are defined in Section 3.3 of the EAP.	N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
	Email: John Neufeld February 11, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #1	**Infra1** General – concern about the current condition of PR 304 and increased deterioration due to Project-related traffic.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Lori Parenteau February 11, 2019 Cottage Owner Public Comments Batch #1	**Infra2** General – concern about the current condition of PR 304 and increased deterioration due to Project-related traffic.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Dave Kennedy February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Public Comments Batch #1	**Infra3** General – would like to see a plan on mitigating the deterioration of PR 304 infrastructure due to Project-related traffic.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Shelly Morris & John MacLise February 7, 2019 Property Owner Belair Public Comments Batch #3	**Infra4** An assessment of existing traffic volumes, weekday vs. weekend, summer/non-summer should be reviewed and an evaluation done on the increased traffic relating to the project operation and the impact this will have on existing infrastructure.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Don Lewicki January 24, 2019 Cottage Owner Public Comments Batch #3	**Infra5** General – concern about the current condition of PR 304 and increased deterioration due to Project-related traffic.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Letter: Tracy Turner February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**Infra6** General – concern about the degradation of PR 304 and PH 59 due to Project-related traffic.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Letter: Vaughn Thibault February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**Infra7** General – concern about the degradation of PR 304 and PH 59 due to Project-related traffic.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Derek Small February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**Infra8** General – concern about the degradation of the current condition of highways due to Project-related traffic.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Mike Peacock February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**Infra9** Any road upgrades planned along heavily travelled roads; PR 304 and others? (infrastructure condition related)	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Lisa Cole February 11, 2019 Cottage Owner Public Comments Batch #4	**Infra10** General – concerns about road maintenance on the highway with the increased traffic (infrastructure condition related). Who will decide when the roads need to be repaired and who will be liable for the cost?	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Ingrid Noland February 11, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**Infra11** How can the plant be up and running the fall of 2019 and the highway situation be dealt with in such a short period of time?	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Kate Storey February 2, 2019 Public Comments Batch #4	**Infra12** General – concerned about the increased wear to the roads.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
	Letter: Richard and Louise Labossiere January 27, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**Infra13** General – concern about the degradation of the current condition of highway infrastructure due to Project-related traffic. What will be done by CPS in order to help mitigate any extra heavy truck traffic on these two affected highways?	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Letter: Maurice and Deanne O'Rourke January 25, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**Infra14** General – concerns about the lack of fire protection in the area for surrounding communities and/or the lakeside communities are not well-equipped to deal with forest fires or spot fires that may result from the introduction of new hydro power lines, forest clearing and mining machinery.	Section 6.6.2.2 'Emergency Services' of the EAP describe the proposed measures to mitigate Project impacts on regional emergency services. An on-site groundwater well and water holding tank will be located at the Project Site and will be dedicated to emergency fire suppression.	EAP, Section 6.6.2.2, Emergency Services
Land and Resource Use	Letter: Don Sullivan on behalf of What The Frack Manitoba Inc. including attached supplemental comments from D.M. LeNeveu (Feb. 4, 2019) and M.J. McCarron (Feb. 6, 2019) February 11, 2019 Public Comments Batch #2	**L&RU1** General - concern regarding detrimental effects of the Project to hunting and fishing activities of nearby aboriginal peoples, including potential for adverse effects to fish and fish habitat from acid drainage.	Information regarding the potential adverse effects of the Project on hunting has been assessed in Section 6.6.3.1 'Hunting and Trapping' in the EAP as 'moderate' in magnitude considering the more frequent use of other regional areas for hunting as indicated through TEK studies (Appendix G of the EAP). As indicated in responses to **SW1** and **SW10**, the Project is not anticipated to affect fish and fish habitat. Therefore, adverse effects to fishing are not expected. Refer to responses for **SW1** and **SW10** regarding aquatic species / fish and fish habitat. Refer to response for **Wild1** regarding wildlife. Refer to response for **Geo3** regarding potential for mineral / acid leaching.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **SW1**, **SW10**, **Wild1** and **Geo3**.
		L&RU2 General – Trapping: concern that mitigation isn't provided regarding the adverse effects of the Project on trapping in the area.	As indicated in Section 6.6.3.1 'Hunting and Trapping' in the EAP, consideration of potential adverse impacts to trapping are addressed in the Economic Participation Agreement with Hollow Water First Nation (Appendix M in the EAP) and will be addressed in pending Participation Agreements with the Incorporated Community of Seymourville and the Community of Manigotagan, both of which have agreed in principal on the essential terms of agreement. Adverse effects to trappers will also be regularly monitored by the Community Oversight Committee.	EAP, Section 6.6.3.1, Hunting and Trapping EAP, Table 6-5: Hunting and Trapping
		L&RU3 Concern that the cumulative effects on trapping have not been considered.	A Cumulative Effects Assessment report is provided as **Attachment A** to this Table 2. Past and present trapping activities are expected to continue into the future within the regional area and will be influenced by fur pricing as is the current situation. Trapping activities within the Local Project Area will be influenced by Project activities (refer to Section 6.6.3.1, 'Hunting and Trapping', in the EAP and response to **L&RU2**).	EAP, Section 6.6.3.1, Hunting and Trapping EAP, Table 6-5: Hunting and Trapping
		L&RU4 Concern that the Project Site visit with Elders to identify traditional medicinal plants occurred during a time when seasonal conditions for plant identification are not optimal (i.e. Oct. 28, 2018)	As indicated in Appendix G1 'Hollow Water First Nation Traditional Knowledge Report' of the EAP, One of the Elders who led the medicinal plant walk conducted on October 28, 2018 is a very well-respected 'medicine man', and is registered in Ottawa's federal database as a knowledge keeper of Indigenous traditional medicine practices. Although some plants may have been in senescence at the time of the Project Site Area walkthrough with Elders, there was no snow cover on the ground and most plants were still able to be readily identified by the Elders. The types of vegetative communities where medicinal plants could potentially occur could be identified. The Elder did not indicate concern regarding the potential for the Project to adversely affect medicinal plants as he had indicated that the medicinal plants in the Project Site Area were common to the Regional Project Area. The Elder also did not indicate any traditional medicinal plant gather areas within the Project Site Area that could only be found within the Project Site Area and not elsewhere within the Regional Project Site Area. Refer to the response to **VEG1** regarding the relative amount of vegetation to be cleared and progressive rehabilitation and revegetation efforts planned to restore areas disturbed by Project-related activities. Over time, revegetation efforts are	EAP, Section 6.4.1, Vegetation EAP, Table 6-5: Vegetation EAP, Section 7, Closure Plan EAP, Section 8.4 Closure Plan Review EAP, Section 8.1, Success of Revegetation Efforts

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
			expected to encourage the regrowth of medicinal plants within previously disturbed areas.	
	Letter: Julie and Steve Belley February 3, 2019 Cottage Lot Holder Public Comments Batch #3	**L&RU5** Why are three major cottage developments, more immediately adjacent to the Project than Hollow Water or Seymourville, apparently ignored within the proposal?	Known cottage development areas adjacent to the Project Site area are identified in Section 4.6.5.3 'Cottages' in the EAP. Potential adverse environmental effects of the Project related to residents of the local cottage areas are considered throughout Section 6 'Environmental Assessment and Mitigation Measures' in the EAP.	EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater; Air Quality; Noise; Transportation; Emergency Services; Community Services; Recreation and Tourism; Human Health and Well-being; Aesthetics EAP, Table 6-6: Accidents and Malfunctions
	Letter: Terry Zdan Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #4	**L&RU6** General – concerns about property value. What measures will be implemented to mitigate the de-valuation of person property and erode economic residential and recreational development in and around the cottage development?	Although property value evaluations are outside of the scope of an environmental assessment, a review of the Policy Study conducted by The Heartland Institute (Krumenacher and Orr, 2016) reviewed several studies from between 1981 and 2011 that used technically sound methods to examine the relationship between non-metallic mining and property values. The Policy Study concluded that there are no documented circumstances of industrial sand mining causing a community-wide reduction of property values.	N/A
	Email: Marv and Pat Koop January 28, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**L&RU7** Why are three major cottage developments, more immediately adjacent to the Project than Hollow Water or Seymourville, apparently ignored within the proposal?	Refer to response for **L&RU5**.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **L&RU5**.
	Letter: Richard and Louise Labossiere January 27, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**L&RU8** General – concerns about the potential property value decreasing.	Refer to response for **L&RU6**.	N/A
	Letter: Ian M.C. Dixon January 14, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**L&RU9** Can the proponents of the project assure those previously established residents that their property values will not suffer from the proposed approach and schedule?	Refer to response for **L&RU6**.	N/A
Recreation and Tourism	Email: John Neufeld February 11, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #1	**R&T1** Did [the assessment] include the substantial fishing on the nearby waters of Lake Winnipeg and the Manigatogan River or the nearby cottage area?	Refer to responses for **SW1** and **SW10** regarding fish and fish habitat. Refer to response for **L&RU5** regarding cottage areas.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **SW1** and **SW10**. Refer to mitigation proposed for **L&RU5**.
	Letter: Maurice and Deanne O'Rourke January 25, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**R&T2** General – concerns how the increase in noise and dust during operation can affect the recreational tourism opportunities.	As indicated in Section 6.6.4 'Recreation and Tourism' of the EAP, the Project Site Area is not located within an area that is used for tourism. Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust. Refer to response **Noise1** regarding noise.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1.** Refer to mitigation proposed for **Noise1.**
Human Health and Well-being (Traffic Safety)	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #1	**Traffic1** General – concern about inhabitant and travelling public safety along the roadway system between the Project Site and transfer location.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Lindy Chubb February 11, 2019 Frequent traveller on Hwy 59 Public Comments Batch #1	**Traffic2** General – concern about increased traffic on the highways.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: John Neufeld February 11, 2019	**Traffic3** General – concerns about the truck traffic on PR 304.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
	Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #1			EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Dave Kennedy February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Public Comments Batch #1	**Traffic4** General – concerns about the increased truck traffic on PR 304 and PTH 59 and road safety. Need to have a clear plan on mitigating risk of traffic accidents.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Lori Parenteau February 11, 2019 Cottage Owner Public Comments Batch #1	**Traffic5** General – concerns about traffic safety along PTH 59 and PR 304.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
		Traffic6 General – PR 304 is a “life line” for communities in the event of a forest fire; if an accident was to occur and blocks both lanes of traffic, where do these people go?	The Environmental Management Program that will be developed for the Project will include an Emergency Response Plan to facilitate quick and effective responses to unanticipated emergency situations. CPS will also be improving an existing 1.5 km road, which will be a gravel road, for construction phase access to the Project site and for emergency use during Project operation. This secondary access road will provide additional assurance of quick evacuation and response time in the event of an emergency.	EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents **Additional proposed mitigation:** CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. 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 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 EAL.
	Email: Noel Zapotocny February 11, 2019 Cottage Owner Hillside Beach Public Comments Batch #1	**Traffic7** General – concerns about adding more trucks to an already busy highway and the potential for increased accidents.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: David Petkau February 11, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #1	**Traffic8** General – concerns about the increased heavy truck traffic on PR 304 between the development and Pine Falls and between Pine Falls until PR 304 opens out into a broad expanse of agricultural farm land.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Letter: Don Sullivan on behalf of What The Frack Manitoba Inc. including attached supplemental comments from D.M. LeNeveu (Feb. 4, 2019) and M.J. McCarron (Feb. 6, 2019) February 11, 2019 Public Comments Batch #2	**Traffic9** General – concern regarding detrimental effects (e.g. increased risk of injury and death) of Project-related road traffic to nearby aboriginal peoples and others.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		Traffic10 General – concern that there may be an increase in injury and death of Brokenhead Reserve residents from traffic accidents related to sand truck traffic.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
		Traffic11 *The large increase in traffic from sand haul trucks, propane tanker trucks, diesel fuel tanker trucks, water trucks and employee vehicles* [including buses to transport workers] *will lead to increased injury and death.*	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
		Traffic12 Information requested regarding how traffic related to tanker trucks (carrying propane and diesel fuel) will increase the risk of accidents.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
		Traffic13 Concerns regarding the increase in sand haul truck traffic along the transport route to Winnipeg and resulting traffic congestion.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
		Traffic14 General – concern that there may be an increase in injury and death to the residents of Black River First Nation on PR 304 from traffic accidents Project-related truck traffic	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
		Traffic15 Concern regarding the use of local gravel roads by the influx of workers living in the local communities regarding road safety (comments refer to other local roads, not just the road segments to be used by sand transport trucks).	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
		Traffic16 General - *Road Safety*: concern regarding the existing condition of PR 304 and potential unsuitability of Project-related use of PR 304.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Sylvia Lasko February 11, 2019 Hillside Beach Community Association Public Comments Batch #3	**Traffic17** General – concerns about the amount of trucks hauling from site to Winnipeg and about the safety on the highways.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Shelly Morris & John MacLise February 7, 2019 Property Owner Belair Public Comments Batch #3	**Traffic18** General – concerns about the increased truck traffic on PTH 59 resulting from the project.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
		Traffic19 An assessment of existing traffic volumes, weekday vs. weekend, summer/non-summer should be reviewed and an evaluation done on the increased traffic relating to the project operation and the impact this will have on safety.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Letter: George and Roger Rempel February 7, 2019 Public Comments Batch #3	**Traffic20** General – safety / human health concerns related to increased truck traffic along the sand transport route.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Letter: Walter Keller & Alexa Hoerster February 5, 2019	**Traffic21** General – concerns about increased traffic and truck traffic on PR 304 and PTH 59 along with potential	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
	Cottage Lot Holder Public Comments Batch #3	increase in accidents.		EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Letter: Julie and Steve Belley February 3, 2019 Cottage Lot Holder Public Comments Batch #3	**Traffic22** General – concerns about road safety and particularly PR 304.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Don Lewicki January 24, 2019 Cottage Owner Public Comments Batch #3	**Traffic23** General – concerns about road safety.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Letter: Tracy Turner February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**Traffic24** General – concerns about road safety.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Letter: Vaughn Thibault February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**Traffic25** General – concerns about road safety.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Martin and Debra Prive February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**Traffic26** General – concerns about the increased travel on PR 304 and the overall safety to people.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Derek Small February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**Traffic27** General – concerns about the increased truck traffic.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Mike Peacock February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**Traffic28** Has consideration been made to install traffic controls along the proposed trucking routes (i.e. traffic light at the corner of PR 304 and PTH 59)?	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
		Traffic29 Any road upgrades planned along heavily travelled roads; PR 304 and others? (safety related)	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Letter: Adrian De Boer Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #3	**Traffic30** General – concerns about the volume of transportation trucks, the narrow width of PR 304, and the dangers of exiting PR 302 onto PTH 59.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Sylvia Lasko February 12, 2019 Public Comments Batch #3	**Traffic31** General – concerns about the number of trucks hauling silica sand.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Letter: George and Roger Rempel February 7, 2019 Public Comments Batch #3	**Traffic32** General – concerns about the large increase in transport truck traffic on the highly congested 2-lane, undivided highway segment of PTH 59 from PR 302 to south of Brokenhead Ojibway Nation, road safety, increased accidents, uncontrolled intersections and the already large volume of traffic during summer recreational season.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
	Email: Lisa Cole February 11, 2019 Cottage Owner Public Comments Batch #4	**Traffic33** General – concerns about road maintenance on the highway with the increased traffic. (safety related)	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Ingrid Noland February 11, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**Traffic34** General – concerns about the increased truck traffic and road safety (accidents); already lack of highway maintenance and snow clearing.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Letter: Terry Zdan Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #4	**Traffic35** General – concerns about the safety of the highways with the increased truck traffic.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Kate Storey February 2, 2019 Public Comments Batch #4	**Traffic36** General – concerns about the increased truck traffic on the highways between Winnipeg and Grand Beach.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Marv and Pat Koop January 28, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**Traffic37** General – concerns about road safety and particularly PR 304.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Letter: Maurice and Deanne O'Rourke January 25, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**Traffic38** General – concerns about the truck traffic between the quarry and (mining sites) to the plant and the number of trucks using these gravel roads.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Letter: Richard and Louise Labossiere January 27, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**Traffic39** General – concerns about the number of trucks traveling on PR 304 and PTH 59 and the impact it will have on traffic.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Letter: Ian M.C. Dixon January 14, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**Traffic40** General – concerns about the number of trucks travelling on PR 304 and the already poor condition of this highway which will degrade rapidly with the truck volumes. Also public safety on this highway with the increased traffic.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Robert Fenton January 10, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**Traffic41** General – concerns about the increased traffic on PR 304 and how this in turn will require additional trucks for road maintenance including snow removal and sand trucks in the winter.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
	Email: Dennis LeNeveu December 21, 2018 Public Comments Batch #4	**Traffic42** General – concerns about the increase in truck traffic from Wanipigow to Center Port.	Refer to the Traffic Memorandum provided in **Attachment D** of this Table 2 for information regarding Project-related traffic.	EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents
Human Health and Well-being (Human Health)	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #1	**HH1** General – concern about the carcinogenic dangers from long term silica exposure.	The public will not experience long-term exposure to silica dust resulting from the Project beyond Manitoba Ambient Air Quality Criteria (MAAQC) guidelines. Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust. Refer to response **HH4** regarding worker health and safety (re: dust).	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**. EAP, Section 6.9.1, Worker Health and Safety EAP, Table 6-6: Worker Health and Safety

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		HH2 What are the additives used to make 'filter cakes?' Do they have the potential for adverse environmental or health effects?	Filter cake is composed of the ultra-fine sand solids resulting from the sand wash process. There are no additives used to produce filter cake. Refer to response for **GW28** for information regarding the polymers used in the sand wash process. Filter cake, which will be used in the reclamation process (as fill) for the annual quarry cells, do not have the potential for adverse environmental or health effects.	Refer to mitigation measures proposed for response for **Geo3**.
	Letter: Don Sullivan on behalf of What The Frack Manitoba Inc. including attached supplemental comments from D.M. LeNeveu (Feb. 4, 2019) and M.J. McCarron (Feb. 6, 2019) February 11, 2019 Public Comments Batch #2	**HH3** General – concern about workers and nearby residents including Aboriginal peoples of Hollow Water First nation being exposed to harmful respirable silica dust, potential for injury and death from increased traffic, and potential for exposure to toxins in drinking water.	Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust. Refer to response **HH4** regarding worker health and safety (re: dust). Refer to a Traffic Memorandum provided as **Attachment D** to this Table 2 for additional information regarding traffic-related issues. Refer to responses **SW1** and **GW4** regarding potential for contamination of surface water and the groundwater aquifer.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1** and **GW4**. EAP, Section 6.9.1, Worker Health and Safety EAP, Table 6-6: Worker Health and Safety EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents EAP, Section 6.3.1, Surface Water Quality EAP, Table 6-5: Surface Water Quality EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
		HH4 *No mention is made in the AECOM EAP of respiratory protection of workers onsite or for mitigation measures for silica dust exceedances in the nearby communities.*	As indicated 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 response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust.	EAP, Section 6.9.1, Worker Health and Safety EAP, Table 6-6: Worker Health and Safety Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**.
		HH5 General – mitigation including shut down of the plant if monitoring indicates that silica dust is beyond allowed limits to protect the public is not mentioned.	Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**.
		HH6 *The Project may detrimentally affect the health of the settlement of Aghaming through the release of toxic flocculant chemicals and acid to the drinking water.*	Refer to response for **GW28** regarding the potential for adverse effects related to the sand wash polymer. Refer to responses **SW1** and **GW4** regarding potential for contamination of surface water and the groundwater aquifer.	EAP, Section 6.3.1, Surface Water Quality EAP, Table 6-5: Surface Water Quality EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
		HH7 *… the company plans to burn brush to clear the site. Smoke will be a health hazard to those with asthma due to the proximity of the site to residential areas.*	Clearing will be performed mechanically (hydro-axe, bulldozer, feller buncher). Areas will not be cleared by burning. When required, burning of woody debris will be conducted in accordance with all applicable permits (i.e. Crown Land General Work Permit; Section 1.7.2 'Other Approvals' in the EAP) and will be scheduled during suitable weather conditions.	Clearing will be performed mechanically (hydro-axe, bulldozer, feller buncher). Areas will not be cleared by burning. When required, burning of woody debris will be conducted in accordance with all applicable permits (i.e. Crown Land General Work Permit) and will be scheduled during suitable weather conditions.
	Letter: Walter Keller & Alexa Hoerster February 5, 2019 Cottage Lot Holder Public Comments Batch #3	**HH8** *General – concerns about the health risk to workers and people in nearby communities due to silica sand.*	Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust. Refer to response **HH4** regarding worker health and safety (re: dust).	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**. EAP, Section 6.9.1, Worker Health and Safety EAP, Table 6-6: Worker Health and Safety
	Letter: Julie and Steve Belley February 3, 2019 Cottage Lot Holder Public Comments Batch #3	**HH9** General – concerns about the health risks of silica sand (also carcinogen concern).	Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust. Refer to response **HH4** regarding worker health and safety (re: dust).	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**. EAP, Section 6.9.1, Worker Health and Safety EAP, Table 6-6: Worker Health and Safety

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		HH10 How will there be assurance that there will be no regular exposure to fine silica sand adjacent to residence.	Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**.
	Letter: Tracy Turner February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**HH11** General – concerns about the health risks of silica sand (also carcinogen concern).	Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust. Refer to response **HH4** regarding worker health and safety (re: dust).	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**. EAP, Section 6.9.1, Worker Health and Safety EAP, Table 6-6: Worker Health and Safety
	Letter: Vaughn Thibault February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**HH12** General – concerns about the health risks of silica sand (also carcinogen concern).	Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust. Refer to response **HH4** regarding worker health and safety (re: dust).	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**. EAP, Section 6.9.1, Worker Health and Safety EAP, Table 6-6: Worker Health and Safety
	Email: Derek Small February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**HH13** General – concerns about the health and safety of those living and playing in the area of the Project when the aggregate is exposed and become airborne.	Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust. Refer to response **HH4** regarding worker health and safety (re: dust). Note that both access roads will be gated to control Project Site access (Section 2.7 'Access Roads' of the EAP).	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**. EAP, Section 6.9.1, Worker Health and Safety EAP, Table 6-6: Worker Health and Safety
	Letter: Terry Zdan Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #4	**HH14** General – concerns about the health risks of silica sand (also carcinogen concern).How are these health concerns being mitigated?	Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust. Refer to response **HH4** regarding worker health and safety (re: dust).	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**. EAP, Section 6.9.1, Worker Health and Safety EAP, Table 6-6: Worker Health and Safety
	Letter: Ian M.C. Dixon January 14, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**HH15** General – concerns about the health risks of silica dust (carcinogen) and the current proposed measures to mitigate this health risk: *Can the applicants convincingly assure me that my family will not be routinely exposed to fine silicate dust (and by association, chronic exposure to a known carcinogen) as a result of the mining operation within the Project?*	Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust. Refer to response **HH4** regarding worker health and safety (re: dust).	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**. EAP, Section 6.9.1, Worker Health and Safety EAP, Table 6-6: Worker Health and Safety
	Email: Dennis LeNeveu December 21, 2018 Public Comments Batch #4	**HH16** General – concerns about exposure to silica dust and the human health effects.	Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust. Refer to response **HH4** regarding worker health and safety (re: dust).	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**. EAP, Section 6.9.1, Worker Health and Safety EAP, Table 6-6: Worker Health and Safety
		HH17 General – concern about workers and nearby residents including Aboriginal peoples of Hollow Water First nation being exposed to harmful respirable silica dust, potential for injury and death from increased traffic, and potential for exposure to toxins in drinking water.	Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust. Refer to response **HH4** regarding worker health and safety (re: dust). Refer to a Traffic Memorandum provided as **Attachment D** to this Table 2 for additional information regarding traffic-related issues. Refer to responses **SW1** and **GW4** regarding potential for contamination of surface water and the groundwater aquifer.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**. EAP, Section 6.9.1, Worker Health and Safety EAP, Table 6-6: Worker Health and Safety EAP, Section 6.7, Traffic EAP, Table 6-5: Transportation EAP, Table 6-6: Transportation Accidents EAP, Section 6.3.1, Surface Water Quality EAP, Table 6-5: Surface Water Quality EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
		HH18 *No mention is made in the AECOM EAP of respiratory protection of workers onsite or for mitigation measures for silica dust exceedances in the nearby communities.*	Refer to response **HH4** regarding worker health and safety (re: dust). Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust.	EAP, Section 6.9.1, Worker Health and Safety EAP, Table 6-6: Worker Health and Safety Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**.
		HH19 General – mitigation including shut down of the plant if monitoring indicates that silica dust is beyond allowed limits to protect the public is not mentioned.	Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust.	Refer to mitigation proposed for **AirQ1**.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		HH20 *The Project may detrimentally affect the health of the settlement of Aghaming through the release of toxic flocculant chemicals and acid to the drinking water.*	Refer to response for **GW28** regarding the potential for adverse effects related to the sand wash polymer. Refer to responses **SW1** and **GW4** regarding potential for contamination of surface water and the groundwater aquifer.	EAP, Section 6.3.1, Surface Water Quality EAP, Table 6-5: Surface Water Quality EAP, Section 6.2.3, Groundwater EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater EAP, Section 8.2, Groundwater Monitoring
		HH21 *… the company plans to burn brush to clear the site. Smoke will be a health hazard to those with asthma due to the proximity of the site to residential areas.*	Refer to response for **HH7.**	N/A
Human Health and Well-being (Accidents and Malfunctions/ Spills): for traffic safety see above	Email: Lindy Chubb February 11, 2019 Frequent traveller on Hwy 59 Public Comments Batch #1	**AM&S1** What guarantees do we have that the closed loop system works?	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.	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.
		AM&S2 What are the emergency plans for anticipation of failure?	The Environmental Management Program that will be developed for the Project will include an Emergency Response Plan to facilitate quick and effective responses to unanticipated emergency situations. CPS will also be improving an existing 1.5 km road, which will be a gravel road, for construction phase access to the Project site and for emergency use during Project operation. This secondary access road will provide additional assurance of quick evacuation and response time in the event of an emergency.	CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. 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 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 EAL.
OTHER				
Closure Plan	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #1	**CP1** Is there a corporate financial set aside for the Closure Plan as part of the license condition?	CPS will provide financial assurance as required by applicable regulatory departments.	N/A
	Email: Mike Peacock February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**CP2** Is there a bond posted in case this is a failed venture to cover the reclamation of the mine?	Refer to response for **CP1**.	N/A
Project Description	Email: Lori Parenteau February 11, 2019 Cottage Owner Public Comments Batch #1	**PD1** What are the environmental or other benefits of the Sand Extraction Project?	As indicated in the content of Project storyboards and Project brochure presented at the Public Information Session held in the community of Seymourville on November 28, 2018 (Section 5.2 and Appendix J of the EAP), approximately 150 direct jobs and more including non-CPS jobs required in other local businesses supporting the Project will be generated. CPS will participate in establishing a clinic that all employees will have access to for physical and mental health treatment as well as addiction treatment and counselling. CPS will be establishing a 'Business Strategy Committee and Advisory Board' intended for business leaders and professionals to provide guidance	N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
			regarding developing business plans, forming businesses, partnering relationships and potential joint venture opportunities with CPS. Additionally, CPS has an Economic Participation Agreement with Hollow Water First Nation, and the governments of Seymourville and Manigotagan have agreed in principal on the essential terms of separate Participation Agreements, and are currently finalizing the documentation for these agreements. CPS will also be improving the following existing local roads: • improvements to an existing 1.5 km road, which will be a gravel road, for construction phase access to the Project site and for emergency use during Project operation; and • CPS will be paving and maintaining local unpaved road segments used by sand transport trucks.	
	Letter: Jared Baldwin Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #1	**PD1** Does CPS actually plan to extract from the areas that are severed from their processing plant? How will this be sequenced?	Mining sequence will begin and proceed based on ongoing geotechnical work and market demands, and in accordance with the Environment Act Licence.	N/A
		PD2 Will the road be moved or remain as is and end up straddling excavations?	Refer to response for **PD1**.	N/A
	Letter: Don Sullivan on behalf of What The Frack Manitoba Inc. including attached supplemental comments from D.M. LeNeveu (Feb. 4, 2019) and M.J. McCarron (Feb. 6, 2019) February 11, 2019 Public Comments Batch #2	**PD3** How did CPS derive a 54 years life expectancy figure for the proposed project and what is the life expectancy based on information contained in the new Technical Report to be filed in March 2019?	The 54 year life was derived based on the best available information at the time of the Environment Act Licence application submission.	N/A
		PD4 More information and details regarding the entire quarry production cycle and calculation methodology used to determine just how much frac sand will be produced on both a yearly basis and over the lifespan of the project using information contained in the New Technical Report to be finalized in March 2019.	Refer to Section 2 ‘Project Description’ of the EAP.	N/A
		PD5 A detail breakdown of the operation’s water requirements based on a completed engineering design of the components of processing plant that require water to operate.	Project description information regarding the amount of water required to operate the sand wash facility is provided in Section 2.9 ‘Water Use’ in the EAP.	N/A
		PD6 Where will trucked water come from and how much will be required?	Refer to response for **PD5**.	N/A
		PD7 How many truckloads of water may be required, if required?	Refer to response for **PD5**.	N/A
		PD8 How many truckloads of propane and diesel fuel will be required?	Propane and diesel consumptions are to be determined.	N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		PD9 What volume of water is required to recharge elements of processing plant at the beginning of start-up, after winter shut down and as it pertains to the operation of the wet plant?	The amount of water required to operate the sand wash facility is provided in Section 2.9 'Water Use' in the EAP. The sand wash plant facility will be operated year-round; 24 hours/day, 7 days/week. Therefore, no winter shut down is planned.	N/A
		PD10 General – explain the discrepancies between information presented in the 2014 Preliminary Economic Assessment Report / '*CPS Technical Report*' (NI-43-101 & 43-101F1 Technical Report: EAP reference: P&E Mining Consultants Inc. 2014) vs. the EAP for Project activities, components/equipment and operations.	The EAP provided the most current Project description information at the time it was submitted.	N/A
		PD11 General – concern regarding the release of process water containing residuals of toxic flocculants and acid drainage from pyrite in sand rejects and overburden as associated adverse environmental effects.	Refer to response for **Geo3** regarding the potential for adverse effects related to the potential for acid drainage. Refer to response for **GW28** regarding the potential for adverse effects related to the sand wash polymer.	Refer to mitigation measures proposed for response for **Geo3.**
		PD12 General – concern regarding the release of process water containing detrimental material that may be released from the disposal of rejected mud from the wash plant, leakage and spillage from the settling pond and from drainage of the wash plant for winter shut down.	Refer to response for **Geo3** regarding the potential for adverse effects related to the potential for acid drainage. Refer to response for **GW28** regarding the potential for adverse effects related to the sand wash polymer. There will be no winter shut-down of the sand wash and dry facility, and no settling pond.	Refer to mitigation measures proposed for response for **Geo3.**
		PD13 General – concern that flocculent toxins, and acid from acid drainage collected from the active quarry cell, will be concentrated in the recycled wash plant water.	Refer to response for **Geo3** regarding the potential for adverse effects related to the potential for acid drainage. Refer to response for **GW28** regarding the potential for adverse effects related to the sand wash polymer.	Refer to mitigation measures proposed for response for **Geo3.**
		PD14 General – concern regarding the use of the silica sand product for hydraulic fracturing and the related adverse environmental effects of hydraulic fracturing.	The proposed Project does not include hydraulic fracturing activities. The silica sand product is being developed for the purpose of supplying high-quality silica sand for use in a variety markets such as oil and gas operations and the glass production industry. The scope of the environmental assessment within the Environment Act Proposal does not include assessment of the potential end uses of the silica sand product.	N/A
		PD15 General – Size of the Project: concern regarding the potential for an increase in Project production capacity for full exploitation of all sand resources in the quarry lease areas beyond what is proposed in the EAP, and associated environmental concerns.	CPS will develop and operate the Project in accordance with the Environment Act Licence. Proposed alterations to the Project will be submitted to the Environmental Assessment Brach for review in accordance with *The Environment Act.*	N/A
		PD16 General – concern that process water will be discharged due to winter shutdown of the wash plant and water settling pond (winter shutdown and water settling pond as described in the NI-43-101 & 43-101F1 Technical Report: EAP reference: P&E Mining Consultants Inc. 2014) resulting in adverse environmental effects.	No winter shut-down of the sand wash and dry facility is anticipated, and there will be no settling pond.	N/A
		PD17 General – concern that the 'sand rejects' (filter cake) from the sand washing process that will be used in quarry reclamation will contain pyrite that will be available for acid drainage.	Refer to response for **Geo3** regarding the potential for adverse effects related to the potential for acid drainage.	Refer to mitigation measures proposed for response for **Geo3.**

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		PD18 General: 'Toxins in Flocculants' – concern that the environmental effects of the polymer to be used in the sand washing process are not generally known, and that as process water evaporates, acids and toxins from the flocculants will concentrate in wash water posing a risk of adverse environmental effects in a water body in case of a release.	Refer to response for **GW28** regarding the potential for adverse effects related to the sand wash polymer.	N/A
		PD19 *The destination of trucks loaded with respirable dust [from the dry plant dust collection system] is not described.*	Dust collected from the baghouse filters is moistened for transport to be used in the quarry reclamation process. The moistened dust will be immediately buried once deposited in the quarry cell undergoing reclamation.	N/A
		PD20 *No mention is made of sand storage buildings in the AECOM EAP.*	No sand storage buildings are planned for the Project. Sand product will be stored in silos prior to transport. Refer to Section 2.3 'Silica Sand Production Process' of the EAP.	N/A
		PD21 *Clarification needed regarding the number of water trucks needed (trucks / hr) to supply wash plant make-up water.*	Refer to response for **PD5**.	N/A
		PD22 *The volume of water required for the wash plant* [including amount needed for make-up water] *is not given in the AECOM EAP.*	Refer to response for **PD5**.	N/A
		PD23 Information requested regarding how traffic related to tanker trucks (carrying propane and diesel fuel) will increase.	Propane and diesel consumptions are to be determined.	N/A
		PD24 General - to mitigate adverse effects related to truck traffic, information required regarding why the barge to rail transportation option was not considered.	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
		PD25 Concern that the EAP has not identified a source for make-up water for the plant.	The proposed sources of all sand wash plant processes, including make-up water, is described in Section 2.9 'Water Use' in the EAP. Water for the processing of silica sand 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.	N/A
	Email: Lonny Karlenzig February 1, 2019 Resident of Manigotagan Public Comments Batch #3	**PD26** General – need clarification on the amount of water needed to operate the facility.	Refer to response for **PD5**.	N/A
		PD27 What are the benefits of the closed loop system?	The closed-loop system for wash plant process water reuse reduces the quantity of water required from the groundwater source, or any other licenced water source that may be required for plant processes. The closed-loop system also eliminates the need for process waste water discharge.	N/A
	Email: Lonny Karlenzig February 1, 2019 Resident of Manigotagan Public Comments Batch #3	**PD28** General – concerns about how the workforce will be trained and in particular to train inexperienced Class 1 drivers to be truck drivers. *How do you train 150 people with absolutely no experience to operate a plant of this size and expect it to be safe?*	Appropriately trained personnel will be employed for the Project.	N/A
	Email: Mike Peacock February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**PD29** Are any chemicals used when washing the sand?	Two sand wash polymers will be used for the sand wash process. Refer to response for **GW28** regarding the potential for adverse effects related to the sand wash polymer.	N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
		PD30 Are any chemicals used when disposing of the sand?	No chemicals are used when disposing of sand wash waste material (i.e. the filter cake).	N/A
		PD31 Is there a water management plan in place for the excavation?	The Environmental Monitoring Program for the Project will include a Surface Water Management Plan.	**Additional mitigation:** CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. 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 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 EAL.
		PD32 When will the EIA be made public?	The Environment Act Proposal includes an environmental assessment (EA) for the Project which was posted on the Manitoba Sustainable Development Public Registry on December 31, 2018.	N/A
	Email: Sylvia Lasko February 12, 2019 Public Comments Batch #3	**PD33** Why a million tonnes annually for a projected 54 years? Why so much silica sand and so fast?	The 54 year life was derived based on the best available information at the time of submitting the Environment Act Licence application. Annual production will be based on market demand for the silica sand product and in accordance with the Environment Act Licence.	N/A
	Email: Sylvia Lasko February 12, 2019 Public Comments Batch #3	**PD34** What about the environmental impact of the trucks; have they been considered in fuel use, GHG emissions, air contaminant emissions, spills, accidents, noise, congestion and introduction of invasive species?	Refer to response for **GHG1** regarding the total GHG emissions over the life of the Project. Refer to response for **Noise1** regarding mitigation for Project-related noise. Refer to response **AirQ1** regarding air quality including dust. Refer to Section 6.9 'Accidents and Malfunctions' regarding methods proposed to mitigate the potential for spills and accidents. The Environmental Management Program for the Project will include an Emergency Response Plan to facilitate quick and effective responses to unanticipated emergency situations. The Project Site Area where the sand wash and dry facility and annual quarries will be located has been previously disturbed to varying extents (e.g. by existing roads and trails, previous wood cutting, quarrying). Therefore, the opportunity for the spread of invasive weed species already exists. Silica sand transport truck traffic will use only paved roads will mitigate the introduction and spread of invasive weed species.	EAP, Section 6.5.2, Noise EAP, Table 6-5: Noise EAP, Section 6.9, Accidents and Malfunctions EAP, Table 6-6, Summary of Potential Accidents and Malfunctions and Measures to Mitigate Risk of Occurrence Refer to mitigation proposed for **Noise1** and **AirQ1**. **Additional proposed mitigation:** Clearing will not be conducted within 100 m of a permanent residence. **Additional proposed mitigation:** CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. environmental management plans proposed to be included within the Environmental Management

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
				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 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 EAL.
	Letter: Maurice and Deanne O'Rourke January 25, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**PD35** General – concerns about the consistency of how much land will be excavated per year.	Information regarding the approximate size of the annual quarries is provided in Section 2.2 'Quarrying' in the EAP. As indicated in Section 2.2 of the EAP, CPS anticipates sequentially extracting silica sand from annual quarries that average 5 ha in size and 10 m to 30 m deep. As indicated in Section 2.2.1 'Quarry Method' of the EAP, each annual sand quarry will be progressively reclaimed each year of operation.	N/A
	Letter: Ian M.C. Dixon January 14, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**PD36** Has there been any assessment of the impact of the strip mine and quarry on these stakeholders (Pelican Inlet, Blueberry Point and Ayers Cove)?	Potential Project-related impacts on local communities were assessed in Section 6.6 'Socioeconomic Environment' of the EAP.	EAP, Section 6.6, Socioeconomic Environment. EAP, Table 6-5: Groundwater; Air Quality; Noise; Transportation; Emergency Services; Community Services; Recreation and Tourism; Human Health and Well-being; Aesthetics EAP, Table 6-6: Accidents and Malfunctions
	Email: Al MacDonald January 13, 2019 Public Comments Batch #4	**PD37** Why was the environmental impact on the area within the Perimeter Highway around Winnipeg not considered?	Environmental assessment information included within EAPs for proposed Projects in Manitoba are typically not scoped to include all highway and road routes proposed to be used, and that may potentially be used, by Project-related traffic to transport resource products (e.g., forestry operations; mineral mining developments). Refer to **Attachment D** of this Table 2 'Traffic Memorandum' for more information regarding Project-related traffic. The spatial boundaries of the environmental assessment for this Project are defined in Section 3.3 of the EAP.	N/A
	Email: Robert Fenton January 10, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**PD38** *Compliance - this is an extremely long project with substantial potential for damage if the commitments made in the proposal are not kept. I am concerned about how compliance will be ensured in the long run. I notice that a committee of indigenous elders will help monitor the project. It might be useful to have representatives of other interest groups as well. This could widen the range of issues monitored.*	The Project will be developed and operated in accordance with an Environment Act Licence and an Environmental Monitoring Program. The Environmental Management Program will require an Environmental Monitor to regularly inspect conditions at the Project Site to see that adaptive management and follow-up environmental protection measures are applied as needed. An Operational Oversight Committee will be established comprised of community residents from Manigotagan, Seymourville, and Hollow Water First Nation. Information regarding the Operational Oversight Committee and other Advisory Councils including an Elders Committee that will be established to oversee Project operations was provided in Project information storyboards presented at the Public Information Session held in Seymourville on November 28, 2018. The Operational Oversight Committee will provide regular tactical guidance and will meet no less than quarterly to review and approve third party compliance data, quarry plans and restoration	**Additional proposed mitigation:** CPS is developing an Environmental Management Program, which will be applied during construction and/or operation of the facility, as required. 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

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
			activities. This committee will also be responsible for an annual investigation and recommendation for the area to be disturbed in the coming year.	• Revegetation Monitoring Plan • Emergency Response Plan 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 EAL.
	Email: Lonny Karlenzig February 6, 2019 Resident of Manigotagan Public Comments Batch #4	**PD39** *Where will all the water come from to operate this plant?*	Project description information regarding the amount of water required to operate the sand wash facility, and proposed sources of sand wash process water, are provided in Section 2.9 'Water Use' in the EAP.	N/A
		PD40 *How much water do they intend to purchase from the new Seymourville licensed water treatment plant that they are paying for?*	Project description information regarding the amount of water required to operate the sand wash facility, and proposed sources of sand wash process water, are provided in Section 2.9 'Water Use' in the EAP.	N/A
Site Reclamation	Email: Lonny Karlenzig February 1, 2019 Resident of Manigotagan Public Comments Batch #3	**SR1** General – the site may provide the opportunity to do something with the land that could offer sustainable food supply like growing fruits and vegetables, wild rice, fish farms and commercially viable lumber are just some examples.	A Project information storyboards presented at the Public Information Session held in Seymourville on November 28, 2018 provided information on the commitment by CPS to support the development of sustainable commercial growing of blueberries and other viable crops that would add value to the local community. CPS will work with community members involved with food security issues to guide these efforts. Usable and merchantable timber will be cut and stacked at the Project Site, for no more than one year, for local use as firewood, and/or potential auction for merchantable timber (Section 6.4.1 'Vegetation' in the EAP).	EAP, Section 6.4.1, Vegetation EAP, Table 6-5: Vegetation **Additional proposed mitigation:** CPS will support the development of sustainable commercial growing of blueberries and other crops that would add value to the local community. CPS will work with community members involved with food security issues to guide these efforts.
	Email: Mike Peacock February 12, 2019 Cottage Owner Driftwood Beach Public Comments Batch #3	**SR2** What are the reclamation plans? How does the reclamation of the mine as they progress look like? How do you replace that much material without significant change to the contours of the landscape?	Refer to Section 2.2.1 'Quarry Method' in the EAP and response for **Geo1** and **VEG1** regarding methods for annual quarry reclamation and monitoring. Refer to response for **Geo5** for information regarding change to the topographic landscape.	Refer mitigation proposed for **Geo1** and **VEG1**. Refer to mitigation measures proposed for **Geo5**.
	Email: Sylvia Lasko February 12, 2019 Public Comments Batch #3	**SR3** *General – concerns on how the rehabilitation and revegetation of the disturbed areas every year will work with the amount of material removed for 54 years.*	Refer to Section 2.2.1 'Quarry Method' in the EAP and response for **Geo1** and **VEG1** regarding methods for annual quarry reclamation and monitoring. Refer to response for **Geo5** for information regarding change to the topographic landscape.	Refer mitigation proposed for **Geo1** and **VEG1**. Refer to mitigation measures proposed for **Geo5**.
	Letter: Maurice and Deanne O'Rourke January 25, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**SR4** *General – concerns about how effective the site reclamation will be due to the amount of material being removed.*	Refer to Section 2.2.1 'Quarry Method' in the EAP and response for **Geo1** and **VEG1** regarding methods for annual quarry reclamation and monitoring. Refer to response for **Geo5** for information regarding change to the topographic landscape.	Refer mitigation proposed for **Geo1** and **VEG1**. Refer to mitigation measures proposed for **Geo5**.
	Letter: Ian M.C. Dixon January 14, 2019 Cottage Owner Pelican Inlet Public Comments Batch #4	**SR5** Could the applicants assure that the rehabilitation of the denuded areas (with lost elevation) will be a viable boreal forest, as promised?	Refer to response for **VEG1** regarding progressive annual quarry reclamation, revegetation and vegetation monitoring for the Project. Refer to response for **Geo5** for information regarding change to the topographic landscape.	Refer mitigation proposed for **VEG1**. Refer to mitigation measures proposed for **Geo5**.
Cumulative Effects	Letter: Don Sullivan on behalf of What The Frack Manitoba Inc. including attached supplemental comments from D.M. LeNeveu (Feb. 4, 2019) and M.J. McCarron (Feb. 6, 2019) February 11, 2019	**CE1** General – concern regarding potential for cumulative environmental effects of the proposed Project with other developments.	A Cumulative Effects Assessment report is provided as **Attachment A** to this Table 2. In summary, changes to the environment due to the proposed Project, combined with the residual effects of other past, present and reasonably foreseeable physical activities, are not anticipated to be significant.	N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT	PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS	KEY ISSUE / QUESTION RAISED	RESPONSE	PROPOSED MITIGATION SUMMARY
	Public Comments Batch #2			
		CE2 Concern expressed regarding the cumulative effects of dust on human health.	CPS has committed to dust control mitigation measures and to air-quality monitoring at the Project Site and Local Project Area (refer to response for **AirQ1**). The Air Quality Monitoring Program will help determine if the Project is substantially contributing to cumulative adverse effects on air quality (refer to Section 8.3. 'Air Quality Monitoring' in the EAP). Additional information regarding the potential cumulative effects to air quality related to dust is provided in Section 4.4 of a Cumulative Effects Assessment report provided as **Attachment A** to this Table 2.	EAP, Section 8.3, Air Quality Monitoring

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 to 'Batch #1 through Batch #4' in the 'Key Issue / Question Raised' column are used to track the .pdf files sent to CPS by MBSD Environmental Assessment Branch (e.g. public_comments_batch_1.pdf)

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

Attachments:

Attachment A: Wanipigow Sand Extraction Project – Cumulative Effects Assessment Report
Attachment B: Safety Data Sheets for Sand Wash Polymers
Attachment C: Revised Air Quality Report, March 2019
Attachment D: Traffic Memorandum