

# **APPENDIX 1-III-C**

## **Responses to Information Requests from Communities**

## APPENDIX 1-III-C INFORMATION REQUEST RESPONSES – COMMUNITIES

Table 1-III-C-1: Nipigon Open House

Comment ID	Comment Theme	NextBridge Open House Question	General Public Open House Response	NextBridge's IR Response	EA Update (Y/N)?
NIPIGON-01	Alternatives Assessed	Do you have any comments on the content of the draft Environmental Assessment Report or Open House materials?	At this open house the material displayed showed only the preferred route and did not display what other options were considered. The EA planning process indicates to display all options so the public is aware of options considered and the evaluation used to select the preferred option is displayed in the open house material. Options were not observed on maps at the open house.	The Draft EA including the alternatives assessment was posted on the NextBridge website at the time of the February open house. Alternatives are assessed in the EA Report (Section 3, Appendices 3-I-A and 3-I-B). A new appendix (Appendix 19-IV; Project Activities in Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves) was added to the EA Report to provide additional information on the Project footprint in provincial parks and conservation reserves.	Y – Appendix 19-IV
NIPIGON-02	Caribou	Do you have feedback or suggestions on the environmental considerations Nextbridge proposed in the draft Environmental Assessment Report as they relate to Project design, construction, operation or decommissioning?	Lake Superior Caribou Recovery Zone: The priority within the Lake Superior Coastal Caribou Zone should be to minimize long term cumulative area of effects. Corridor and supporting infrastructure should be planned to overlap as much as possible within existing areas of long term disturbances. The end cumulative effect should be the lowest possible, regardless of a habitat categorization from a model output not supported by field, observational and historical data to confirm the value of that habitat for caribou on the Lake Superior coastal area. The preferred route of the transmission corridor did not minimize the area of effect. Optional routes were not displayed. Minimizing long term cumulative area of effect should be prioritized in attempts to reduce impact to caribou within the Lake Superior Recovery Zone.	Habitat availability and disturbance for woodland caribou are assessed in Section 14.5.2.1.1 of the EA Report. Refer to the response to NIPIGON-01 regarding the Project footprint and environmentally sensitive areas.	N

## APPENDIX 1-III-C INFORMATION REQUEST RESPONSES – COMMUNITIES

Table 1-III-C-1: Nipigon Open House

Comment ID	Comment Theme	NextBridge Open House Question	General Public Open House Response	NextBridge's IR Response	EA Update (Y/N)?
NIPIGON-03	Project Purpose	Do you have any additional questions or information for the Project team?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The first publicized coverage of an East-West transmission proposal indicated the rationale was to send excess Northern Ontario electricity to southern Ontario so the shortest route along the north shore of Lake Superior was proposed. At this open house it was explained the rationale is to send Southern Ontario electricity to Northern Ontario to support proposed electricity demands, mainly extrapolated mining industry demands (information provided verbally by Chad Bolger at the open house) expected by 2020. If providing mining industry with access to electricity is a priority for this proposal then why wouldn't the transmission corridor be placed closer to the proposed mining industry activity in need? This would indicate the corridor should go to the west of Lake Nipigon across the north. The mining activity and proposed mining activity along the north shore of Lake Superior has access to existing electricity options. Mining to the west and north of Lake Nipigon and Ring of Fire have less access to power transmission options. The proposed corridor should be placed closer to the industry in need.</li> <li>■ Considering the existing high costs to deliver electricity to consumers in Ontario any development adding to that burden should be clearly needed and not utilize data from 2004 to project what could be expected 16 years later in 2020, as presented in the open house. Nextbridge Infrastructure should request a re-evaluation of this proposal, with updated data to assess the economic viability of the proposal at the present location, to justify this proposal to the public at their open houses.</li> </ul>	NextBridge understands that this comment is directed toward the Minister of Energy and the Ontario Energy Board (OEB). The East-West Tie Project has been identified as a priority transmission project in Ontario's 2013 Long-Term Energy Plan (OEB 2017) <sup>(a)</sup> .	N

a) Source: Ontario Energy Board (OEB). 2017. East-West Tie Line. <https://www.oeb.ca/industry/policy-initiatives-and-consultations/east-west-tie-line>. Last accessed June 19, 2017.