

APPENDIX B.1 Detail Design Correspondence

#	Contact	Comment	Response
1.	Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism Ontario Public Service	Comment received Apr 29, 2024: Dale Wiersema, Please find attached our initial advice on the above referenced undertaking. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or concerns. A summary of letter: recommendations to complete built heritage and cultural landscape screening Regards, Joseph Harvey Heritage Planner Heritage Branch Citizenship Inclusion and Heritage Division Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism Ontario Public Service	Response provided May 14, 2024: Thank you for your comments on the study. In response to your question, screening checklists for built heritage and cultural landscapes have been completed by a qualified person for this project, and the screening did not identify any cultural heritage features requiring further technical evaluation or assessments. The outcome of the screening will be documented in the EA report prepared for this project. If you have any further comments, please let us know.
2.	NW Region Traffic Manager Ontario Provincial Police	Project acknowledgement.	<i>No response required.</i>
3.	District Planner Nipigon District Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry	Comment received Apr 3, 2024: Requested confirmation of all the previous correspondence shared from MNRF on this file Inquired about the status of the Park Mgmt Plan amendment, and MNRF role in this process.	Response provided April 17, 2024: Provided a zip file containing all previous MNRF correspondence on file for this project and also documented the correspondence in an attached table.

APPENDIX B.1 Detail Design Correspondence

		Comment received May 24, 2024: Requested confirmation of current MECP Parks contact on this file to facilitate MNR's understanding of Ontario Parks processes (Class EA PPCR and Park Management Plan Amendment) and confirm whether MNRF is triggered in any of the pieces. MNRF confirms that we would appreciate receiving and reviewing the Design and Construction Report when available for this project.	Response provided July 24, 2024: Provided existing Parks contacts to MNR.
4.	Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks Northern Region	Comment received Apr 15, 2024: Dear Project Team, Thank you for providing the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks with the Notice of Commencement for the Detail Design for Hwy 17 Curve Realignment, Hewitson Creek Culvert Replacement in Killraine. Attached are proponent's guide to preliminary screening of species at risk and the acknowledgement for the proposed project. Please ensure continuous communication as required throughout the progress of the project. Thank you, Maya Jacewicz Assistant Project Officer Environmental Assessment and Permissions Division Environmental Assessment Branch MECP	<i>No response required: communication with MECP will be undertaken throughout the project as required.</i>
5.	Nature and Outdoor Tourism Ontario (NOTO)	Comment received Mar 28, 2024: Can we share this in our next newsletter that way our members in the area also have the opportunity to comment?	Response sent Apr 2, 2024: MTO has no problems with sharing the information from the study notice in the newsletter.

APPENDIX B.1 Detail Design Correspondence

6.	Casque Isles Hiking Club	Hello Dale and Patrick, The Casque Isles Hiking Club is very pleased with the communication and cooperation that we have received on this project, especially the advance notice of preliminary clearing of the corridor line and the recent drilling program. This has allowed us to give our users advance notice of trail closures, keeping hikers out of the work area. We look forward to conducting a site assessment when the time is right. We have a plan in place to close the portion of trail that crosses the construction zone and direct hikers safely around it. I am sure that we will receive sufficient notice to close the affected portion and take down any signage. I have walked in the area and have some idea of where we can cross the highway after the construction is complete, but I want to take [names] around there so we can come to a consensus. Because there will be a large in-fill where the trail currently crosses the realignment, I think that we should wait until later in the process to make any decision where our trail may cross post-construction. As the plan calls for wide paved shoulders for cyclists, I will ask if those wide shoulders will also be incorporated into the new access to Rainbow Falls? That would be an added safety benefit to cyclists on the new access, and potential hikers, depending on where our trail meets the new access as well. Thank you for keeping us in the loop.	<i>Consultation and ongoing discussions occurred with CIHC throughout the detail design study to identify specific impacts to the trail and to develop the integration of the trail along the new park entrance road and a new safe trail crossing along the proposed Highway 17 alignment.</i>
7.	Property Owner	Comment received April 29, 2024: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed highway realignment. When entering onto the highway from Hunter Road looking west we are aware of a low spot on the highway directly opposite to the east study limit marker on your map. Quite often when entering onto the highway from our entrance heading east we will look west for oncoming traffic and see none and then part way through our entry on the highway a vehicle will	<i>Resolution: Sight distances from Hunter Road were reviewed and found to be substandard. MTO will conduct all necessary consultation, finalize design and road closure requirements to potentially re-establish access for Hunter Road at the Winston / Whitesand Lake Road. If feasible, this will be included into the contract; the Contractor will provide residents with advanced notice prior to any changes to access occurring.</i>

APPENDIX B.1 Detail Design Correspondence

		appear out of nowhere as it was in that low area when we look initially. Our question is might that low area be part of the proposed realignment? I have witnessed many accidents along the section of highway being realigned so we are all very happy to see this work commencing next year.	
--	--	---	--

APPENDIX B.2 Correspondence in response to the TESR Public Comment Period (2021/2022)

#	Contact	Post-TESR Comment	Response / Resolution
Indigenous Communities and Organizations			
1.	Jackfish Metis Association	Comment received October 2021: Supportive of proposed work and safety improvements, preference to include rest area along realignment.	Response provided January 2022: Preferred new highway configuration similar to existing and will include truck climbing lane. Existing rest area will be within abandoned alignment and a new rest area not warranted along realigned segment.
2.	Red Sky Metis Independent Nation	Comments received December 2021 and January 2022: - Inquired about work opportunities during construction. - Noted no concerns with project regarding Treaty Rights, requested to be notified if archaeological discoveries found during construction.	Response provided December 2021: Indigenous participation in procurement to be determined during detail design. MTO to provide RSMIN with project updates as design progresses.
Agencies			
3.	Filanes Motel	Comment received October 2021: Questioned location of alignment concern with hotel being along abandoned highway	Response provided October 2021: Hotel not within section subject to realignment, no impacts.
4.	Casque Isles Hiking Club	Comment received November 2021: - Noted preference for track of hiking trail be shown on plan - Realignment of trail required to accommodate new highway alignment. - Requested to be notified once construction commences to discuss trail impacts. - Trail closure signs required if segment to be closed during construction. - Provided suggestions for new trail alignment. - Requested continuous communication on impacts to trail, trail signage.	Response provided January 2022: MTO to carry out ongoing discussion and work with CIHC in detail design to determine plans and mitigation for new safe trail crossing if proposed realignment is developed.

APPENDIX B.2 Correspondence in response to the TESR Public Comment Period (2021/2022)

5.	Ministry of Mines	Comments received November 2021: - Requested GIS files for project area. - Identified potential fugitive tailings area immediately south of proposed ROW within limits of property request.	Response provided November 2021: - Provided GIS files of project area - Noted additional investigations will be carried out to confirm presence of fugitive tailings within the proposed MTO Right of Way including preparation of a plan for removal and disposal if required.
6.	MNR	Comment received November 2021: - Provided fisheries concerns within project limits. - Concern with ownership and maintenance of new park road through Crown lands. - Reference to Class EA RSFD not identified in TESR and MNR would not proceed with disposition of Crown land unless provided with proof the project met requirements under EA Act.	Response provided January 2022: - MTO to work with MNR and MECP on ownership of proposed park access road. - Targeted fisheries studies to be undertaken in detail design, water crossings to be designed to meet MTO standards for fish passage requirements. - Eligible for Environmental Clearance letter to be completed at end of study identifying how requirements of MTO Class EA process meet requirements under EA Act.
7.	Schreiber Fire Department	Comment received November 2021: - Concern with no new pull off location on proposed realignment and potential for vehicles to park along highway to photograph lake views. - Request for pull off to be located along realignment.	Response provided January 2022: Existing Selim pull off to be along abandoned highway, pull off along realignment not warranted.
8.	Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM)	Comment received December 2021: - Stage 2 archaeological assessment should be completed prior to any ground disturbance. - Impacts to potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes should be evaluated and documented in EA Report.	Response provided January 2022: - Stage 2 archaeological assessment will be undertaken prior to ground disturbance. - Screening for cultural landscapes and built heritage including checklists were completed for the project.
Property Owners			
9.	Property Owner	Requested hard copy of TESR	Hard copy provided.

APPENDIX B.2 Correspondence in response to the TESR Public Comment Period (2021/2022)

10.	Property Owner	Comments received October and November 2021: - Concerns with Lakeshore Road intersection and requested modifications to pavement markings to identify left turn slip around and added signage. - Proposed alignment would increase noise for residents along Lakeshore Road, preferred to have highway north of hydro corridor.	Response provided January 2022: - Left turn slip around was reviewed but not warranted at Lakeshore Road. - Noise impact assessment completed which found preferred alignment would not result in distinguishable noise increases. - Preferred alternative selected based on numerous factors.
11.	Property Owner	Comment received November 2021: - Noted tailings north of CP tracks within proposed alignment C, project provides potential for remediation. - Impacts to residents from realignment not detailed in report. - Noted preference for Option A. - Blasting not a concern during construction. - Existing highway not high risk for accidents. - Reuse existing highway corridor through the park. - CP access should be improved to accommodate emergency vehicles.	Response provided January 2022: - Appreciated notice of tailings, noted MINES identified potential for fugitive tailings along proposed right-of-way. A plan will be developed if tailings present within proposed right of way. - Many factors considered in development of preferred realignment plan. - CP access is an internal private crossing not to be used by public. CP no longer requires this access.
12.	Property Owner	Comments received October 2021: - Questioned east bound lane remaining as passing lane. - Requested access be maintained from Lakeshore Road to new Park entrance road to facilitate ski trail grooming and equipment. - Requested turning lane onto Lakeshore Road as speed limits will increase with proposed realignment.	Response provided January 2022: - Eastbound passing lane will be included in selected realignment. - Entrance to the new park road from south of the highway will require an entrance permit and official trail crossings will require encroachment permits. - Turning lanes not warranted at intersection as posted speed to remain as is and intersection does not have a pattern of collisions.

APPENDIX B.2 Correspondence in response to the TESR Public Comment Period (2021/2022)

13.	Property Owner	Comment received November 2021: • Questioned noise levels and threshold of significant, noted existing highway traffic is loud to residents, proposed realignment will increase noise. Questioned campers being a priority over residents. • No mention of tailing location in report. • No mention of safety when turning off Highway 17 onto Lakeshore Road.	Response provided January 2022: • Noise impact assessment completed which found preferred alignment would not result in distinguishable noise increases. • Appreciated notice of tailings, noted MINES identified potential for fugitive tailings along proposed right-of-way. A plan will be developed if tailings present within proposed right of way. • Turning lanes not warranted at intersection as posted speed to remain as is and intersection does not have a pattern of collisions.
14.	Property Owner	Comment received November 2021: • Noted disappointment with proposed alignment and lack of direct consultation with property owners. • Significant concerns with Increased noise to residents; • Impacts to recreational trails and areas north of CP tracks and closure of trails; and • Impacts to Whitesand River regarding hiking, fishing, and resident Brook Trout populations.	Response provided January 2022: • Foliage does not provide significant noise attenuation unless it is thick, coniferous, and close to receiver or road. The realignment would have less visible shielding from forest. • Access to trails requires crossing CP tracks, CP access is an internal private crossing not to be used by public. CP no longer requires this access. Entrance to the new park road from south of the highway will require an entrance permit and official trail crossings will require encroachment permits. • Targeted fisheries studies to be undertaken in detail design, water crossings to be designed to meet MTO standards for fish passage requirements. • Many factors were considered in selection of preferred alternative.