

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
Eabametoong First Nation	1	Further, the EA and Appendix O repeatedly reference community-specific ATRI reports, which are confidential and are to be delivered directly to First Nations. On February 20, 2026, MFFN announced these reports would be made available in “Spring 2026”, yet we have received no communication since then regarding the status of this report. MFFN does not acknowledge the outstanding status of these reports in the EA, and implies that First Nations have already received their final reports. This is misleading, and the delay further frustrates EFN’s ability to do a thorough assessment of the potential impacts of the Project on our Aboriginal and Treaty rights and interests. Further, as noted above, EFN has not received its final community-specific ATRI report. This is unacceptable considering the EA makes repeated references to these reports as an indication that MFFN had completed its due diligence prior to the submission of the EA. At minimum, EFN should have been provided with an update on the status of its ATRI report prior to the deadline for initial comments.	ATRI Impact Assessment Report Timelines: As mentioned in the July 2025 email correspondence to Eabametoong First Nation and in Section 11.10.4 (Release of Community-Specific Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests: Final Impact Assessment Reports) of the Final EA/IS, the ATRI Impact Assessment Reports issued to Indigenous communities were in draft form to allow for a 90-day review and comment period. It was noted that the Final ATRI Impact Assessment reports would be issued to individual communities following the submission of the Final EA/IS. The Final EA/IS references these reports because they are an important aspect of the Assessment Process. The ATRI Impact Assessment reports are being updated and finalized based on feedback provided by communities. They will be provided to each Indigenous community in May 2026. As noted to communities confidential information will be redacted from the Final ATRI Impact Assessment Reports, as applicable before being shared with the regulators. ATRI Impact Assessment Report Background: Instead of an overarching ATRI report, individual community-specific ATRI Impact Assessment reports were prepared. Potential impacts to Eabametoong First Nation's	882

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests (ATRI) were assessed through their ATRI Impact Assessment Report. The following steps were undertaken to share information and to gather feedback from Eabametoong First Nation: 1) Communications with Indigenous communities on the Indigenous Knowledge Program began in December 2019. Funding was offered to Eabametoong First Nation starting in the summer of 2021. However, Eabametoong First Nation chose not to participate. 2) Two ATRI forums were held that were exclusive to Indigenous community representatives and Elders. Members from Eabametoong First Nation attended both forums. 3) Draft existing conditions sections of the Eabametoong First Nation's ATRI Impact Assessment report were prepared and sent to Eabametoong First Nation for their review and feedback. Eabametoong First Nation did not provide feedback on the draft existing conditions sections. 4) Eabametoong First Nation's Draft ATRI Impact Assessment report was sent on July 10, 2025 with a 90-day review period to provide	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			feedback (a due date of October 8, 2025). 5) Additional information regarding Eabametoong First Nation's primary land use area was received on December 16, 2025 from the Ontario government. 6) Eabametoong First Nation sent their comments on the Draft ATRI Impact Assessment Report and Draft EA/IS on December 19, 2025 along with a map showing the traditional territory they assert rights on. Eabametoong First Nation's feedback on their Draft ATRI Impact Assessment Report and the maps shared in December 2025 are being used to finalized their ATRI Impact Assessment report, which is expected for release in May 2026.	
Eabametoong First Nation	1	EFN remains willing and able to meet with MFFN to develop a protocol agreement on how we can work together better to respond to proposals and manage developments in our Territory – including the Road – to protect our Aboriginal and Treaty rights.	Marten Falls First Nation appreciates the feedback received from Eabametoong First Nation throughout the Environmental Assessment / Impact Assessment process. Your insights have helped shape the Final Environmental Assessment / Impact Statement (EA / IS). After the release of the Final EA/IS which took place on February 20, 2026, consultation and engagement activities have been led by the provincial and federal government agencies with the Community Access Road Project Team providing support,	883

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			where needed. In addition, should the Final EA/IS for the Community Access Road be approved to proceed, a consultation and engagement program will be established to guide discussions through the next phase of the Community Access Road. The involvement of Indigenous communities will be determined during the next phase of the Community Access Road. At that time, engagement processes will be further defined to enable appropriate participation and representation.	
Eabametoong First Nation	1	EFN Chief and Council appreciate the cordial and productive working relationship we have with Chief Achneepineskum on other political and even infrastructure planning dialogue (e.g. recent work together at IESO/MEM energy planning working group), yet we do not even have a response to our December submission despite the significant communications and consultant support available through the MFCAR project team, funded by Ontario.	The Draft EA/IS was released to Indigenous communities in February 2025 for a 120 day review and comment period ending June 23, 2025. This date was later extended to September 5, 2026 to accommodate requests from Indigenous communities and regulators, providing Indigenous communities over 6 months to provide their feedback. Eabametoong First Nation comments on the Draft EA/IS were received on December 19, 2025. As per our communication of January 20, 2026 to Eabametoong First Nation their feedback on the Draft EA/IS could not be incorporated into the Final EA/IS given the late submission. Responses to Eabametoong First Nation's comments on the Draft EA/IS are included	881

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			under separate cover.	
Eabametoong First Nation	1	Procedural Concerns In the ATRI Technical Support Document (Appendix O of the Draft EA), Marten Falls First Nation (“Martin Falls” or “MFFN”) promised “Indigenous communities will be provided the opportunity to be involved at critical decision-making points throughout the EA Report so that the Proponent can consider and incorporate, where appropriate IK and indigenous land and resource use information into the Project” (p 7). Through a press release dated November 27, 2025, we learned that pursuant to a Community Partnership Agreement with Ontario, Marten Falls will receive \$39.5 million in funding in exchange for submitting its final EA Statement by February 20, 2026. We view this timeline decision as a ‘critical decision-making point’, and we are concerned that it was unilaterally agreed to by MFFN without consultation with EFN. We expect that MFFN will uphold its commitment to engage with Eabametoong at critical decision- making points. Accordingly, we expect that MFFN will work with us to agree on steps and a timeline to meet MFFN commitments as well as properly assessing and addressing potential impacts of the Project on Eabametoong’s Aboriginal and Treaty rights.	Eabametoong First Nation's submitted comments on the Draft EA/IS and their Draft ATRI Impact Assessment Report on December 19, 2025. Eabametoong First Nation's feedback on their ATRI Impact Assessment Report is being used to update it and the final will be available in May 2026. To avoid duplication of information, responses to the Draft ATRI Impact Assessment Report will be submitted along with the Final ATRI Impact Assessment Report. These set of responses relate to the Final EA/IS. This is a comment on the Draft ATRI Impact Assessment Report and will be responded to under separate cover. The Final EA/IS and the Technical Support Documents were prepared to meet the requirements outlined in the Terms of Reference, the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines and the technical discipline-specific study plans. The Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks will determine if the EA / IS meets the provincial requirements; while the Agency will make a determination on whether or not it meets the key issues under federal jurisdiction. Consultation for the Community Access Road has been conducted in accordance with the Terms of Reference and the Tailored Impact	991

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			Statement Guidelines and has been ongoing since 2019. Engagement with Indigenous communities, government agencies, stakeholders, and the public was initiated early and carried out throughout the EA/IA process to inform design, effects assessment, and mitigation measures. With respect to timelines, the accelerated schedule announced by the Ontario government in March 2026 applies only to the timing of the Final EA/IS submission and does not affect the scope, quality, or extent of consultation undertaken for the Community Access Road. All consultation commitments have been, or are being, implemented as planned, and input received has been documented and considered in the Final EA/IS. Taken together, consultation has been continuous and robust, and the accelerated schedule does not diminish the completeness or integrity of the consultation process.	
Eabametoong First Nation	1	In our previous letter, EFN stated that Ontario and MFFN must take several critical steps to address our concerns related to the Project and EA, including providing a written response to our questions. Unfortunately, to date, Ontario and MFFN have not taken any steps to address our concerns	These comments are directed at government agencies and outside the scope of the Community Access Road. We would therefore encourage you to direct these to the regulators, as they will be best positioned to address them.	879

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		and failed to provide any written response. MFFN asserts the reason for this is that EFN did not provide any comments or note “specific interests” in relation to its Aboriginal and Treaty rights.¹ This statement is highly inaccurate and misleading considering we detailed our comments and interests in the previous submission. The EA identifies 14 other Indigenous communities/organizations/councils that had not provided comments prior to September 5, 2025. The extent of outstanding feedback from directly impacted communities, including from EFN, clearly demonstrates that the EA process was procedurally flawed and did not allow adequate opportunity for EFN and other First Nations to participate. Moreover, MFFN did not even acknowledge our feedback in the final EA that we provided in December, or provide any direct response. Through this letter, we are now providing our concerns directly to Ontario. As you know, Ontario has a legal duty to ensure that our comments and concerns will be integrated into the final decision. It is difficult to trust that Ontario and MFFN are		

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		grappling with EFN's comments, considering Ontario has predetermined the outcome of the EA process by announcing construction of the Road by August 2026.² This is unacceptable, considering that EFN's Aboriginal and Treaty rights and interests stand to be seriously and negatively impacted in irreversible ways. While Marten Falls received nearly \$40 million in funding from Ontario in exchange for submitting its final EA Statement by February 20,³ EFN was not consulted or even notified about the EA timeline prior to the announcement. If MFFN and Ontario were serious about protecting section 35 rights and involving First Nations in "critical decision-making points throughout the IS / EA",⁴ they would have consulted EFN about the feasibility of the EA timeline and ensured EFN was a partner in decision-making. In the circumstances, the 50-day comment period is not reasonable. EFN has been forced to review and respond to a report of over 16,000 pages without the benefit of any responses to our questions and comments to date. A full review of an EA is a time and resource intensive process, yet		

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		Ontario has not provided adequate time or capacity funding to support EFN's review. While EFN will continue to analyze the EA following the April 10 deadline for initial comments and will prepare to provide final comments, those efforts should not be interpreted in any way as a tacit approval of the EA process. We note also that EFN is working diligently to consult internally and, as noted in our December letter, working to review the EA reports despite suffering tremendous losses within the community including a violent incident just in the last week that prevented further TKLRU mapping when we had technicians scheduled to arrive in the community. Every First Nation affected by this project is constitutionally entitled to procedural fairness and meaningful consultation. By continuing to rush this EA process in an arbitrary fashion, Ontario is exposing its decision to serious legal risk — including potential court challenges and reversal. But simply fulfilling the duty to consult is no longer enough. The Crown must be held to a higher		

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		standard: it must seek the free, prior, and informed consent, as recognized by the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and enshrined in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act. This process falls far short of that standard.		
Eabametoong First Nation	1	Discrepancies between Reported and Actual Engagement We agree with the Consultation and Engagement Plan to Support the EA Statement (Appendix A of the Draft EA), which characterizes Eabametoong as a neighbouring community with the highest level of interest in the Road (p 12). Marten Falls promised that not only will Eabametoong be provided with comprehensive information, they will be encouraged to meet (in-person, by phone or online) “more often and as needed” to discuss the Project and gather feedback (p 12). As noted above, since the commencement of the EA, only two Chief and Council meetings have occurred, and one workshop took place where a limited number of Eabametoong members attended. Further Council to Council meetings, as well as a community meeting for Eabametoong members, are needed as soon as possible to bridge this gap.	We are committed to ongoing efforts to advance discussions with Eabametoong First Nation. Engagement efforts were made throughout the Assessment Process and are reflected in the Record of Consultation and Engagement. Below please find highlights of these efforts. A) Consultation and engagement with 23 Indigenous communities including Eabametoong First Nation began in 2019. In that year we launched the Indigenous Knowledge Program, which included the provision of funding to support participation. The program was active up until the release of the Draft EA/IS. In addition to the Indigenous Knowledge Program funding, Eabametoong First Nation was also offered funding for a community coordinator and, subsequently, capacity funding to support its review of the Draft EA/IS. These programs were established to provide multiple support avenues for communities to review and provide feedback	992

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			on the project. Eabametoong First Nation chose not to participate in any of the three funding programs offered during the Assessment Process. B) Instead of an overarching Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests (ATRI) report, individual community-specific ATRI Impact Assessment reports were prepared. Potential impacts to Eabametoong First Nation's ATRI were assessed through their ATRI Impact Assessment Report. The following steps were undertaken to share information and to gather feedback from Eabametoong First Nation: 1) Communications with Indigenous communities on the Indigenous Knowledge Program began in December 2019. Funding was offered to Eabametoong First Nation starting in the summer of 2021. However, Eabametoong First Nation chose not to participate. 2) Two ATRI forums were held that were exclusive to Indigenous community representatives and Elders. Members from Eabametoong First Nation attended both forums. 3) Draft existing conditions sections of the Eabametoong First Nation's ATRI Impact Assessment report were prepared and sent to Eabametoong First Nation for their review and feedback. Eabametoong First Nation did not provide feedback on the draft existing	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			conditions sections. 4) Eabametoong First Nation's Draft ATRI Impact Assessment report was sent on July 10, 2025 with a 90-day review period to provide feedback (a due date of October 8, 2025). Efforts were made to meet with Eabametoong First Nation in October 2025 to discuss the ATRI Impact Assessment Report, however due to local matters, Eabametoong First Nation Council was not available to meet. 5) Additional information regarding Eabametoong First Nation's primary land use area was received on December 16, 2025 from the Ontario government. 6) Eabametoong First Nation sent their comments on the Draft ATRI Impact Assessment Report and Draft EA/IS on December 19, 2025 along with a map showing the traditional territory they assert rights on. Eabametoong First Nation's feedback on their Draft ATRI Impact Assessment Report and the maps shared in December 2025 are being used to finalized their ATRI Impact Assessment report, which is expected for release in May 2026. C) The Record of Consultation and Engagement (RoCE) documents how input from the 23 Indigenous communities engaged was sought, received, and considered. The ROCE consists of four Milestone Progress Reports, these were provided to communities	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			for their review and updated with their feedback. Each Progress report summaries engagement and appends full records of emails exchanged and meeting minutes where applicable and is searchable on the EA/IS website by Indigenous Community name. Eabametoong First Nation did not provide feedback on the milestone progress reports. D) The initial response date to provide comments on the Draft EA/IS was June 23, 2025; this date was later extended to September 5, 2026 to accommodate requests from Indigenous communities and regulators, providing Indigenous communities over 6 months to provide their feedback. Eabametoong First Nation sent their comments on the Draft EA/IS on December 19, 2026. Communication to Eabametoong First Nation on January 20, 2026 advised that given the date we received the feedback, we were not able to adequately incorporate it into the Final EA / IS. However, Eabametoong First Nation was encouraged to provide their comments during the 7-week review period for the Final EA/IS that was undertaken by the MECP. E) We recognize that not all community members are able to participate in the in-person sessions. To allow for broad and inclusive engagement, we provided a comprehensive range of online resources and	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			encouraged feedback through email, telephone, and mail. These resources included discussion guides, field notices, monthly newsletters, plain-language summaries, webinars, and videos. Although the last meeting with Eabametoong First Nation was in June 2023, engagement efforts continued through 2026. Recent attempts to engage were made in October 2025 and in early 2026 (outside reporting period of the Record of Consultation and Engagement); however, meetings were not able to proceed due to local community priorities and scheduling conflicts. Furthermore, we reached out on April 21, 2026 with a request to meet with Eabametoong First Nation. We look forward to coordinating a meeting soon in a way that best supports your availability.	
Eabametoong First Nation	1	Identification of Preferred Route and Indigenous Knowledge With respect to the preferred route for the Project (Alternative 4), the Draft EA states that “received Indigenous Knowledge did not raise any concerns with Alternative 4” (p 42). As noted above, Eabametoong has not yet had an opportunity to provide Indigenous Knowledge, and Eabametoong’s input is absent from section 4.4.2 of the report. Eabametoong input	Consultation and engagement with 23 Indigenous communities including Eabametoong First Nation began in 2019. In that year we launched the Indigenous Knowledge Program, which included the provision of funding to support participation. The program was active up until the release of the Draft EA/IS. In addition to the Indigenous Knowledge Program funding, Eabametoong First Nation was also offered funding for a community coordinator and, subsequently,	993

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		must be reflected in the final EA to justify such a highly consequential decision such as the road route. Moreover, Eabametoong intends to review in further detail specific proposals for the bridge crossing to ensure options, impacts and mitigation measures are properly addressed.	capacity funding to support its review of the Draft EA/IS. These programs were established to provide multiple, support avenues for communities to review and provide feedback on the project. Eabametoong First Nation chose not to participate in any of the three funding programs offered during the Assessment Process. Section 4.4.2 of the Final EA/IS reflects Indigenous Knowledge that was received within the applicable timeframes and available to inform the assessment. As noted in the Draft EA/IS, the Indigenous Knowledge received did not raise concerns with Alternative 4 at the time of assessment. Consultation on route alternatives, including the Preferred Route, was also undertaken during our public engagements including Public Information Centres 3, 4 and 5 and at the November 2023 ATRI Forum, held specifically for Indigenous community representatives. Eabametoong First Nation was represented at the ATRI November 2023 Forum. The representative was interested in information on the Albany and Wabassi River crossings. We shared the map of the proposed route alternatives that were to be used to assist in discussions with elders on the preliminary route selection results. Following the Forum, on December 1, 2023, we also	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			provided pictures of the crossings and an example of a comparable bridge via email. We followed up on February 6, 2024 to see if the maps and photos were useful in discussions and if any other items were needed to help facilitate conversations. No response was returned. At this stage of the process, the Final EA/IS has been finalized and it is not possible to incorporate additional Indigenous Knowledge into the Final EA/IS. However, Eabametoong First Nation's intent to review specific design elements, including bridge crossing options, impacts, and mitigation measures, is acknowledged. Opportunities for continued engagement and input will remain as the Project progresses into subsequent phases, where applicable.	
Eabametoong First Nation	1	We also wish to correct the record with respect to claims made in the EA about MFFN and Ontario's efforts to engage EFN. For example, the EA asserts "[p]rogress has also been made to host Council-to-Council meetings between Marten Falls First Nation and other Indigenous communities (for example, Eabametoong First Nation and Aroland First Nation) to discuss relationship protocols, approaches for meaningful consultation and engagement, and to provide updates related to the Community Access Road."6 To be clear, despite EFN's	The Final EA/IS accurately reflects the proponent's ongoing efforts to advance Nation-to-Nation discussions with Indigenous communities, including Eabametoong First Nation (EFN). While the most recent acknowledged meeting with EFN occurred in June 2023, engagement efforts continued through 2026. Recent attempts to engage were made in October 2025 and in early 2026 (outside the Milestone 4 Progress Report window); however, meetings were not able to proceed due to local community priorities and	880

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		best efforts to arrange a Council-to-Council meeting, we have not received an invitation or met with MFFN since June 2023, which is the last acknowledged meeting in the EA.	scheduling conflicts. MFFN Leadership remains committed to advancing this relationship and looks forward to an opportunity to meet with EFN to discuss relationship protocols and approaches to meaningful engagement.	
Eabametoong First Nation	2	Eabametoong recently received a notice of significant 'field work' to be conducted this month, including vegetation clearing, site maintenance activities, and helicopter traffic throughout EFN territory. As noted in our previous letter, such field work is of direct concern to EFN because it has high potential to cause significant impacts to our rights and interests. The work will disturb wildlife and EFN members who have a Treaty right to access the land for hunting and trapping without interference. Many EFN members on the land will not be aware of the purpose of the activity due to the lack of adequate notice and consultation, causing additional impacts to social and cultural well-being. Ontario and MFFN are fully aware that April is spring hunting season for EFN members. As a neighbour and member of the Matawa First Nations, MFFN members have practiced hunting and trapping during the spring season alongside EFN members for generations. EFN has also made every effort over the course of decades to alert Ontario of the importance of spring hunting season.	The notice for field work related to clearing and maintenance activities within the study area was initially advised on March 12, 2026. The proposed work involves clearing in preparation of future drilling at three sites. One of the sites is within Marten Falls First Nation Reserve itself. The other two are located at the bedrock site closest to Marten Falls First Nation and shown in pink north of Marten Falls First Nation on ES 4-1 of the Final EA/IS. The size of the clearings will be approximately 35 m diameter for helipads, and approximately 4 m x 15 m for well/drill pads. This work is required to support aggregate sampling, water monitoring, and investigations at water crossing sites--or bridges--for the Community Access Road. The schedule was pending approval from the Ministry of Natural Resources. Please note that prior to issuing the permit, MNR conducted consultation in 2025. Upon approval by the MNR, a follow-up field notice was issued on April 7, 2026 to advise of wolverine sweeps in advance of the clearing activities. The purpose of the sweep is	884

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		The approach taken by Ontario and MFFN with respect to field work is contrary to the promises made in the final EA, which repeatedly promises engagement with “Indigenous communities and relevant stakeholders to coordinate the planned construction schedule before the start of construction and prior to specific noisy activities to minimize overlap with the timing of traditional land use activities (for example, fall and spring hunting seasons)”. There is no reasonable excuse to not consult EFN about field work prior to its commencement. The proposed field work will have a significant ecological footprint through sustained helicopter use and vegetation clearing throughout EFN Territory, risking widespread disturbances to wildlife. As a result, the ‘notice’ fails to meet the Province’s baseline duty to consult and accommodate prior to authorizing activities that impact our Treaty rights. Ontario and MFFN must, at minimum, not permit any field work until the end of spring hunting season. A short delay would be of minor consequence to the development of the Project, and will minimize potential impacts to EFN members. We urge MFFN and Ontario to immediately cease all Field Work until the conclusion of spring hunting season, and provide an opportunity for meaningful consultation with EFN.	to confirm the presence / absence of active wolverine dens within the study area. If denning is confirmed, work in the area will be avoided. Understanding that April is hunting season, work was coordinated with a local Community Member advisor to oversee the work and minimize disturbance where possible. Helicopters will maintain suitable altitude when flying to, from and between sampling sites to not disturb wildlife. Efforts will also be made not to circle sites more than is necessary.	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
Eabametoong First Nation	2	Road Management and Control Eabametoong cannot provide informed input on the Project in light of ongoing uncertainty about who is going to manage the Road. In general, we view the Draft ATRI Report and Draft EA as understating the potential impact of increased public access, including potential industrial activity, in now remote areas where we practice our Aboriginal and Treaty rights. We note the Draft ATRI Report states in relation to potential mitigation measures: "In addition, Aroland First Nation has indicated their preference for controlled access along the road, which if implemented, would limit access levels to the public." If MFFN continues to be the Project proponent, will MFFN work with other impacted First Nations, including Eabametoong, on regulating road use to ensure impacts on Aboriginal and Treaty rights, and the environment, are properly and effectively mitigated? Will the road be a provincial road, subject to general provincial highway regulations? If Ontario, or a Federal-Provincial partnership of some kind, is responsible for funding, constructing and managing the road, will EFN be included in the management of the road and controlling access to our homelands that may be impacted by new access and activities throughout the region? These are vital	Eabametoong First Nation's submitted comments on the Draft EA/IS and their Draft ATRI Impact Assessment Report on December 19, 2025. Eabametoong First Nation's feedback on their ATRI Impact Assessment Report is being used to update it and the final will be available in May 2026. To avoid duplication of information, responses to the Draft ATRI Impact Assessment Report will be submitted along with the Final ATRI Impact Assessment Report. These set of responses relate to the Final EA/IS. This is a comment on the Draft ATRI Impact Assessment Report and will be responded to under separate cover. As per the comment directed to Ontario as the EA funder, it is outside the scope of the Community Access Road. We would therefore encourage you to direct these to the regulators, as they will be best positioned to address them.	994

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		questions for MFFN as EA proponent and Ontario as the EA funder to answer in order to determine long term impacts upon EFN, and for and Aboriginal and Treaty rights assessment to fully consider mitigation and accommodation measures. Moreover, Eabametoong must be included in these monitoring and management commitments.		
Eabametoong First Nation	3	Despite the accelerated EA timeline, EFN is currently working as quickly as possible with community members to identify additional traditional use areas that are relevant to the Project. We remain prepared to work cooperatively with Ontario and MFFN to agree on a process for the incorporation of this next layer of TUS information into the EA through the Ministry Review phase and a final EA decision. IAAC, recognizing the importance of this work, has provided funding to support this initiative and we expect preliminary results later this month.	This comment is directed at government agencies and outside the scope of the Community Access Road. We would therefore encourage you to direct these to the regulators, as they will be best positioned to address them.	887
Eabametoong First Nation	3	The ATRI Report with respect to EFN is highly inaccurate due to the incorrect use of the LUP Area as a proxy for EFN's traditional use area. This is disappointing and frustrating as EFN and MFFN have close familial connections and shared history of use and occupancy throughout the region impacted by this Project. Both Ontario and MFFN know or ought to know that the ATRI Report does not include an	The Draft Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interest (ATRI) Report was based on a preliminary Area of Interest and publicly available sources and information gathered through the Consultation and Engagement Program. Section 5 of the Final ATRI Report, including the Area of Interest (Section 5.5) as well as throughout the Final ATRI Report has been updated to reflect newly received	886

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		assessment of additional areas identified by EFN members, which is a critical flaw in the EA from EFN's perspective.	information (December 2025) related to Eabametoong First Nation's traditional use area. Eabametoong First Nation's Final ATRI Report will be available in May 2026.	
Eabametoong First Nation	3	Further, as noted above, EFN has not received its final community-specific ATRI report. This is unacceptable considering the EA makes repeated references to these reports as an indication that MFFN had completed its due diligence prior to the submission of the EA. At minimum, EFN should have been provided with an update on the status of its ATRI report prior to the deadline for initial comments.	The Final ATRI Reports will be provided to each Indigenous community in May 2026.	888
Eabametoong First Nation	3	As repeatedly emphasized in our correspondence, EFN's overarching concern with the EA is that it limits assessment of impacts to EFN's Aboriginal and Treaty rights to the "Area of Interest" identified in the Taashikaywin Community Based Land Use Plan Planning Process (the "LUP Area"). EFN's primary land use/consultation area boundary is outlined in the attached guidance document (Schedule A) and has been shared with Ontario and mining proponents since at least 2022. This boundary is identified in the guidance document as an 'Eabametoong Areas of Interest Example for Discussion' and is again shared on a without prejudice basis as	Potential impacts to Eabametoong First Nation's Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests (ATRI) were assessed through a community-specific ATRI Impact Assessment Report. A draft copy of which was provided to Eabametoong First Nation for review and feedback. Additional information regarding Eabametoong First Nation's primary land use area was received on December 16, 2025 from the Ontario government. As a result, Eabametoong First Nation's Area of Interest has been updated to reflect this information in Section 5.5 and throughout the ATRI Final Report, which is being finalized for release in May	885

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		a publicly available illustration of EFN's Aboriginal and Treaty rights core use and occupancy area of interest.	2026	
Eabametoong First Nation	3	Road Use In the Draft EA, Marten Falls acknowledges “[w]hile the main use of the Project will be for Marten Falls, the Province also wants it to be used for potential future mineral exploration” (p ii). This statement appears to be a serious understatement in the context of the broader Draft EA which reflects that the Project is a key component for future mineral exploration and development in the Ring of Fire and the surrounding region. As implied throughout the Draft EA, primary road use will not be Indigenous community members, who will nonetheless be forced to accommodate the wide-ranging impacts from the Road for generations. As stated in the Draft EA, “[t]raffic levels for the Project have been estimated at 700 vehicles per day for the north-south section and 100 vehicles a day for the east-west section of the Marten Falls Community Access Road. These volumes are reflective of the anticipated peak traffic in 2046” (p. 94). These estimates include expected traffic from the mining industry. This may be a conservative estimate of vehicle traffic if we consider the Road will facilitate a	Appendix W (Traffic Data Review Memorandum) of the Final EA/IS, was prepared to estimate future traffic volumes, distribution, and composition for the Community Access Road. Appendix W documents the assumptions, data sources, and rationale used to derive projected peak 2046 Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) values for both road segments. The memorandum was used to inform the Technical Support Document assessment.	995

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		far greater number of visitors, such as non-Indigenous hunters and fishers, who are neither community members or employed in the mining industry. Nonetheless, assuming the projection is accurate, volume of traffic must be more thoroughly considered as part of the final EA. This must include economic projections related to the Project.		
Eabametoong First Nation	4	As noted in our previous comments, while the Project is primarily marketed as a 'community access road' for MFFN members, its core purpose is also to induce mineral exploration and industrial activity in the Ring of Fire and the surrounding region. Accordingly, a key purpose of the EA should be to analyze the potential impact of increased public access, including potential industrial activity, in remote areas where EFN has practiced our Aboriginal and Treaty Rights largely undisturbed since time immemorial, and seek effective mitigation measures.	The Community Access Road's multi purpose As stated in Section 2.2 of the Draft EA/IS, "While the main use of the Community Access Road will be for our community, the road will also be used for potential future mineral exploration." This reflects a transparent acknowledgment of the Community Access Road's multi purpose. The Community Access Road is a multi-purpose, all-season connection that will provide Marten Falls First Nation with year-round access to essential services, reduce the cost of living, and unlock long-term economic opportunities. These include employment, business development, and improved access to healthcare and education. The economic and social benefits for Indigenous communities—and the region as a whole—are substantial and must be considered alongside the Community Access Road's potential role in resource development.	889

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			Final EA/IS Assessment The Community Access Road traffic volumes cited in Section 7.2.5.1 reflect a long-term, regional perspective that accounts for both community and industrial use. This is consistent with the EA/IS's transparent and comprehensive approach to assessing the Community Access Road's broader implications. We have carefully considered the TISG in development of the EA/IS, including the assessment of cumulative effects. As outlined in Section 10 of the Final EA/IS, "The Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012 (Government of Canada, 2017b) requires that each Environmental Assessment of a project take into account any cumulative environmental effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with the environmental effects of other physical activities that have been or will be carried out." In alignment with this requirement, the cumulative effects assessment was prepared in accordance with the approved Terms of Reference for the Community Access Road. Notably, Table 10-1 of the Final EA/IS identifies infrastructure projects with spatial or temporal overlap with the Community Access Road,	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			based on publicly available sources that describe or predict specific effects for those projects. The Final EA/IS and the Technical Support Documents were prepared to meet the requirements outlined in the Terms of Reference, the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines and the technical discipline-specific study plans. Inclusion of projects in the cumulative effects assessment (CEA) that do not meet the criteria of reasonably foreseeable is not a regulatory requirement and as such was not developed as part of the Final EA/IS. For a project to be considered reasonably foreseeable, sufficient information about the activity must have been available to make a reasonable assessment of its potential effects (i.e., in the planning / approvals / design stage). Ring of Fire The Community Access Road is intended to improve access, foster economic development and improve the overall quality of life for the Marten Falls First Nation members. Although the Community Access Road is frequently linked to larger regional efforts such as the Ring of Fire, Marten Falls First Nation underscores that this Environmental Assessment / Impact Assessment process is	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			focused solely on the advancement of the Community Access Road itself—an infrastructure project Marten Falls First Nation has been advocating for almost four decades. We have carefully considered the TISG in development of the Final EA/IS, including the assessment of cumulative effects. As outlined in Section 10 of the Final EA/IS, “The Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012 (Government of Canada, 2017b) requires that each Environmental Assessment of a project take into account any cumulative environmental effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with the environmental effects of other physical activities that have been or will be carried out.” In alignment with this requirement, the cumulative effects assessment was prepared in accordance with the approved Terms of Reference for the Community Access Road. Notably, Table 10-1 of the Final EA/IS identifies infrastructure projects with spatial or temporal overlap with the Community Access Road, based on publicly available sources that describe or predict specific effects for those projects. Relevant projects that fit these criteria, including other road segments (i.e., Northern Road Link, Webequie Supply Road), are included in the Final EA/IS to the extent possible. Cumulative effects assessments for future environmental assessments for mining projects in the Ring of Fire will be the	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			responsibility of those project proponents and is outside the scope of the Final EA/IS. Eabametoong First Nation's Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests Potential impacts to Eabametoong First Nation's Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests (ATRI) are included in the Eabametoong First Nation ATRI Impact Assessment Report, which is being finalized and which will be send to Eabametoong First Nation in May 2026.	
Eabametoong First Nation	4	Mineral Claims and Road Development A very significant deficiency in the Draft EA is the failure to identify and assess, particularly with respect to Aboriginal and Treaty rights, the significant increase of mining claims, and the potential development of the Eagle's Nest nickel project and other Wyloo projects being proposed throughout the region, resulting from road development. This effect is not hypothetical, and was recently and dramatically demonstrated as described below. On November 24, 2025, a widely published letter from the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada to Ontario regarding Federal – Provincial Cooperation on the Ring of Fire Project Assessment (including the Road),	A) We have carefully considered the TISG in development of the EA/IS, including the assessment of cumulative effects. As outlined in Section 10 of the Final EA/IS, "The Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012 (Government of Canada, 2017b) requires that each Environmental Assessment of a project take into account any cumulative environmental effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with the environmental effects of other physical activities that have been or will be carried out." In alignment with this requirement, the cumulative effects assessment was prepared in accordance with the approved Terms of Reference for the Community Access Road. Notably, Table 10-1 of the Final EA/IS identifies	996

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		indicated that the federal review would be completed in June 2026 “provided that the final Impact Statements from proponents are submitted without delay”. Subsequently, on November 27, 2025, the government of Ontario issued a press release stating it had reached an agreement with Marten Falls for the submission of the Road environmental assessment by February 20, 2026, on an expedited basis, and further stating that “pending approvals and consultations, construction will begin as soon as August 2026”. As demonstrated in the maps attached as Schedules “A” and “B”, within a week of the events described above, there was a near doubling of recorded mining claims in Eabametoong traditional territory, which are spatially linked to the Road route. These new claims are in the heart of Eabametoong traditional use areas and constitute a significant impact on Eabametoong Treaty rights and community well being. This reality, and further staking of claims which can be expected, must be recognized, documented, and meaningfully assessed – with mitigation measures identified – prior to the submission of a final EA. We view this to be a necessity in both the direct and cumulative effects assessments, and in relation to all Valued Components, including Aboriginal and Treaty	projects, including minies and mining exploration activities with spatial or temporal overlap with the Community Access Road, based on publicly available sources that describe or predict specific effects for those projects. The Final EA/IS and the Technical Support Documents were prepared to meet the requirements outlined in the Terms of Reference, the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines and the technical discipline-specific study plans. Inclusion of projects in the cumulative effects assessment (CEA) that do not meet the criteria of reasonably foreseeable is not a regulatory requirement and as such was not developed as part of the Final EA/IS. For a project to be considered reasonably foreseeable, sufficient information about the activity must have been available to make a reasonable assessment of its potential effects (i.e., in the planning / approvals / design stage). B) Potential impacts to Eabametoong First Nation's Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests (ATRI) are included in the Eabametoong First Nation ATRI Impact Assessment Report, which is being finalized and which will be send to Eabametoong First Nation in May 2026.	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		rights.		
Eabametoong First Nation	4	Finally, the EA does not confirm who will be responsible for managing the Road and how road access and use may be controlled. Specifically, it does not provide basic information about options regarding the regulatory framework of the road, (e.g., whether the road will be an open-access provincial highway), any options to restrict public access, or explain who will be assuming responsibility for maintaining the road and monitoring use during operations. Information regarding road management is critical for EFN because it will inform our understanding of the types of mitigation and accommodation measures that may be available as options to regulate public access to our Territory. Whether MFFN or Ontario will be managing the road, it is critical that EFN be provided this information and have adequate opportunity to participate in discussions regarding the regulation of road use and access prior to a final decision.	Marten Falls First Nation continues to engage in ongoing discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations of the Community Access Road. It is anticipated that by the next phase of the Community Access Road, the owner and operator of the road will be confirmed. Furthermore, while the ownership of the Community Access Road has not yet been determined, the commitments made through the Environmental Assessment/Impact Assessment process are documented and form part of the Community Access Road's approval conditions. These commitments are intended to carry forward regardless of future ownership. Commitments are documented in Appendix AA and will be shared with future owned/operator of the Community Access Road.	892
Eabametoong First Nation	4	The lack of attention to detail with respect to expected road traffic is particularly confusing given the EA explicitly acknowledges that increased public access may impact hunting on valued species such as moose in the region, which EFN and other First Nations rely	Appendix W (Traffic Data Review Memorandum) of the Final EA/IS, was prepared to estimate future traffic volumes, distribution, and composition for the Community Access Road. Appendix W documents the assumptions, data sources,	891

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		upon to exercise their Treaty rights. The EA states the Road “may also increase hunting pressure on moose”¹⁵, may result in an increase in illegal hunting and poaching,¹⁶ and “is expected to result in an increase in public access... with potential for hunting opportunities for Indigenous and non-Indigenous hunters in the vicinity of the road during operations which may lead to decreased moose abundance.”¹⁷ With respect to mitigation measures, the only proposal in the EA is that the “Proponent will discuss possible restrictions for hunting in the Project Area with the Ministry of Natural Resources.”¹⁸ This statement falls far short of any serious consideration of potential mitigation measures through road controls. With such significant impacts to our Treaty rights at stake, it is inexcusable for the EA to assess induced road traffic with a mere cursory glance.	and rationale used to derive projected peak 2046 Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) values for both road segments. The memorandum was used to inform the Technical Support Document assessment. The Land and Resource Use Technical Support Document identifies additional mitigation measures than the one listed in the comment. Examples include: - limiting development of side trails and roads; - meet with the Ministry of Natural Resources to discuss hunting restrictions and signage to educate those who may interact with recreation users while on the road. - continued engagement with trappers and community members about construction timelines and safe access through the Construction Disturbance Area	
Eabametoong First Nation	4	The EA estimates a peak of approximately 700 vehicles per day will travel the north-south section of the Road, and 100 vehicles a day for the east-west section of the Road by 2046.¹⁰ 64 percent of the traffic on the north-south segment and 3 percent of traffic on the east-west segment is anticipated to be heavy trucks, with the remaining as light-duty vehicles and medium-sized trucks.¹¹ A total of 71 percent of traffic on the north-south segment is	Appendix W (Traffic Data Review Memorandum) of the Final EA/IS, was prepared to estimate future traffic volumes, distribution, and composition for the Community Access Road. Appendix W documents the assumptions, data sources, and rationale used to derive projected peak 2046 Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) values for both road segments.	890

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		expected to be medium and heavy trucks.¹² With a current on-reserve population of less than 400 people, the majority of this traffic will not be MFFN members but rather employees of industrial developments induced by the Road, and members of the public who are neither local First Nation members or employed in the mining industry (e.g., non-Indigenous hunters and fishers). The EA estimate of vehicle traffic is likely conservative because the EA does not consider mineral exploration and extraction activities that have not yet been formally initiated, but will likely be induced by the Road. Currently, the EA identifies roughly 20 mineral deposits but excludes them from the cumulative effects assessment and seemingly also from road traffic projections.¹³ The failure to consider any potential future development from any of these identified deposits is unreasonable – while these are technically not ‘active projects’, MFFN and Ontario must consider traffic related to the reasonably foreseeable development of any of these deposits, as the purpose of the Road is to induce development of such mineral deposits. Further, the EA fails to consider or acknowledge the extensive mineral claims in our Territory and in proximity to the Road, which doubled within weeks of the public announcement of the MFFN-Ontario Community Partnership Agreement, and which	Specifically, Appendix W proposes an AADT of approximately 100 vehicles per day for the east–west segment, which was assessed as reasonable for a remote northern community. For the north–south segment, Appendix W proposes a peak AADT of approximately 700 vehicles per day. Appendix W provides a breakdown of traffic composition, including traffic anticipated for Ring of Fire mining operations. The high proportion of medium and heavy trucks on the north–south segment reflects this anticipated mining-related use, while significantly lower truck volumes are projected on the east–west segment, consistent with its function as a community access route. These assumptions are presented in Tables 1 and 2 of Appendix W. With respect to concerns regarding induced development, the EA traffic projections are based on reasonably foreseeable developments that have sufficient publicly available information to support the assessment. We have carefully considered the TISG in development of the EA/IS, including the assessment of cumulative effects. As outlined in Section 10 of the Final EA/IS, “The Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012 (Government of Canada, 2017b) requires	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		were identified in our previous submission.¹⁴ If even a small fraction of these claims are induced to be developed by the Road, the number of vehicles using the Road will likely far exceed the EA estimate. Even if the projection is accurate, the estimated volume of traffic is insufficiently detailed in the final EA. At minimum, a detailed explanation of the estimated traffic, including a more detailed breakdown of the types of vehicle traffic, should have been provided in the EA based on baseline economic projections from staked mineral deposits. Moreover, it appears that the proponent has not considered a substantial increase of visitors, such as non-Indigenous hunters, fishers and tourists, in the traffic projections.	that each Environmental Assessment of a project take into account any cumulative environmental effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with the environmental effects of other physical activities that have been or will be carried out." In alignment with this requirement, the cumulative effects assessment was prepared in accordance with the approved Terms of Reference for the Community Access Road. Notably, Table 10-1 of the Final EA/IS identifies infrastructure projects with spatial or temporal overlap with the Community Access Road, based on publicly available sources that describe or predict specific effects for those projects. The Final EA/IS and the Technical Support Documents were prepared to meet the requirements outlined in the Terms of Reference, the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines and the technical discipline-specific study plans. Inclusion of projects in the cumulative effects assessment (CEA) that do not meet the criteria of reasonably foreseeable is not a regulatory requirement and as such was not developed as part of the Final EA/IS. For a project to be considered reasonably foreseeable, sufficient information about the activity must have been available to make a reasonable assessment of its potential effects	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			(i.e., in the planning / approvals / design stage).	
Eabametoong First Nation	5	Lastly, the EA repeatedly highlights low to moderate prediction confidence and high levels of uncertainty due to incomplete information and data. Rather than resolving uncertainty, the EA proposes to defer resolution to after a final decision through future studies, monitoring, and adaptative management programs. This approach is not helpful and is not a credible basis for concluding that residual effects can be effectively mitigated or reversed.	As outlined in Section 6 of the Final EA/IS, Marten Falls First Nation submitted an Effects Assessment Methodology to the Province and the Agency in 2021, consistent with the approved Terms of Reference and Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines. Both regulators provided comments and questions, which Marten Falls First Nation used to update the methodology. The confidence ratings reported in the Final EA/IS and Technical Support Documents reflect transparent disclosure of results. This makes sure that determinations of significance and the effectiveness of mitigation are using worst case or reasonably conservative inputs, not deferred. Follow up, monitoring, and adaptive management are accepted practice for projects undergoing environmental assessment with the understanding that designs will be refined through detail design and in response to project-specific permitting requirements.	898
Eabametoong First Nation	5	As EFN pointed out in our earlier comments, by choosing to not answer this fundamental question of proponentcy and responsibility for Project-related impacts and/or mitigation	Potential impacts to Eabametoong First Nation's Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests (ATRI) resulting from the Community Access Road are outlined in Eabametoong	897

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		measures, Ontario and MFFN are perpetuating a cyclical (and political) argument of minimal impacts in Ontario's interests rather than providing a reasoned and thoughtful evaluation of effects and tangible measures to avoid, mitigate, or manage them and meaningfully consider the residual effects, especially cumulative effects and those impacts to EFN's Aboriginal and Treaty rights.	First Nation ATRI Impact Assessment Report. It is being finalized to incorporate Eabametoong First Nation's feedback on the Draft ATRI Impact Assessment Report. The Final ATRI Report will be provided to Eabametoong First Nation in May 2026. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road. Marten Falls First Nation cannot act solely as the owner/operator of an all-weather access road, and therefore this transition to a future entity is necessary for development of the Community Access Road. Establishing a different entity as owner/operator will not void the requirements outlined under the Terms of Reference, the Tailored Impact Statement Guideline or the commitments within the Final EA/IS, nor does it revoke the commitments made to Indigenous communities through its consultation and engagement efforts to date. The owner/operator is bounded by the commitments within the Final EA/IS and the approval conditions provided by the regulators. It is anticipated that by the next phase of the Community Access Road, the owner and operator of the road will be confirmed. The comments are directed at government agencies and outside the scope of the	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			Community Access Road. We would therefore encourage you to direct these to the regulators, as they will be best positioned to address them.	
Eabametoong First Nation	5	Additionally, there is no clarity in the EA documents on what party(ies) will be undertaking the “careful management” of the range of impacts that are being downplayed throughout the document. This is a fundamental issue, also related to the comment in Section 4 above on Road Management, Use and Control. EFN and other First Nations engaging with the EA documents are left to guess as to whether MFFN, as the Project proponent, will have any capacity to manage impacts (and potentially to provide resourcing for EFN and other First Nations to collaboratively manage such impacts). Alternatively, is EFN to assume that the Province will be managing the impacts of the Project the Province is funding? This question must be answered clearly for any of the proposed mitigation measures to have any credibility, and the EA-related decision-points for carrying forward residual effects for consideration.	Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road. Marten Falls First Nation cannot act solely as the owner/operator of an all-weather access road, and therefore this transition to a future entity is necessary for development of the Community Access Road. Establishing a different entity as owner/operator will not void the requirements outlined under the Terms of Reference, the Tailored Impact Statement Guideline or the commitments within the Final EA/IS, nor does it revoke the commitments made to Indigenous communities through its consultation and engagement efforts to date. The owner/operator is bounded by the commitments within the Final EA/IS and the approval conditions provided by the regulators. It is anticipated that by the next phase of the Community Access Road, the owner and operator of the road will be confirmed.	896
Eabametoong First Nation	5	The EA summary and recommendations, including the executive summary, emphasize economic benefits and access to services, and	The Executive Summary of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the	895

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		downplay impacts by noting they will “require careful management.” ¹⁹ These summaries, which many readers will rely upon to inform their understanding of the Project, do not provide any detail into the substantial risk of irreversible impacts which are identified in the body of the EA Report. It is misleading to overemphasize potential Project benefits while downplaying all negative impacts in these key documents, and this will not ultimately serve the interests of MFFN, Ontario, EFN or other affected First Nations, or the public.	technical details are provided in the Technical Support Documents for those who wish to review them in depth. The Executive Summary does emphasize the benefits of the Community Access Road. However, it should be noted that a total of twelve plain language summaries were prepared to share the findings of the Technical Support Documents. The plain language summaries include both potential positive and negative effects of the Community Access Road and are available online in English, Cree, Oji-Cree, Ojibway and French at https://eais.martenfallsaccessroad.ca/ . These were prepared to facilitate sharing the findings of the Technical Support Documents, which are attached to the Final EA/IS.	
Eabametoong First Nation	5	For example, the EA states that all residual impacts with respect to surface water have no or negligible magnitude and have either no or insignificant impacts. While these findings alone are suspect given the vast geographic and temporal scope of the Project, they are especially flawed because they are used to conclude that there are correspondingly no residual impacts to Aboriginal and Treaty Rights. This methodology fails to consider that even if there are no or insignificant residual impacts to surface water, there may still be extensive impacts to EFN members’ use of surface water due to Project-related activities. For example, land users may believe that	The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. Section 6 of the Final EA/IS provides a plain language description of the methodology. Section 4 of each one of the Technical Support Documents provides the study methods and assessment scope for that specific technical discipline. Section 9.3 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level	894

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		surface water near the Road is not clean and safe to use, and therefore avoid the areas, diminishing their stewardship and use of water resources. EFN has similar concerns with respect to Land (especially vegetation, wildlife and ungulates) and People (Aboriginal and Treaty Rights and Interests). It is not credible to claim that the vast majority of residual effects are negligible and insignificant, even in cases where the likelihood is certain. EFN will require more time to analyze the credibility of these conclusions based on the mitigation measures proposed in the appendices. However, it is certain that the conclusions are fundamentally flawed due to the identified methodological issue.	summary of the residual effects on Water Valued Components. Refer to Appendices F, G, H and I for detailed assessments completed on Water Valued Components completed for the Community Access Road. Section 9.4 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the residual effects on Land Valued Components. Refer to Appendices J, K, L, M and N for detailed assessments on Land Valued Components completed for the Community Access Road. Section 9.5 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the residual effects on People Valued Components. Refer to Appendices O, P, Q, R, S T, U and V for detailed assessments on People Valued Components completed for the Community Access Road. The results of the Technical Support Documents supported the Eabametoong First Nation Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests (ATRI) Impact Assessment Report. This information along with Eabametoong First Nation feedback on the Draft ATRI Impact Assessment Report is being used to finalize the ATRI Impact Assessment Report, which will be provided in May 2026. The time allocated for the review of the Final EA/IS is outside Marten Falls' control. As such	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			Eabametoong First Nation statement that they will require more time cannot be addressed by Marten Falls. We would therefore encourage you to direct these to the regulators, as they will be best positioned to address them.	
Eabametoong First Nation	5	The EA does not address our concerns from the draft EA, as there does not appear to be substantive revisions to many conclusions regarding residual impacts on three Valued Components: Water, Land, and People (including Aboriginal and Treaty rights and interests) ("VCs"). As discussed in our previous submission, our concern is that the biophysical VCs are not a foundation on which to adequately assess impacts to Aboriginal and Treaty rights. The EA concludes, often without sufficient justification, that anticipated residual impacts on most VCs are unlikely, negligible and insignificant.	The main body of the Final EA/IS is intentionally written in plain language to make it accessible to a broader audience, while the technical details are provided in the appendices for those who wish to review them in depth. There were substantive revisions made to the Final EA/IS, most notably the significance rating for peatlands, caribou and moose. This change was a direct result from feedback received from Indigenous communities and regulators. Section 9.3 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the residual effects on Water Valued Components. Refer to Appendices F, G, H and I for detailed assessments completed on Water Valued Components completed for the Community Access Road. Section 9.4 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the residual effects on Land Valued Components. Refer to Appendices J, K, L, M and N for detailed assessments on Land Valued Components completed for the Community Access Road.	893

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			Section 9.5 in the Final EA/IS is a high-level summary of the residual effects on People Valued Components. Refer to Appendices O, P, Q, R, S T, U and V for detailed assessments on People Valued Components completed for the Community Access Road. The results of the Technical Support Documents supported the Eabametoong First Nation Aboriginal and / or Treaty Rights and Interests (ATRI) Impact Assessment Report. This information along with Eabametoong First Nation feedback on the Draft ATRI Impact Assessment Report is being used to finalize the ATRI Impact Assessment Report, which will be provided in May 2026.	
Eabametoong First Nation	5	Table 5-1 of the Draft ATRI Report summarizes Information and Concerns Related to Rights and Interests Provided by Eabametoong (p 153). As previously stated, this limited list of concerns was based on one multi-party workshop in 2023 with a very limited group of land users participating. Table 5-1 will need to be updated when further TK information is collected and shared by EFN.	Refer to Response 5 (Internal ID 997).	999
Eabametoong First Nation	5	Eabametoong's self-identified primary land use/consultation area boundary is outlined in the attached guidance document (Schedule "C") that has been shared with Ontario and mining proponents since at least 2022. This	Refer to Response 5 (Internal ID 997).	1000

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		boundary is identified in the guidance document as an 'Eabametoong Areas of Interest Example for Discussion' and is shared here on a without prejudice basis as a publicly available example of Eabametoong's Aboriginal and Treaty rights core use and occupancy area of interest. As discussed above, the effects assessment in the Draft ATRI Report is highly inaccurate due to the incorrect use of the Taashikaywin LUP Area as a proxy for Eabametoong's traditional use area. This is particularly confusing and frustrating for EFN since we have such close familial connections and shared history of use and occupancy throughout the region with MFFN. A proper process must be determined, now under unfortunately compressed timelines, to ensure that the final ATRI report includes an assessment of additional areas identified by Eabametoong land users. Eabametoong is presently coordinating land user meetings to identify, on a preliminary basis, additional traditional use areas that are relevant to the Project. As noted above, we are prepared to work cooperatively with MFFN to agree on a process for the incorporation of this next layer of TUS information into the EA. We are currently targeting January for preliminary information, and February for a formal report.		

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
Eabametoong First Nation	5	A major concern with the Draft ATRI Report is the identification of Eabametoong's "Area of Interest" for the purpose of the assessment as being the same as the boundary line for the Taashikaywin Community Based Land Use Plan Planning Process ("the LUP Area"). The LUP Area was specifically designed for a joint planning table with Mishkeegogamang First Nation and Ontario and was based on trapline boundaries, not EFN's self-identified area of historical use, occupancy and current traditional territory (as Ontario has acknowledged in the CBLUP process). As you know, Eabametoong's Land Use Planning Team has had previous meetings with the MFFN Planning Team regarding our shared interests in the Makokabatan Lake, Washi Lake, and Wabassi River areas. Eabametoong families are closely inter-connected with those of current MFFN members, and EFN has historical and continued use of these lands. Our Land Use Plans were intended to jointly develop management direction for these areas, and are not confined to MNR trapline divisions. It is therefore surprising that these areas were ignored in using the LUP Area as a proxy for Eabametoong Treaty and Aboriginal Rights areas, thereby functioning to exclude EFN from decision making in our traditional territory. Eabametoong members depend on these areas for travel and traditional harvesting.	Eabametoong First Nation's submitted comments on the Draft EA/IS and their Draft ATRI Impact Assessment Report on December 19, 2025. Eabametoong First Nation's feedback on their ATRI Impact Assessment Report is being used to update it and the final will be available in May 2026. To avoid duplication of information, responses to the Draft ATRI Impact Assessment Report will be submitted along with the Final ATRI Impact Assessment Report. These set of responses relate to the Final EA/IS. This is a comment on the Draft ATRI Impact Assessment Report and will be responded to under separate cover.	997

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		Impacts on Eabametoong Aboriginal and Treaty rights from the Road and the further exploration or development activities it has – and will continue to spur -- in must be considered and addressed.		
Eabametoong First Nation	5	A very limited number of EFN members made comments at an ATRI data collection event in November 2023, and as you have identified in the Draft ATRI Report (p 161), EFN members and harvesters intensively use areas outside the LUP Area. Some of these include Makokibatan and Washi lakes, MacIntyre Lake and Creek area, as well as the Wabassi and numerous other tributary systems of the Albany. These areas, and the lands and river systems impacted by multiple river crossings of the Road through EFN territory must be the subject of further detailed TK/TLRU data collection in the coming weeks to better understand the potential impacts to EFN Aboriginal and Treaty rights in these areas, as well as site specific concerns at the proposed river crossings. Similarly, potential Road impacts on the Otokwin-Attawapiskat River watershed cannot be considered in isolation from the Northern Road Link project with respect to Eabametoong Aboriginal and Treaty Rights impacts and cumulative effects	Refer to Response 5 (Internal ID 997).	998
Eabametoong First Nation	6	Finally, Eabametoong has concerns regarding the temporal boundaries for baseline data	Refer to Response 5 (Internal ID 997).	1006

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		collection identified in the Draft ATRI Report (7.1 p. 21). We do not agree with the scope of past use starting at 1947, based on the introduction of the MNR trapline system. This approach does not reflect Eabametoong's historic and customary occupation, travel, and shared stewardship, including ethnohistory, nor does it reflect standard assessment practices for Aboriginal and Treaty rights, including cumulative effects assessment to pre-contact or pre-development times. The proposed temporal scale ignores the generations of shared use of the Albany river, common travel routes overland between Marten Falls and the Fort Hope post, as well as familial connections throughout our shared history for generations past, as well as the shared future between Marten Falls and Eabametoong membership. EFN finds this inconsistent with the stated guiding principles of your EA Consultation and Engagement program (see, p18 of Draft EA/EIS), in particular: Kawininitojikateg nikan onajikewining ineke: the Anishinaabe relationship to the land should be seen as a cultured landscape; also an area that is continuously being used by the Anishinaabe as a habitation and as a resource.		
Eabametoong First Nation	6	Similarly to the methodology applied to surface water impacts, the Draft ATRI Report concludes there are no impacts to EFN's	Refer to Response 5 (Internal ID 997).	1005

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		Aboriginal and Treaty rights to fish based on the biophysical assessment in the EA Report. Again, this approach overlooks potential impacts to EFN fishing practices, which are likely to be adversely impacted through avoidance of areas subject to development due to loss of peace and quiet, loss of traditional knowledge from landscape changes and loss of access, even if temporary, and/or perception of pollution. We acknowledge the Draft ATRI Report assesses impacts to some of these values through the Cultural Continuity and Well Being VC, it fails to integrate how these values interact with each other (e.g. impacts to use of water and fishing as an exercise of Aboriginal and Treaty rights due to loss of sense of place and changes in experience of being on the land, connection to the land and the ability to transmit cultural teachings and traditions).		
Eabametoong First Nation	6	Table 9-3 of the Draft EA describes interactions of the Project with the environment during the construction and operations phase, including changes to water quality due to factors such as water taking, discharge, and fuel spill accidents (p 381-382). Table 9-6 of the Draft EA describes the potential residual impacts of these interactions. All predicted residual impacts are described as having none or negligible magnitude and insignificant impact despite moderate uncertainty. As a threshold	Refer to Response 5 (Internal ID 997).	1004

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		concern, it is suspect that residual impacts to this VC will be insignificant in light of the vast geographic and temporal scope of the Project including construction and operation phases. This conclusion is then reflected in the Draft ATRI report Table 7-3, which does not identify any residual impacts to potential contamination of fresh water on Eabametoong's Aboriginal and Treaty Rights and VCs. What is lost in this methodology is the fact that predicted impacts to surface water quality are different and distinct from potential impacts to EFN use of surface water – for example, land users may perceive that surface water near the Road is no longer pristine and safe to use, thus diminishing their traditional stewardship and use of this critical resource.		
Eabametoong First Nation	6	Our concern is that assessment of impacts on biophysical VCs set out in the Draft EA do not set a foundation through which to adequately assess impacts to Aboriginal and Treaty rights either in general, or with respect to EFN practices specifically. As explained in the ATRI methodology set out in Table 9-1 of the ATRI Study Plan (Appendix O), identification of pathways from project-related activities that may interfere with the exercise of Aboriginal and Treaty rights (step 4) informs the assessment of the potential level of impact (step 5) and discussions about measures to	Refer to Response 5 (Internal ID 997).	1003

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		address impacts (step 6). In this case, the Draft EA concludes (often without sufficient justification) that anticipated residual impacts on most VC's are unlikely, negligible and insignificant. These conclusions are reflected in the Draft ATRI Report (see Table 7-3 starting at p 230), which concludes many anticipated impacts to VCs, such as Indigenous Current Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes, have low severity.		
Eabametoong First Nation	6	Regarding Table 7-3 of the Draft ATRI Report, Eabametoong strongly disagrees with the conclusion that there will be no residual effects on Eabametoong related to "changes in ability to exercise governance and stewardship rights", based on the fact that Canada and Ontario, not EFN, have conduct of the EA and the regulation of the Project and the affected VC's. This approach ignores the fact that the exercise of Eabametoong's governance and stewardship rights are inherent and integral to all land based activities. Impact on land use from an increase of outsider use, including new mining claims and activities, will result in Eabametoong's further loss of control and our ability to pass on of traditional teachings related to land stewardship and harvesting practices. Moreover, the question of 'jurisdiction' of affected Treaty First Nations	Refer to Response 5 (Internal ID 997).	1002

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		with respect to Ring of Fire roads has been the subject of discussion for many years, with the Eabametoong expressing its strong views that Treaty 9 was intended by the Indigenous signatories to reflect a co-management approach to resources, and that any road and resource development should be jointly governed. This section of the draft ATRI Report must be significantly revised.		
Eabametoong First Nation	6	The Draft ATRI Report notes that the Project will likely result to result in changes in the availability of resources harvested for traditional purposes, but concludes that the quality of those resources are likely not to be affected (p 190). We would appreciate a more detailed explanation as to how Marten Falls came to the conclusion that a reduction of available resources will not correlate with the quality of the remaining resources.	Refer to Response 5 (Internal ID 997).	1001
Eabametoong First Nation	6	The cumulative effects assessment is a critical component of any EA, as it accounts for reasonably foreseeable future activities that will be induced by a project. However, as noted, the Project Inclusions List (Table 10.1-1) excludes future developments linked to approximately 20 existing mineral deposits, and does not consider the extensive number of claims staked in EFN territory since November 2025. On this basis, we view projected use of the Road to be grossly underestimated, and	Following the guidance of the IAAC Policy Framework for Assessing Cumulative Effects under the Impact Assessment Act, the EA/IS includes information on projects which have publicly available information and which are reasonably foreseeable activities. We are unable to assess effects of projects that do not have a reasonably foreseeable footprint or activities.	899

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		the cumulative effects assessment to be flawed. Our concern is substantiated by the Summary of Predicted Cumulative Effects for Water, Land, and People, which are overwhelmingly found to be “not significant” or “not applicable” with low magnitude.²⁰ As with the direct impacts of the Project, it is difficult to square these conclusions with the nature and magnitude of the Project and lack of detailed mitigation measures. The EA fails to consider IESO’s Northern Ontario Connections Study (“NOCS”) dated March 9, 2026. The NOCS considered four transmission supply options, and recommended a double-circuit 230kv major transmission corridor aligning with the Road alongside the Webequie Supply Road and Norther Road Link (the “North-South-Option” or “Greenstone Line”). Ontario has since declared the Greenstone Line a priority project which will run 230-kilometres from Nipigon Bay to Geraldton near the Ring of Fire.²¹ That scale of power could reach 500MW, which is more than the City of Thunder Bay requires and is clearly intended to induce region-altering levels of development. In our view, it is a fatal flaw for the EA to omit any consideration of the Greenstone Line as part of the cumulative effects assessment. As emphasized in our previous letter, the cumulative effects assessment also omits consideration of future hydro generation		

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		developments in the Albany and Attawapiskat watersheds that may become viable due to the probable connection with the Webequie Supply Road and Northern Road Link. As noted in the Made in Ontario Northern Hydroelectric Power Opportunities Report, “transmission connection for a subset of the Albany-Attawapiskat facilities could be used to support the Ring of Fire due to the proximity of potential development sites to the proposed North-South road.”		
Eabametoong First Nation	6	EFN continues to participate in the Regional Assessment process for the Ring of Fire. ²³ We maintain our position that the Regional Assessment should have been integrated into the EA to ensure proper consideration of various development scenarios throughout the region. The models take into account the construction of the Road as well as probable induced developments in describing potential impacts that are likely to occur throughout the region. The purpose of the Regional Assessment is to provide a baseline upon which to conduct a proper EA, yet Ontario and MFFN decided to move ahead with the benefit of this analysis. This is unfortunate and results in a cumulative effects assessment that is deliberately impoverished and limited.	While we recognize that the Community Access Road is one of several components of potential future development in the region, the timing of the Regional Assessment process did not allow for its integration into the Community Access Road EA/IS. The draft Terms of Reference for the Regional Assessment were released in September 2024, and the final Terms of Reference were published on January 20, 2025. The Draft EA/IS for the Community Access Road was issued in February 2025, at which point the Regional Assessment was still in its very early stages and no substantive analysis was available to inform the project-specific assessment. Similarly, the Regional Assessment Interim Report was released in February 2026, the same month as the Final EA/IS. As a result, there was no opportunity to incorporate the	900

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			Interim Report into the Final EA/IS without delaying the project by a significant period. The Regional Assessment's final report is not expected until mid-2027, and it would not have been feasible to postpone the Draft or Final EA/IS in anticipation of a separate, multi-year process led by the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada (IAAC). Instead, the Regional Assessment is intended to consider the Community Access Road and other related projects within a broader cumulative effects framework for the Ring of Fire region. Marten Falls First Nation remains committed to transparency and collaboration and will continue to share relevant information with IAAC to support the Regional Assessment as it progresses.	
Eabametoong First Nation	6	We must emphasize that the EA does not adequately account for potential downstream effects of the Road on the environment or EFN's Aboriginal and Treaty rights, or propose adequate mitigation measures to account for such effects as part of the cumulative effects assessment. The pathways from a singular impact to the environment (downstream effects) are related to cumulative effects because downstream effects will accumulate over time in the environment, resulting in greater impacts over time. Over the lifecycle of the Road, which is permanent with no plans for	A) We have carefully considered the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (TISG) in development of the EA/IS, including the assessment of cumulative effects. As outlined in Section 10 of the Final EA/IS, "The Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012 (Government of Canada, 2017b) requires that each Environmental Assessment of a project take into account any cumulative environmental effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with the environmental effects of other physical activities that have been or will be carried out."	901

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		decommissioning, there will inevitably be disturbances—such as spills of toxic substances related to vehicle traffic, public activity, and induced mineral developments—that will result in new impacts to the environment and people. Downstream effects are significant as they risk contamination to the environment and wildlife far from the Project study area, yet there are no clear mitigation measures addressed in the EA to ensure proper detection and containment of disturbances as they arise. Consequently, the EA ignores the risk of greater cumulative effects over time, as downstream effects work their way through surface and ground water, wildlife and vegetation, and ultimately people including EFN members who rely on these resources to exercise our Aboriginal and Treaty Rights, food security, and nourishment. As a neighbouring First Nation that relies on an environment affected by the Project study area, we would expect the EA to provide more explicit recognition of such impacts, and included recommendations for monitoring/guardian programs and emergency and spill response, informed by our Traditional Knowledge of the land, to help ensure proper protection of the land and waters and prevent or minimize potential downstream effects. The EA and appendices' mere references to potential mitigation measures are wholly insufficient.	In alignment with this requirement, the cumulative effects assessment was prepared in accordance with the approved Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Community Access Road. Notably, Table 10-1 of the Final EA/IS identifies infrastructure projects with spatial or temporal overlap with the Community Access Road, based on publicly available sources that describe or predict specific effects for those projects. The EA/IS and the Technical Support Documents were prepared to meet the requirements outlined in the TOR, the TISG and the technical discipline-specific study plans. Inclusion of projects in the cumulative effects assessment that do not meet the criteria of reasonably foreseeable is not a regulatory requirement and as such was not developed as part of the EA/IS. For a project to be considered reasonably foreseeable, sufficient information about the activity must have been available to make a reasonable assessment of its potential effects (i.e., in the planning / approvals / design stage). Following the guidance of the IAAC Policy Framework for Assessing Cumulative Effects under the Impact Assessment Act, the EA/IS includes information on projects which have	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		Despite its many limitations, the EA acknowledges the high potential for significant cumulative effects on wildlife (caribou, moose and wolverine) within its narrow scope. This conclusion alone supports our view that the Project will likely result in significant impacts on our hunting and trapping rights. If the EA applied a broader and more robust analysis that properly considered the effects of industrial developments that are likely to be induced by the Road, it is fair to presume that the actual cumulative effects are in fact likely to be far greater than reported.	publicly available information, and which are reasonably foreseeable activities. We are unable to assess effects of projects that do not have a reasonably foreseeable footprint or activities. B) Instead of an overarching ATRI report, individual community-specific ATRI Impact Assessment reports were prepared. Potential impacts to Eabametoong First Nation's Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests were assessed through their ATRI Impact Assessment Report. The draft of which was provided to Eabametoong First Nation on July 10, 2025 for a 90-day review period to provide feedback (a due date of October 8, 2025). Eabametoong First Nation provided their feedback on December 12, 2025 and is being used to finalize their ATRI Impact Assessment which will be available in May 2026. Specifically, Section 8 of Eabametoong First Nation's ATRI Impact Assessment report includes the cumulative impact assessment. C) Appendix AA of the Final EA/IS includes a summary of recommendations, including mitigation, protection, monitoring and study commitments resulting from the assessment on water, land and people. Section 9 of the Eabametoong First Nation's ATRI Impact Assessment report includes monitoring programs and future commitments resulting	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			from the ATRI Impact Assessment. Of note is the proposed mitigation measure in Eabametoong First Nation's ATRI: Impact Assessment Report, which include the collaboration with local existing environmental advisory committees to support the development and implementation of all environmental monitoring programs. The objective is to include Indigenous interests and perspectives, particularly concerning resources utilized for rights-based purposes. In the absence of an existing advisory committee with an aligned mandate to Marten Falls First Nation, a Terms of Reference between relevant agencies and Eabametoong First Nation will be established.	
Eabametoong First Nation	7	Cumulative effects identification and analysis is a critical component of any EA. We appreciate that the Projects Inclusion List for effects assessment includes not only other roads nearby (Northern Road Link and the Webequie Supply Road), but also historical and existing developments, and mining activities with various deposits such as Eagle's Nest, Black Thor, Black Bird, Big Daddy, and Black Label (p 72). However, as noted above, the large array of new mining claims and subsequent exploration and development that will inevitably follow with increased access is not sufficiently scoped into the cumulative effects assessment; in this light, we view projected	We have carefully considered the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (TISG) in development of the EA/IS, including the assessment of cumulative effects. As outlined in Section 10 of the Final EA/IS, "The Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012 (Government of Canada, 2017b) requires that each Environmental Assessment of a project take into account any cumulative environmental effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with the environmental effects of other physical activities that have been or will be carried out." In alignment with this requirement, the cumulative effects assessment was prepared	1007

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		use and public assess of the Road to be grossly underestimated, and the cumulative effects assessment to be flawed. Moreover, the cumulative effects assessment needs to be updated with the publicly-available information on the IESO's ongoing Northern Ontario Connections Study. The NOCS preliminary findings recommend a double-circuit 230kv major transmission corridor aligning with the MFCAR, NRL, and WSR corridors.² That scale of power, with an IESO-recommended 500MW delivered to the Ring of Fire area according to the NOCS draft, is more than the city of Thunder Bay requires and implies a region-altering level of development. That Ontario study outlines the Project, the Northern Road Link ("NRL") and the Webequie Supply Road ("WSR") as segments of the so-called Ring of Fire road as the primary driver of industrial change for the region.	in accordance with the approved Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Community Access Road. Notably, Table 10-1 of the Final EA/IS identifies infrastructure projects with spatial or temporal overlap with the Community Access Road, based on publicly available sources that describe or predict specific effects for those projects. The Final EA/IS and the Technical Support Documents were prepared to meet the requirements outlined in the TOR, the TISG and the technical discipline-specific study plans. Inclusion of projects in the cumulative effects assessment that do not meet the criteria of reasonably foreseeable is not a regulatory requirement and as such was not developed as part of the Final EA/IS. For a project to be considered reasonably foreseeable, sufficient information about the activity must have been available to make a reasonable assessment of its potential effects (i.e., in the planning / approvals / design stage). Potential projects within the Ring of Fire that do not meet the definition of reasonably foreseeable were not included. Following the guidance of the IAAC Policy Framework for Assessing Cumulative Effects under the Impact Assessment Act, the Final	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			EA/IS includes information on projects which have publicly available information, and which are reasonably foreseeable activities. We are unable to assess effects of projects that do not have a reasonably foreseeable footprint or activities.	
Eabametoong First Nation	7	Also absent from the cumulative effects assessment in the Draft EA is possible hydro generation development(s), and projects with potential in Albany and Attawapiskat watersheds that would become viable due to the Road and the probable connection with the NRL and WSR road segments. The list of projects under your cumulative effects analysis must include hydro development potential, as understood and made clear in recent Ontario Power Generation comments and official reports. For example, the Made in Ontario Northern Hydroelectric Power Opportunities report makes an important causal link that your cumulative effects assessment must incorporate: "...as the IESO has identified in its report, transmission connection for a subset of the Albany-Attawapiskat facilities could be used to support the Ring of Fire due to the proximity of potential development sites to the proposed North-South road."	Hydroelectric development projects with information on their location that were publicly available at the time of preparation of the Project Inclusions List, were included. For example, the Little Jackfish River Hydroelectric Project, Water control Structures along the Albany River Watershed and Ogoki Forest Management Plans are included on the Project Inclusions List (Table 10.1-1 in the Final EA/IS) and are considered as part of the disciplines cumulative effects assessments. Following the guidance of the IAAC Policy Framework for Assessing Cumulative Effects under the Impact Assessment Act, the EA/IS includes information on projects which have publicly available information and which are reasonably foreseeable activities. We are unable to assess effects of projects that do not have a reasonably foreseeable footprint or activities.	1008
Eabametoong First Nation	7	EFN will continue to make every effort to work in good faith with Ontario and MFFN on the Project. We are also prepared to use every	Eabametoong First Nation's request for meeting with Ontario has been shared with MECP.	903

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		legal tool available to us to protect our rights and interests. We request a meeting with Ontario at the earliest opportunity.		
Eabametoong First Nation	7	We respect MFFN's economic development goals and recognize the Road's potential to improve the lives of First Nations in the region. As Chief Achneepineskum has acknowledged, the Road may open the door to new possibilities — among them good jobs, reliable supply routes for their community and possibly others, improved food security, and greater access to essential services. These are goals we understand and appreciate. However, economic opportunity cannot come at the expense of our Aboriginal and Treaty rights and interests. This Road is not only a path to economic potential; it is also a path toward permanent, irreversible changes to the land and a way of life that defines us as First Nations with a shared history, shared families, and shared future in our homelands together. Development must be pursued in a manner that places greater weight on the protection of our Aboriginal and Treaty rights and our lands. At an absolute minimum, EFN must be provided an opportunity to participate in decisions together with MFFN on these matters that will impact our shared future. Ideally, as partners in planning for opportunities and managing future impacts to our rights and stewardship responsibilities	As mentioned in the Final EA/IS and Eabametoong First Nation's Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interest (ATRI) Impact Assessment report, there are also anticipated positive impacts to Indigenous communities. The Project will enhance connectivity to remote regions and expand access to sites and areas that support traditional land and resource use, including: - Access to harvesting areas and opening locations that were previously difficult to reach and supporting hunting, trapping, and fishing for local Indigenous communities. - Access to sites used for traditional activities, including hunting, trapping, fishing, and gathering. - Access to previously isolated grounds for berry picking and medicinal plant gathering. - Access to local harvesting of traditional foods and support for community food sharing. - Access to traplines, improving mobility for trappers. - Access to areas used for ceremonial and spiritual practices. The Project will improve access to currently remote areas and may benefit Indigenous	902

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		together. However, nothing about this process has been ideal and EFN continues to await a meaningful response to our previous correspondence while the Province's political timelines and pressures drive this EA.	communities already connected to the provincial road network by making it easier to exercise traditional land use rights. Shorter and safer travel to hunting, trapping, and fishing grounds can extend seasons, lower costs, and strengthen traditional harvesting. New routes to berry patches and medicinal plant sites support gathering across seasons, while better access to traplines supports set up and maintenance. Improved connectivity to ceremonial and teaching places reinforces cultural practices and intergenerational knowledge transfer. Enhanced access to the land can also bolster food security and sustain community food sharing. Eabametoong First Nation's request for an opportunity to participate in decisions is noted. Marten Falls First Nation continues to have discussions with the Province regarding the ownership and operations for the Community Access Road. It is anticipated that by the next phase of the Community Access Road, the owner and operator of the road will be confirmed. These conversations are ongoing, and consultation and engagement activities will be led by the provincial and federal government agencies with the owner/operator providing support, where needed. Eabametoong First Nation's comments on the process and timelines cannot be addressed by	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			Marten Falls. We would therefore encourage you to direct these to the regulators, as they will be best positioned to address them.	
Eabametoong First Nation	8	Appendix T – Community Well Being Based on our preliminary review of the Community Well Being (“CWB”) Appendix to the Draft EA, we are disappointed with the lack of community-relevant indicators, especially given CWB baseline data developed by MFFN in parallel with Eabametoong and Webequie First Nation over the past decade and funded by Ontario. As you know, we have conducted local community wellbeing baseline studies that contain valuable information regarding potential additional VCs and indicators that are relevant to the EA and the Aboriginal and Treaty rights assessment in particular. Ontario has received summary reports of these projects, and Eabametoong is willing to share insights and data from the baseline study and collaborate with the MFCAR team through a data sharing agreement.	Indigenous Knowledge used in the Community Well Being assessment is documented in Table 3.1 of Appendix T - Community Well-being Assessment. EFN knowledge informed the assessment, with primary contributions related to the Cultural Preservation and Change and Traditional Foods valued components. EFN is identified as a Regional Study Area (RSA) community for the Community Well Being assessment based on the potential for interaction with Project activities through the exercise of Aboriginal and/or Treaty Rights and Interests, particularly with respect to harvesting activities. Consistent with the established Community Well Being methodology, comprehensive baseline characterization across the full suite of community well being valued components is conducted for Local Study Area (LSA) communities only, defined as those with the greatest potential for direct spatial and functional interaction with the Project. For the Community Access Road Project, the LSA includes Marten Falls First Nation and Aroland First Nation. For RSA communities, including EFN, baseline characterization and effects assessment are	1009

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			undertaken on a pathway specific basis, focusing on those indicators for which a plausible interaction with Project activities has been identified. For EFN, these pathways are primarily associated with traditional harvesting. As a result, the baseline information provided in Appendix T emphasizes elements relevant to these pathways, including traditional foods and culturally important harvesting practices, rather than a comprehensive characterization of all community well being valued components. Targeted outreach related to socio economic considerations of the Community Access Road was undertaken, including outreach to EFN on December 3, 2023, to inquire whether the community had interests or concerns regarding potential social and/or economic effects of the Project. No response was received at that time. We acknowledge and appreciate EFN's offer to share insights and baseline data developed through community led wellbeing studies and recognize the value of this work. At this stage, the Final EA/IS and the Community Well Being Technical Support Document have been finalized and will not be reissued.	
Eabametoong First Nation	9	Role of Terms of Reference for Regional Assessment We understand that that the draft Terms of Reference for the regional assessment was released in September 2024, after the	While we recognize that the Community Access Road is one of several components of potential future development in the region, the timing of the Regional Assessment process did not allow for its integration into the Community	1010

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		cumulative effects assessment was underway, and therefore is not included in the EA Statement (EA Statement, p 72). In our view, over a year later, the Regional Assessment, with final TOR released in January 2025⁴, should be drawn on as much as possible in the EA Statement to ensure for full transparency for all stakeholders including First Nations. For example, the Indigenous co-led Regional Assessment Working Group has made significant progress on methodology and approach to considering the cumulative effects of various development scenarios (of varying development intensity and temporal scale) throughout the region. Most of those models take into account the possible construction of the Road and work is underway to consider the varying forms of induced development that may be possible, and the range of impacts that are likely throughout the region.	Access Road EA/IS. The draft Terms of Reference for the Regional Assessment were released in September 2024, and the final Terms of Reference were published on January 20, 2025. The Draft EA/IS for the Community Access Road was issued in February 2025, at which point the Regional Assessment was still in its very early stages and no substantive analysis was available to inform the project specific assessment. Similarly, the Regional Assessment Interim Report was released in February 2026, the same month as the Final EA/IS. As a result, there was no opportunity to incorporate the Interim Report into the Final EA/IS without delaying the project by a significant period. The Regional Assessment's final report is not expected until mid 2027, and it would not have been feasible to postpone the Draft or Final EA/IS in anticipation of a separate, multi year process led by the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada (IAAC). Instead, the Regional Assessment is intended to consider the Community Access Road and other related projects within a broader cumulative effects framework for the Ring of Fire region. Marten Falls First Nation remains committed to transparency and collaboration and will continue to share relevant information with IAAC to support the Regional Assessment	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			as it progresses.	
Eabametoong First Nation	10	Prior to the conclusion of the EA, the follow critical steps must be taken: MFFN support for EFN TK/TLRU data collection and inclusion into ATRI assessment (winter 2026) at a sufficient funding amount. EFN-MFFN Council meeting in January 2026 to discuss a government to government protocol, including EFN involvement in road governance, shared interests in impact avoidance and mitigation, and potential benefits. Written response to EFN questions on road proponency and management (not just EA proponency), and questions throughout this letter. Adjustments to the Draft ATRI report methodology based on the concerns identified in this letter. Assessment and mitigation of cumulative effects, in particular the significant and immediate impact of increased mining claims and exploration activities.	Refer to Response 5 (Internal ID 997).	1011
Eabametoong First Nation	10	Prior to the conclusion of the EA, the follow critical steps must be taken:	Consultation and engagement activities started in 2019, including the Indigenous Knowledge	1012

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
		MFFN/Ontario commitment to EFN involvement at critical decision-making points on the draft EA/EIS and Final EA/EIS, including focused dialogue on mitigation/accommodation measures including but not limited to long term Project monitoring and control of Road access in EFN use and occupancy areas.	Program. Funding was offered to Eabametoong First Nation starting in the summer of 2021. In addition to this funding Eabametoong First Nation was also offered funding for a community coordinator and later on to support their review of the Draft EA/IS. However, Eabametoong First Nation decided not to participate in any of the funding programs offered to them. The Draft EA/IS and Draft Community Well-Being Technical Support Document were released to Indigenous communities in February 2025 for a 120 day review and comment period ending June 23, 2025. This date was later extended to September 5, 2026 to accommodate requests from Indigenous communities and regulators, providing Indigenous communities over 6 months to provide their feedback. Eabametoong First Nation did not request an extension and provided their feedback on the Draft EA/IS on December 19, 2025. As per our communication of January 20, 2026 to Eabametoong First Nation their feedback on the Draft EA/IS could not be incorporated into the Final EA/IS given the late submission. The comment relating to Ontario's commitments to Eabametoong First Nation are outside the scope of the Community Access Road. We would therefore encourage you to	

Responses to Eabametoong First Nation Comments on the Final EA/IS

Group Name	Comment ID from source	Comment Raised	Response	Internal ID
			direct these to the regulators, as they will be best positioned to address them.	