December 12, 2025

RESPONSES PREPARED BY THE APPLICANT
TO COMMENTS SUBMITTED IN THE CONTEXT OF THE CTA PUBLIC CONSULTATION
ON THE APPLICATION FOR AUTHORIZATION OF THE LAC-MÉGANTIC RAIL BYPASS PROJECT

NOVEMBER 12, 2025 TO JANUARY 30, 2026

In the context of the Canadian Transportation Agency's ("**CTA**") public consultation on the application for authorization of the Lac-Mégantic Rail Bypass Project (the "**Project**"), Canadian Pacific Railway Company, doing business as Canadian Pacific Kansas City ("**CPKC**"), as the operating railway company and on behalf of Central Maine and Quebec Canada Railway Inc. (the "**Applicant**"), submits the following responses to questions and comments received during the December 2, 2025 in-person session held in the City of Lac-Mégantic.

1. How long will it take to get water if wells are affected? There could be several residences impacted at the same time—how will this be managed? What will the response time be if this happens on a weekend?
As described in Transport Canada's Groundwater and Potable Water Well Monitoring Plan (Appendix 5-7), monitoring of individual wells will occur on a regular basis so that trends can be identified and mitigations implemented at the different threshold levels (which in all cases are prior to wells running out of water). The specific intervention thresholds are described in Section 6 of the plan.
2. Who will bring water to residents, and where will this water come from since the groundwater will have been affected?
As described in Section 7 – Intervention of the Groundwater and Potable Water Well Monitoring Plan (included as Appendix 5-7), there are different methods of ensuring residents have water depending on the specifics of the situation. Amongst other solutions, this could include the provision of bottled water, providing water from a delivery truck into a cistern or drilling a new (deeper) well.
3. Are we really choosing the right route?
The route for the proposed Lac-Mégantic Bypass was established prior to CPKC's purchase of CMQR and subsequent involvement in the project. In 2015, AECOM was retained by the City of Lac-Mégantic to evaluate potential routes for a bypass around downtown Lac-Mégantic. This study considered topography, proximity to residential areas, and watercourse and road crossings amongst other factors. The preferred alignment from that study was carried forward into the initial provincial environmental review (BAPE) process and was ultimately the corridor that Transport Canada instructed CPKC to use for the detailed design of the project. The 2017 BAPE Report and the CPTAQ concluded that out of the five options identified at that time, the proposed route represented the most advantageous option considering its environmental, social and economic benefits, and considering it had the least impact on agricultural lands. Section 3 of Appendix 3-1 – Environmental Effects Evaluation presents a description of alternative routes as well as the retained route and its variants.

4. Will we be able to insure our home that will be less than 250 m from the bypass?

5. Will we be able to sell our home in the near future given the risks of impacts on our drinking water, considering that we are elderly?

If a homeowner believes that permanent depreciation of their property value is directly linked to the construction or operation of the bypass, despite mitigation measures by Transport Canada, they must provide evidence of the impact. If these claims are deemed valid, Transport Canada will engage with the homeowner to assess the situation, identify the source of the issues, and determine appropriate corrective measures.

6. How can the proposed route be considered acceptable given the numerous impacts ranging from moderate to significant?

The 2017 BAPE Report and the CPTAQ concluded that out of the five options identified at that time, the proposed route represented the most advantageous option considering its environmental, social and economic benefits, and considering it had the least impact on agricultural lands. Section 3 of Appendix 3-1 – Environmental Effects Evaluation presents a description of alternative routes as well as the retained route and its variants.

7. Who will be responsible for managing impacts (e.g., on drinking water, land subsidence) when they occur?

As stated in the Groundwater and Potable Water Well Monitoring Plan (included as Appendix 5-7), Transport Canada is responsible for the implementation of the plan (including the mitigations and interventions it describes).

8. Have they considered the impacts on surface water? Have they considered contamination of the Chaudière River by blasting products? This could have effects downstream, such as in Beauce. Have they thought about that?

Effects on surface water are discussed in Sections 6.3.4 (Construction Phase) and 6.4.4 (Operation Phase) of Appendix 3-1 – Environmental Effects Evaluation ("EEE"). With the exception of the reduction in surface water flow due to the lowering of the groundwater table (construction phase), which could be either significant or insignificant, the potential impact on all of the potential effects considered was found to be insignificant. This range is due to the uncertainty with respect to groundwater and the inability to directly mitigate a drawdown in regional groundwater, as further detailed in Appendix 3-2 – Communications on Potential Additional Studies. Additionally, as detailed in Appendix 5-4 – Construction Monitoring Plan for Surface Water, the quality of the surface water will be monitored during the construction phase of the project.

9. Who will benefit from the bypass?

As stated in the Application, the purpose of the Project, as articulated by the Government of Canada, is "promoting the collective wellbeing of the Lac-Megantic community" and "to help the community of Lac-Megantic move forward and mitigate the traumatic effects associated with the accident."

10. How can the Agency demonstrate its independence from TC in its decision-making? The Coalition recommended that the Agency obtain opinions from independent experts and make these opinions public.

As stated by the Government of Canada (www.canada.ca), the Canadian Transportation Agency is an independent, quasi-judicial tribunal and economic regulator. It makes decisions and determinations on a wide range of matters involving air, rail and marine modes of transportation under the authority of Parliament as set out in the Canada Transportation Act and other legislation.
11. What are the costs of the bypass? What will be the costs of decontaminating the old railway?
On November 14, 2025, CPKC launched the tender process for the construction of the Lac Megantic Bypass. As such, so that the construction bids being prepared are not unduly influenced, it would be inappropriate to comment on the potential costs at this time. No contract will be awarded until after the CTA has rendered a Decision on the Project.
12. What justifies the construction of the bypass?
As stated in the Application, the purpose of the Project, as articulated by the Government of Canada, is “promoting the collective wellbeing of the Lac-Megantic community” and “to help the community of Lac-Megantic move forward and mitigate the traumatic effects associated with the accident.”
13. What will be the level of tranquillity for residents near the bypass?
Appendix 3-6 – Noise and Vibration Assessment, Appendix 5-1 – Construction Noise Monitoring Plan and Appendix 5-2 Construction Vibration Monitoring and Building Survey Plan demonstrate there were a few residences that would see noise increases (without mitigation) above accepted thresholds. Anti-noise barriers comprised of anti-noise walls and earth berms will be constructed at specific locations to keep the noise increase experienced at these properties within accepted limits. Tables 6-8 and 6-20 of Appendix 3-1 – Environmental Effects Evaluation provide a noise and vibration effect assessment of the construction and operation phases of the project, and present recommended mitigation measures for each potential effect as well as the classification and significance rating of the residual effect. The implementation of recommended mitigation measures for the construction and operation phases of the Project is expected to render the residual effects on noise and vibration insignificant.
14. What will be the impact on safety at the level crossing on Rang 10 given the heavy road traffic at that intersection?
As more fully described in Section 6.4.9 of Appendix 3-1 – Environmental Effects Evaluation (“**EEE**”), there is projected to be an overall positive impact on traffic in the Lac Megantic Bypass project area. The removal of the railway from the downtown will improve the fluidity of traffic in this sector and there will be an increase in road safety due to a net reduction of 10 public grade crossings as well as a net reduction of 3 private grade crossings. Section 3.2.3 and Table 3-2 of Appendix 3-3 – Traffic Impact Study further detail the impact of the project on accessibility of emergency services in the study area and analyze travel times from/to emergency services before and after the implementation of the new track. Section 2.5.5 and Table 6-15 of the EEE provides that emergency services will be constantly informed of the traffic management plan, where and when roads are closed, and that detours and bypass lanes constructed will be wide enough to accommodate emergency vehicles.

15. Is it normal that the local population did not receive the same benefit as Indigenous peoples to obtain funding and conduct studies on wetlands?	
As described in detail on the Department of Justice website (Duty to consult and accommodate), the Crown (represented by the Government of Canada) has a constitutional obligation to consult with potentially affected Indigenous communities. In order to ensure that the potentially affected Indigenous communities can meaningfully participate in consultation, the Crown may offer funding.	
16. Why has the area of wetlands affected by the bypass decreased in recent years? Why has the ecological value of these wetlands been downgraded in those same years?	
As described more fulsomely in Section 5.3.6 on Appendix 3-1 – Environmental Effects Evaluation ("**EEE**"), the initial assessment was completed based on the 2018 environmental impact assessment ("EIA") produced as part of the BAPE process. This EIA relied on a review of aerial imagery and publicly available mapping. In order to increase the accuracy of the estimation of the area and types of wetlands which would be impacted by the project, Transport Canada commissioned a field study in 2024 of the future Right-of-Way which would be permanently impacted by the project. In 2025, additional refinement was made to wetland areas and types outside of the future Right-of-Way using more recent aerial images. Both of these activities led to updates in the EEE which more accurately predict the potential impacts of the project.	
17. What are the maximum timeframes for providing drinking water if wells are affected, including on weekends and holidays? How will this work during winter?	
As described in Transport Canada's Groundwater and Potable Water Well Monitoring Plan (Appendix 5-7), monitoring of individual wells will occur on a regular basis so that trends can be identified and mitigations implement at the different threshold levels (which in all cases are prior to wells running out of water). The specific intervention thresholds are described in Section 6 of the plan.	
18. Who will compensate property owners whose property values decrease due to drinking water issues, soil subsidence, foundation cracks, or other impacts?	
If a homeowner believes that permanent depreciation of their property value is directly linked to the construction or operation of the bypass, despite mitigation measures by Transport Canada, they must provide evidence of the impact. If these claims are deemed valid, Transport Canada will engage with the homeowner to assess the situation, identify the source of the issues, and determine appropriate corrective measures.	
19. Why are there no studies concerning the sediments of the Chaudière River and the risk of contamination if they resurface?	
As shown on the design drawings included in Appendix 2-3 – Drawing Package (specifically drawing SHT-CTA-TS-1002), the piers of the Chaudière River bridge have been set back from the edge of the water and no excavation is planned in the river itself.	

20. During the blasting, 55 million litres of water will escape from the water table and flow into the Chaudière River. This quantity of water would have been available to the region's residents for several generations to come.
During an average flood, approximately 9.9 million cubic meters of water discharge through the Chaudière River each day (see Appendix 2-8 – Hydraulic Study). The discharge from the project area is modelled to be 4,442 cubic meters per day (see Appendix 2-7 Hydrogeology Report) which represents 0.045% of the daily flow of the river.