December 16, 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 between December 8 and December 15, 2025.

To promote clarity and avoid duplication, the Applicant has consolidated its responses by thematic category. When appropriate, a single response has been prepared to address multiple questions or comments that fall within the same category.

General Comments
The following is in response to comments submitted by Ginette Turgeon, Eric Fortin, Francois Charbonneau, Jean-François Landry, André Tanguay, Sylvie Turner and Richard Massicotte. Several of the communications submitted between the response dates listed above did not pose any questions and were in the form of comments in favour or opposed to the Lac-Mégantic Bypass project for various reasons. We wish to thank the individuals who took the time to review the Application and formulate these comments, which are important to be raised before the CTA in this consultation process.
Route Selection
The following is in response to comments submitted by Luc Bouffard, Josette Maranda, Felix Dennis LaRocque. 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.

Risk of Contamination
The following is in response to comments submitted by Alexandra Sivret. As further developed in Appendix 3-1 – Environmental Effects Evaluation ("**EEE**"), there is a risk of contamination to the soil and groundwater during both the construction phase (Section 6.3.3 EEE) and operation phase (Section 6.4.3 EEE) of the proposed bypass. With the implementation of mitigation measures during construction (including amongst others, daily equipment inspections, reporting and clean-up of spills, and the use of clean materials in construction) the residual effect will be insignificant. With the implementation of mitigation measures during operations (including, amongst others, maintaining equipment in good working order and spill reporting and clean-up) the residual effects will also be insignificant. To mitigate uncertainty surrounding the potential impacts to the regional groundwater and the risk to drinking water, Transport Canada has committed to implement the Groundwater and Potable Water Well Monitoring Plan ("**GPWWMP**") (see Appendix 5-7). As part of the GPWWMP, potable water wells located within the assessment area will be monitored during the construction period, the post-construction period, and until the water table stabilizes. Transport Canada has made a commitment to ensure a constant and safe supply of drinking water for residents (mitigation measures TC-SG-08 to TC-SG-10). Section 7.1 of the GPWWMP details the steps TC will take in the event of a shortage of potable water as follows: (1) Emergency drinking water supply by means of bottled potable water and potable water available through a temporary outdoor tank, while a permanent solution is being put in place; (2) Deepening an existing well or construction of a new well; and (3) Connecting to a municipal aqueduct network when previous options have been considered and tested or deemed not applicable.
Train Whistling
The following is in response to comments submitted by Alexandra Sivret. As detailed on Transport Canada's website (Apply to stop train whistling at a public grade crossing), the *Canadian Rail Operating Rules* require all trains to whistle whenever they approach a public grade crossing. In some cases Municipalities may wish to stop the whistling to provide local residents with relief from the noise. There is a multi-step process, initiated by the Municipality, which may lead to the cessation of train whistling at public grade crossings.
Water Management
The following is in response to comments submitted by François Charbonneau. As shown on the design drawings include in Appendix 2-3 – Drawing Package, and as is common practice in both road and rail construction, the groundwater which comes out of the rock cuts will enter the ditches and flow into the receiving waterbodies (either the tributary streams or the river itself).

Groundwater and Potable Water Well Monitoring Plan
The following is in response to comments submitted by Gaby Gendron. 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.
Impact to Lac Megantic Municipal Water Supply
The following is in response to comments submitted by Gaby Gendron. As stated in Section 7.5 of Appendix 2-7 – Hydrogeology Report, "residences connected to the municipal supply are not expected to be impacted by the [groundwater] drawdown". Appendix 5-7 – Groundwater and Potable Water Well Monitoring Plan also states that, out of an abundance of caution, the municipal wells will be monitored.