

**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 16 and December 19, 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
<p>The following is in response to comments submitted by Violette Baillargeon, Bruno Bernier, Julie Potvin-Barakatt, Jocelyn Fortin, Jean Marcoux, Mi Bou, Jean Dubé, Sylvie Dubé, Jacques Huard, Christian Dubé, Alain Dodier, Françoise Forest, Jacinthe Bédard, Rosie Fredette-Champagne & Christophe Lachance.</p> <p>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.</p>
Risk to the Environment and Groundwater
<p>The following is in response to comments submitted by Marie-Hélène D. Roux, Richard Bolduc and Richard Breton.</p> <p>As identified in Appendix 3-1 – Environmental Effects Evaluation, the residual effects during the construction phase of the project for waterways, groundwater, and sensitive ecosystems could range from insignificant to significant (with the consequences of the residual effects ranging from moderate to very high). 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. The residual effects on private wells have been assessed to be insignificant with the implementation of mitigation measures. If impacts on private wells do materialize, Transport Canada has committed to implement the measures described in section 7.1 of the Groundwater and Potable Water Well Monitoring Plan, as follows:</p>

- (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.

Wetlands and Vegetation

The following is in response to comments submitted by Marie-Hélène D. Roux and Richard Bolduc.

As indicated in Appendix 3-1 – Environmental Effects Evaluation (“EEE”), mitigation measures focus on minimizing the project footprint and construction impacts. As indicated in Appendix 5-8 - Wetlands Monitoring Plan, and in Appendix 5-9 – Forest Compensation Monitoring Plan, Transport Canada has committed to propose and implement corrective measures to private landowners should there be impacts observed during the implementation of the monitoring program, or if there is further loss of forest outside the strip that is currently planned (a 5-m-wide strip along either side of the RoW (or 12.5-m-wide strip in maple tree stands).”

After implementation of adapted corrective measures where applicable, should there be permanent loss of wetlands observed outside the ROW, Transport Canada has committed to providing a financial contribution to the provincial wetland habitat compensation program. Mitigation measures to address potential loss of ecosystem functions provided by wetlands at a local or regional level, modification or loss of wildlife habitat due to hydrogeological impacts, or reduction in streamflow due to the potential lowering of the groundwater table are not part of the bypass project.

As described in Appendix 5-8 – Wetlands Monitoring Plan, if the permanent loss of wetlands is greater than 35ha, Transport Canada has committed to make additional contributions to the Provincial wetland habitat compensation program to offset the habitat loss.

Condition of the Current Track

The following is in response to comments submitted by Marie-Hélène D. Roux and Richard Bolduc.

Since CPKC’s purchase of the CMQ in 2019, over \$90 Million has been invested in the infrastructure to raise it to Class 3 Track Standards (as defined in Transport Canada’s *Rules Respecting Track Safety*). This has included the installation of new ties and rail, upgrades to the ballast and repair and replacement of watercourse crossings.

Train Speed

The following is in response to comments submitted by Richard Breton.

The proposed bypass has been designed by professional engineers in accordance with accepted engineering principals and standards (confirmed by the placement of the professional stamps on the drawings included Appendix 2-3 – Drawing Package). As described in Appendix 2-2 – Bypass Design Criteria, the engineering design of the bypass conforms to the requirements set by the Transport Canada Rules Respecting Track Safety for Class 3 Track, the standards set by the American Railway Engineering and Maintenance of Way Association (AREMA) in the 2024 version of the

December 19, 2025

Manual of Railway Engineering as well as other published engineering standards. The Transport *Canada Rules Respecting Track Safety* further specify that the maximum operating speed on Class 3 Track is 40 mph for freight trains (unless limited by other factors such as curvature).