


# GENERATION PGM

## 2014 Project Design Proposed in EA



**LEGEND:**

- WATER
- EMBANKMENT
- LANDFILL
- PROCESS SOLIDS/WATER
- PROPERTY BOUNDARY
- RECLAIM WATER PIPELINE
- HIGH SULPHUR PROCESS SOLIDS DELIVERY PIPELINE
- LOW SULPHUR PROCESS SOLIDS DELIVERY PIPELINE
- EXCESS WATER DISCHARGE PIPELINE
- SPILLWAY
- SPILLWAY / DISCHARGE LOCATION
- PROPOSED PUMP STATION WATER TREATMENT PLANT
- RECLAIM BARGE/PUMP
- LOW SULPHUR PROCESS SOLIDS DISCHARGE POINT
- HIGH SULPHUR PROCESS SOLIDS DISCHARGE POINT
- WATERSHED BOUNDARY (SEE NOTE 5)

**NOTES:**


- COORDINATE GRID IS UTM (NAD27) ZONE 18N AND IS IN METRES.
- PLAN BASED ON INFORMATION PROVIDED BY STILLWATER CANADA INC.
- CONTOURS ARE IN METRES. CONTOUR INTERVAL IS 10 METRES.
- ACCESS ROAD CONSTRUCTION REQUIRED ALONG PROPOSED PIPE ROUTES.
- WATERSHED BOUNDARIES AROUND THE PIT AND MINE ROCK STOCKPILE FROM CALDER DRAWING DATED SEPTEMBER 2011. ALL OTHER WATERSHED BOUNDARIES FROM ECOMETRIX DRAWING (DATED DEC. 2009).

SCALE 1:2500

STILLWATER CANADA INC.  
MARATHON PGM-Cu PROJECT  
IMPROVED OPTION 3  
PROCESS SOLIDS MANAGEMENT FACILITY  
GENERAL ARRANGEMENT

**Knight Piésold CONSULTING** FIGURE 1

## Preliminary Design 2020



**LEGEND:**

- WATER
- EMBANKMENT
- LANDFILL
- PROCESS SOLIDS/WATER
- PROPERTY BOUNDARY
- RECLAIM WATER PIPELINE
- HIGH SULPHUR PROCESS SOLIDS DELIVERY PIPELINE
- LOW SULPHUR PROCESS SOLIDS DELIVERY PIPELINE
- EXCESS WATER DISCHARGE PIPELINE
- SPILLWAY
- SPILLWAY / DISCHARGE LOCATION
- PROPOSED PUMP STATION WATER TREATMENT PLANT
- RECLAIM BARGE/PUMP
- LOW SULPHUR PROCESS SOLIDS DISCHARGE POINT
- HIGH SULPHUR PROCESS SOLIDS DISCHARGE POINT
- WATERSHED BOUNDARY (SEE NOTE 5)

**NOTES:**


- COORDINATE GRID IS UTM (NAD27) ZONE 18N AND IS IN METRES.
- PLAN BASED ON INFORMATION PROVIDED BY STILLWATER CANADA INC.
- CONTOURS ARE IN METRES. CONTOUR INTERVAL IS 10 METRES.
- ACCESS ROAD CONSTRUCTION REQUIRED ALONG PROPOSED PIPE ROUTES.
- WATERSHED BOUNDARIES AROUND THE PIT AND MINE ROCK STOCKPILE FROM CALDER DRAWING DATED SEPTEMBER 2011. ALL OTHER WATERSHED BOUNDARIES FROM ECOMETRIX DRAWING (DATED DEC. 2009).

SCALE 1:2500

STILLWATER CANADA INC.  
MARATHON PGM-Cu PROJECT  
IMPROVED OPTION 3  
PROCESS SOLIDS MANAGEMENT FACILITY  
GENERAL ARRANGEMENT


**Knight Piésold CONSULTING** FIGURE 1

# GENERATION PGM



## Marathon Palladium Project

- Generation PGM Inc.(GenPGM) proposes to develop an open pit mine and milling operation near the Town of Marathon and the community of Biigtigong Nishnaabeg.
- Ore will be processed (crushed, ground and concentrated) at an on-site processing facility.
- Final concentrates containing palladium (pd) and copper (cu), will be transported off-site via road and/or rail to a smelter and refinery for subsequent metal extraction and separation.
- The site preparation and construction phase will take 18 to 24 months. During peak construction workforce can reach up to 900 workers with an average of approximately 450 to 550.
- Production is estimated to start late 2023. For the operations phase, the workforce will comprise of an estimated 350 to 400 workers.
- The mine has been designed to ensure that the environment will be protected. Air emissions will be limited, water will be treated prior to discharge and disturbed areas will be reclaimed in a progressive manner throughout the mine life.
- Palladium and copper are considered “green metals”. Pd is used in vehicle engines to clean exhaust gas and Cu will be used significantly in battery and continued electrification of the future.




More Information on the Project can be found at [www.genmining.com](http://www.genmining.com)

and the Impact Assessment Registry at

<https://iaac-aeic.gc.ca/050/evaluations/proj/54755?culture=en-CA>

If you have additional questions, please email us at [comments@genpgm.com](mailto:comments@genpgm.com)



# GENERATION PGM

## Marathon Palladium Project Timelines

In 2014, the Project and the Environmental Assessment was paused shortly before the start of the Joint Review Panel (JRP) Hearings. Since the Project was only paused and not cancelled, the Environmental Assessment (EA) will be restarted generally from where it stopped.

Generation PGM Inc. has officially restarted the EA and will have to refresh some aspects of studies previously completed and submit the update to the Joint Review Panel.

Approximate timelines for the EA are provided below:

Stages for Environmental Assessment	TENTATIVE TIMELINE																					
	2020												2021						2022			
	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2
Baseline Data Collection/Confirm	█	█	█	█																		
Prepare Baseline Addendum				█	█	█	█															
Complete Impact Analysis/Models				█	█	█	█	█														
Joint Review Panel (JRP) Appointed						█	█	█	█													
Prepare Main Report Addendum						█	█	█	█	█												
Submit Addendum(s)						█	█	█	█	█	█											
Public Review Period						█	█	█	█	█	█	█										
JRP Information Requests (IRs)										█	█	█	█	█								
GenPGM Review and Respond to IRs											█	█	█	█	█							
JRP Review - Sufficiency Determined												█	█	█	█	█						
Panel Hearing Notice													█	█	█	█	█					
Public Hearings														█	█	█	█	█				
JRP Report															█	█	█	█	█			
Environment Ministers Decision																			█	█	█	█

## Overall Schedule for Project

### Key Steps for 2019/2023




### TIMELINE (ESTIMATED)

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Asset Acquisition	✓				
Update Resource	✓				
PEA Study	✓	✓			
New Listing					
Feasibility Study					
Permitting/Approvals					
Construction					
Production					➤


*Important note: Construction and production are subject to favorable results in the feasibility study, permitting and financing of the project.*

# GENERATION PGM



## Project Area

- 2020 optimized design largely unchanged from 2014.
- Project boundary is the same (blue outline).
- 2020 Project study area (green outline), relatively the same as 2014.
- Powerline and access road alternatives being considered.



## Local Study Area Environmental Assessment

# GENERATION MINING



## QUALITY PROJECTS

Generation Mining is a mineral exploration and development company focusing on palladium, copper, zinc and molybdenum projects in Canada. The company holds an option on an advanced project, the Marathon Palladium deposit in Northern Ontario. The company also holds four promising exploration projects in British Columbia, Nova Scotia and the Northwest Territories.



# GENERATION PGM

## MARATHON PROPERTY

Generation Mining has an option to acquire an initial 51% interest (and potentially up to an 80% interest) in Sibanye-Stillwater's Marathon PGM deposit located near Marathon, Ontario (the "Property"). The Property consists of 44 mining leases totaling 3,013 hectares, and an additional 82 contiguous mining claims covering 13,312 hectares.



The Property was developed from 1985 to 2010 by various companies and was eventually owned by Marathon PGM Corporation. Stillwater Mining Company ("Stillwater") acquired Marathon PGM Corporation in 2010 for US\$118 million. In 2017, the Property was acquired by Sibanye-Stillwater when it purchased Stillwater.

The Property is located in north-western Ontario approximately 215 km east of Thunder Bay and 10 km north of Marathon, Ontario, on the eastern margin of the Coldwell Complex. The known zones of significant mineralisation have a total north-south strike length of approximately 3km and dip 30° to 40° toward the west. The mineralisation has a true thickness ranging from 4m to 100m.

More than 146,000 metres of drilling in 790 holes have been drilled to date on the Property, which has been the subject of feasibility studies and numerous mineral resource estimates. The portion of the Property that hosts the Main Marathon deposit has no outstanding royalties.

The Property is located in close proximity to excellent infrastructure. The Trans-Canada highway runs through the Property, as does the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railroad. There are also several power lines crossing the Property. The town of Marathon, where many of the employees of the nearby Hemlo gold mine reside, offers a staging point for any future mine construction.



**GENERATION  
MINING**

# **GENERATION MINING**

**GENERATION PGM**

## North of Superior District School Board will re - open full day in-school instruction

The North of Superior Catholic District School Board said on its website that due to its small classroom sizes they will be offering in - school full day instructions with enhanced health and safety measures.

The NSCSB operates Holy Saviour School in Marathon.

The board said it has chosen this model to open based on the following: answering to the parents' surveys; students mental health and well being, and, students academic success.

The enhanced health and safety measures include:

Hand washing and hand sanitizing - handwashing stations will be available throughout the schools and offices. School staff will support students in ensuring proper handwashing is occurring frequently.

Two meter distance: two meter markers will be placed throughout the schools. Students will be separated by two meters throughout the school day both in the class and when transitioning to and from recess.

Cleaning of building: High touch surfaces like banisters, door handles, light switches, elevator buttons, etc. will be sanitized on a continuous basis throughout the day by the custodians. Toilets and sinks will be sanitized on a continuous basis throughout the day by the custodians.

Teaching and learning: This is a new learning situation. Our goal is to provide students with

some familiarity of school routines for social/emotional/academic learning in a school environment. Lessons will be designed to provide practice for consolidating skills and will focus on some new learning where possible. Teachers will use teaching materials, strategies and teaching styles that are familiar to the students. The academic work for the students will be as familiar and as independent as possible. Spiraling and narrowing of the curriculum is recommended in order to help reduce the learning gaps.

Outdoor play time: Students should have at least two recesses during the day. This is imperative for their mental health and well - being. These recesses will also be used in lieu of physical education classes. Students go out to play with their classroom teacher and two groups of students at a time. Groups of students remain separate outside.

Breakfast club, lunch and snacks: All students will eat snacks and lunch in their classroom. Breakfast clubs will be operating during the entire school year. Volunteers will wear masks or face shields and gloves while in the building. Breakfasts will be provided to classrooms in an individual paper bag - one per student. Lunch is provided at a staggered time. Students may leave the premises to eat lunch at home at their scheduled time.



The MV Peninsula on the beach adjacent to the Marathon Boat Launch. (Photo by Gord Wright)

### 'Peninsula not part of town's plans moving forward' - Skworchinski

In a second affidavit submitted to the Ontario Superior Court of Justice involving the Peninsula tugboat, Marathon CAO/clerk Daryl Skworchinski said that after the April 24, 2020 deadline passed he made various inquiries concerning the potential removal of the Peninsula.

The town's lawyer - Michael Strickland - spoke with Gerry Dawson, owner/manager of Thunder Bay Tug Services Ltd., regarding the removal and towing of the Peninsula back to Thunder Bay for storage and disposal and he was advised that the cost of a one - way trip from Thunder Bay to Marathon was \$14,000. meaning \$28,000. round - trip plus the time on site to get the Peninsula in the water. The estimated cost to return the Peninsula to Thunder Bay would

be \$35,000.

Strickland also told Skworchinski that Thunder Bay Tug advised him that there was a real risk that the Peninsula's stern could become damaged in the process of dragging the Peninsula back into the water. Such damages would increase costs and/or mean that the Peninsula could no longer be towed to Thunder Bay harbour. Storage in Thunder Bay would also be an additional and on - going cost if the Peninsula were taken to Thunder Bay.

Strickland also told Skworchinski that he inquired whether or not Thunder Bay Tug would be prepared to tow and store the Peninsula and as storer seek recovery of its costs through its own liens on the Peninsula and Mr. Dawson was

not interested in this proposal.

Skworchinski said he also contacted Priestly Demolition regarding potential services it might render and was advised it would attend at the site, dismantle the Peninsula on site and remove the scrap created for \$35,000. plus HST with Priestly Demolition then keeping the scrap metal and any other proceeds.

Skworchinski concluded his affidavit noting the Peninsula is not part of the Town of Marathon's plans moving forward. It is merely taking up space next to a public boat launch and devolving into a blight on the community's image. Since April 24, 2020 the Peninsula has been stored on the town's land without consent of the town.

### Museum did not deliver removal plan as requested by town

(Con't from Page 1.)

On Nov. 25, 2019 the town advised the museum: it was not agreeable to providing any of its land for a permanent placement of the Peninsula; it was not agreeable to providing funding for the Peninsula project or for perpetual care of the Peninsula; it was not agreeable to insuring the Peninsula; it was not agreeable to extending the deadline, and, failure to comply with the Nov. 30, 2019 deadline would result in the town enforcing available remedies under the Repair and Storage Liens Act.

The museum did not deliver a plan and failed to comply with the Nov. 30 deadline and on Jan. 27, 2020 . the town told the museum that it would levy storage fees of \$750. per month beginning Feb. 1, 2020. and advised that the Peninsula was to be removed by April 24, 2020 failing which it would have the Peninsula disposed of.

On Feb. 7, 2020 the town notified the museum that no further meetings would be held to address the Peninsula and again invited the museum to provide a detailed plan to a Marathon councillor and the museum has never provided said plan.

In the application, the town said 'the Peninsula remains situate on town lands and is a public safety hazard'.

Stan Johnson, president of

the Marathon and District Historical Society and the main

force behind the Peninsula Project said he has 'no comment, at this time, and we are exploring all options that are available to us'.

### Happy 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary



Ellie and Terry Cooper were married on August 8, 1970 in Ellie's hometown of South Oxhey, England after meeting here in Marathon. It wasn't in Ellie's original plans to stay this long but Terry stole her heart and the rest is history. Ellie and Terry are the proud parents of Robin (Ralph) and David (Keith) and more recently a grandson Luke. An anniversary trip to England was in the plans but was not to be. Their family is proud of this major milestone and the loving example they set for a truly special partnership.

Congratulations!

### GENERATIONPGM

Generation PGM Inc. is excited to announce the restart of the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the **Marathon Palladium Project**. The Project footprint is largely unchanged from the 2014 design, and current optimizations within that footprint are being explored for the Project.

Although traditional indoor town hall meetings are not an option currently during the pandemic, we are available to answer your questions regarding the Project, design, timelines, and EA process.

Our Main Office in Marathon at 90 Peninsula Road will be open for drop ins on August 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> from 2:00 pm to 7:00 pm.

Social distancing will be respected, only five (5) visitors can be allowed at anytime and everyone is asked to wear masks. Alternatively, if you have questions please email at:

[comments@genpgm.com](mailto:comments@genpgm.com)



GM  
CANADA

## SPADONI MOTORS MARATHON

2 ONTARIO ST. SUITE 1 | MARATHON, ON | P0T 2E0  
CALL: 807.229.3330 | EMAIL: SPADONIMARATHON@SHAW.CA  
WEBSITE: WWW.SPADONIMOTORS.CA  
FIND US ON FACEBOOK: @SPADONIMARATHON



SERVING CUSTOMERS ALONG THE NORTH SHORE FOR 90+ YEARS!  
GREAT SELECTION OF NEW GMC, CHEVROLET & BUICK VEHICLES & CERTIFIED  
PRE-OWNED VEHICLES AT SPADONI MOTORS LIMITED IN MARATHON & TERRACE BAY!

**DAYNA BOBROWSKI-LOWNDES**  
MARATHON SALES & RENTAL CONSULTANT

CONTACT DAYNA AT 807.229.3330  
FOR YOUR SALES & RENTAL NEEDS TODAY!

When you embrace change,  
you embrace life's possibilities.



At IG Wealth Management, we're changing the way people see wealth. By proactively adjusting your whole financial picture, our advisors will help you explore life's possibilities.



**IG WEALTH MANAGEMENT**  
Welcome Change

**Laura Daley, RRC**  
Consultant  
Investors Group Financial Services Inc.

(807) 229-1147  
[laura.daley@investorsgroup.com](mailto:laura.daley@investorsgroup.com)

formerly  Investors Group

# GENERATION PGM

## MARATHON PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT TECHNICAL WORKSHOPS

### DAY ONE

19 August 2020



# DISCLAIMER

GENERATION PGM

This presentation (in this projected form and as verbally presented) (Presentation) is provided on the basis that neither Generation Mining Limited (Gen Mining), nor its officers, shareholders, related bodies corporate, partners, affiliates, employees, representatives and advisors make any representation or warranty (express or implied) as to the origin, validity, accuracy, reliability, relevance, currency or completeness of the material contained in the Presentation and no responsibility is taken for any errors or omissions. Nothing contained in the Presentation is, or may be relied upon as, a promise, representation or warranty, whether as to the past or the future.

Gen Mining excludes all warranties (including implied warranties) and all liability that can be excluded by law for any loss, claim, damage, cost or expense of any nature (including that arising from negligence) arising out of the Presentation (or any accompanying or other information) whatsoever, nor by reason of any reliance upon it. Gen Mining accepts no responsibility to update any person regarding any inaccuracy, omission or change in information in this Presentation or any other information made available to a person or any obligation to furnish the person with any further information.

The Presentation contains "forward-looking statements". Where the Presentation expresses or implies an expectation or belief as to future events or results, such expectation or belief is expressed in good faith and is believed to have a reasonable basis. However, forward-looking statements are subject to risks, uncertainties and other factors, which could cause actual results to differ materially from future results expressed, projected or implied by such forward looking statements. Such risks include, but are not limited to, price volatility, currency fluctuations, increased production costs and variances in ore grade, recovery rates or other matters from those assumed in mining plans, as well as political and operational risks and governmental regulation and judicial outcomes. Gen Mining does not undertake any obligation to release publicly any revisions to any "forward-looking statement" to reflect events or circumstances after the date of the Presentation, or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as may be required under applicable securities laws. Statements relating to reserve and resource estimates are expressions of judgment, based on knowledge and experience and may require revision based on actual production experience.

Such estimates are necessarily imprecise and depend to some extent on statistical inferences and other assumptions, such as metal prices, cut-off grades and operating costs, which may prove to be inaccurate. Information provided relating to projected costs, capital expenditure, production profiles and timelines are expressions of judgment only and no assurances can be given that actual costs, production profiles or timelines will not differ materially from the estimates contained in this Presentation.

All persons should seek appropriate professional advice in reviewing or considering the Presentation and all other information with respect to Gen Mining and evaluating the business, financial performance and operations of Gen Mining. Neither the provision of the Presentation nor any information contained in the Presentation or subsequently communicated to any person in connection with the Presentation is, or should be taken as, constituting the giving of investment or financial product advice to any person in respect of dealing in Gen Mining securities, and no such information should be taken to constitute a recommendation or statement of opinion that is intended to influence a person in making a decision to deal in Gen Mining securities.

This Presentation does not purport to contain all of the information that may be required to evaluate all of the factors that would be relevant in determining whether to deal in Gen Mining securities, including but not limited to any person's objectives, financial situation or needs. Each person must not rely on the information provided but should make, and will be taken to have made, its own investigation, assessment and analysis of the information in this Presentation and other matters that may be relevant to it in considering whether to deal in Gen Mining securities. Gen Mining owns the copyright in this Presentation.

8:50am to 9:00am

1. Introductions meeting facilitator(s) announce who is on call – GenPGM for proponent and IA Agency for governments
2. IA Agency provide Overview of Joint Review Panel Background and Process (IA Agency)
3. Provide Project Update and Schedule (GenPGM)
4. General Overview of Workplan to Refresh EIS (Stantec)
5. General discussion/feedback/next steps for topics reviewed – Federal and Provincial gov't
6. Hydrology (Stantec)
7. Hydrogeology (Stantec)
8. Surface Water Quality (Ecometrix)
9. General discussion/next steps for topics reviewed – Federal and Provincial gov't

8:50am to 9:00am \*\* Note Time Slots for Topics in Eastern Time (ET) listed at the bottom of most slides

## AGENDA- WORKSHOP DAY 1 (CONTINUED)

GENERATION PGM

10. Geochemistry, Fate Modelling, Discharge (Ecometrix)
11. General discussion/feedback/next steps for topics reviewed – Federal and Provincial gov't
12. Geotechnical and Site Water Balance (KP)
13. Mine Waste Alternatives Assessment (KP)
14. General discussion/feedback/next steps for topics reviewed – Federal and Provincial gov't
15. Closing General discussion/feedback/next steps for topics reviewed

8:50am to 9:00am

# INTRODUCTIONS / PARTICIPANT LIST

**GENERATION PGM**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Discipline / Role on Project</b>
Tabatha LeBlanc	Generation PGM Inc.	Point of Contact Proponent Project Manager
Ruben Wallin	WESC Inc.	EA PM and Support - GenPGM Inc.
Paula Sdao	Stantec Consulting Ltd.	EA Consulting Project Manager, Permitting
Piero Amodeo	Stantec Consulting Ltd.	EA PM Backup/Provincial EA Lead
Chris Powell	Stantec Consulting Ltd.	Federal EA Lead/JRP Lead
Jennifer Mills	Stantec Consulting Ltd.	Indigenous/Community Engagement Lead
Gregory Crooks	Stantec Consulting Ltd.	Atmospheric Lead
Frank Babic	Stantec Consulting Ltd.	Acoustic and Vibration Lead
Michelle Fraser	Stantec Consulting Ltd.	Hydrogeology Lead
Sheldon Smith	Stantec Consulting Ltd.	Hydrology Lead
Mark Shrimpton	Stantec Consulting Ltd.	Socioeconomic Lead
Colin Varley/Meaghan Rivard	Stantec Consulting Ltd.	Archaeology/Cultural Heritage
Isaac Bartlett	Stantec Consulting Ltd.	Traffic Lead
Alex McIntyre	Knight Piésold Ltd.	Feasibility Study/PSMF/MRSA
Craig Hall	Knight Piésold Ltd.	Feasibility Study/PSMF/MRSA
Brian Fraser	Ecometrix Incorporated	Aquatics, Surface Water Quality, HHRA, CEA
Ron Nicholson	Ecometrix Incorporated	Geochemistry
Robert Foster	Northern Bioscience	Terrestrial, Caribou

8:50am to 9:00am

# INTRODUCTIONS / PARTICIPANT LIST (CONTINUED) **GENERATION PGM**

Name	Organization	Discipline / Role on Project
Government list to be provided...		

8:50am to 9:00am

# OVERVIEW OF JOINT REVIEW PANEL BACKGROUND AND PROCESS

GENERATION PGM

- IA Agency to provide an overview of the Joint Review Panel (JRP) process for the Marathon Palladium Project (the Project).

9:00am to 9:20am

## Background

- January 2014 - EA put on pause 4 weeks before the start of JRP hearings; Project placed on care and maintenance
- December 2016 - Sibanye Gold acquired Stillwater and formed Sibanye-Stillwater
- 2014 to 2019 - Project continued with baseline data collection, exploration activities and engagement with Indigenous communities and the Town of Marathon
  - Baseline Data: monitored surface water flow / surface water quality data and terrestrial studies over the Site Study Area and exploration areas
  - Exploration: conducted prospecting and geophysics studies and partnered on research projects
  - Engagement: communication with Indigenous communities and the Town of Marathon regarding the status of the Project and exploration activities

## Proponent

- Original proponent: Stillwater Canada Inc. (Stillwater)
  - Currently a subsidiary of Sibanye-Stillwater
- July 2019 – Joint Venture formed between Generation Mining Limited (GML) and Stillwater
  - GML - an exploration / development company, an experienced management team with a track record of advancing projects to operations (e.g. Wheaton River, Thompson Creek, Glencairn Gold and Detour Gold)
- New Proponent: Generation PGM Inc (GenPGM)
  - A wholly-owner, subsidiary of GML
  - 51% ownership and operator of the Joint Venture
- March 2020 – GML initiated a Feasibility Study to update previous technical studies, optimize the Project design and operating strategy and confirm the financial viability of the Project

# LOCATION


# GENERATION PGM



9:20am to 9:40am

# STUDY AREAS

# GENERATION PGM




## Project Area

- 2020 optimized design largely unchanged from 2014.
- Project boundary is the same (blue outline).
- 2020 Project study area (green outline), relatively the same as 2014.
- Powerline and access road alternatives being considered.


## PROJECT 2014

- Site Study Area (SSA) outlined in green
- Current progress of optimized designs *suggests* no major infrastructure outside of SSA will be required
- Minor changes to access and infrastructure within the SSA are being evaluated



## Key Design Elements Being Progressed and Evaluated

- Mineral Reserve Estimate
  - Anticipating to increase mine life and total ore mined
- Mine Rock Storage Area footprint
  - Locations to be largely unchanged
  - Including mine rock storage into mined-out pits
- Process Solids Management Facility (PSMF)
  - Location and footprint unchanged
  - Inclusion of a water management pond within the original PSMF footprint
  - Storage capacity to match updated reserves
  - Potentially acid generating (PAG or Type 2 material) to be placed into the PSMF in years prior to in Pit storage being available
- Process flowsheet design
  - Creating a marketable off-take of high sulfide material that can be delivered to an off-site processing facility



# Preliminary Design 2020

- LEGEND:**
- WATER
  - EMBANKMENT
  - LANDFILL
  - PROCESS SOLIDS/WATER
  - PROPERTY BOUNDARY
  - RECLAIM WATER PIPELINE
  - HIGH SULPHUR PROCESS SOLIDS DELIVERY PIPELINE
  - LOW SULPHUR PROCESS SOLIDS DELIVERY PIPELINE
  - EXCESS WATER DISCHARGE PIPELINE
  - SPILLWAY
  - SPILLWAY / DISCHARGE LOCATION
  - PROPOSED PUMP STATION/WATER TREATMENT PLANT
  - RECLAIM BARGE/PUMP
  - LOW SULPHUR PROCESS SOLIDS DISCHARGE POINT
  - HIGH SULPHUR PROCESS SOLIDS DISCHARGE POINT
  - WATERSHED BOUNDARY (SEE NOTE 5)

- NOTES:**
1. COORDINATE GRID IS UTM (NAD27) ZONE 18N AND IS IN METRES.
  2. PLAN BASED ON INFORMATION PROVIDED BY STILLWATER CANADA INC.
  3. CONTOURS ARE IN METRES. CONTOUR INTERVAL IS 10 METRES.
  4. ACCESS ROAD CONSTRUCTION REQUIRED ALONG PROPOSED PIPE ROUTES.
  5. WATERSHED BOUNDARIES AROUND THE PIT AND MINE ROCK STOCKPILE FROM CALDER DRAWINGS DATED SEPTEMBER 2011. ALL OTHER WATERSHED BOUNDARIES FROM ECONOMETRIX DRAWINGS (DATED DEC. 2009).




STILLWATER CANADA INC.  
 MARATHON PGM-Cu PROJECT  
 IMPROVED OPTION 3  
 PROCESS SOLIDS MANAGEMENT FACILITY  
 GENERAL ARRANGEMENT

# PROCESS SOLIDS MANAGEMENT FACILITY


# GENERATION PGM

- No fundamental change to the past design
- Update trade-off and technology evaluations (BAT/BAP)
- Proposed change to Cell 1 for water management pond (no process solids in Cell 1)
- Improvement to water management / quality
- Integration of sitewide water balance




9:20am to 9:40am

# COMPARISON



2014  
Project  
Design  
Proposed  
in EA



Preliminary  
Design  
2020

# DETAILED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE

# GENERATION PGM

Stages for Environmental Assessment	TENTATIVE TIMELINE																										
	2020												2021												2022		
	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3				
Baseline Data Collection/Confirm	█	█	█	█																							
Prepare Baseline Addendum				█	█																						
Complete Impact Analysis/Models				█	█	█																					
Joint Review Panel (JRP) Appointed						█	█																				
Prepare Main Report Addendum						█	█	█																			
Submit Addendum(s)						█	█	█	█																		
Public Review Period							█	█	█	█																	
JRP Information Requests (IRs)								█	█	█	█																
GenPGM Review and Respond to IRs										█	█	█															
JRP Review - Sufficiency Determined											█	█	█														
Panel Hearing Notice												█	█	█	█												
Public Hearings													█	█	█	█											
JRP Report																█	█	█	█	█	█						
Environment Ministers Decision																					█	█	█				

9:20am to 9:40am

# MARATHON PROJECT SCHEDULE

- Environmental Impact Statement Report / Review Panel / Federal and Provincial Impact Assessment Approval: Q2-2020 to Q4-2021
- Feasibility Study: Q2-2020 to Q1-2021
- Financial Investment / Construction Decision: Q2-2021 to Q3-2021
- Environmental Permitting: Q1-2022 to Q2-2023
- Detailed Design / Construction / Commissioning: Q4-2021 to Q3-2023
- Operations: 2023 to 2038+

## TIMELINE (ESTIMATED)

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Asset Acquisition	✓				
Update Resource	✓				
PEA Study	✓	✓			
New Listing					
Feasibility Study					
Permitting/Approvals					
Construction					
Production					➤

9:20am to 9:40am

- Stantec undertook an analysis of the Project documentation for the environmental assessment work completed in support of the Project that was submitted by Stillwater to the JRP between 2012 and 2014
- The purpose of the analysis was to consider the potential changes that may be required to the baseline and environmental assessment work as a result of:
  - changes to provincial or federal legislation and guidance material that has occurred since 2012
  - changes to technical criteria and standards that have been introduced since 2012
  - changes to computer models since 2012, which are now expected to be used to assess Project effects

## EIS ADDENDUM REVIEW (CONTINUED)

**GENERATION PGM**

- changes to federal, provincial, or municipal guidelines that may have an impact on baseline data gathering, establishment of baseline conditions, or assessment of the effects of the Project (i.e., thresholds for significance criteria)
- changes to existing site conditions that may have occurred in the Project area (Site Study Area (SSA), Local Study Area (LSA), Regional Study Area (RSA) that could affect baseline conditions (i.e., new or reduced development, new industry, etc.) or potential effects of the Project

9:40am to 10:00am

- Gather additional targeted Baseline Data to address time lapse
- Reassess conclusions with respect to updated Regulations, Guidelines, or Standards to reflect updated thresholds for significance
- Re-model/reassess to update effects assessment due to mine plan changes, model updates, new parameters (i.e., changes to pit design, MRSA, PSMF, access road, plant location, production rate)
- Additional assessment of Project Effects and Cumulative Effects to reconfirm previous conclusions or address potential changes through additional mitigation

- Update and/or confirm targeted baseline conditions (existing conditions) pertaining to the various technical disciplines (VECs/VCS) to reflect updated background information, confirm site conditions and confirm the characterization of the existing environment
- Prepare an EIS Addendum that reflects an update of the environmental assessment based on updated baseline conditions, refined site plan and updated effects assessment incorporating recognition of new criteria, standards, and thresholds to confirm or refine previous EIS conclusions
- EIS Addendum to be prepared based on CEAA 2012, EIS Guidelines and JRP Terms of Reference

# PAUSE FOR DISCUSSIONS

10:00am to 10:15am

## Topics for discussion:

- Project Updates
- Proposed Schedule
- EIS Addendum Approach

# ORIGINAL HYDROLOGY REVIEW: REGIONAL HYDROLOGY

# GENERATION PGM

Regional climate information was collected from four Environmental Canada weather stations within 35 km of the Project site.

Station Name	Station ID	Data Record	Distance from Site (km)	Elevation (m)	Latitude	Longitude	Average Annual Precipitation (mm)	Average Annual Snowfall (mm)	Mean Temperature Range (°C)
Marathon	6044959	1952 - 1983 (32)	8 km (SW)	189.0	48°43'00" N	86°24'00" W	826.5	238.1	-13.9 to 14.6
Marathon Airport	6044961	1989 - 1999 (11)	4 km (SW)	315.5	48°45'20" N	86°20'40" W	847.9	236.3	-15.2 to 15.0
Pukaskwa Nat. Park	6046770	1984 - 2004 (21)	15 km (S)	192.0	48°36'00" N	86°18'00" W	737.3	196.7	-13.4 to 15.4
Hemlo Battle Mountain	6043452	1986 - 2001 (16)	30 km (E)	335.0	48°42'00" N	85°53'00" W	766.1	197.8	-14.7 to 16.8

Regional hydrometric flow data was collected from the following Water Survey of Canada stations:

Station Name	Station ID	Data Record	Drainage Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	Latitude	Longitude	Average Yearly Flow (m <sup>3</sup> /s)
Little Pic River near Coldwell	02BA003	1972 - 2010 (38)	1320	48°50'56" N	86°36'25" W	15.7
Pic River near Marathon	02BB003	1970 - 2010 (40)	4270	48°46'26" N	86°17'47" W	51.5
Black River near Marathon	02BB002	1967 - 1990 (23)	1980	48°41'20" N	86°12'45" W	26.6
Cedar Creek near Hemlo	02BB004	1984 - 2010 (26)	201	48°42'22" N	85°54'33" W	2.26

10:15am  
to  
10:45am



The Project site near Marathon, Ontario

# ORIGINAL HYDROLOGY REVIEW: LOCAL HYDROLOGY

# GENERATION PGM

## Watershed Delineation

- 8 major sub-basins (numbers 101 through 108) with the total drainage area of 7,263 hectares




## Field Stations

Manual flow measurements were made at 41 locations (S1 to S41)

- Continuous stream flow data was recorded at six locations (S10, S11, S14, S15, S22, and S41)

## Rating Curves




- Rating Curves were used to determine the flow from the recorded water pressure and water level data





Drainage Patterns and Sub-Basins

## Seasonal Hydrograph

Sample hydrographs for the S11 station (near the outlet of Hare Lake) in 2009, 2010 and 2011



## Monthly mean flow comparison by year for the S11 and S14



10:15am to 10:45am

# HYDROLOGY – UPDATES THROUGH THE IR PROCESS GENERATION PGM

- The IR raised concerns about the accuracy of the developed rating curve relationships for the gauging sites and recommended the barometric compensation of the 2010 data set to improve the relationship established for the rating curve
  - SCI in response used the barometric pressure readings recorded by Environment Canada at the Pukaskwa AUT Climate Station (ID #6046767) to correct the recorded 2010 streamflow data at the gauging sites (S11, S14, and S41)
- The IR raised concerns about collecting the climate information for the period of 1952 to 1983 (Marathon station) and recommended considering a long-term data record using more recent observations for precipitation data to produce more reliable and accurate results
  - SCI in response reviewed data from nine climate stations to assess the degree monthly precipitation derived from a longer data set would differ from the precipitation data set that was applied in the analysis

Station Name	Station ID	Data Record	Distance from Site (km)	Elevation (m)	Latitude	Longitude	Average Annual Precipitation (mm)	Average Annual Snowfall (mm)	Mean Temperature Range (°C)
Marathon	6044959	1952 – 1983 (32)	8 km (SW)	189.0	48°43'00" N	86°24'00" W	826.5	238.1	-13.9 to 14.6
Marathon Airport	6044961	1989 – 1999 (11)	4 km (SW)	315.5	48°45'20" N	86°20'40" W	890.9	261.6	-13.9 to 14.8
Pukaskwa Nat. Park	6046770	1984 – 2004 (21)	15 km (S)	192.0	48°36'00" N	86°18'00" W	811.7	219.7	-13.5 to 15.6
Pukaskwa (AUT)	6046767	1996-2012 (17)	15 km (S)	207.6	48°35'18" N	86°17'41" W	-	-	-
Hemlo Battle Mountain	6043452	1986 – 2001 (16)	30 km (E)	335.0	48°42'00" N	85°53'00" W	809.7	223.8	-14.5 to 16.8
Geraldton A	6042716	1981-2012 (32)	125 km (NE)	348.4	49°46'58" N	86°55'50" W	758.3	241.2	-18.5 to 17.3
Terrace Bay	6048230	1972-1999 (28)	60 km (W)	289.0	48°48'00" N	87°06'00" W	811.5	210.3	-14.7 to 15.1
Terrace Bay A	6048231	1996-2006 (11)	60 km (W)	289.6	48°49'00" N	87°06'00" W	906.8	267.6	-14.4 to 15.8
White River	6059475	1886-1976 (91)	76 km (E)	378.9	48°36'00" N	85°17'00" W	749.0	260.2	-17.6 to 15.9

10:15am to 10:45am

- Continue monitoring the baseline/existing conditions to present and demonstrate that the pervious hydrology work is still representative of the current baseline conditions
- Update the baseline data collection methodology to provide adequate manual flow readings and spot measurements used in rating curve development (i.e., installing barometric and surface water loggers to update the available baseline data record)
- Update/improve the rating curve equations using the updated baseline data record

- Effects of proposed changes will be assessed
- Effects assessment will be updated using new baseline data and predictions
- Previous conclusions will be validated/verified
- Output will feed into the Site Water Balance

- Groundwater level and quality data was collected from 2008 to 2011 from a monitoring well network consisting of 36 monitoring wells
- 2020 baseline update involved collecting groundwater quality and groundwater level data at 10 of the monitoring wells to confirm the 2008 to 2011 baseline conditions for groundwater
- Comparison of the 2020 groundwater data to the 2012 baseline technical report will be documented in a technical memorandum

- Potential merging of the open pit and four satellite pits may result in changes to the EA prediction of groundwater flow, groundwater seepage pathways and rates from the mine rock stockpiles to surface water receivers, and open pit dewatering rates
- Expansion of the mine rock stockpile and increasing the height of the PSMF may result in changes to the EA prediction of seepage rates and quality to groundwater, and subsequently to the surface water receiver
- Changes to the prediction of effects to groundwater quantity and quality as a result of Project Optimization has the potential to affect the water balance and water quality model for prediction of effects to surface water quantity and quality

- Rerun the groundwater flow model to predict the groundwater flow contours, dewatering rate to the open pit, and seepage rates and pathways for the same scenarios completed in the EA (3 scenarios, two for operation and one for closure). We assume the model will not have to be recalibrated
- Update the predictions of mass loading (seepage rate and quality) from the mine rock stockpile and PSMF to surface water. We will require updated estimates of seepage quality from the mine rock stockpile and PSMF from the geochemistry team
- Incorporate the results of the updated prediction of effects to groundwater quantity and quality into the assessment of effects of surface water quantity and quality (e.g. water balance and water quality model)

- Key uses of the data derived from the original baseline surface water quality characterization program
  - characterize existing conditions
  - define background water quality for the purpose of assessing potential Project-related effects (e.g., effects of mine/mill water discharges)

- Key results of the original baseline surface water quality characterization program
  - Concentrations of most parameters were below the respective provincial and federal Water Quality Guidelines and Objectives (WQG/WQO) on most occasions
  - Isolated WQG exceedances small in magnitude and typical of regional background or associated with mineralized areas on the Project site
  - Little evidence of significant groundwater–surface water interaction (strong correlation between concentrations of conservative tracers in headwater and down stream areas; no correlation between concentrations of conservative tracers in groundwater and surface waters)

- Original baseline surface water quality characterization was extensive:
  - Sampling network comprising 58 sampling stations
  - Monthly sampling between 2008 and 2012 during ice-free season
  - Included a wide-suite of constituents (physical parameters, nutrients and carbon, anions, metals, organics, radionuclides)
  - Routine data supplemented by sampling events in winter (under ice) and spot measurements back to the early 2000s
  - > 60,000 discrete data points
  - Supplemental Information Document (SID) #3

- Update to the baseline surface water quality characterization program
  - Routine, seasonal sampling of select sampling stations representing key downstream locations in the various subwatersheds has been ongoing since the EA was put on hold
  - Same wide suite of water quality constituents that were measured in the past
  - Analysis of combined data set ongoing to identify temporal/spatial trends in the data that may need to be considered in the effects assessment
- Results and conclusions of this analysis to be summarized in a technical memo that will be an attachment to the EIS Addendum
  - Updated data set will be used to:
    - characterize existing conditions
    - define background water quality for the purpose of assessing potential Project-related effects (e.g., effects of mine/mill water discharges)

# PAUSE FOR DISCUSSIONS

## Topics for discussion:

- Hydrology
- Hydrogeology
- Surface Water

- Geochemical characteristics of mine process streams (mine rock, process solids, overburden), mine-influenced drainage (process water, contact runoff) and other mine aspects (e.g., walls) were assessed
- Static and kinetic testing and mineralogy completed on representative materials consistent with appropriate, industry-standard guidance
- Objectives
  - Understand the ARD/ML behaviour of the materials tested
  - Develop geochemical source terms (concentrations, loading rates) for the various mine components on a constituent specific basis
  - Aid in decision making concerning mine waste and water management
  - Provide basis to assess water quality in downstream receiving environments potentially affected by site discharge and drainage
- SID #5

- Key outcomes of the geochemistry assessment
  - S cut-off values were defined on the basis of testing for both process solids and mine rock to establish Type 1 and Type 2 materials

Mine Process Stream	Type 1 Characteristics	Type 2 Characteristics
Process Solids	< 0.1% S (85-90% of material)	> 0.2% S (10-15% of material)
Mine Rock	< 0.3% S (94% of material)	> 0.3% S (6% of material)

- Mine process stream management strategies were developed according to the test results
  - Type 1 process solids stored safely on surface in PSMF
  - Type 2 process solids covered with Type 1 material below phreatic surface
  - Type 1 mine rock stored safely in surface stockpile
  - Type 2 mine rock stored in temporary piles on surface and relocated to pits for long term underwater storage
- Constituent specific source terms developed for all mine components

- Update to the geochemistry assessment
  - Significant differences in geochemical nature of mine components are not anticipated, nevertheless minor differences to pit shell configuration and ore processing are being evaluated
  - Additional confirmatory geochemical testing is underway
  - Geochemical source terms will be updated to support updated water quality modelling
  - Working with Feasibility Study team on mine design/configuration trade-off studies concerning water and waste management strategies
    - Any new information will be integrated into the assessment as appropriate
  - Results and conclusions of the updated analyses will be summarized in a technical memo that will be an attachment to the EIS Addendum

- Constituent fate modelling for water was documented in SID #6
- Modelling combined baseline water quality, study area hydrology, the site water balance and the geochemical source terms associated with site components to predict water quality on site and in downstream receiving environments
- Seasonal discharge from process water to Hare Lake
- Seasonal discharge of drainage from mine rock stockpile to Pic River
- In both cases the analysis demonstrated adherence to WQOs and provincial water management framework
- Water quality predictions also used to assess potential effects on sediments and risks to aquatic biota

- Constituent fate modelling for water will be updated with new information that is available, as appropriate
  - Water quality data, study area hydrology, site water balance, geochemical source terms, water and waste management strategies
- Modelling used to demonstrate adherence to statutory requirements (O.Reg. 560/94; MDMER), current WQOs and provincial water management framework
- Modelling results used to assess risks to ecological receptors and human health as appropriate
- Results and conclusions of the updated analyses will be summarized in a technical memo that will be an attachment to the EIS Addendum

# PAUSE FOR DISCUSSIONS

## Topics for discussion:

- Geochemistry
- Fate Modelling

### • Topography

- Moderate to steep hilly terrain, ground surface ranges from El. 200 m to greater than El. 400 m
- Bedrock is at or near surface across most of the site
- Low lying area characterized by abundant water bodies
- Local drainages defined by faults that crosscut the project area



## GEOTECHNICAL - SITE CONDITIONS

## GENERATION PGM

### ● Surficial Geology

- Bedrock outcrop
- Thin intermittent layer of glacial drift (sand and gravel)
- Low lying areas - thin organic layer underlain by fine grained soils
- Soil along Pic River flood plain comprise sand, silt and clay (>20 m thick in some places)




12:45pm to 1:15pm


# GEOTECHNICAL - PSMF


# GENERATION PGM

- Footprint to remain the same as the 2013 arrangement
- Waste Management Terminology
  - PS = Process Solids
  - MR = Mine Rock
  - Type 1 = Non-Acid Generating (NAG)
  - Type 2 = Potentially Acid Generating (PAG)
- All PS to be stored within PSMF
- Type 2 MR to be stored in PSMF until Open Pit is available
- Paddock style impoundment with perimeter embankments
- Seepage collection basins around perimeter of PSMF



- PSMF Optimization
  - Divider berms added to Cell 1 and 2
  - All Type 2 PS and MR to be stored on east side of Cell 2
  - Contact Water Management Pond included on east side of Cell 1
- Potential Increase to Cell 2 embankment height
  - All PS stored in PSMF, previously spilt between PSMF and Open Pit during later operations
- Revised embankment staging to suit updated mine plan






- Rockfill embankments, downstream construction methodology, bedrock foundations
- Geosynthetic lining system on upstream of dam to minimize seepage, filter and transitions zones for filter compatibility
- Preliminary Cell 2 embankment crest El. 379 m to 383 m
  - previously El. 363 m (with in pit PS storage), option to El. 375 m

# GEOTECHNICAL - PSMF

- Site investigations (SI) in 2012 and 2013.
- Most of the area comprises near surface bedrock
- Fine grained overburden present in low lying areas and drainages
- No additional SI required to support the updated FS


12:45pm to 1:15pm



## GEOTECHNICAL – MRSA

GENERATION PGM



- Similar footprint to 2013 arrangement.
- Type 1 MR storage in MRSA
- Type 2 MR storage in Open Pit
- Separate overburden stockpiles for surface soils/reclamation materials
- Runoff water collection in Open Pit and MSRS Catch Basins



# GEOTECHNICAL – MRSA



- MRSA primarily founded on bedrock
- Thins intermittent glacial drift in some areas
- Fine grained sediments at northeast corner and along east toe adjacent to Pic River

12:45pm to 1:15pm



# GEOTECHNICAL - MRSA

- Catch basins to be installed along the east side of the MRSA adjacent to Pic River.
- Water collected in Catch Basins transferred to Open Pit and PSMF
- Catch basins sized to manage 1 in 25 year 24-hour event
- Seasonal overflow (freshet) to Pic River



12:45pm to 1:15pm

- Open pit arrangement is similar to 2013
- Optimization by Gmining
- KP providing geotechnical support for pit wall slope design
- Additional data collected in July 2020 (televviewer surveys of existing drillholes)
- Open pit inflow estimates by Stantec

April 2013 Pit in Purple


August 2020 Pit in Green



## GEOTECHNICAL – PLANT SITE AND HAUL ROADS

GENERATION PGM

- Mill relocated approx. 1.5 km west, closer to PSMF
- Crusher and conveyor located along west side of open pit
- Haul roads integrated into Open Pit development
- Foundations to consist of bedrock and rockfill pad constructed of Type 1 MR
- Contact water collected in Open Pit, local catch basins and/or PSMF



12:45pm to 1:15pm

## GEOTECHNICAL – SITE ACCESS ROAD

GENERATION PGM

- Peninsula Rd./Trans Canada Hwy Intersection
- Upgrade approx. 1 km of existing Camp 19 road
- Construct approx. 3 km of new road (10 ha dist. area, 730,000 m<sup>3</sup> of fill)
- Three drainage crossings with culvert installations




12:45pm to 1:15pm

## GEOTECHNICAL – SITE ACCESS ROAD

GENERATION PGM

- SI completed in 2013
- Bedrock at or near surface along steeper ridges and higher elevations
- Glacial drift ranging from sand and gravel to silty clay present along alignment, thicknesses vary



12:45pm to 1:15pm

## GEOTECHNICAL – SITE ACCESS ROAD

GENERATION PGM


- Alternate access road alignment
- Marathon Airport Entrance
- Construct approx. 3.4 km of new road (8 ha dist. area, 130,000 m<sup>3</sup> of fill)
- Three drainage crossings, two with culvert installations
- Shared embankment with PSMF Cell 1



12:45pm to 1:15pm

# SITE WATER BALANCE


- Overall project footprint is similar
- Contact water from MRSA, Open Pit and Plant Site to be transferred to PSMF
- Water Management Pond to be maintained at east side of Cell 1
- Excess water conditions predicted, treatment and discharge to Hare Lake



12:45pm to 1:15pm

# SITE WATER BALANCE


- Preliminary flowsheet illustrating updated site water management strategy



12:45pm to 1:15pm



# WATER BALANCE

- 2013 Water Balance inflows
  - Cell 1 (Top)
  - Cell 2 (Bottom)
- Water Transfer from Open Pit includes water from MRSA
- Water Transfer from Cell 2 to Cell 1
  - Optimized arrangement to include for gravity flow from Cell 2 to Cell 1
  - Minimize water storage on west side of Cell 2



# WATER BALANCE

- 2013 Water Balance Outflows
  - Cell 1 (Top)
  - Cell 2 (Bottom)
- Water Transfer from Cell 2 to Cell 1
  - Optimized arrangement to include for gravity flow from Cell 2 to Cell 1
  - Minimize water storage on west side of Cell 2
- Excess water discharge to Hare Lake starting in Year 5
  - Excess water discharge may occur sooner as less water will be stored in PSMF as compared to 2013 operating strategy



## MINE WASTE ALTERNATIVES ASSESSMENT – PSMF GENERATION PGM

- Five initial candidate sites identified in 2008 (Golder, 2008)
- Eight candidate sites subsequently identified in 2009 with three preferred options evaluated (Amec, 2009)
- PSMF options subsequently reviewed in 2010 (KP) with consideration for the following criteria:
  - Runoff from PSMF, Open Pit and Plant areas to be directed to the west away from Pic River
  - PSMF footprint entirely within existing property boundary
  - PSMF design and operation must reduce dust generation
  - Dry land PSMF and MRSA storage options should be considered
- Four preferred options identified and evaluated through a Multiple Accounts Analysis
  - South Option
  - Option 3
  - Improved Option 3
  - Combined Storage Area

# MINE WASTE ALTERNATIVES ASSESSMENT - PSMF GENERATION PGM

- Multiple Accounts Analysis (MAA)


- Accounts used to evaluate options include Environment, Socio-economic, Technical and Economic
- Accounts divided into sub-accounts and specific indicators to reflect basic differences between options
  - Relative weightings assigned to accounts and sub-accounts
  - Values for indicators defined based on characteristics for each PSMF option
- Combined Storage Area PSMF identified as preferred PSMF option
  - Less impact on existing water bodies and fish communities, smaller catchment area, lower water management requirements and lower potential for dust generation
- MAA Ranking Summary

Print Jul/05/12 10:44:46

Account	South Option	Option 3	Improved Option 3	Combined Storage Area
Environmental	2.7	4.0	4.2	4.5
Socio-Economic	2.8	2.2	3.6	3.6
Technical	3.5	4.2	4.1	4.3
Economics	4.0	4.5	3.2	3.8
<b>WEIGHTED TOTAL</b>	3.0	3.4	3.9	4.1
<b>RANKING</b>	4	3	2	1

I:\11\01\00446\02\AI\Report\Report 1 Rev 0\Tables\[Table 4.7 to 4.12 - Process Solids MAA Rev 0.xlsx]Table4.12 Ranking Summary

# MINE WASTE ALTERNATIVES ASSESSMENT - PSMF GENERATION PGM




## ● PSMF Updates

- Revised tailings and water management strategy
- Embankment construction stages to be updated for revised tailings management strategy
- Site water balance to be updated to reflect changes to PSMF and mine plan

## ● Other Key Points

- Design has considered entire facility lifecycle; construction operations and closure
- Best available technologies and practices assessment being prepared for PSMF to support EA

# MINE WASTE ALTERNATIVES ASSESSMENT - PSMF GENERATION PGM



## ● PSMF Updates

- Revised tailings and water management strategy
- Embankment construction stages to be updated for revised tailings management strategy
- Site water balance to be updated to reflect changes to PSMF and mine plan

1:15 to 1:45pm

# MINE WASTE ALTERNATIVES ASSESSMENT – MRSA GENERATION PGM


- Eight candidate sites identified (KP, 2012)
- Four preferred options identified and evaluated through a MAA similar to PSMF
  - Option 2 - West of Open Pit; Hare Creek, Stream 2 and Stream 4 watersheds
  - Option 4 - East of Open Pit; Stream 2, Stream 3, Stream 4 watersheds
  - Option 6 - South of Plant Site; Stream 1 and Malpa Lake watersheds
  - Option 8 - Site 2 and Site 4, smaller storage areas
- Option 4 MRSA identified as preferred MRSA option
  - Smaller disturbance area, simpler runoff water management, proximity to Open Pit
  - MAA Ranking Summary

Print Jul/05/12 11:21:41

Account	Option 2	Option 4	Option 6	Option 8
Environmental	3.1	4.4	3.6	1.9
Socio-Economic	2.7	3.9	2.8	3.6
Technical	2.9	3.1	2.6	2.7
Economics	3.5	3.9	2.4	2.2
<b>Weighted Total</b>	2.9	3.9	3.0	2.7
<b>RANKING</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>

I:\11010044\02\A\Report\Report 1 Rev 0\Tables\{Table 5.2 to 5.7 - Mine Rock Storage MAA\_Rev 0.xlsx}Table5.7\_Ranking

# MINE WASTE ALTERNATIVES ASSESSMENT – MRSA GENERATION PGM



- MRSA arrangement consistent with Option 4 evaluated in Alternatives Assessment
- A portion of the Type 2 mine rock will be used to backfill the south end of the open pit
- Review of overburden stockpile locations is ongoing with consideration of fish habitat
- MRSA development stages to be reflected in updated site water balance

1:15 to 1:45pm

# PAUSE FOR DISCUSSIONS

## Topics for discussion:

- Geotechnical
- Site Water Balance
- Process Solids Management Facility
- Mine Rock Storage Area

# CLOSING GENERAL DISCUSSION

- Federal and Provincial Government Comments
- Next Steps for Topics Reviewed

1:55 to 2:00pm