

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3



### VERSION 3 UPDATE SUMMARY

The public consultation and aboriginal engagement as presented in Chapter 7 of the Version 2 EIS/EA reflects the activities that took place prior to the submission of the Version 2 EIS/EA in December of 2013 and is reproduced in its entirety below. CMC has maintained active engagement with the public and Aboriginal communities from the submission of the Version 2 EIS/EA to the present day. A summary of these recent consultation/engagement activities is provided in this summary and throughout the text of this Chapter, where relevant, in italic text. A comprehensive list public and aboriginal consultation activities from December 2013 to August 2017 is provided in Table 7-A below. Additional records of meetings and communications where available are provided in Appendix 7.VI.

**Table 7-A: Public and Aboriginal Consultation Activities (December 2013 to August 2017)**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description of Consultation/Engagement Activity</b>
January 2, 2014	Meeting with Chiefs from Lac Des Mille Lacs First Nation, Seine River First Nation and Lac La Croix First Nation to give an update presentation on the Project.
January 28, 2014	Public Open House in the Town of Atikokan to answer questions and to share the results of the Final EIS/EA Report. Approximately fifty (50) people from the community of Atikokan attended the event.
February 10, 2014	Community Open House at Couchiching First Nation to answer questions and to share the results of the Version 2 EIS/EA Report.
February 11, 2014	Community Open House at Naicatchewenin First Nation to answer questions and to share the results of the Version 2 EIS/EA Report.
February 11, 2014	Community Open House at Rainy River First Nation to answer questions and to share the results of the Version 2 EIS/EA Report.
February 12, 2014	Community Open House at Nigigoonsiminikaaning First Nation to answer questions and to share the results of the Version 2 EIS/EA Report.
February 12, 2014	Community Open House at Mitaanjigamiing First Nation to answer questions and to share the results of the Version 2 EIS/EA Report.
February 13, 2014	Community Open House at Seine River First Nation to answer questions and to share the results of the Version 2 EIS/EA Report.
February 13, 2014	Community Open House at Lac La Croix First Nation to answer questions and to share the results of the Version 2 EIS/EA Report.
February 18, 2014	Meeting with the Fort Frances Chiefs Secretariat at the Rendezvous Hotel in Fort Frances, ON. Four (4) Chiefs were in attendance, along with staff from the FFCS. The purpose of the meeting was to provide an update on the Hammond Reef Project, RSA committees and to request letters of support for the Project.
February 26, 2014	CMC was invited to attend and present at a Treaty 3 Conference held in Kenora. CMC gave an overview of the complete history of the Hammond Reef Gold Project, and its project engagement with the First Nation communities affected
February 2014	Received written letters of support from Five (5) First Nation Communities – Lac La Croix FN, Seine River, FN, Lac Des Mille Lacs FN, Rainy River FN, and Naicatchewenin FN.

**AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT  
CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND  
ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT  
VERSION 3**



**Table 7-A: Public and Aboriginal Consultation Activities (December 2013 to August 2017)**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description of Consultation/Engagement Activity</b>
May 22, 2014	Spring Ceremony held at Couchiching First Nation at the CFN Pow Wow grounds.
September 2014	Meeting held in Atikokan at the Goodwin Street office with Lac Des Mille Lacs FN, Seine River FN, and Lac La Croix FN to discuss Mitta Lake. It was determined these three communities would take the lead on the Project.
November 4, 2014	Annual Fall Blessing Ceremony held at Lac La Croix First Nation.
February 12, 2015	Met with the Métis Nation of Ontario in the Yamana Boardroom in Toronto, ON to discuss the Shared Interest Agreement (SIA).
February 17, 2015	Attended the MNO Collaborative Forum in Thunder Bay, ON.
March 3, 2015	A project update was given to the Chiefs and community members from Seine River FN, Lac La Croix FN, Lac Des Mille Lacs FN, MNO Region One at the Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada (PDAC) Conference in Toronto, ON. The Mineral Development Advisor was also in attendance.
May 19, 2015	Annual Spring Ceremony held at Lac Des Mille Lacs First Nation. Ceremony took place at the community's new Roundhouse. Attendance from six (6) First Nation communities.
June 11, 2015	SIA virtual signing with the Métis Nation of Ontario.
June 26, 2015	Official signing of the SIA in person in Fort Frances, Ontario with the Métis Nation of Ontario.
July 23, 2015	Meeting with Lac Des Mille Lacs FN Band Manager and Chief at the Agnico Eagle Boardroom in Toronto, ON to discuss the EA/Project Update.
September 9, 2015	Project Update to Métis Nation of Ontario Region One in Thunder Bay, ON.
September 10, 2015	Update presentation to Fort Frances Chiefs and Resource Sharing Agreement committee members in Thunder Bay, ON – Lac Des Mille Lacs FN, Seine River FN, and Lac La Croix FN. This included consultation on Worker camp relocation
September 28, 2015	Conference call with Rainy River First Nation regarding the EA.
October 9, 2015	Conference call with Mitaanjigamiing First Nation regarding consultation.
October 19, 2015	Conference call with Métis Region One regarding the EA.
October 20, 2015	Annual Fall Blessing Ceremony held at the Hammond Reef Site. The host community was Seine River First Nation and eight communities were in attendance, as well as the MNO and Mayor of Atikokan.
October 21, 2015	Update Presentation to Fort Frances Chiefs and RSA committee members at the Youth Correctional Centre in Fort Frances, ON. This included worker camp relocation
October 22, 2015	Community Presentation at Mitaanjigamiing First Nation - Project Update and question and answer session in their Multi-Use Building. This included worker camp relocation
October 23, 2015	Community Presentation at Rainy River First Nation Band Office in Emo, ON – Project Update and question and answer session to address concerns attended by Chief and staff. This included worker camp relocation
October 28, 2015	Site visit by eight (8) community members from Mitaanjigamiing First Nation (all-day tour).

**AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT  
CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND  
ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT  
VERSION 3**



**Table 7-A: Public and Aboriginal Consultation Activities (December 2013 to August 2017)**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description of Consultation/Engagement Activity</b>
February 22, 2016	Project Update given to Member of Parliament Don Rusnick in Ottawa.
February 26, 2016	Attended the Métis Collaborative Forum in Toronto at the Intercontinental Hotel.
February 27, 2016	Project Update given Atikokan Town Council and Mayor Dennis Brown.
March 7, 2016	Project Update given at PDAC to Chiefs and community members who were in attendance at the conference.
June 8, 2016	A Project update presentation was given to Mayor Brown at the CMC Boardroom in downtown Atikokan, ON.
June 9, 2016	Spring Ceremony held at the Lac La Croix Teaching Centre in Quetico Park. Host community was Lac La Croix First Nation. Attendance from seven (7) FN communities, local residents, MNO, Atikokan Native Friendship Centre, and government representatives. Approximately 65 people were in attendance.
September 19, 2016	Project Update given to the Métis Nation of Ontario in Fort Frances, ON.
September 20, 2016	Project Update given to the Chiefs in Fort Frances, Ontario.
September 26, 2016	CMC invited to attend a Lac La Croix FN ceremony at their roundhouse at French Lake in Quetico Park
November 2, 2016	Annual Fall Blessing Ceremony held at the Hammond Reef Site. Attendance from seven (7) FN communities, local residents, MNO, Atikokan Native Friendship Centre, and government representatives.
February 27, 2017	Project update to Mayor and Council in Atikokan in Council chambers.
February 28, 2017	Project update to Métis Nation of Ontario Region One presented in Atikokan, Ontario.
February 28, 2017	Project update/EA Permitting presentation to Fort Frances Chiefs and Lac Des Mille Lacs First Nation in Thunder Bay, Ontario.
March 2017	Meeting with the Chiefs at PDAC and gave informal Hammond Reef Update.
June 8, 2017	Annual Spring Ceremony held at the Lac La Croix Teaching Centre in Quetico Park. Attendance from eight (8) FN communities, Grand Chief of Treaty 3, Chiefs Secretariat, local residents, MNO, Atikokan Native Friendship Centre, and government representatives.
June 8, 2017	RSA committee meeting in Atikokan to discuss the draining of Mitta Lake. Attendance from the FN communities part of the committee.
June 15, 2017	Visited Mitta Lake with Mineral Development Advisor for Pwi-Di-Goo-Zing Ne-Yaa-Zhing Advisory Services, and Elder from Lac La Croix FN.
July 30, 2017	Visited with Chiefs from Naicatchewenin FN, Nigigoonsiminikaaning FN, Treaty 3 Grand Chief, Elder from Naicatchewenin FN, and RSA Committee member from Lac La Croix.
August 10, 2017	Meeting with Aboriginal trapper regarding a project support letter and clarification of using the trapline as a teaching site.

-----

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.0 PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT

This chapter describes the public consultation and Aboriginal engagement activities conducted to meet provincial and federal requirements, as outlined in the Public Consultation Plan and Aboriginal Engagement Plan included as part of the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Project.

The consultation and engagement reported in this chapter covers the time period between the submission of the final ToR on April 4, 2012 through October 2013. Additional activities that took place in the earlier stages of the Project are summarized in the Record of Consultation Report that is included as part of the ToR.

The following six regulatory milestones and associated information sharing were carried out with the public, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), government (local, provincial and federal) and Aboriginal communities. The first three milestones were documented in the Record of Consultation published as part of the ToR.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>1) Project Description:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Project components</li><li>▪ Consultation process</li></ul> <p><b>2) Commencement of Terms of Reference:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Issues scoping</li><li>▪ Project overview</li><li>▪ Potential effects</li><li>▪ Environmental assessment process.</li></ul> <p><b>3) Submission of Terms of Reference:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Criteria and indicators</li><li>▪ Project alternatives</li><li>▪ Valued ecosystem components</li></ul> | <p><b>4) Commencement of the EA Report:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Results of baseline studies</li><li>▪ Project alternatives</li><li>▪ Environmental assessment evaluation methodology</li><li>▪ Valued Ecosystem Components</li><li>▪ Potential impacts</li><li>▪ Mitigation measures</li></ul> <p><b>5) Submission of the EA Report:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Results of the assessment</li><li>▪ Potential effects</li><li>▪ Mitigation measures</li><li>▪ Commitments</li></ul> <p><b>6) Review of Decommissioning Plans (ongoing):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Coordinated with the MNDM process</li><li>▪ Commencement and submission of the Closure Plan</li></ul> |
|--|--|

Discussion of the public consultation activities and results is provided in Section 7.1. Government consultation is reviewed in Section 7.2. Aboriginal engagement is discussed in Section 7.3.

---

# AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT

## CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT

### VERSION 3

---



## 7.1 Public Consultation

### 7.1.1 Identification of Interested Parties

Public stakeholders were identified as residents of Atikokan, Fort Frances, Ignace and Thunder Bay. Residents were informed through regular news columns and public Open House events. Additionally, individuals who provided their contact information at Open House events were added to the information distribution list. Individuals and non-governmental organizations that commented on the EIS Guidelines or ToR, or contacted OHRG at any point throughout the environmental assessment process were also added to the information distribution list. Although the Town of Atikokan is a municipal government, they have been included in the Public Consultation Record instead of the Government Consultation Record because they do not have a regulatory approval role in the EA process and their primary contribution was to represent the residents of Atikokan.

The following non-government organizations were included on the Project email distribution list:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| ■ Atikokan Economic Development Corporation | ■ Mining Watch                              |
| ■ Atikokan Chamber of Commerce              | ■ North Watch                               |
| ■ Atikokan Sportsmen's Conservation Club    | ■ Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters |
| ■ Canadian Boreal Initiative                | ■ Rainy Lake Conservancy                    |
| ■ H2O Power LP (formerly Abitibi Bowater)   | ■ Ontario Coalition of Aboriginal People    |
| ■ International Joint Commission            | ■ Sierra Club of Canada                     |

As shown in Table 7-1, two non-governmental organizations were provided funding for participation in the environmental assessment, through the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency's Regular Funding Envelope.

### 7.1.2 Consultation Activities

A summary of public consultation activities is provided in this section. The consultation activities were carried out by OHRG's Sustainable Development group as part of the Project planning process. OHRG's approach is to be inclusive with information sharing and listen to concerns from all interested parties. Further, OHRG sought to identify and use a variety of communications methods to provide a range of means for people to be informed about the Project and have the opportunity to provide their input. Each of these communications methods is discussed briefly below along with the results of the consultation.

#### 7.1.2.1 Notifications

On July 30, 2012 the Notice of Commencement of Environmental Assessment was placed in local newspapers and emailed directly to Project stakeholder contacts. The Notice also included an invitation to the upcoming Open House and a link to the ToR documentation on the Project website.

On November 5, 2012 the Notice of Commencement of Closure Planning was published in local newspapers and on the Project website. The Notice included a link to the Notice of Project Status and supporting information on the Project website.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



The Notice of Draft EIS/EA Report Review was published on February 11, 2013. The notice was published in local newspapers and on the Project website. The Notification includes a link to the EIS/EA Report on the Project website.

The Notice of Final EIS/EA Report Submission

The Final EIS/EA Report was submitted to the CEA Agency on December 13 2013 for conformity review. The Final EIS/EA report will be submitted to the CEA Agency and MOE EAB in January 2014 followed by a public comment period. OHRG circulated the Notice of Publication to Project stakeholders through email, the Osisko website and newspaper advertisements. A hard copy of the Final EIS/EA Report has been made available at Osisko's Atikokan office and the Ministry of Environment in Toronto.

Copies of published Notices are provided in Appendix 7.I.

### **7.1.2.2 Community News Briefs**

A newspaper column was published online and in local newspapers (the Atikokan Progress, the Thunder Bay Chronicle Journal, the Ignace Driftwood and the Fort Frances Times) since November 2010.

The objective of the Community News publication was to keep the public and Aboriginal communities with an interest in the Project aware through regular updates. The column was published online and in the following local newspapers:

- Atikokan Progress
- Ignace Driftwood
- Fort Frances Times
- Wawatay Time
- Thunder Bay Chronicle

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3



The following is a list of the publication titles from April 2012 to October 2013. A copy of each publication is provided in Appendix 7.I.

- Modern Uses of Gold
- Existing Environment at Hammond Reef
- Aquatic Biology
- Metis Community Feast and Aboriginal Spring Ceremony
- Terrestrial Biology
- Cultural Heritage
- Working with our Aboriginal Partners
- Atmospheric Environment
- Open House 4
- Working out the Project Details
- Environmental Assessment Process Moves Forward
- Summer Comes to an End
- Mine Closure Planning
- Project Phases and Schedule
- Careers in Mining
- Osisko Files Notice of Project Status with MNDM
- Committed to a Healthy Fishery
- Publication of Draft Environmental Assessment Report Planned for February
- How Does the Acquisition of Queenston Mining Affect Plans for the Development of OHRG?
- Draft Environmental Impact Statement / Environmental Assessment (EIS/EA) Report
- Sharing the Results of the Environmental Assessment
- Fire at Osisko Hammond Reef Gold Site
- Osisko Open House
- Corporate Update
- Mercury and the Environment
- Your Feedback is Important
- Sharing the Results of the Environmental Assessment – Terrestrial Biology
- Sharing the Results of the Environmental Assessment – Hydrology
- Field Studies – Bats
- Hammond Reef Impairment
- 2012 Sustainable Development Report
- Sharing the Results of the Environmental Assessment – Water Quality
- Does an Environmental Assessment Report Have a Shelf Life?
- Environmental Assessment – Considering Comments and Finalizing the Report
- Sharing the Results of the Environmental Assessment – Hydrogeology
- Sharing the Results of the Environmental Assessment – Aquatic Biology

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.1.2.3 Community Open House Events

*Version 3 Update:* Following submission of the Version 2 EIS/EA, a community open house was held with the Town of Atikokan to share the results of the EIS/EA on January 28, 2014. Approximately fifty (50) people from the community of Atikokan attended the event.

-----

Six public open houses have been held in Atikokan and Fort Frances throughout the environmental assessment process. The following four open houses took place prior to the submission of the ToR and are documented in the Record of Consultation Report:

- Open House 1 took place on June 18, 2011 from 8 am to 5 pm. Approximately 220 people signed in to the Open House. The objective of the Open House was to share the details of the Project Description accepted by CEAA on April 28, 2011. This Open House was the first of four public Open Houses planned to take place in the Town of Atikokan over the course of the EA.
- Open House 2 took place on October 19, 2011 from 3 pm to 8 pm at OHRG's Main Street office in Atikokan. Approximately 50 people signed in to the event. The objective of the Open House was to share the details of the Draft Terms of Reference published on September 21, 2011.
- Open House 3 and 4 took place on March 9 and 10, 2012 in Atikokan and Fort Frances, respectively. Approximately 60 people signed in to the event at Atikokan and approximately 20 people signed in to the event at Fort Frances. The goal of the Open House events was to share the details of the Terms of Reference report submitted on January 23, 2012.

#### 7.1.2.3.1 Open House Five – Baseline Studies

As part of the Commencement of the EA Report consultation milestone, a fifth Open House event took place on August 18, 2012 from 10 am to 3 pm in Atikokan at OHRG's Main Street Office. One hundred and five people signed in to the Open House and 30 people filled in comment forms. The purpose of the Open House was to review the results of the baseline studies, confirm the range of alternatives and solicit feedback about community land use. Copies of supporting information materials are provided in Appendix 7.III.

The Notice for the open house was published in the following local newspapers the week of July 16, 2012 and August 13, 2012:

- Atikokan Progress
- Ignace Driftwood
- Fort Frances Times
- Wawatay Times
- Thunder Bay Chronicle

The formal Notice followed the template provided by the MOE and was reviewed by MOE EAB and CEA Agency. A less formal, plain language notice was also placed in the newspapers the week of July 30, 2012. Both Notices were posted on Osisko's website.

An invitation was also posted on community notice boards, and a mass email to Aboriginal, Community and Government stakeholder lists was sent on August 7, 2012.



---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### *Open House Presentation*

Feedback from public stakeholders and attendees of previous Open House events has identified that a formal presentation would be welcomed as part of a public open house. Feedback has indicated that many residents are interested in an exploration update. A 15-minute presentation was given at Open House 5. The presentation included

- Project Components and Updated Project layout
- Updated Project alternatives
- Baseline study results
- Next Steps

Similar presentations were given to government and Aboriginal communities. Handouts of the presentation were provided to attendees. The presentation included a question and answer period.

### *Information Panels*

Open House 5 was set-up into four information stations, each with a series of posters and fact sheets. The information provided was developed based on the interim baseline reports provided by Golder Associates and updated Project detail information provided by Osisko's engineering and design team.

The panels displayed at Open House 5 included:

<i>Welcome</i>	<i>Federal EA Process</i>	<i>Open Pit</i>	<i>Closure Planning</i>
<i>Exploration Update</i>	<i>Provincial EA Process</i>	<i>Processing</i>	<i>Land and Resource Use</i>
<i>Project Schedule</i>	<i>Project Layout Update</i>	<i>Tailings</i>	<i>Next Steps</i>
	<i>Project Components</i>	<i>On Site Workers Camp</i>	
		<i>Electricity Use</i>	

### *Fact Sheets*

Information handouts were made available at the Welcome desk and at each information station. The following is a list of written information made available at Open House 5:

- Project Alternatives and Layout
- Project Phases and Schedule
- Assessment Criteria and Evaluation
- Baseline Study Results Presentation
- Large-scale Project Layout maps

### *Project Overview Video*

The Project Overview Video was played for attendees.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### *Feedback Received*

Thirty Open House attendees filled in a comment form. Copies of completed sign in sheets and comment forms are provided in Appendix 7.III.

Comment forms were available throughout the venue and attendees were encouraged to provide written feedback. Comment forms included four questions each about fishing, hunting and collecting berries. The comment form also included a map of the land use study area to focus the questions on the area specific to the Project. The land use study area provided in the map was defined as the area likely to be affected by the direct environmental effects of the Project and corresponded to the LSAs selected for aquatic and terrestrial biology (Figure 4-3), which represent the primary linkages between direct Project-related effects and potential effects on land and resource use. Effects on land and resource use are primarily a result of: (1) restricted access to the land directly impacted by the Project – the Project “footprint” – or (2) indirect effects as a result of effects on the aquatic or terrestrial environments. It should be noted that some respondents may have been answering the land use questions in a general way, and not focussed only on their land use of the Project study area. The tabulated results of the comment form responses are provided below. The sample size for each question is 30.

As seen in Figure 7-1, fishing is the most popular resource use in the study area. More than half of the respondents indicated they fish in the study area, whereas only five respondents indicated that they harvest plants in the study area.

As seen in Figure 7-2, 54% of the respondents stated that they do not hunt in the study area. Of the respondents that do hunt in the study area, most indicated they hunt for moose and deer. A small percentage (5%) stated that they hunt birds in the study area.

As seen in Figure 7-3, most of the respondents (17) stated that they do not eat wild game that they have caught. Of the respondents that do eat game, the frequency with which they reported eating game varied from more than once a week to a couple times a year.

As seen in Figure 7-4, 55% of the respondents stated that they fish for walleye in the study area. Bass, pike and trout were also reported as fish that are caught in the study area. A small percentage (8%) stated that they do not fish in the study area.

As seen in Figure 7-5, most of the respondents (13 and 11, respectively) stated that they eat fish that they have caught once a week or once a month. Very few respondents (1 and 2, respectively) stated that they eat fish more than once a week or not at all.

As seen in Figure 7-6, 40% of the respondents stated that they do not harvest plants in the study area. Of the respondents who do harvest plants in the study area, the majority harvest blueberries (47%) and a portion of respondents also harvest raspberries and pin cherries.

As seen in Figure 7-7, most of the respondents (11) stated that they do not eat berries that they have harvested. Of the respondents that do eat berries, the frequency with which they reported eating berries varied from once a week to a couple times a year. One respondent stated that they eat berries more than once a week.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.1.2.3.2 Open House Six – EA Results

As part of the Submission of the EA Report consultation milestone, a sixth Open House event took place on April 3, 2013 from 3 pm to 8 pm in Atikokan at Osisko's Main Street Office. Eighty-one people signed in to the Open House and 40 people filled in comment forms. The purpose of the Open House was to share the results of the environmental assessment. Copies of supporting information materials are provided in Appendix 7.III.

The Notice for the open house was published in the following local newspapers the week of March 11 and April 1, 2013.

- Atikokan Progress
- Fort Frances Times
- Thunder Bay Chronicle
- Ignace Driftwood
- Wawatay Times

The formal Notice followed the template provided by the MOE and was reviewed by MOE EAB and CEA Agency. The Notice was also posted on Osisko's website.

#### *Open House Presentation*

Feedback from public stakeholders and attendees of previous Open House events has identified that a formal presentation would be welcomed as part of a public open house. A 15-minute presentation was given at Open House 6. The presentation included information on:

- Osisko Mining Corporation
- Hammond Reef Gold Project
- Project Components
- Environmental Assessment Results
- Environmental and Social Management
- Next Steps

Similar presentations were given to government and Aboriginal communities, as described in Sections 7.2 and 7.3. Handouts of the presentation were provided to attendees. The presentation session included a question and answer period.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### Information Panels

Open House 6 was set-up into four information stations, each with a series of posters and fact sheets. The information provided was developed based on the Draft EIS/EA Report published on February 15, 2013.

The panels displayed at Open House 6 included:

<i>Welcome</i>	<i>Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment</i>	<i>Social Management Planning</i>	<i>Water Intake and Discharge</i>
<i>Project Components</i>	<i>Employment and Economics</i>	<i>Environmental Management Planning</i>	<i>Hydrogeology</i>
<i>Open Pit</i>	<i>Outdoor Tourism and Recreation</i>	<i>Geochemistry</i>	<i>Water Quality</i>
<i>Processing</i>	<i>Aboriginal and Treaty Rights</i>	<i>Atmospheric Hydrology</i>	<i>Fish Habitat</i>
<i>Tailings</i>			<i>Compensation</i>
<i>On Site Workers Camp</i>			<i>Terrestrial Biology</i>
<i>Electricity Use</i>			

### Project Overview Video

The Project Overview Video was played for attendees.

### Feedback Received

Forty Open House attendees filled in a comment form. Copies of completed sign in sheets and comment forms are provided in Appendix 7.III.

Comment forms were available throughout the venue and attendees were encouraged to provide written feedback. Comment forms included six questions focused on the respondent's understanding and support of the Project. The tabulated results of the comment form responses are provided below. Considering that the sample size for each question is 40, the results should be taken as indicative rather than statistically precise.

As seen on Figure 7-8, 80% of the respondents feel up to date on the status of the Project.

As seen on Figure 7-9, 100% of the respondents believe that the quality of life will improve for local residents should the Project go forward.

As seen on Figure 7-10, 90% of the respondents are confident that Osisko's plan will minimize the environmental impacts from the Project.

As seen on Figure 7-11, 90% of the respondents fully support the Hammond Reef Project going forward.

As shown in Table 7-2, the majority of the Open House respondents stated economic and employment benefits as their top hopes for the Project.

As shown in Table 7-3, the majority of the Open House respondents stated economics and general environmental concerns as their top concerns about the Project.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.1.2.4 Presentation of Project Details and Alternatives

*Version 3 Update:* In February 2017, a summary of alternatives means of carrying out the project was presented to Mayor and Council in Atikokan. This presentation included content from the supplemental alternatives assessment studies included in Parts 2, 3 and 4 out the Version 3 Alternatives Assessment TSD and is provided in Appendix 7.VI.

-----

OHRG has worked to inform the community and Project stakeholders about the Project Details on an ongoing basis. A series of Project overview presentations have been provided to share the details of the Project and receive feedback on the alternatives from members of the public and NGOs as detailed below.

#### 7.1.2.4.1 Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters

On May 5, 2012 OHRG was invited to attend the Zone A Meeting of the Ontario Anglers and Hunters, of which the Atikokan Sportsmen's Conservation Club is a member. OHRG gave a Project Overview presentation on the Project and answered questions about the Project. The Project Overview video was shown and the Project Overview Booklet was distributed to attendees.

Questions from Anglers and Hunters related to:

- Tailings management practices and proposal
- Proposed traffic study
- Groundwater management
- EA methods

Questions and comments were responded to at the meeting and no follow up items were recorded. Detailed notes from the May 5, 2012 meeting are provided in Appendix 7.III. The Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters received federal funding for a technical review of the Hammond Reef Gold Project and provided written feedback on the Draft EIS/EA Report as detailed in the section below.

#### 7.1.2.4.2 Town of Ignace

On September 19, 2012 the OHRG consultation team gave a Project Overview presentation to the Town of Ignace. The Town of Ignace contacted OHRG and requested a meeting to learn more about the Project. OHRG invited the Town of Ignace to Atikokan, and met with the Mayor, one Councillor and the Economic Development Officer at OHRG's Main Street office. The Town of Ignace was shown the Project Overview video and provided a Project Overview presentation. Key topics of discussion with the Town of Ignace included:

- Alternatives assessment
- Municipal infrastructure
- Project schedule
- Opportunities for community involvement
- Socio-economic baseline report results

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT

### CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT

#### VERSION 3

---



#### 7.1.2.4.3 On-Site Worker Accommodation Camp

*Version 3 Update:* In response to concerns raised by the government review team, CMC provided a supplemental assessment of alternative camp locations and a new location, to the north of the access road and west of the Tailing Management Facility (TMF), was selected as the preferred location for the on-site accommodation camp (see Revised Figure 5-1). Relocation of the camp was considered to be a minor change to the Project description presented in the EIS/EA that did not result in new impacts or increase the impacts predicted in the EIS/EA. The Assessment of Alternative Camp Locations is provided in Part 2 of the Version 3 Alternatives Assessment TSD.

Consultation on the camp location alternatives was conducted through a meeting in February 2017 with the Mayor and Council in Atikokan. Presentations delivered at these meetings are provided in Appendix 7.VI.

-----

The need to consider an on-site worker accommodation camp as an additional alternative method of carrying out the Project was determined based on detailed planning, consultation, and baseline studies. Detailed planning for the Project clarified the total anticipated workforce, length of the commute and duration of the Project. Consultation activities, including engagement with Aboriginal communities confirmed that employment is important and that many community members live two or more hours from the Project Site. Socio-economic baseline studies confirmed the demographics of the local population, including age distribution and education levels. The conclusion from the detailed planning, consultation and baseline studies was that an on-site worker accommodation camp would be required to ensure the Project remained feasible.

Upon reaching the decision to include an on-site worker accommodation camp as an alternative means of carrying out the Project, the government, public and Aboriginal stakeholders were informed of this change.

The following provides a summary of consultation activities that included information about the on-site worker accommodation camp:

- Presentation to Atikokan Mayor and Council July 30, 2012
- Presentation to the Metis Nation of Ontario August 3, 2012
- Community News Brief August 13, 2012
- Consultation Update meeting with provincial and federal government leads August 14, 2012
- Community Open House August 18, 2012
- Presentation to Fort Frances Chiefs Secretariat September 17, 2012
- Letter to the CEA Agency September 20, 2012
- Letter to the MOE EAB September 20, 2012
- Letter from CEA Agency to Aboriginal communities October 26, 2012
- Metal Mining Effluent Regulations (MMER) Alternatives Assessment Workshop (provincial and federal government) November 20, 2012

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.1.2.5 Presentation of Baseline Studies

The results of baseline studies were presented to the public at the Community Open House and through presentations provided to the Town of Atikokan Mayor and Council.

On July 30, 2012 the OHRG consultation team gave a presentation to the Town of Atikokan to share the results of the baseline studies and present the new alternative of an on-site worker accommodation camp. The presentation also included responses to questions raised by the Town in previous meetings. Key topics of discussion with the Town of Atikokan included:

- Project alternatives
- Project details
- On-site worker accommodation camp
- Project schedule
- Closure planning
- Environmental assessment process
- Project Economics
- Employment and training
- Hydrology

### 7.1.2.6 Social Management Planning

On August 1, 2012, OHRG met with the Town of Atikokan to discuss the status of the Town's plan for a new landfill. The objective of the meeting was an information exchange about waste management plans and identification of opportunities to work together. The Town provided OHRG copies of reports from the engineering firm working on the permitting and design of the new landfill. OHRG provided the Town with estimates of volumes of waste that could be generated throughout different phases of the Project.

On September 20, 2012, OHRG hosted a socio-economic workshop and site tour with the Town of Atikokan. The purpose of the workshop was to present the socio-economic baseline results and confirm that OHRG's understanding of the socio-economic environment in Atikokan is correct. The workshop also included information sharing regarding economic modelling assumptions and OHRG's social management strategy. The Town was also provided an update on the Project alternatives.

OHRG has been sharing information with the Town throughout the EA process and has received feedback through meetings and workshops during the Terms of Reference preparation stage of the EA planning process. The workshop on September 20, 2012 built on information sharing to date and allowed for a focused discussion on the socio-economic aspect of the Project. The use of stakeholder feedback such as this workshop will be integral to developing the Social Management Plan for the Project, as detailed in Chapter 8.

The Mayor and seven Town councillors, the Town Clerk and a board member of the Economic Development Corporation attended the workshop. Five representatives from OHRG attended, including the consultation team and staff working at Site.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT

### CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT

#### VERSION 3

---



Feedback was provided by attendees through group discussion and question and answers. The key topics of discussion raised during the workshop were:

- General consensus that the socio-economic information presented was accurate
- Some knowledge of local camping sites and trappers cabins was shared
- General agreement that the labour force assumptions for the four Project phases are reasonable; however, the Town expressed an interest in increasing the percentage of workers that live in Town

The Town asked for specific information that has not been finalized in the Project planning process. OHRG committed to following up on the following two issues:

- OHRG is currently developing a list of goods and services it requires based on its experience at Malartic. This information will be provided to the Town once it becomes available
- OHRG is planning to form a beneficiary fund and a committee to administer the fund. The Town Council would like to be directly involved in administering the beneficiary fund and would like to know: Who would be on the beneficiary committee? How would they be selected?

#### 7.1.2.7 Comments Received on EA Process

OHRG received several information requests and written feedback from public stakeholders throughout the environmental assessment process. The following section provides a summary of written comments received from public stakeholders. Additional comments and letters of support were received from local stakeholders and municipal governments, as detailed in the Record of Consultation included in the April 2012 Terms of Reference submission.

The following is a summary of written comments that required responses OHRG to address. Discussions with stakeholders are maintained on an ongoing basis.

##### 7.1.2.7.1 H2O Power LP

*Version 3 Update: CMC has been in regular contact with H2O Power and Brookfield Renewable Power, beginning with a meeting and presentation in Toronto on November 5, 2015. The presentation given at this meeting is provided in Appendix 7.VI.*

*CMC, in consultation H2O Power and Brookfield, has developed contingency measures to mitigate project water taking related effects to water levels in Upper Marmion Reservoir during low flow and water level conditions, as defined by the Seine River Water Management Plan. Details of this water taking contingency plan are provided in the supplemental document: 'Technical Memorandum: Contingency Measures to Eliminate Water Taking from Marmion Reservoir during Low Water Level and Outflow Periods at Raft Lake Dam – Hammond Reef Gold Project' provided Part D of the Addendum to the Version 3 EIS/EA.*

*CMC continues to have productive discussions and is working towards a comprehensive water taking agreement with the power producers. Once the agreement is finalized, the power producers have expressed their intent to submit letters to CMC indicating their support of the Project.*



---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



*Response to comments received from Brookfield Renewable Power are provided in Part C of the Addendum to the Version 3 EIS/EA. The comments and responses were received and submitted prior to the above reference consultation activities.*

-----

H2O Power LP operates a hydroelectric power station, and provided a letter dated March 14, 2011 to OHRG voicing their concern that the water withdrawals from the Project could impact their ability to continue to successfully operate in the Marmion Basin. OHRG provided a written response on March 28 2011. A review of the Seine River Water Management Plan was included in the hydrology component of the EIS/EA.

OHRG attended a meeting on May 17, 2011 of the Seine River Watershed Management Plan; however, since the water balance for the Project was not yet complete, it was determined that attendance at future meetings would be postponed until the water balance information is available.

OHRG coordinated a meeting on January 28, 2013 with H2O Power, Brookfield Renewable Power, Ontario Power Generation and the Ministry of Natural Resources. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the potential effects of the Project on the Marmion Reservoir. Further discussions with these members of the Seine River Watershed Management Committee are planned throughout the four phases of the Project.

### 7.1.2.7.2 Rainy Lake Conservancy

The Rainy Lake Conservancy is a registered charity based in Fort Frances, Ontario. Its purpose is to preserve and protect Rainy Lake and the surrounding watershed. Conservancy members are involved in science and research, education and community involvement and land protection.

Representatives from the organization were sent an information package and replied on December 14, 2011 with further information requests and recommendations. A written response was provided to Rainy Lake Conservancy on December 19, 2011. Remaining questions from the Rainy Lake Conservancy that were not addressed in OHRG's response include:

- Requested details regarding surface water and groundwater monitoring plan. Recommended real-time monitoring and sampling locations downstream on Seine River. Requested water quality information is published regularly on a public web site.
- Requested specific water quality standards to be used for discharge to Marmion Reservoir.

Rainy Lake Conservancy was provided an electronic copy of the Draft EIS/EA Report and confirmed they had received it. They will also be sent an electronic copy of the Final EIS/EA Report and will be provided a copy of the supplemental water quality information undertaken in 2013.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.1.2.7.3 Ontario Coalition of Aboriginal People

The Ontario Coalition of Aboriginal People, (OCAP), was formed in 2006 and has been incorporated as a not for profit association. OCAP was formed to represent Métis, off reserve status/non-status Indians and other people who reside or were born in Ontario, who can prove through genealogy that they are descendants of Aboriginal people in Ontario.

OCAP has stated an interest in being involved in the EA process for the Project. On April 13, 2012, members of the OHRG consultation team met with OCAP and representatives from the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines to introduce the Project and answer questions and concerns. Meeting notes are included in Appendix 7.III. Hard copies of Project information materials produced for public open house meetings, workshops and community news briefs were provided to OCAP representatives at the April 2012 meeting and on an ongoing basis through regular mail.

OHRG has also corresponded with OCAP on several occasions throughout August 2012. A second information package was provided to OCAP at that time, including information about baseline studies and environmental assessment criteria. This information package included paper copies of posters and fact sheets produced for public open house meetings.

Besides the general requests for Project information and environmental concerns discussed at the April 2012 meeting, OCAP has stated on a number of occasions that they would like to be acknowledged by the Crown as an Aboriginal community and have requested funding for OCAP to participate in the EA process. OHRG is not able to address this concern directly but has shared information with the Crown.

OHRG sent a Notice of Draft Submission of the EIS/EA Report to OCAP on February 15, 2013 and some correspondence was initiated to organize a meeting.

OHRG met with OCAP on April 16, 2013 to present a summary of the findings presented in the Draft EIS/EA Report. The meeting took place in Thunder Bay and included a presentation given by OHRG. The presentation included information on the following points:

- Osisko Mining Corporation
- Hammond Reef Gold Project
- Project Components
- Environmental Assessment Results
- Environmental and Social Management
- Project Schedule

The discussion was focussed on water use and OCAP's Aboriginal status.

Osisko has addressed OCAP's concerns by providing them with Project information and conducting an environmental assessment that fully considered potential impacts and mitigation measures. OCAP will be notified of the publication of the Final EIS/EA report and ensure they are provided with an opportunity to understand the conclusions, mitigation measures and ongoing commitments included in the Report.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT

### CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT

#### VERSION 3

---



#### 7.1.2.7.4 Camp Quetico

Camp Quetico is an outdoor tourism outfitter whose owner and operator holds licenses for both bait fishing and bear hunting in the area of the Project. Camp Quetico has voiced their concern about the impacts of the Project to their business. OHRG has provided access to the Project site for staff from Camp Quetico to set and collect minnow traps on Mitta Lake. OHRG has corresponded with Camp Quetico throughout the EA process and has had meetings, phone calls and email communications with Camp Quetico's owner. The key topics of discussion with Camp Quetico have included:

- Fishing in Mitta Lake by OHRG staff
- Impacts to bear hunt due to exploration activities
- Impacts to Mitta Lake due to exploration activities and baseline data collection
- Impacts to Mitta Lake due to planned construction and operations
- Camp Quetico's desire for compensation
- Consultation Process

OHRG has requested that Camp Quetico provide catch records for the bait fish blocks within the Project area so that we can better understand the potential effects of the Project.

Ongoing correspondence and discussion with Camp Quetico resulted in a mutually beneficial agreement that would restrict access to bait fishing blocks and bear management areas should the Project proceed. On October 17, 2013, Mr. Giles wrote a letter to Ministry of Environment and Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency formally acknowledging that all Camp Quetico's concerns regarding the Hammond Reef Gold Project have been resolved.

#### 7.1.2.7.5 Public Stakeholders

*Version 3 Update: Consultations held with public stakeholders since the submission of the Version 2 EIS/EA are summarized in Table 7-A at the beginning of this chapter.*

-----

On December 27, 2011, an individual stakeholder contacted the Town of Atikokan with several questions about the Project. OHRG provided a written response that addressed all concerns on January 20, 2012. One remaining question that was not addressed in OHRG's response was a request for a list of chemicals used on site. The Project planning process has not yet advanced to include material inventory lists. This request will be considered for further community publications including disclosure of material use in Osisko's Sustainable Development Report.

On September 2, 2012, the same individual stakeholder contacted the Town of Atikokan again with concerns about potential mercury contamination from the Project. OHRG provided a written response addressing the individual's concern on September 27, 2012. This stakeholder wasn't the only individual who expressed concerns about mercury contamination. In response to this common concern of mercury, OHRG prepared a Mercury Fact Sheet to explain why the Project is not anticipated to result in any increase in mercury levels either through exploration, ore processing or mining activities. A copy of the Mercury Fact Sheet is provided in Appendix 7.III.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.1.2.8 Publication of Draft EIS/EA Report

The Draft EIS/EA Report was published on February 15, 2013. OHRG circulated the Notice of Publication to public stakeholders through email, the Osisko website and newspaper advertisements. A hard copy of the Draft EIS/EA Report was made available at Osisko's Atikokan office and the Ministry of Environment in Toronto. The public was invited to submit their comments on the Draft EIS/EA Report by April 5, 2013.

### 7.1.2.9 Presentations of EIS/EA Results

*Version 3 Update:* The result of the Version 2 EIS/EA were presented and questions were sought from public stakeholders in several meetings as summarized in Table 7-A at the beginning of this chapter.

*Fish habitat 'compensation' refers to 'offsetting' under the current Fisheries Act and 'No Net Loss Plan' (NNLP) refers to 'Offsetting Plan'.*

-----

The results and conclusions of the EIS/EA Report were presented to the public at the Community Open House and through presentations provided to the Town of Atikokan Mayor and Council. Presentations were also provided to the local youth and offered to local seniors and sportsmen's club. An EIS/EA Results meeting was also held with the Ontario Coalition of Aboriginal People as detailed in the previous section.

#### 7.1.2.9.1 Town of Atikokan

On February 20, 2013 OHRG attended the Atikokan Town Council meeting to present an overview of the Draft EIS/EA Report for the Project. Approximately 30 people were in attendance, including Osisko staff, Atikokan Mayor and Council, Town Staff, CEAA, MNR and MNDM representatives and local residents.

A brief overview of the potential effects, mitigation measures and follow up program was provided by component, including a discussion of the Conceptual Closure and Rehabilitation plan. OHRG's Environmental and Social Management Plan was also presented, as well as a brief summary of the anticipated benefits of the Project. Discussion, questions and comments were focussed on:

- Worker Accommodation Camp
- Cyanide Use and Management
- Noise
- Water Quality
- Fish and Fish Habitat
- Employment Opportunities

On May 21, 2013 OHRG attended an Atikokan Town Council meeting to present a summary of the comments received from the public, government and Aboriginal groups on the Draft EIS/EA Report and OHRG's approach to responding to these comments. Approximately 15 people were in attendance, including Osisko staff, Atikokan Mayor and Council and Town Staff. Comments and discussion were focussed on the Project schedule.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT

### CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT

#### VERSION 3

---



#### 7.1.2.9.2 Local Youth

On April 2, 2013 OHRG visited the Atikokan High School to give a presentation on the results presented in the Draft EIS/EA Report. Approximately 30 Grade-11 and 12 students attended the presentation. The discussion was focussed on employment opportunities, the environmental assessment process and OHRG's environmental and social management planning.

#### 7.1.2.10 Comments Received on Draft EIS/EA Report

OHRG received written comments from five different public stakeholder groups, as detailed below. Copies of all comments received are included in Appendix 7.III.

##### 7.1.2.10.1 Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters

On April 5, 2013 the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters (OFAH) submitted formal comments on the Draft EIS/EA Report. The comments were provided in the form of a two-page letter stating OFAH's concerns for the potential effects on fish and the aquatic environment. Their letter detailed specific comparison points with fish tissue sampling protocol outlined in the Ministry of Environment's publication.

##### 7.1.2.10.2 The Atikokan Sportsmen's Club

On April 4, 2013 the Atikokan Sportsmen's Club submitted formal comments stating their concerns, which were also focussed on fish health and the potential effects on the aquatic environment. The comments were provided in the form of a three-page letter stating the Atikokan Sportsmen's concerns for the potential effects on fish and the aquatic environment. Comments also touched on effluent treatment methods, potential vibration effects, closure planning and fish habitat compensation planning.

##### 7.1.2.10.3 Tourist Outfitter

Throughout March and April, 2013 a series of email correspondences were received from a local tourist outfitter outlining their comments on the Draft EIS/EA Report. The comments were received by email and in hard copy at the Community Open House. The comments were related to potential effects to the tourism industry as it relates to the following topics:

- Construction details
- Benefits to tourism operators
- Fishing pressure from worker accommodation camp
- Visual effects
- Noise
- Restricted access
- Effluent testing
- Closure plan

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.1.2.10.4 Local Stakeholders

Two local stakeholders provided comments on the Draft EIS/EA Report. One stakeholder sent an email stating they do not support Steep Rock as a suitable fish habitat compensation measure. OHRG has heard this feedback at the Community Open House and from Aboriginal groups, and has therefore removed off-site fish compensation as an option in the revised No Net Loss Plan.

A second stakeholder wrote about their concern that their personal mining claim was not considered by OHRG during the Project planning process. The location of the claim was checked and it was confirmed that it is more than 10 km away from any planned Project infrastructure.

### 7.1.2.10.5 Letters of Support

*Version 3 Update: CMC continues to have productive discussions with H2O Power and Brookfield Renewable Power and is working towards a comprehensive water taking agreement. Once the agreement is finalized, the power producers have expressed their intent to submit letters to CMC indicating their support of the Project.*

-----

OHRG received several letters of support for the Draft EIS/EA Report from municipalities, local organizations and local residents. A quote from each organization that sent a letter of support is provided below. Copies of the letters are provided in Appendix 7.III.

#### **Town of Atikokan**

*I am confident that Osisko is doing everything possible to meet all environmental standards, and I look forward to Osisko being given permission to move forward.*

#### **Township of Ignace**

*I whole heartedly support the Osisko Hammond Reef Gold Project, for all the economical and social benefits it will provide for the Town of Atikokan*

#### **Township of O'Connor**

*Council feel that the project will greatly benefit local residents and will encourage a healthy and prosperous community and hey also feel that it is in the best interest of the Town of Atikokan that the project proceeds as quickly as possible*

#### **City of Thunder Bay**

*You have served Northwestern Ontario well as a model mining company of which social, corporate and environmental mining practices is leading edge.*

#### **Northwestern Ontario Municipal Association**

*We are excited about the positive impacts that this project will have on employment and economic activity for the region as well as the skills development opportunities that will be realized.*

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.1.2.10.6 Responses to Draft EIS/EA Report Comments

OHRG provided three presentations to public stakeholders who commented on the Draft EIS/EA Report. These presentations were focussed on specific comments that were received and the initial responses prepared by OHRG to address the comments.

### 7.1.2.10.7 Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters

In response to the concerns outlined by the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters, OHRG prepared the responses to all comments and held a teleconference to discuss. A Mercury Fact Sheet was also prepared for attendees to take away with them. The Mercury Fact Sheet explains why the Project is not anticipated to result in any increase in mercury levels either through exploration, ore processing or mining activities. A copy of the Mercury Fact Sheet is provided in Appendix 7.III.

The teleconference with the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters (OFAH) took place on May 31, 2013. Six people were in attendance, including three representatives from OFAH, a representative from the Atikokan Sportsmen's Club, the aquatic biologist from Golder and OHRG Director of Sustainable Development. OHRG prepared and delivered a presentation to the OFAH which gave an overview of all comments received on the Draft EIS/EA Report, detailed OHRG's responses to OFAH's specific comments, provided a summary of potential effects of the Project on hunting, fishing, tourism and recreation, and OHRG's planned mitigation measures.

Discussion and comments regarding the presentation were focussed on the MOE Guideline for sport fish tissue analysis and the validity of its application to the environmental assessment process.

Follow up from the meeting included the following additional information requests:

- Rationale for fish tissue collection
- Fish tissue comment from MOE surface water branch
- Details on planned Environmental Effects Monitoring (EEM)

Meeting notes, fact sheets and additional information requests were distributed to attendees by email on June 14, 2013 and are provided in Appendix 7.III.

A formal letter was sent to the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters in November 2013 prior to the submission of the Final EIS/EA Report. The letter provided OHRG's detailed response to each concern included in OFAH's April 2013 letter, and is provided in Appendix 7.III.

Notwithstanding the fact that OHRG believes that the fish tissue sampling undertaken for the EA was sufficient for EA purposes and as a result of the comments received from OFAH, the Atikokan Sportsmen's Club and Seine River First Nation, OHRG has committed to providing capacity support to Seine River First Nation (SRFN) to collect additional fish tissue and benthic samples in the Spring of 2014 in conjunction with an environmental study being undertaken with their community. The sampling work plan and data will be shared with SRFN, OFAH and the Atikokan Sportsmen's Club.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.1.2.10.8 Atikokan Sportsmen's Club

In response to the concerns outlined by the Atikokan Sportsmen's Club, Osisko travelled to Atikokan and held a meeting. A Mercury Fact Sheet was also prepared for attendees to take away with them. The Mercury Fact Sheet explains why the Project is not anticipated to result in any increase in mercury levels either through exploration, ore processing or mining activities. A copy of the Mercury Fact Sheet is provided in Appendix 7.III.

The meeting with the Atikokan Sportsmen's Club took place on May 21, 2013 and was attended by 17 Club members. Osisko gave a presentation that summarized each comment provided by the Sportsmen's Club and provided responses to each question. Meeting notes were provided to the Club President for distribution and are included in Appendix 7.III.

Discussion and comments regarding the presentation were focussed on the MOE Guideline for sport fish tissue analysis and the validity of its application to the environmental assessment process.

A formal letter was sent to the Atikokan Sportsmen's Club in November 2013 prior to the submission of the Final EIS/EA Report. The letter provided OHRG's detailed response to each concern included in the Sportsmen Club's April 2013 letter, and is provided in Appendix 7.III.

Notwithstanding the fact that OHRG believes that the fish tissue sampling undertaken for the EA was sufficient for EA purposes and as a result of the comments received from OFAH, the Atikokan Sportsmen's Club and Seine River First Nation, OHRG has committed to providing capacity support to Seine River First Nation (SRFN) to collect additional fish tissue and benthic samples in the Spring of 2014 in conjunction with an environmental study being undertaken with their community. The sampling work plan and data will be shared with SRFN, OFAH and the Atikokan Sportsmen's Club.

### 7.1.2.10.9 Tourist Outfitters

In response to the concerns outlined by Crystal Beach Resort, OHRG organized a tourism operators' workshop in Atikokan. The following local tourism outfitters were invited to the workshop:

- Canoe Canada
- Niobe Lake Lodge
- Finlayson Lake
- Eva Lake
- Camp Quetico
- Perch Lake
- Crystal Beach
- Quetico North
- Branches Resort



---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



On May 21, 2013, OHRG held a tourism operators workshop at the Main Street office in Atikokan. Representatives from four local tourism operations attended the workshop. The purpose of the workshop was to present a summary of comments received from the tourism industry and outline OHRG's approach to responding to the comments. The presentation also outlined the potential effects to tourism, including visual effects from the Project (the 3-D renderings from key sites included in the draft EIS/EA report were shared and discussed with participants) and OHRG's planned mitigation measures. A formal written response was also provided to Crystal Beach Resort.

Discussion and comments on the presentation were focussed on:

- Noise
- Visual effects
- Water Use
- Air quality
- Mitigation measures

As a result of the workshop, OHRG has agreed to add a commitment to invest in advertisement to promote tourism in Atikokan (for example, a website) in Chapter 9 commitments of the EIS/EA Report.

### 7.1.3 Key Issues Identified by Public

Throughout communications and consultation events OHRG has received many questions about Project design details. Many members of the public have stated their support for the Project and their interest in employment with OHRG. Concerns about potential effects to the environment and in particular the aquatic environment have also been raised by public stakeholders.

The public consultation log provided in Appendix 7.III provides details of the following:

- Written issues or concerns received from the public
- OHRG's response to the issue or concern
- Whether follow-up action is required to resolve the issue

OHRG has provided immediate detailed responses to many questions received from the public. Public comments were considered during the preparation and revision of the EIS/EA Report.

#### 7.1.3.1 Aquatic Health

Fishing is an important recreational activity and is also the source of income for local tourism operators. Two of the public stakeholders who submitted written comments on the Draft EIS/EA Report listed potential effects to fish as their key concern. The Atikokan Sportsmen's Club and the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters both requested further sampling of fish tissue and benthic invertebrates in the area.

Notwithstanding the fact that the fish tissue sampling undertaken for the EA was sufficient for EA purposes, OHRG has committed to providing capacity support to Seine River First Nation (SRFN) to collect additional fish tissue and benthic samples in the spring of 2014 in conjunction with an environmental study being undertaken with their community. Data collected will be shared with SRFN, OFAH and the Sportsmen's Club.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT

### CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT

#### VERSION 3

---



#### 7.1.3.2 Water Use

The Marmion Reservoir is a regulated water body that is subject to the Seine River Watershed Management Plan. The Plan includes target outflow rates at specified dams and target water elevation levels at certain times of year. The hydrology assessment has concluded that the Hammond Reef Gold Project can operate within these target rates. Ongoing discussion with existing water users is required to allow for cooperation and understanding of each other's seasonal water needs.

#### 7.1.3.3 Land Use

Overlapping land users were engaged and mutually beneficial agreements were reached with the identified bait fish block and bear management area license holder, trapline holders and adjacent tourist operator. Land use agreements include restriction of access as required for safety during identified Project phases. All agreements are contingent on the Project moving forward.

#### 7.1.3.4 Tourism

In addition to the tourism industry's concern about aquatic health, the changes to the visual landscape and the potential effects to the tourism industry were a key concern.

### 7.1.4 OHRG's Commitment to the Community

The overall approach for addressing concerns is to continue actively sharing information about the Project through written information, face to face meetings and regular Project updates. As detailed in the Public Consultation Plan for the Project, OHRG will continue to share information and host events at the following remaining milestones in the planning process:

- Submission of the EA Report.
- Review of Decommissioning Plans.

Stakeholder feedback to date has shown that the Community News Brief publications are effective ways of regularly communicating with Project stakeholders. OHRG will continue to publish a bi-weekly newspaper column which will strive to address comments and questions received to date. Chapter 8 Environmental and Social Management Planning outlines OHRG's further plans for ongoing community involvement.

A local monitoring committee will be established to allow ongoing communication with the local population. The mandate of the Atikokan/OHRG Committee will be to provide a direct link for communications between community members and OHRG. Information about the Project will be shared with the Committee, and Committee members will disseminate this information to the community at large. In turn, community members can approach the Committee with their concerns, and the Committee can share these community concerns with OHRG.

#### Terms of Reference Commitments

Table 7-4 provides a list of commitments that were made to the public at the ToR development stage. OHRG has already met many of these commitments, and will continue to work towards fulfilling all the commitments as Project planning and regulatory review proceeds.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.1.5 Outstanding Concerns from the Public

The following section identifies the issues and concerns that have not been addressed prior to submission of the EIS/EA Report. Many of the issues relate to commitments by OHRG to provide specific information to stakeholders. These concerns will be addressed throughout the ongoing permitting process.

#### 7.1.5.1 Social Management Planning

Ongoing discussions with the Town are considered essential to the Project planning process. A local Monitoring Committee (the Atikokan/OHRG Committee) will be formed as detailed in Chapter 8, to include representatives from various sectors including emergency planning, infrastructure and recreation.

OHRG is currently developing a list of goods and services based on its experience at Malartic. This will be provided to the Town (and Aboriginal communities) once it becomes available.

OHRG is planning to form a beneficiary fund and committee to benefit the community. The Town Council would like to be directly involved in administering the beneficiary fund and would like to know who would be on the beneficiary committee and how would they be selected.

#### 7.1.5.2 Water Use

The Marmion Reservoir is a regulated water body that is subject to the Seine River Watershed Management Plan. Ongoing discussion with existing water users is required to allow for cooperation and understanding of each other's seasonal water needs.

OHRG has shared the preliminary water balance for the OHRG project and will continue to share water balance information as it is verified throughout operations with the Seine River Watershed Management Committee.

#### 7.1.5.3 Tourism

In addition to the tourism industry's concern about aquatic health, the changes to the visual landscape and the potential effects to the tourism industry was a key concern. Visual renderings of the planned Project in the landscape have been shared with the tourism operators and OHRG has committed to providing capacity for advertising for recreation and tourism in the Atikokan area.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.2 Government Consultation

*Version 3 Update: CMC received a total of 322 follow-up comments and requests for information from the government following the submission of the Version 2 EIS/EA; 113 from the federal government and 209 from the provincial government. CMC worked closely with the joint federal-provincial review team in responding to these comments to ensure concerns are address and expectations are met. Responses to federal and provincial comments are provided in Part A and Part B, respectively, of the Addendum to the Version 3 EIS/EA.*

-----

#### 7.2.1 Stakeholder Identification

Provincial and federal government agencies have been working together to provide a streamlined consultation process where possible. Key contacts for the environmental assessment from provincial and federal governments have been identified as:

- Ministry of Northern Development Mines
- Ministry of Environment – Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch
- Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency

Other ministries and government offices that have been involved in consultation, including review of preliminary baseline studies and OHRG’s environmental assessment approach, include:

- |  |                                   |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| ■ Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada | ■ Ministry of Labour              |
| ■ Department of Fisheries and Oceans                 | ■ Ministry of Natural Resources   |
| ■ Environment Canada                                 | ■ Ministry of Tourism and Culture |
| ■ Health Canada                                      | ■ Ministry of Transportation      |
| ■ Major Projects Management Office                   | ■ Natural Resources Canada        |
|  | ■ Transport Canada                |

On August 16, 2011, OHRG hosted a site tour of the Project site (including helicopter views of the Project area) for 10 provincial and federal regulators including representatives from the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Environment Canada, the Ministry of Natural Resources, the Ministry of the Environment, and Transport Canada. The tour was well received by the participants.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT

### CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT

#### VERSION 3

---



### 7.2.2 Consultation Activities

A summary of government consultation activities is provided below. OHRG relied on input from the key contacts to determine inclusion in government consultation activities. A full record of meeting notes, presentations and a government consultation log is provided in Appendix 7.IV.

#### 7.2.2.1 Lead Agency Coordination

Regularly scheduled update meetings between OHRG, the CEA Agency, MOE and MNDM allowed for continual dialogue and updates about the EIS/EA progress and activities.

Table 7-5 summarizes the date, participants and topics covered at our regularly scheduled update meetings with the key contacts, commonly referred to as Consultation Update Meetings. Notes from meetings with all other stakeholders, including the wider government review team, the public and Aboriginal communities are routinely shared with the Crown through the MOE EAB, MNDM and the CEA Agency as part of the key component's oversight. Notes include copies of presentations, if any, as appendices to the meeting minutes.

#### 7.2.2.2 Presentations of Baseline Studies Results

On May 31, June 1, June 4 and August 14, 2012, OHRG hosted a series of meetings with the government review team to present information from the baseline data collection. The purpose of the meetings was for OHRG to present and discuss the revised project layout and baseline data for the Project, with the federal and provincial government review teams. The desired outcome of the meetings was to identify any data gaps that need to be addressed during the 2012 field season in order to fulfill the federal EIS guidelines and the Provincial Terms of Reference.

Table 7-6 summarizes the date, participants and topics covered at the baseline results meetings for each component of the EIS/EA:

#### 7.2.2.3 Fish Compensation Planning

*Version 3 Update: Fish habitat 'compensation' refers to 'offsetting' under the current Fisheries Act and 'No Net Loss Plan' (NNLP) refers to 'Offsetting Plan'.*

-----

A series of meetings/workshops were held with the government review team to discuss a number of issues specifically related to Aquatic Biology including collection of baseline data, development of fish habitat accounting methodology, discussions regarding federal and provincial regulatory requirements, and preliminary discussions regarding compensation for loss of fishing opportunities. OHRG has been working with the government review team to finalize a Fish Habitat Accounting methodology for use in development of a No Net Loss Plan for the OHRG project.

Upon the recommendation of DFO, a review was solicited of the draft Fish Habitat Accounting methodology by Dr. C.K. Minns. On August 29, Dr. Minns provided his review of the methodology. On October 9, 2012, OHRG and Golder Associates met with Dr. Minns to further clarify his recommendations and to incorporate his recommendations. The final version of the Habitat Accounting methodology reflects Dr. Minns suggestions.

Table 7-7 summarizes the date, participants and topics covered during the development of the habitat accounting methodology.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



On May 29, 2013 OHRG received an email from DFO confirm that they had received enough direction as to what habitat gains will be created to offset the fish habitat losses to meet the EIS requirements. OHRG committed to creating only off-set projects “on-site” and Steep Rock is no longer part of the proposed fish compensation projects.

### **7.2.2.4 Publication of Draft EIS/EA Report**

The Draft EIS/EA Report was published on February 15, 2013. OHRG circulated the Notice of Publication to public stakeholders through email, the Osisko website and newspaper advertisements. A hard copy of the Draft EIS/EA Report was made available at Osisko’s Atikokan office and the Ministry of Environment in Toronto. The public was invited to submit their comments on the Draft EIS/EA Report by April 5, 2013.

### **7.2.2.5 Presentation of EIS/EA Results**

OHRG hosted a series of EIS/EA Results presentations for the Government Review Team (GRT). The purpose of the meetings was for OHRG to present and discuss the potential effects and mitigation measures to the federal and provincial government review teams. The desired outcome of the meetings was to provide the GRT with a fulsome understanding of the Project, answer initial questions and facilitate the technical review of the Draft EIS/EA Report.

On February 19, 2013 OHRG hosted a meeting with the government review team to present the findings of the EIS/EA Report. Approximately 20 individuals attended the meeting in person and by teleconference including representatives from the following federal agencies and provincial ministries:

- Ministry of Environment
- Ministry of Natural Resources
- Ministry of Northern Development and Mines
- Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
- Department of Fisheries and Oceans
- Environment Canada
- Health Canada
- Natural Resources Canada
- Transport Canada

OHRG prepared and delivered a presentation that provided an overview of the EIS/EA Report structure and conclusions. The presentations outlined recent stakeholder engagement activities and feedback and clarified the preferred alternative selected for the Project. A summary of each environmental and social component was given including potential effects, planned mitigation measures and environmental monitoring requirements. Finally, the presentation included an overview of OHRG’s conceptual environmental and social management plan and the overall benefits of the Project.

Discussion was focussed on minor clarifications and an expression of interest in the Project by Transport Canada under the Navigable Waters Act. OHRG followed up with Transport Canada to provide a more thorough description on the water bodies that may result in changes to navigability due to changes in lake water levels.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.2.2.6 *Comments Received on Draft EIS/EA Report*

OHRG received approximately 700 comments on the Draft EIS/EA Report from the Government Review Team (GRT). These comments were authored by regulators from ten different agencies.

The federal comments totalled approximately 165 and were compiled into an excel sheet by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and to allow for categorization by Topic and Agency.

- Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (40)
- Department of Fisheries and Oceans (38)
- Environment Canada (59)
- Health Canada (10)
- Natural Resources Canada (9)
- Transport Canada (16)

The provincial comments totalled approximately 515 and were coordinated by the Ministry of Environment, Environmental Approvals Branch.

- Ministry of Natural Resources (294)
- Ministry of Northern Development and Mines (48)
- Ministry of Environment (175)
- Additional letters provided on Air Model, Sewage Works, Archaeology and Heritage Assessment

### 7.2.2.7 *Responses to Comments on the Draft EIS/EA Report*

OHRG prepared written responses to all comments received from the Government Review Team. Government reviewers were invited to participate in a discussion around the draft responses to their comments at face to face meetings or teleconferences. OHRG's responses to comments were provided in draft form prior to each meeting. All responses are included in Appendix 1.IV of this final EIS/EA Report.

#### 7.2.2.7.1 *Ministry of Natural Resources*

On April 4, 2013 approximately 290 comments on the Draft EIS/EA Report were received from Ministry of Natural Resources, and are categorized as follows:

- |                            |                       |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| ■ Alternatives Assessment  | ■ Aquatic Environment |
| ■ Project Description      | ■ Terrestrial Ecology |
| ■ Environmental Assessment | ■ Socio-Economic      |
| ■ Water Quality            | ■ Cumulative Effects  |
| ■ Hydrology                | ■ Closure             |

On August 7, 2013 OHRG provided the Ministry of Natural Resources with draft responses to all of their comments.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



On August 21, 2013 OHRG travelled to Atikokan for a meeting with MNR to discuss the responses to comments received from MNR on the draft EIS/EA Report. Seven Ministry staff members were present as well as representatives from MOE EAB and CEA Agency. The meeting included a presentation with draft responses to each of the comments. A discussion took place on areas of concern or where draft responses were deemed to need further clarification.

A discussion of EIS/EA Report revisions took place throughout the meeting with MNR. Several revisions to the EIS/EA Report were recommended, as provided in the detailed meeting notes. The following provides a summary of key changes undertaken to the Final EIS/EA Report as per MNR recommendations.

### ***Alternatives Assessment Report (Chapter 4 of the EIS/EA Report)***

- Additional detail about on-site worker accommodation, auxiliary power line and fibre optic line.
- Further detail about tailings pipeline alternatives included.
- Assessment of the alternative of constructing a 25m retaining wall that was ruled out because of safety.

### ***Construction Phase (Chapter 5 of the EIS/EA Report)***

- As requested, Osisko has provided some additional detail on high level aspects of the fish relocation plan in Section 5.1.1 of the EIS/EA Report.
- MNR has indicated that Osisko also needs to address the Land Use Guideline for Marmion that requires a 120-m buffer from the shore for all infrastructure. Osisko indicated that this requires further negotiation as the project cannot proceed with this buffer due to the location of the mineral resource and the environmental benefits of keeping the project contained within the peninsula to the extent possible.

### ***Conceptual Closure Plan (Technical Supporting Document to the EIS/EA Report)***

- MNR has suggested that there should be a section in the report that speaks specifically to restoration.
- MNR would like to see some information about what areas will be re-seeded, mulched, etc.
- MNR cares about habitats, not just chemical and physical stability.
- Osisko tried to provide additional clarity in the EIS/EA report and will provide more information in the formal closure plan to be submitted to MNM following acceptance of the EIS/EA

### ***Mitigation Measures (Chapter 6 of the EIS/EA Report)***

- MNR requested clarification that restricting hunting means no hunting at all. No firearms at all would be permitted.
- MNR requested some clarity regarding what is monitored and what is measured.



---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### Conclusions (Chapter 12 of the EIS/EA Report)

- MNR is concerned that Osisko is reaching the conclusion that there won't be any effects much quicker than they should.
- MNR has indicated that Osisko should clearly state that there will be a change to the environment due to the Project. The landscape will change. Osisko has made changes to address this:
  - Osisko has added the visual assessment results to the conclusions and executive summary.
  - Osisko has provided a more of a clear summary of effects in the conclusions and executive summary.

Follow up and action items from the MNR meeting are detailed in the meeting notes provided in Appendix 7.IV and summarized below. The following provides a summary of completed and planned discussions to be undertaken with Project stakeholders based on MNR's recommendations.

**Environmental Monitoring:** OHRG hosted a meeting about environmental monitoring including a presentation which summarized the changes made to Chapter 8 of the EIS/EA Report and a discussion of ongoing concerns regarding planned environmental monitoring for the Project.

**Closure Planning:** OHRG undertook a further assessment of closure alternatives, which is provided as a supplemental to the Conceptual Closure Plan TSD.

**Fishery Management:** MNR collects data on fishing estimates and would like OHRG to participate in this information collection. MNR recommended a site-specific count of fishing boats on the lake. Further discussion is required on the need for clear objectives of undertaking a fishing study.

**Water Users:** MNR has recommended ongoing discussions and follow up with power producers regarding water level impacts during drought conditions. OHRG plans to engage the local water users for further discussion and participate in the Seine River Watershed Management Committee.

**Site Specific Water Quality Objectives:** Ongoing discussions with MOE are required to discuss specific values and water quality management plans for the closure phase.

#### 7.2.2.7.2 Environment Canada

On April 4, 2013 approximately 55 comments on the Draft EIS/EA Report were received from Environment Canada, and are categorized as follows:

- |                              |                           |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| ■ Accidents and Malfunctions | ■ Hydrogeology            |
| ■ Alternatives Assessment    | ■ Hydrology               |
| ■ Cumulative Effects         | ■ Water Quality           |
| ■ Project Details            | ■ Aboriginal Interests    |
| ■ Atmospheric Environment    | ■ Terrestrial Environment |
| ■ Geochemistry               | ■ Aquatic Environment     |

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT

### CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT

#### VERSION 3

---



On October 10, 2013, OHRG held a meeting in Toronto to discuss the responses to the comments received from Environment Canada on Draft EIS/EA Report. Five Environment Canada staff members were present as well as representatives from MNDM, MOE-EAB and CEA Agency. The meeting included a presentation with draft responses to each of the comments. The majority of the responses to comments were deemed suitable by attendees. A discussion took place on areas of concern or where draft responses were deemed to need further clarification. Topics of discussion throughout the meeting included:

- Alternatives Assessment
- Access Roads
- Atmospheric Environment
- Water Quality
- Terrestrial Biology

Follow-up and action items from the meeting included providing additional detail on the air quality assessment. The approach to air quality modeling, including the bounding scenario approach and focus on provincial requirements is further detailed and explained in the Supplemental information package provided for the Atmospheric TSD.

Discussion on reclamation and restoration work included the recommendation for presenting a clearer depiction of OHRG's specific closure and rehabilitation plans, such as areas targeted for topsoil spreading and predicted volumes of topsoil to be spread on the Project site. This level of detail has not been determined at this time and will be included in ongoing closure planning with the MNDM.

#### 7.2.2.7.3 Water Quality

On January 16, 2012, OHRG attended an Ontario Mining Association (OMA) teleconference with the MOE Director, Environmental Approvals Access & Service Integration to discuss setting limits and objectives for Environmental Compliance Approvals (ECAs). There were over 30 OMA members on the call. The Director committed that limits and objectives for ECAs will be site-specific and receiver-based (i.e., the receiving water is taken into account, as well as the operation of the applicant). She strongly encouraged early meetings with the EAB group and the regional MOE representatives to discuss the setting of limits and objectives.

On November 20, 2012, OHRG and Golder met with MOE (EAB and regional), EC, the CEA Agency, DFO, NRCan and MNDM. The purpose of the meeting was to have preliminary discussions regarding water quality findings for the OHRG Project and to obtain some clarification on the process for setting Site Specific Water Quality Objectives.

On April 4, 2013, approximately 55 comments regarding water quality were received on the Draft EIS/EA Report which were mainly focussed on clarification of baseline data, the need for site specific water quality objectives and requests for new mixing model work to clarify the extent of the effluent mixing zone. Comments from the GRT also recommended that the on-site worker accommodation camp discharge location be moved downstream of the intake location. This recommendation has been acted upon and the revised location is presented in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS/EA Report.

On June 3, 2013, a meeting was held with regulators to discuss comments received on water quality. The discussion was focused on potential changes or clarifications needed to finalize the initial water quality results presented in the Draft EIS/EA Report. The discussion included requests for new work and a follow up meeting.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



On July 2, 2013, a third meeting was held with regulators to discuss water quality. The discussion was focused on draft responses and new work undertaken based on the government review of water quality results. The meeting included a presentation with draft responses to each of the comments. The majority of the responses to comments were deemed suitable by attendees. A discussion took place on areas of concern or where draft responses were deemed to need further clarification. Topics of discussion throughout the meeting included:

- Baseline data
- Lake mixing model
- Diffuser design
- Site specific water quality objectives

Attendees agreed that a stronger understanding of the water quality modeling methods and prediction values was established through the discussion.

### **Summary of Water Quality Report Revisions**

Revisions to the water quality portion of the EIS/EA Report have not changed the conclusions of the assessment. The changes to the calculated cyanide concentration levels and pit flooding time were evaluated and not determined to require further assessment or mitigation measures. Chapter 6 has been revised to provide a summary of planned mitigation measures for water quality and includes additional mixing model results for the proposed diffuser. Chapter 8 has been revised to include a more detailed water quality monitoring plan that is clearly linked to Project guidelines.

Supplemental information packages have been provided for the Site and Lake Water Quality TSDs that include:

- Technical Memorandum providing the results of additional work on the Mixing Model and Diffuser Design (Lake Water Quality TSD)
- New water quality predictions for cyanide values based on the change to cyanide concentration levels leaving the Processing Plant (Chapter 6; Site Water Quality TSD; Lake Water Quality TSD)
- Revised location of effluent discharge and intake locations for the on-site worker accommodation (Chapter 5)
- Revised water quality sampling locations

#### **7.2.2.7.4 Groundwater Management**

On October 10, 2013 OHRG held a meeting in Toronto to discuss the comments received from Environment Canada, Natural Resources Canada, Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Northern Development and Mines regarding groundwater management. Representatives from the CEA Agency and Ministry of Natural Resources were also present.

Approximately 30 comments regarding groundwater management were received and were mainly focussed on the approach to modelling. OHRG used a water balance approach to evaluate the potential for groundwater to effect surface water quality. This approach is considered to provide more certainty than a hydrogeological modelling approach due to the inherent uncertainty and heterogeneity in hydraulic conductivity values and boundary conditions. Comments also included points on closure and groundwater monitoring plans.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



The meeting included a presentation with draft responses to each of the comments. The majority of the responses were deemed suitable by attendees. A discussion took place on areas of concern or where draft responses were deemed to need further clarification. Topics of discussion throughout the meeting included:

- Seepage modelling assumptions
- Water quality predictions
- Contingency planning and commitments
- Closure phase predictions

Follow-up from the meeting includes ongoing information sharing with MOE and a commitment to provide some additional context to the groundwater predictions. A discussion on the role of attenuation and estimation of how potential attenuation rates could influence copper and cyanide levels in groundwater outflows was recommended. Additional recommendations by the MOE included providing a discussion differentiating between worst case predictions and anticipated operations conditions. OHRG was also advised to review EIS Guidelines and ensure water management details line up with requirements, including the requirement to provide conceptual level details of the water collection and management systems.

### ***Summary of Groundwater Report Revisions***

Revisions to the groundwater portion of the EIS/EA Report are considered minor. The changes to calculated cyanide concentration levels and pit flooding time were evaluated and not determined to require further assessment or mitigation measures as they do not change the conclusions of the EIS/EA. Chapter 6 has been revised to provide a summary of planned mitigation measures for groundwater, and a qualitative description of copper attenuation mechanisms. A discussion of attenuation of cyanide is provided in the Lake Water Quality TSD. Chapter 8 has been revised to include a more detailed groundwater monitoring plan that is clearly linked to Project guidelines.

A supplemental information package will be provided for the Hydrogeology TSD that includes:

- Water management collection system conceptual design details
- A qualitative discussion of predicted attenuation rate (assumed to result in a 10X reduction)
- Discussion of modeled worst case scenario vs. anticipated operations case (included in response to IRs)
- New GW3 guideline comparison table (same conclusion)
- Revised Figure 2-10A

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### *Osisko's Commitment to Groundwater Management*

Osisko is committed to responsible groundwater management. The Project design will include seepage collection ponds around all stockpiles and the TMF as part of our conservative approach to water management.

Osisko will monitor groundwater levels and seepage water quality routinely, as detailed in Chapter 8, Environmental Monitoring Plan. Groundwater quality and flow predictions will be confirmed through monitoring in wells focussed around the open pits. Design assumptions will be confirmed through monitoring of water levels and seepage rates near the TMF and stockpiles. Adaptive management will be applied should monitoring results differ from predictions.

Osisko will review monitoring data and modify seepage collection systems as needed. Active management of the Project water management system will be ensure downstream aquatic health is protected. Contingency planning includes the use of additional pumping infrastructure if needed to ensure downstream aquatic health is protected.

#### **7.2.2.7.5 Alternatives Assessment**

During the OHRG site visit on August 16 2012, representatives from EC encouraged OHRG to meet further with them to discuss the mine waste alternatives assessment and to discuss any water bodies that might fall within Schedule 2 of the MMER. Environment Canada also provided a copy of correspondence on the Detour Gold project and suggested that the concerns raised within the letters were considered in the design of OHRG project.

On November 20, 2012, OHRG and Golder met with EC, the CEA Agency, DFO, NRCan and MNDM. OHRG presented and received clarification from the GRT on the following items:

- The overall approach to the Mine Waste Alternatives Assessment
- The “dry land” mine waste management facility option
- Letters from EC regarding the Detour Gold project
- Initial discussion on MMER Schedule 2 requirements for the OHRG Project

On April 4, 2013, Osisko received approximately 35 of the comments on the Draft EIS/EA Report about alternatives. Most comments requested further detail and a stronger link to the regulatory requirements. Comments on the alternatives assessment were provided by the following regulatory agencies:

- Environment Canada
- Ministry of Environment, EAB
- Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
- Ministry of Natural Resources

On May 27, 2013, OHRG met with MOE EAB, CEAA and MNDM to discuss comments on Alternatives Assessment. The discussion included a commitment by OHRG to re-organize the report for clarity and provide additional details regarding on site worker accommodation as well as a stronger link to VECs.

Mine waste alternatives were a specific area of concern for Environment Canada. OHRG travelled to Gatineau QC to meet with Environment Canada regarding this topic on July 23, 2013. Subsequent correspondence to the meeting outlined Environment Canada's specific requests for report revisions.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### *Summary of Revisions to Alternatives Assessment Report*

Revisions to the Alternatives Assessment TSD and Chapter 4 of the EIS/EA Report are considered substantial. Environment Canada requested that OHRG undertake a more detailed mine waste alternatives assessment by including additional sub-accounts and indicators in the multiple accounts analysis. Environment Canada provided suggested indicators for consideration in the Environment, Economic and Socio-Economic accounts and sub-accounts. OHRG incorporated many of the suggested revisions to the report as summarized in Table 7-8.

Additional changes to the Alternatives Assessment TSD and Chapter 4, outside of mine waste alternatives, included a stronger link to VECs and an overall revision for consistency and clarity. Some new discussion regarding the on-site worker accommodation alternative was also provided.

#### **7.2.2.7.6 Environmental Monitoring**

Environmental Monitoring is provided in Chapter 8 of the EIS/EA Report. This chapter was identified by regulators as an area needing improvement, and was therefore revised substantially based on written comments and discussions during meetings.

Approximately 30 of the comments received on the Draft EIS/EA Report included questions about environmental monitoring. Most comments requested further detail and a stronger link to the regulatory requirements. Comments on the alternatives assessment were provided by the following regulatory agencies:

- Ministry of Environment, EAB
- Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
- Ministry of Northern Development and Mines
- Ministry of Natural Resources
- Health Canada

On October 15, 2013, OHRG held a meeting with regulators to discuss environmental monitoring plans for the Project. The meeting included a presentation with tables that detailed point by point OHRG's approach to environmental monitoring through management planning, contingency planning and specific monitoring plans for each component. The providing specific monitoring objectives

A discussion took place on areas of concern or participants required further clarification. Topics of discussion throughout the meeting included:

- Report Revisions
- Closure Planning
- Social Monitoring
- Contingency Planning

Follow up action items include the need to have further detailed discussions with agencies to fully define roles and responsibilities as the Project moves forward.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### *Summary of Environmental Monitoring Report Revisions*

Revisions to Chapter 8, the Environmental Monitoring portion of the EIS/EA Report, have been substantial to include further details and provide a closer link to government guidelines. The revised Chapter 8 is organized by Physical, Biological and Social environmental components. The Chapter includes a narrative explaining potential effects by component and providing justification for the focus of the proposed monitoring plan. The Chapter includes clear presentation of management and monitoring plans through the use of a Management Planning table and Monitoring Planning table for each physical and biological component considered in the environmental assessment.

The Management planning table lists the Project interaction and the potential effect to the environment. It includes proposed mitigation measures and clear monitoring objectives. The management table also includes lists of applicable regulations and guidelines that relate to monitoring objectives. Contingency planning is included in the Management tables in the event that predictions are not accurate.

The Monitoring plan tables bring forward the potential effects listed in the Management planning tables and further defines indicators to meet the stated monitoring objective. Monitoring plan tables also include a description of planned sampling location, sampling method, and estimated frequency and duration of monitoring plan for each physical and biological component. The biological monitoring tables also provide a direct link to the VECs described and assessed in Chapter 6 of the EIS/EA Report.

### *Osisko's Commitment to Environmental Monitoring*

Chapter 8 of the EIS/EA Report represents the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for the Hammond Reef Gold Project. The EMP was created to reduce the risks to the environment through consideration of predictions and development of a plan that allows the predictions to be confirmed. The EMP also includes contingency planning should the case arise that a prediction is not confirmed.

Once construction and operations commence, environmental monitoring will be an integral part of evaluating the effectiveness of the EMP.

The objective of the EMP is to ensure that negative impacts on the physical and biological environments are mitigated; benefits that will arise from the development of the Project are enhanced; and compliance with existing legislation and consistency with provincial guidelines and best practice is achieved.

#### **7.2.2.7.7 Terrestrial Ecology - Bats**

On October 17, 2013, OHRG held a meeting with Environment Canada, Ministry of Natural Resources and Ministry of the Environment to share the results of the bat studies carried out at the Osisko Hammond Reef Gold project site and to discuss planned mitigation measures for inclusion in EIS/EA Report.

The meeting included a presentation provided by OHRG to share the results of the bat surveys and begin a discussion of the proposed compensation measures that would be undertaken should the Project trigger the Endangered Species Act for its potential to affect provincially listed bats.

Topics of discussion throughout the meeting included:

- Federal designation of bats
- Planned mitigation measures
- Permitting process

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### **Summary of Terrestrial Ecology – Bats Report Revisions**

Revisions to the terrestrial ecology portion of the EIS/EA Report are considered minor. Chapter 3 has been revised to include information about bats. Chapter 6 has been revised to provide a summary of planned mitigation measures for terrestrial biology and Chapter 8 has been revised to include a more detailed terrestrial biology monitoring plan, including a plan for bats. Discussion of bats will acknowledge that an *Endangered Species Act* authorization may be required and conclusion of bat studies will be included in stakeholder consultation.

A supplemental information package was prepared for the Terrestrial Ecology TSD that includes:

- Bat field work, analysis and effects assessment
- Predicted numbers of individual birds that could be displaced
- Eco-site types within TMF, WRMF and Low Grade Ore Stockpile footprints prior to disturbance and the type of rehabilitation planned
- Wetland complex evaluation results
- Revised Figures 1-3; Figure 2-5; Figure 2-10 and Figure 3-5

### **7.2.3 Publication of Final EIS/EA Report**

#### Version 3 Update:

~~The Final EIS/EA Report will be published in December 2013. OHRG will circulate the Notice of Publication to Project stakeholders through email, the Osisko website and newspaper advertisements. A hard copy of the Final EIS/EA Report will be made available at Osisko's Atikokan office and the Ministry of Environment in Toronto at the time of publishing. The public will be invited to submit their comments on the Final EIS/EA Report following CEAA's conformity review in early 2014.~~

#### **7.2.3.1 Version 2 EIS/EA Report Published in December 2013**

*The Version 2 EIS/EA Report was published in December 2013.*

#### **7.2.3.2 Version 3 EIS/EA Report published in January 2018.**

*The final (Version 3) amended EIS/EA report was published electronically in January 2018, and includes the Version 2 EIS/EA in its entirety as well as a consolidation of all responses to information requests and supplemental documentation submitted between 2014 and 2017. The Version 3 text includes clearly identifiable supplemental text for clarification purposes and to direct the reader to supplemental information provided in responses to information requests. The Version 3 EIS/EA was provided to the federal and provincial governments for posting by the MOECC on their website. The public will be invited to submit their comments on the Final (Version 3) EIS/EA Report in 2018.*



---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.2.4 Ongoing Communications and Review

OHRG has maintained open communication with the GRT throughout the environmental assessment process. Communications will be ongoing throughout the Project phases and the completion of the environmental assessment.

OHRG has provided a Draft EIS/EA Report for review to the GRT, and conducted summary presentations of assessment methods, results and mitigation measures. Comments received from the initial technical review are incorporated into this final EIS/EA Report submission, which includes a concordance table that details where responses to comments can be found within the EIS/EA Report.

#### 7.2.4.1 Closure Planning

A Certified Closure plan that complies in all respects with the Mining Act and O. Reg. 240/00 will be prepared for the Project. On July 29, 2013, OHRG held a teleconference with MNDM to discuss a Draft Certified Closure Plan and responses to comments on the Draft EIS/EA report regarding Closure. Ongoing discussions with MNDM are anticipated to ensure the Certified Closure Plan for the Project meets all requirements and expectations.

The Mining Act requirements regarding preparation of a Closure Plan are very specific, and will be followed carefully by OHRG. MNDM has stated that the Closure Plan may not be formally submitted until OHRG has received approval on the Final EIS/EA Report.

As required in the Mining Act, the Closure Plan will rely on qualified professionals and included estimated costs of the rehabilitation work that is required. Financial Assurance that is adequate and sufficient to cover the cost of the rehabilitation work required will be provided at the time of Closure Plan submission. Preliminary consultation on closure planning has been initiated with the public and Aboriginal groups. Further consultation on details of closure planning is identified as an upcoming topic in 7.6.3.2 for Aboriginal groups. A formal consultation plan on Closure will be developed as required under the Mining Act. Closure has been a topic of discussion in many meetings and presentations to date, and ongoing consultation with government, public stakeholders and Aboriginal communities on Closure is part of OHRG's plan forward.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.3 Aboriginal Engagement

*Version 3 Update: CMC has maintained active engagement with the Aboriginal communities from the submission of the Version 2 EIS/EA to the present day. A comprehensive list public and aboriginal consultation activities from December 2013 August 2017 is provided in Table 7-A at the beginning of this chapter.*

*The Aboriginal stakeholders submitted 22 information requests and comments following submission of the Version 2 Final EIS/EA. CMC has responded to and/or acknowledged all requests and comments and continues to consult with Aboriginal communities. Comments received for the Aboriginal communities and responses to their comments are provided in Part C of the Addendum to the Version 3 EIS/EA.*

*On March 14, 2014 the Metis Nation of Ontario (MNO) submitted a series of comments on the Final EIS/EA Report. The comments were subsequently withdrawn by the MNO as detailed in the letter provided in the Version 3 EIS/EA, Addendum Part 3 under Aboriginal and Public Comments. On June 11, 2015 Canadian Malartic Corporation and the Métis Nation of Ontario signed a Shared Interest Agreement with respect to the development and operation of the Hammond Reef Gold Project. The MNO has also provided a letter of support for the Project.*

*In February 2017, a summary of alternatives means of carrying out the project was presented to the Métis Nation of Ontario Region One and to the Fort Frances Chiefs and Lac Des Mille Lacs First Nation. This presentation included content from the supplemental alternatives assessment studies included in Parts 2, 3 and 4 out the Version 3 Alternatives Assessment TSD and is provided in Appendix 7.VI.*

*Consultation on the camp location alternatives was conducted through meetings held in October 2015 with the Mitaanjigamiing First Nation, the Fort Frances Chiefs and RSA committee members - Lac Des Mille Lacs FN, Seine River FN, and Lac La Croix FN, and in February 2017 with the Métis Nation of Ontario Region One, the Fort Frances Chiefs and Lac Des Mille Lacs First Nation. Presentations delivered at these meetings are provided in Appendix 7.VI.*

*Information related to the CMC initiated and facilitated Spring and Fall Pipe and Drum Ceremonies is provided in the response to T(3)-08. CMC has committed to continuing to facilitate the Spring and Fall Pipe and Drum ceremonies during construction, operations and active closure.*

*CMC has also received letters in support of the Project from six (6) First Nation Communities since the submission of the Version 2 EIS/EA – Lac La Croix FN, Seine River FN, Lac Des Mille Lacs FN, Rainy River FN, Nigigoonsiminikaaning FN and Naicatchewenin FN.*

-----  
OHRG understands that Aboriginal people have constitutionally protected rights, and can offer a unique understanding of the environment based on their special relationship with the land. The purpose of Aboriginal engagement for the Project is to:

- Understand Aboriginal concerns and values
- Meet government requirements
- Build long-term relationships

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



The duty to consult with Aboriginal people, where engaged, lies with the Crown and, although procedural aspects of the consultation process can be delegated to project proponents, OHRG understands that ultimate responsibility rests with the Crown. This section is intended to allow the Crown to assess the adequacy of the consultation that has taken place with Aboriginal communities who have rights that may be affected by the Project.

OHRG is committed to supporting capacity building to ensure that local First Nations and Métis communities can meaningfully participate in the Project. The result of engagement with Aboriginal communities in the early stages of the Project included the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding leading to a Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA) with the Fort Frances Chiefs Secretariat First Nations (seven member communities) and the Lac des Mille Lacs First Nation in December 2010. The agreement includes the formation of an environmental committee, a training, employment and economic development committee and a social and cultural committee, and is focussed on coordinating benefits to First Nations with key milestones in Project development. OHRG also has a signed agreement with the First Nations individual who owns the trapline within the Project area.

In March 2012, OHRG signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Métis Nation of Ontario, including four identified Métis community councils (Kenora, Sunset Country, Northwest and Atikokan). The agreement includes the formation of a consultation committee with specific deliverables. Signatories to the agreement agreed that fulfillment of the deliverables constitutes adequate consultation.

OHRG has invested in creating positive relationships with the Aboriginal communities who have an interest in the Project. Through ongoing information sharing, community investments and partnerships, OHRG has effectively engaged identified Aboriginal communities throughout the Project planning process. To this end, OHRG received formal letters from all three of the key Aboriginal groups involved in the Project. Copies of these letters are provided in Appendix 7.V.

On January 30, 2013, the Chief of LDMLFN (the closest First Nations reserve land to the Project site) sent a letter to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, Ministry of the Environment and Ministry of Northern Development and Mines stating that OHRG had provided clear and ongoing communications regarding the Project. The letter recognized OHRG as a leader in Canada in working with First Nations.

On February 11, 2013, the Métis Nation of Ontario provided a letter to OHRG confirming that effective consultation on the Project had taken place. The completion of six Committee Meetings with the Metis Nation of Ontario in November 2012 also formally signaled fulfillment of meaningful consultation on the Project, as per the Memorandum of Understanding between the two parties.

On February 12, 2013, the Fort Frances Chiefs Secretariat sent a letter to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, Ministry of the Environment and Ministry of Northern Development and Mines stating that OHRG had provided clear and ongoing communications regarding the Project. The letter also recognized OHRG's efforts to engage community members, both Elders and youth.

OHRG plans continued discussions with Aboriginal communities and ongoing communications regarding identified concerns to date.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.3.1 Identification of Communities

Aboriginal communities with a potential interest in the Project were identified using the following four methods:

- Initial Identification by Brett Resources (the former owner of the Hammond Reef property)
- Preliminary Screening by OHRG
- Verification with Aboriginal governance groups
- Provision and verification of a list by federal and provincial Government Agencies

In *Haida v. British Columbia* (2004), the Supreme Court of Canada determined that the Crown's duty to consult is proportionate to the strength of an Aboriginal peoples' claim and the degree of potential adverse effects of the proposed activity on that claim. OHRG's approach is to be inclusive with information sharing and to listen to concerns from all communities.

The following Aboriginal communities have been identified as having an interest in the Project:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ <b>Métis Nation of Ontario:</b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ Atikokan Métis Council</li><li>■ Kenora Métis Council</li><li>■ Sunset Country Métis Council</li><li>■ Northwest Métis Nation of Ontario Council</li></ul></li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ <b>First Nations:</b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ Fort Frances Chiefs Secretariat:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Couchiching First Nation</li><li>– Lac La Croix First Nation</li><li>– Mitaanjigamiing First Nation</li><li>– Naicatchewenin First Nation</li><li>– Nigigoonsiminikaaning First Nation</li><li>– Rainy River First Nation</li><li>– Seine River First Nation</li></ul></li><li>■ Lac des Milles Lacs First Nation</li><li>■ Wabigoon Lake Ojibway Nation</li></ul></li></ul> |
|---|---|

The Fort Frances Chiefs Secretariat (FFCS) is a regional governing body comprised of the seven chiefs of the Rainy River District; with the collective authority, granted by the people, to represent the Anishnaabe of the region. Representing seven individual First Nations, the FFCS identifies issues of common interest, and collectively determines solutions through advocacy and partnership.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT

### CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT

#### VERSION 3

---



### 7.3.2 Aboriginal and Treaty Rights

The *Constitution Act, 1982*, defines Aboriginal people as the Indian (also referred to as First Nations), Métis and Inuit peoples of Canada. Section 35 of the *Act* recognizes and affirms the Aboriginal rights of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada.

#### 7.3.2.1 Aboriginal Rights

When considering the definition of an Aboriginal “right,” the Supreme Court of Canada in *R v. Van der Peet* (1996) has provided some direction. In this decision, the Court stated that an Aboriginal right is an activity, which is an element of a practice, custom or tradition integral to the distinctive culture of the Aboriginal people asserting the right. According to the court the Aboriginal right must have:

- Continuity with the historic practice, custom or tradition
- Remained integral to the Aboriginal peoples’ culture
- Existed at the time of first contact with Europeans
- For Métis, existed prior to effective European control

Identified Aboriginal rights in the Project area are summarized below. Aboriginal rights for the Project area were defined through assertion by First Nations, a Traditional Use Study (TUS) carried out for the Project, and ongoing engagement with First Nations communities. The methods for the TUS are provided in the Aboriginal Interests TSD.

Aboriginal people have historically used the Treaty 3 lands for hunting, trapping, fishing, plant gathering. Plants were historically important for medicine. Water ways were historically used for navigation. Water was also used for drinking, cleaning and washing. Country foods are historically important to Aboriginal people, including berries, meat and fish.

The traditional language spoken by the Aboriginal people in the Treaty 3 area is Ojibway. Maintaining language is important to the maintenance of a culture. Aboriginal people in the area continue to practice traditional ceremonies that are often tied to the seasons and include praying, singing, dancing, drumming and use of plants for spiritual purposes. Practicing spiritual beliefs at special sites also occurs in the Treaty 3 lands.

Métis communities also assert Aboriginal rights in the area of the Project. These are described in Section 7.3.3.

#### 7.3.2.2 Treaty Rights

Treaty rights are those rights expressly set out in treaties and agreements between Aboriginal peoples and the Crown, or subsequently inferred as a result of judicial interpretation. The courts have found that oral promises made at the time of the written treaty can also be part of a treaty right. Treaties often included money or goods in return for which many Aboriginal peoples ceded the land they traditionally used and occupied. Treaty rights for the Project area were defined by research and review of publicly available information including the Treaty Research Report published by the Government of Canada, Aboriginal organization publications and Aboriginal community websites.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



The Project is located within the Treaty 3 territory. Figure 7-12 shows the boundary of the Treaty 3 area. Treaty 3 is a written agreement between the Saulteaux Tribe of the Ojibway Indians and Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland signed in 1873. Upon signing, each Chief received a British flag and a treaty medal. Treaty 3 includes an 1875 adhesion (addition to the Treaty) that extends all rights and benefits to the “Half-breeds” (Métis) of Rainy River and Lake. Some Métis were absorbed into the Little Eagle Band and are now part of the Couchiching First Nation (Chiefs of Ontario 2005).

Treaty 3 outlined many rights and benefits for signatories, in exchange for the cessation of rights, titles and privileges to 55,000 square miles of land, currently understood as the Treaty 3 lands. Hunting and fishing rights, Reserve lands and annual payments were the main benefits to Treaty 3 signatories, but additional promises included: maintaining schools on Reserve; providing agricultural implements; and providing a new suit of clothing for each Chief and his subordinates every three years. In addition, the Treaty stated that Reserve lands may be appropriated for public works at any time with proper compensation.

Questions exist relating to when Treaty 3 was drafted and how the document differs from what was said to the Indians during actual negotiations. Some evidence exists that the Treaty 3 document may have been drafted as early as 1871, and that some oral promises were not included in the official document (Grand Council of Treaty 3 2010).

The “Paypom Treaty” is a document which contains original notes made for Chief Powasson during 1872 treaty negotiations. Some key points not found in the official Treaty 3 document include:

- The Right to harvest rice within the territory
- The promise to provide rations every year
- The promise that the Queen would provide police services

The “Paypom Treaty” also includes the following gold and silver mine clause:

*“If some gold or silver mines be found in their Reserves, it will be to the benefit of the Indians, but if the Indians find any gold or silver mines out of their Reserves they will surely be paid the finding of the mines (Grand Council of Treaty 3 2010).”*

The gold and silver mine clause has been interpreted by First Nations to mean that these two metals are the only mineral rights that the Treaty 3 signatories surrendered.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.3.2.3 *Métis Rights*

The Métis assert harvesting and trapping rights throughout most of Ontario, including the Project area. These rights include consideration of the following:

- The Project lies within the traditional territory of a potential rights-bearing Métis community.
- The Métis community lived in, used and occupied this territory prior to effective control in the region.
- The Métis community asserts and exercises aboriginal rights throughout its territory, including:
  - hunting, fishing (food and commercial);
  - trapping (food and commercial);
  - gathering, sugaring, wood harvesting;
  - use of sacred and communal sites; and
  - use of water.
- In addition, some Metis within this territory have treaty rights, as the descendants of the beneficiaries of the Halfbreed 1 Adhesion to Treaty# 3.

In 1875, the Halfbreeds at Rainy Lake negotiated and signed an Adhesion to Treaty #3 with Canada. The MNO emphasizes that this Adhesion was negotiated by and for a Métis collective as Métis not Indians. As such, the personal choices of Métis individuals or families to register as "Indians" historically or in contemporary times could not and cannot extinguish the treaty rights of the Métis collective. In this region, there have always been and remain beneficiaries of the Adhesion who have never been and are not registered as "Indians".

The distinct Métis community has never merged into the Ojibway community. The MNO also notes that the decisions or actions of registered Indians or Indian Bands in the past or in contemporary times could not have any effect on the treaty rights of the Métis collective, since Indians and Métis are two distinct aboriginal peoples with their own identity and rights.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.3.3 Aboriginal Engagement Activities

Osisko understands that Aboriginal people have constitutionally protected rights, a unique understanding of the environment and a special relationship with the land.

Osisko's Aboriginal engagement activities are conducted according to the following principles:

- Focus on Aboriginal communities whose proven or asserted rights could potentially be affected by Osisko's projects;
- Develop engagement processes and methods in cooperation with Aboriginal communities;
- Engage and build relationships early in the Project, provide clear and accurate information and seek to address questions and concerns; and
- Acknowledge that Aboriginal communities may require some capacity funding in order to participate in a meaningful manner.

A summary of Aboriginal engagement activities is provided below. OHRG's approach is to be inclusive with information sharing and listen to concerns from all interested communities.

#### 7.3.3.1 Crown Oversight

In order to ensure its consultation obligations are being met for the Project the Crown has provided ongoing assessment and oversight of the Aboriginal engagement activities carried out by OHRG, through the methods outlined below.

#### Delegation of Procedural Aspects

The provincial and federal governments have delegated some procedural aspects of consultation to OHRG, as follows:

- Providing information about the nature of the proposed project, which includes:
  - Providing information in a format that is accessible.
  - Conducting any meetings or information sessions that may be appropriate to ensure the community has a clear understanding of the Project in order to respond.
  - Following up with Aboriginal communities to ensure that they are aware of the opportunity to express comments and concerns about the Project including any concerns regarding potential adverse impacts on existing or asserted aboriginal or treaty rights (e.g., hunting, fishing) and any concerns over potential impacts to sites of cultural significance (e.g., burial grounds, archaeological sites).
- Gathering information about the potential of the Project to impact Aboriginal or treaty rights (as opposed to assessing the information gathered which is the Crown's role).
- Proposing/discussing measures to mitigate concerns identified.
- Maintaining an appropriate record of the process steps taken; what was shared (where possible, recognizing that traditional use information may not be made public), what was heard, how it was considered.



---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### Confirmation of Identified Communities

The Crown has verified the initial list of Aboriginal communities to which a duty to consult may be owed. The scope of consultation is determined by the Crown and is assessed on an on-going basis throughout the environmental assessment and permitting/approval process. Ongoing work and engagement will allow further determination of how the Project may impact the rights of specific Aboriginal communities.

### Update Meetings

Regularly scheduled update meetings between OHRG, the CEA Agency, MOE and MNDM allowed for continual dialogue and updates about completed and planned engagement activities. A total of 16 meetings took place between January 2012 and July 2013.

### Review of Meeting Notes

Notes from meetings with Aboriginal communities where the Crown representatives were not present were distributed to the participating community representatives and copied to the MOE EAB, MNDM and the CEA Agency as part of the Crown's oversight and validation from the Aboriginal communities in attendance.

#### 7.3.3.2 Notifications

Identified Aboriginal communities and groups were provided Notification as detailed in the Public Consultation section above. Copies of published Notices are provided in Appendix 7.I.

#### 7.3.3.3 Community News Briefs

A newspaper column has been published online and in local newspapers (the Atikokan Progress, the Thunder Bay Chronicle Journal and the Fort Frances Times) since November 2010. In response to feedback from Aboriginal communities, beginning in the spring of 2012, OHRG expanded the news publication to include the Wawatay News, an Aboriginal newspaper that is widely available throughout First Nations band offices.

The objective of the Community News publication is to keep the public and Aboriginal communities with an interest in the Project aware through regular updates. The column was published online and in local newspapers, including the First Nations publication Wawatay News. A hard copy of the bi-weekly publication was also mailed to each Chief of the nine identified First Nations communities for posting in their band offices.

A list of the publication titles from April 2012 to October 2013 is provided in the Public Consultation section (7.1) and a copy of each publication is provided in Appendix 7.II.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.3.3.4 Community Visits

OHRG visited the identified First Nations communities on a regular basis to ensure that interested individuals understand the details of the Project and that their concerns are heard. Several formal information sessions have also taken place within the First Nations communities, focussing on the following three topics:

- Project Overview and Mining 101 (Spring 2011)
- Project Update and Environmental Assessment (Winter 2011-12)
- Project Alternatives and Land Use (Fall 2012)

The first two sets of community meetings took place prior to the submission of the ToR, and have been duly documented in the Record of Consultation that was included with the April 2012 submission. Outstanding issues from these meetings have been carried forward and are addressed in Section 7.3.4.

A Project Update and Land Use community open house was organized for the seven member nations of the Fort Frances Chiefs Secretariat. The primary goals of the open houses were to provide information about the OHRG project through the use of posters and the video and to gather land use information to support the Traditional Use Study. Information was gathered through community surveys, the results of which are presented in the Aboriginal Interests TSD. The community survey forms included a map of the land use study area to focus the survey responses on the area specific to the Project. The land use study area provided in the map was defined as the area likely to be affected by the direct environmental effects of the Project and corresponded to the LSAs selected for aquatic and terrestrial biology (Figure 4-3), which represent the primary linkages between direct Project-related effects and potential effects on land and resource use. Effects on land and resource use are primarily a result of: (1) restricted access to the land directly impacted by the Project – the Project “footprint” – or (2) indirect effects as a result of effects on the aquatic or terrestrial environments. Detailed questions and comments are provided in Appendix 7.V.

The following posters were displayed at each community open house:

- |                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| ■ <i>The Project</i>          | ■ <i>Mine Closure</i>                     |
| ■ <i>Project Layout</i>       | ■ <i>Provincial EA Process</i>            |
| ■ <i>Open Pit</i>             | ■ <i>Federal EA Process</i>               |
| ■ <i>Ore Processing</i>       | ■ <i>Potential Effects of the Project</i> |
| ■ <i>Electricity Use</i>      | ■ <i>Land and Resource Use</i>            |
| ■ <i>On-site Workers Camp</i> | ■ <i>Consultation Milestones</i>          |
| ■ <i>Tailings Management</i>  | ■ <i>Next Steps</i>                       |

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### Couchiching First Nation

On October 30, 2012, OHRG representatives travelled to Couchiching First Nation to share the details of the Project alternatives and receive feedback about key concerns from a small group of community members. The objective of the meeting was to share information about the Project and gain a better understanding of Aboriginal land use in the study area.

Approximately seven community members attended the open house. Feedback was provided by attendees through informal discussions and the completion of land use surveys. The key topics of concern raised by the community were:

- Consultation Process
- Employment and Training

### Nigigoonsiminikaaning First Nation

On November 5, 2012, OHRG representatives travelled to Nigigoonsiminikaaning First Nation to share the details of the Project alternatives and receive feedback about the key concerns from a small group of community members. The objective of the meeting was to share information about the Project and gain a better understanding of Aboriginal land use in the study area.

Approximately a dozen community members attended the open house. Feedback was provided by attendees through informal discussions and the completion of land use surveys. The key topics raised by attendees were:

- Hydrology
- Water Quality
- Community Benefits
- Employment and Training
- Consultation Process

### Naicatchewenin First Nation

On November 6, 2012, OHRG representatives travelled to Naicatchewenin First Nation to share the details of the Project alternatives and receive feedback about the key concerns from a small group of community members. The objective of the meeting was to gain a better understanding of how the Project could affect Aboriginal rights, including land use.

Approximately six community members attended the workshop. Feedback was provided by attendees through informal discussions and the completion of land use surveys. No specific concerns were raised by attendees.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### Mitaanjigamiing First Nation

On November 22, 2012, OHRG representatives travelled to Mitaanjigamiing First Nation to share the details of the Project alternatives and receive feedback about the key concerns from a small group of community members. The objective of the meeting was to gain a better understanding of how the Project could affect Aboriginal rights, including land use.

Approximately 13 community members attended the open house. Feedback was provided by attendees through informal discussions and the completion of land use surveys. The key topics of concern raised by attendees were:

- Tailings Management
- Water Management
- Mitta Lake
- Environmental Assessment Process
- Traditional Use
- Community Benefits
- Consultation Process

### Seine River First Nation

On November 29, 2012, OHRG representatives travelled to Seine River First Nation to share the details of the Project alternatives and receive feedback about the key concerns from a small group of community members. The objective of the meeting was to gain a better understanding of how the Project could affect Aboriginal rights, including land use.

Approximately 15 community members attended the open house. Feedback was provided by attendees through informal discussions and the completion of land use surveys. The key topics raised by attendees were:

- Environment
- Water Use
- Community Benefits
- Employment and Training
- Consultation Process
- Tailings Management

On June 5, 2013, OHRG representatives travelled to Seine River First Nation to take part in their inaugural Annual Community Open House. The objective of the attendance at the Community Event was to share information about the Project and answer community questions and concerns.

Over 80 community members attended the Open House event which included representatives from other local businesses and organizations. The Project Overview Fact Sheets were provided to attendees as well as the Mercury Fact Sheet, since the potential for mercury contamination was a topic of interest for the Seine River First Nation. OHRG also displayed information panels providing an overview of the Project and the proposed

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



Project Layout. Questions received from community members were focussed on employment and Project schedule.

### Lac des Mille Lacs First Nation

On November 22, 2012, OHRG representatives travelled to the Lac des Mille Lacs First Nation band office in Thunder Bay to share the details of the Project alternatives and receive feedback about the key concerns from a small group of community members. The objective of the meeting was to gain a better understanding of how the Project could affect Aboriginal rights, including land use. Due to space constraints at the LDMLFN Open House, the 14 posters listed above were not displayed. At the suggestion of the Band Manager, the Project Layout Poster was displayed and a Project Overview Fact Sheet was distributed. In addition to written information, the Project video was shown and a presentation was given about closure planning.

Twenty-seven community members attended the open house. Feedback was provided by attendees through informal discussions and the completion of land use surveys. The key topics raised by attendees were:

- Environmental Effects
- Water Quality
- Water Management
- Employment
- Project Details
- Environmental Assessment Process

### Lac La Croix First Nation

On November 27, 2012, OHRG representatives travelled to Lac La Croix First Nation to share the details of the Project alternatives and receive feedback about the key concerns from a small group of community members. The objective of the meeting was to gain a better understanding of how the Project could affect Aboriginal rights, including land use. In addition to the fourteen posters listed above, a presentation was given by OHRG's Manager of Aboriginal Affairs to address community questions about the December 2011 Resource Sharing Agreement.

Approximately 30 community members attended the open house. Feedback was provided by attendees through informal discussions and the completion of land use surveys. The key topic of discussion raised by attendees was economic development.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### Rainy River First Nation

On February 12, 2013, OHRG representatives travelled to Rainy River First Nation to share the details of the Project alternatives and receive feedback about the key concerns from a small group of community members. The objective of the meeting was to gain a better understanding of how the Project could affect Aboriginal rights, including land use.

Approximately 11 community members attended the open house. Feedback was provided by attendees through informal discussions and the completion of land use surveys. The key topics raised by attendees were:

- Water Use
- Consultation Process

#### 7.3.3.5 Presentations to Chiefs

Presentations were given to the Fort Frances Chiefs Secretariat and the Lac des Mille Lacs Chief in order to ensure that there is a broad understanding of the Project, participation opportunities exist for their members and the group members are aware of what actions, if any, have been taken to address issues that have been raised by the communities were made.

Presentations were made around key regulatory milestones and topics of concern to the Chiefs including:

- Project Description
- Terms of Reference
- Closure Plan
- Publication of Reports
- Aquatic Health
- Traditional Use

##### 7.3.3.5.1.1 Fort Frances Chiefs Secretariat

A series of presentations were given to the FFCS throughout the environmental assessment process. Meeting dates and topics of discussion are summarized in Table 7-9, below. Meeting notes and issue tracking is provided in the Terms of Reference for those meetings that took place prior to the official commencement of the environmental assessment (March 2012).

##### 7.3.3.5.1.2 Lac des Mille Lacs First Nation

A series of presentations were given to LDMLFN throughout the environmental assessment process. Meeting dates and topics of discussion are summarized in Table 7-10, below. Meeting notes and issue tracking is provided in the Terms of Reference for those meetings that took place prior to the official commencement of the environmental assessment (March 2012).

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.3.3.6 Resource Sharing Committee Meetings

Three Resource Sharing Committees were set up to provide a communication link between the FFCS communities and LDMLFN and Osisko, as illustrated in Figure 7-13 below. The committees include two members from Osisko, and one member each from the FFCS and LDMLFN. The committees meet on a quarterly basis for two-way information sharing and to address the social, environmental and economic commitments detailed below.

**Environment Committee Mandate:** Reviews environmental findings and shares environmental information with community. This committee supports OHRG management in the development, operation and closing of its project by recommending environmental, archeological and historical considerations relating to the participation of the First Nation peoples or partnered communities in the Project.

**Social and Cultural Committee Mandate:** To provide cross-cultural training to OHRG and First-Nations partners by seeking advice through elders and leaders. Determine and advise on necessary cultural activities for events and activities.

**Education and Training Committee Mandate:** Identify training, employment and economic opportunities and recommend investment projects and initiatives.

The Table 7-11 below provides a summary of all meetings that have taken place to date with the Resource Sharing Committees. Copies of meeting notes for each Resource Sharing Committee meeting are provided in Appendix 7.V.

Upcoming topics of discussion with the Resource Sharing Committees include:

- Environmental Monitoring Planning
- Closure Planning
- Fish Relocation Planning

OHRG's goal is to host at least one Resource Sharing Committee meeting per quarter throughout the Project phases. OHRG and the Resource Sharing Committees are currently developing a communications plan to allow for clearer communication and ongoing evaluation of committee objectives. A conceptual illustration of the communication links that the Resources Sharing Committees can provide is provided in Figure 7-14 below.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.3.3.7 Elder Forums

The Chiefs of the nine First Nations communities have identified the need to include Elders in the EA process. OHRG held a series of Elder's Forums throughout the Project planning process. Elders from all nine First Nations communities were included.

The format of the Elder's Forums is a large gathering where traditional ceremonies, drumming, singing and prayers take place. The forums provide an opportunity for Elders from the communities to discuss the Project with one other and give speeches in the Ojibway language.

The role of OHRG staff is generally to provide the capacity and plan for logistics of the gathering. Formal presentations by OHRG staff do not generally take place; however, staff are available to answer questions and concerns.

- Project Introduction (August 2011)
- Spring Ceremony (May 2012)
- Fall Ceremony (October 2012)
- Spring Ceremony (May 2013)
- Fall Ceremony (November 2013)

The first Elders Forum took place prior to the submission of the Terms of Reference, and is documented in the Record of Consultation that was included with the April 2012 submission.

### Pipe and Drum Ceremonies

In the summer of 2011, Elders from Seine River FN informed OHRG that a Pipe and Drum Ceremony should occur at Mitta Lake. Upon the Elder's advice, a drum carrier from each community was invited to the ceremony. The ceremony took place at the core shack approximately one kilometre east of Mitta Lake. The ceremony was attended by representatives from each community and included seven drums. Tobacco and food offerings were made to Mitta Lake at the end of the ceremony. The Senior Advisor of Aboriginal Affairs coordinated the ceremony and attended on behalf of OHRG, as well as the Project manager, site manager, and environmental manager.

As a result of this ceremony OHRG was approached by members from Mitaanjigamiing FN and asked to hold a second ceremony with some of their members. This second was held in August of 2011 with three members of Mitaanjigamiing FN. During this second ceremony, the Senior Advisor of Aboriginal Affairs spent several hours on the north shore of Mitta Lake with the community members offering songs, gifts, and prayers.



---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### Spring Ceremonies

OHRG hosted an Elders Spring Ceremony in 2012 and 2013. The ceremonies were arranged in response to suggestions from First Nations to hold multiple ceremonies at the Mine Site in order to address the spiritual and traditional aspects of the Project. The 2012 Elders Spring Ceremonies was hosted at the OHRG Site and took place on May 3, 2012. An Elder from Naicatchewenin FN guided us through the ceremony.

OHRG was honoured by the attendance of the Ogichidaakwe/Grand Chief of Treaty #3 at the ceremony. Grand Chief Kelly spoke to the gathering, saying “It is important that we (First Nations) keep our traditions and remember our treaty rights”. The spring ceremony was very successful and was well attended. Also in attendance were Atikokan Friendship Centre and OHRG exploration staff.

The 2013 Elders Spring Ceremony was hosted at the OHRG Site and took place on May 21, 2013. Elders from Seine River First Nation guided the ceremony, gave speeches and dedicated an Honour Song to Osisko. Staff from Osisko were also invited to speak.

The following First Nations communities were in attendance:

- Lac la Croix
- Seine River
- Nigigoonsiminikaaning
- Couchiching
- Mitaanjigamiing
- Naicatchewenin
- Lac Des Mille Lacs
- Wabigoon

### Fall Ceremonies

OHRG hosted an Elders Fall Ceremony in 2012 and 2013. The ceremonies were arranged in response to suggestions from First Nations partners to hold multiple ceremonies at the potential mine site in order to address the spiritual and traditional aspects of the project. The 2012 Fall Ceremony was held at the OHRG site on the East Shoreline of Mitta Lake on October 19, 2012. Chief Norman Jordan of Lac La Croix FN guided the ceremony. The 2013 Fall Ceremony was held on November 8<sup>th</sup> in the roundhouse at Nigigoonsiminikaaning. Don Jones was the presiding Elder.

The fall ceremonies have been very successful and well attended by First Nations communities, including members from the following:

- Lac la Croix
- Seine River
- Nigigoonsiminikaaning
- Couchiching
- Mitaanjigamiing
- Naicatchewenin
- Lac Des Mille Lacs
- Wabigoon

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.3.3.8 Great Earth Law Meeting

On March 10, 2012 OHRG representatives met with First Nations community members in Fort Frances at the Rendez-Vous hotel. Approximately a dozen people from the community attended.

The meeting was held at the request of one of the community members who wanted the opportunity to inform OHRG of community dynamics and Aboriginal laws that should be considered in the Project consultation and planning process. Some specific issues presented were:

- Adequate consultation should extend beyond consulting with Chief & Council
- OHRG should consider the Great Earth Law in Project planning and consultation
- Arguments within the community are preventing fair access to training and certification
- The community is not fairly informed of employment opportunities

The OHRG team indicated that it was interested in comments and concerns and input from the community and had a desire to consult the community. The Project overview video was shown to inform attendees about the key components of the Project.

### 7.3.3.9 Métis Nation of Ontario Consultation Protocol

In March 2012, OHRG signed a MoU with the Métis Nation of Ontario, including four identified Métis community councils (Kenora, Sunset Country, Northwest and Atikokan). The MoU provides capacity for community meetings, engagement activities, a review of the EA Report and a traditional use study in the Project area.

As per the MoU, Aboriginal engagement activities with MNO followed the Consultation Protocol for Treaty #3 (the Protocol). As per the Protocol, a five-person Consultation Committee was established to develop and implement a work plan that guides the process and coordinates communications with MNO citizens and OHRG.

The goals of the MoU are as follows:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| ■ Foster trust between Osisko Hammond Reef Gold (OHRG) and Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO) | ■ Identify potential impacts to Métis rights and interests |
| ■ Gain potential support for the Project by the MNO                                      | ■ Determine how any potential impacts can be mitigated     |

Specific deliverables of the MoU include:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| ■ Four community feasts.                                 | ■ One mail-out to all Métis households (~1,000) |
| ■ Six committee meetings.                                | ■ Two to three ads in the Métis Voyageur        |
| ■ Plain language information materials about the Project |   |

Upon completion of the deliverables listed above, the signatories to the agreement acknowledge that adequate consultation has been undertaken.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.3.3.9.1 Committee Meetings

The MoU signed between OHRG and the MNO stipulated the formation of a Region 1 Consultation Committee as the points of contact for communications with OHRG regarding the Project. This committee is made up of six members including:

- Region 1 Consultation Committee Chair
- Northwest Community Council President
- Atikokan Community Council President
- MNO Lands Resources and Consultation Staff Member
- Kenora Community Council President
- Captain of the Hunt for Region 1
- Sunset Country Community Council President

A series of meetings have taken place between the OHRG environmental assessment team and the Region 1 Consultation Committee, as detailed in Table 7-12 below. These meetings have been structured to keep the Committee involved in the Project planning process through information sharing and discussion. Meetings include presentations given by OHRG designed around answering questions and concerns and meeting regulatory milestones. Detailed meeting notes, including copies of presentations are provided in Appendix 7.V.

### 7.3.3.9.2 Community Feasts

The first community feast took place in Atikokan at the Royal Canadian Legion on April 4, 2012. Approximately 60 people from the local Métis community attended, including the Region 1 Consultation Committee. Prior to dinner, the Métis Nation of Ontario presented OHRG staff members with Metis sashes and the Atikokan president spoke about the importance of signing an MoU with OHRG. OHRG then gave a short Project overview presentation including a description of Project components, the potential impacts of the Project and a brief explanation of the environmental assessment process.

The second community feast took place in Kenora at the Legion Hall on June 21, 2012. Approximately 120 people from the local Metis community attended, including the Region 1 Consultation Committee. Prior to dinner, one of the local Metis youth spoke about the importance of the Metis way-of-life, especially to Metis youth, and encouraged OHRG to design a project that would allow Metis people to continue to practice their culture. OHRG then showed a Project overview video and gave a short presentation including a description of Project components, and a brief explanation of the environmental assessment process. A question and answer period followed the presentation and included questions about closure planning, Project feasibility, planned chemical use and renewable energy. Project fact sheets and information booklets were on hand for attendees to take home. After dinner there was fiddling and an informal social time.

The third community feast took place in Dryden at the Best Western Hotel on September 16, 2012. Approximately 40 people from the local Metis community attended, including the Region 1 Consultation Committee. Prior to dinner, the Metis youth who worked at OHRG as part of the Summer Experience Program gave a presentation about her work experience. OHRG then showed a Project overview video and gave a short presentation including a description of Project components, and an explanation of the environmental assessment process. A question and answer period followed the presentation and included questions about Mitta Lake, cyanide, tailings management and ore processing. After dinner, there was fiddling and an informal social time.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT

### CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT

#### VERSION 3

---



The fourth community feast took place in Fort Frances on October 21, 2012. Approximately 70 people from the local Metis community attended, including the Region 1 Consultation Committee. Prior to dinner, attendees enjoyed fiddle music and Gary Lipinski, the President of the Metis Nation of Ontario, spoke about the Métis support for the Project and positive relationship with OHRG. Mr. Lipinski also emphasized the importance of employment for Metis youth and the need for ongoing environmental monitoring. OHRG showed a Project overview video and gave a short presentation including a description of Project components, and an explanation of the environmental assessment process. A question and answer period followed the presentation and included questions about Mitta Lake, the consultation process, Aboriginal hiring and ore processing.

#### **7.3.3.9.3 Household Mailing**

OHRG provided written information to the MNO Lands, Resources and Consultation staff to be included in the household mailing. The mailing was carried out in Spring 2013.

#### **7.3.3.9.4 Métis Voyageur Advertisements**

OHRG provided written information for two advertisements, which were placed in the Métis Voyageur:

- Memorandum of Understanding Announcement – Summer 2012 Issue
- Hammond Reef Project Overview – Fall 2012 Issue.

#### **7.3.3.10 Written Comments on EA Process**

OHRG received several written comments from Aboriginal communities during the EA process. These comments were focussed around the EIS Guidelines and Terms of Reference publications. OHRG provided a written response to all comments received. In addition to written responses, OHRG developed and delivered presentations to the Fort Frances Chiefs Secretariat to further explain responses and allow for additional discussion. The comments received and responses provided are detailed in the issues tracking table included in Appendix 7.V and summarized below.

##### **7.3.3.10.1 Letters of Acknowledgement of OHRG's Consultation Efforts**

OHRG has invested in creating positive relationships with the Aboriginal communities who have an interest in the Project. Through ongoing information sharing, community investments and partnerships, OHRG has effectively engaged identified Aboriginal communities throughout the Project planning process. To this end, OHRG received formal letters from all three of the key Aboriginal groups involved in the Project. Copies of these letters are provided in Appendix 7.V.

On January 30, 2013 the Chief of LDMLFN (the closest First Nations reserve land to the Project site) sent a letter to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, Ministry of the Environment and Ministry of Northern Development and Mines stating that OHRG had provided clear and ongoing communications regarding the Project. The letter recognized OHRG as a leader in Canada in working with First Nations.

On February 11, 2013 the Métis Nation of Ontario provided a letter to OHRG confirming that effective consultation on the Project had taken place. The completion of six Committee Meetings with the Metis Nation of Ontario in November 2012 also formally signaled fulfillment of meaningful consultation on the Project, as per the Memorandum of Understanding between the two parties.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT

### CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT

#### VERSION 3

---



On February 12, 2013 the Fort Frances Chiefs Secretariat sent a letter to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, Ministry of the Environment and Ministry of Northern Development and Mines stating that OHRG had provided clear and ongoing communications regarding the Project. The letter also recognized OHRG's efforts to engage community members, both Elders and youth.

#### 7.3.3.10.2 Fort Frances Chiefs Secretariat

Four communities from the Fort Frances Chiefs Secretariat provided written comments about the Project during the environmental assessment process. The comments were focused on potential environmental effects from the Project as summarized in the Table 7-13 below.

#### 7.3.3.10.3 Lac des Mille Lacs First Nation

Lac des Mille Lacs First Nation provided written comments about the Hammond Reef Gold Project in March 2012 and August 2012. The comments were focused on Project design details and management strategies to reduce potential effects to the environment. In response to the written comments, OHRG:

- Sent a letter acknowledging comments
- Developed and delivered a presentation with comment responses (July 2012)
- Provided comments to EA technical component leads
- Sent a second letter to further clarify Project details (August 2012)

#### 7.3.3.10.4 Wabigoon Lake Ojibway Nation

Wabigoon Lake Ojibway Nation was included in the engagement program for the environmental assessment at the direction of government officials because of the First Nation's assertion that they harvested wild rice in the vicinity of the Project. OHRG met with members of the Wabigoon Lake Ojibway Nation on several occasions and was able to provide a clearer understanding of the Project details. After participating in the Traditional Use Study, Wabigoon Lake Ojibway Nation was able to provide a formal letter to the CEA Agency, MOE EAB and MNDM dated September 20, 2012 clearly stating that their community members do not harvest wild rice in the Project area, their harvesting rights would not be impacted by the Project and that their key interest in the Project is employment for youth.

#### 7.3.3.10.5 Métis Nation of Ontario

The Métis Nation of Ontario submitted two formal letters regarding the environmental assessment process, both in February 2012. The first letter was an assertion and explanation of Aboriginal and treaty rights held by the Métis in the Treaty 3 area. The second letter detailed the MNO's environmental and Project specific concerns. Detailed comments and responses are provided in the issues tracking table and meeting notes in Appendix 7.V.

In response to the written comments, OHRG:

- Sent a letter to the Métis Nation of Ontario
- Developed and delivered a presentation to the Region 1 Consultation Committee

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### **7.3.3.11 Written Comments on Draft EIS/EA Report**

OHRG received written comments on the Draft EIS/EA Report from two First Nations and the Métis Nation of Ontario.

#### **7.3.3.11.1 Seine River First Nation**

On April 4, 2013 OHRG received comments from the Seine River First Nation on the Draft EIS/EA Report. The comments were provided in a letter form and included approximately 23 comments on a variety of topics. The key concerns were relating to water quality and aquatic biology. A copy of the letter is provided in Appendix 7.V.

#### **7.3.3.11.2 Lac des Mille Lacs First Nation**

On March 28, 2013 OHRG received comments from the Lac des Mille Lacs First Nation on the Draft EIS/EA Report. The comments were provided in a letter form and included approximately 16 comments on a variety of topics. The key concerns were relating to air quality, water quality and emergency planning. A copy of the letter is provided in Appendix 7.V.

#### **7.3.3.11.3 Métis Nation of Ontario**

On April 5, 2013, OHRG received comments from the Métis Nation of Ontario on the Draft EIS/EA Report. The MNO hired an external consultant to provide a technical review of the Draft EIS/EA Report. The technical review included a submission to OHRG of 60 comments and questions on a variety of topics, as provided in Appendix 7.V.

The key questions as summarized by the external consultants on MNO's behalf were:

- Did the Métis influence what valued component was studied?
- Did the Métis influence how and when each valued component was studied?
- Can the Métis have confidence in the prediction of effects on each valued component?

OHRG is confident that the answer to the above questions is yes as evidenced by the meeting notes and ongoing discussions that took place with the Métis Nation of Ontario Consultation Committee throughout 2012 and 2013. Appendix 7.V clearly documents that the Metis Nation of Ontario have been actively involved in the selection of Valued Ecosystem Components and that OHRG has actively solicited feedback from the Committee members at each of the eight meetings that took place in 2012 and 2013.

### **7.3.3.12 Responses to Comments on Draft EIS/EA Report**

OHRG has provided written responses to all comments received on the Draft EIS/EA Report. Additional meetings and discussions took place as required and are summarized below.

#### **7.3.3.12.1 Seine River First Nation**

On August 19, 2013 OHRG travelled to Seine River First Nation to provide community leaders with a presentation that summarized the responses prepared to address questions received from SRFN on the Draft EIS/EA Report. The presentation provided point form answers to the 23 comments submitted by SRFN. The responses were well received. Some discussion took place on the subject of

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



On November 8, 2013 OHRG provided SRFN with a formal written response to the comments discussed at the August meeting. Notwithstanding the fact that OHRG believes that the fish tissue sampling undertaken for the EA was sufficient for EA purposes, OHRG's response to SRFN includes a commitment to provide capacity support to Seine River First Nation to collect additional fish tissue and benthic samples in the Spring of 2014 in conjunction with an environmental study being undertaken with their community.

### 7.3.3.12.2 Lac des Mille Lacs First Nation

On October 16, 2013 OHRG provided a written response to the LDMLFN's comments on the Draft EIS/EA Report. A copy of the letter is provided in Appendix 7.V. Ongoing correspondence has been taking place with LDMLFN regarding Project schedule and planning. A face to face meeting is anticipated as part of the Final EIS/EA Report publication consultation activities.

### 7.3.3.12.3 Métis Nation of Ontario

On May 24, 2013 OHRG received a letter from the Métis Nation of Ontario requesting notifying OHRG that an MNO Negotiations Team had been appointed and requesting the first negotiations meeting take place. Since receipt of the letter from MNO, ongoing communications have taken place to discuss Shared Interests between MNO and OHRG. These discussions have included two meetings, for which OHRG prepared presentations as provided in Appendix 7.V. The nature of the discussion at these meetings is confidential and therefore some presentation slides have been removed and meeting notes have not been published.

A summary of main points that have been addressed through ongoing discussions include Project and corporate updates, identification of mechanisms that could increase Project benefits to the Métis community, structure of future committees and schedule for future meetings.

OHRG's approach to resolving the concerns listed by the MNO in their April 2012 letter is to arrive at a private and mutual beneficial agreement that addresses all MNO's listed concerns. OHRG plans to work with the Métis Nation of Ontario on an ongoing basis to ensure the communities benefit from the Project. OHRG is committed to optimizing business opportunities for Métis community members, including the Métis in environmental monitoring programs and supporting the Métis Way of Life through ongoing investment in Métis culture.

### 7.3.3.13 Publication of Final EIS/EA Report

*Version 3 Update: The Version 2 Final EIS/EA report was published and circulated as indicated below. The Version 3 EIS/EA Report was published electronically in January 2018. The Version 3 document will include the Version 2 EIS/EA in its entirety as well as a consolidation of all responses to IRs and supplemental documentation between 2014 and 2017. The Version 3 text includes clearly identifiable supplemental text for clarification purposes and to direct the reader to the most recent IR responses on a given topic.*

-----

The Final EIS/EA Report will be published in December 2013. OHRG will circulate the Notice of Publication to Project stakeholders through email, the Osisko website and newspaper advertisements. A hard copy of the Final EIS/EA Report will be made available at Osisko's Atikokan office and the Ministry of Environment in Toronto at the time of publishing. Aboriginal groups will be invited to submit their comments on the Final EIS/EA Report following CEAA's conformity review in early 2014.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



Electronic and/or hard copies of the Final EIS/EA Report will be provided to the following Aboriginal groups:

Fort Frances Chiefs Secretariat; Métis Nation of Ontario; Lac Des Milles Lacs First Nation; Couchiching First Nation; Lac La Croix First Nation; Mitaanjigamiing First Nation; Naicatchewenin First Nation; Nigigoonsiminikaaning First Nation; Rainy River First Nation; Seine River First Nation; Wabigoon Lake Ojibway Nation; Sunset Country Métis Council; Atikokan Métis Council; Northwest Métis Nation of Ontario Council; and Kenora Métis Council.

### 7.3.4 Issues Identified through Aboriginal Engagement

An Aboriginal communications log, with identified issues and responses is provided in Appendix 7.V. A summary of concerns is included in the section below, organized into Cultural, Environmental and Economic categories.

#### 7.3.4.1 Cultural Concerns

Both First Nations and Métis people expressed concerns regarding any adverse effect the Project may have on maintenance and continuation of their culture.

The importance of the Ojibway language has been identified as a cultural concern. First Nations communities have stated the importance of communicating in Ojibway to ensure the larger Aboriginal community is informed about the Project. The importance of the maintenance of the relationship of language to the preservation of Aboriginal culture was identified.

Aboriginal people have a spiritual relationship with the land for traditional and cultural purposes. Continued access to medicinal plants, and the ability to harvest plants used for medicine, was identified as an important cultural concern. This concern related specifically to the effects the Project could have on loss of vegetation and restricted access to cultural or spiritual sites, collectively referred to as special sites. Throughout our long-standing relationship with Aboriginal people in the area, we have been continually reminded that Aboriginal peoples are the keepers/protectors of the land and waters.

The Michif language has been identified as important to the Metis. Métis communities have cited their ability to continue practicing the Métis Way of Life as an important cultural concern. The Métis community lived in, used and occupied this territory prior to effective control in the region. The Métis community asserts and exercises aboriginal rights throughout its territory, including hunting, fishing (food and commercial), trapping (food and commercial), gathering, sugaring, wood harvesting, use of sacred and communal sites, and use of water.

Throughout the engagement process, OHRG has addressed cultural concerns by providing capacity and allowing time for traditional protocols at each of our Project meetings. Traditional drumming, singing and prayers often take place throughout meetings and Elder's forums. Two pipe and drum ceremonies, as well as two fall ceremonies and two spring ceremonies have taken place at the Project Site. OHRG is also committed to incorporating Ojibway information materials into our consultation program for the Project. OHRG engaged Ojibway translators for the Elders forums, including traditional use study meetings, and worked with the several individuals from First Nations communities to translate a Project Overview into Ojibway. This Ojibway-language video has been shared with the First Nations in community meetings and workshops.



---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT

### CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT

#### VERSION 3

---



#### 7.3.4.2 Environmental Concerns

Throughout communications and engagement events, OHRG heard many concerns about potential long-term effects of the Project on the environment. Although the focus of these comments is often expressed through the importance of the whole and interconnected environment, environmental concerns are largely related to potential effects to water quality, fishing areas and the health of fish, and animals that live near the Project Site.

Environmental concerns raised by Aboriginal communities have been addressed in a fulsome way in the EIS/EA Report and associated TSDs. Specific concerns have also been and will continue to be addressed in plain language presentations provided to Aboriginal communities. Healthy fish and animals are important for ongoing traditional land use and the ability to consume country foods in the vicinity of the Project Site.

Many comments have also been received with regards to Project closure, environmental monitoring and OHRG's ability to assure the Project Site will not be abandoned as has occurred in past mining projects within the region. OHRG has included Aboriginal communities in the closure planning process through a series of presentations and ongoing information sharing. The long-term monitoring plan for the Project will include direct participation of Aboriginal communities, as described further in Chapter 8 of the EIS/EA Report.

A summary of written environmental concerns is provided in Table 7-14 which also shows where they are addressed in the EIS/EA Report. OHRG will continue to engage with Aboriginal communities, with a focus on specific identified issues. Appendix 7.V provides a detailed record of communications and a comment response table which clearly outlines each comment, when it was received, and Osisko's response to addressing the comment.

#### 7.3.4.3 Economic Concerns

Throughout the engagement with Aboriginal communities many community members, committee members, Elders and Chiefs stated the importance of employment and skills training for Aboriginal communities. Given the high unemployment levels and below-average levels of educational attainment among Aboriginal communities, opportunities for employment and skills training are of high importance. The need for ongoing information sharing with communities regarding employment opportunities has also been stated throughout consultation.

Because of the general principle held by many Aboriginal people that current planning activities should take into consideration the potential impacts and benefits to future generations, youth is a large focus for many Aboriginal communities. Youth employment and training opportunities have been stated as one of the key issues in formal letters and speeches by Aboriginal leaders including the Grand Chief of Treaty 3, the President of the Métis Nation of Ontario and the Chief of Wabigoon Lake Ojibway Nation.

Business opportunities are also an important focus for Aboriginal communities. Many communities have indicated their willingness to work with OHRG and their eagerness to be involved in a mutually beneficial business relationship. Information about OHRG's current and future needs has been requested in order to facilitate business planning. For example, the FFCS requested a list of heavy machinery that OHRG anticipates will be used throughout the Project in order to determine if the machinery could be purchased by Aboriginal businesses.

Throughout the development of the Project and during the EA process, OHRG has worked with our Aboriginal partners to provide information about prospective goods, services and positions of employment related to the development of the Project. OHRG has an Aboriginal Affairs team that actively works to promote the training and employment of Aboriginal people throughout all phases of the Project, including exploration, construction and operations.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



OHRG aims to promote the use of Aboriginal enterprises whenever possible in supplying goods and/or services required during the Project. For example, Rainy Lake Tribal Contracting Company was contracted to upgrade the Sawbill Road. Eva Lake Mining, a Métis Contracting company, has been contracted to maintain the road. Camp Security has been awarded to Synterra Security Solutions, the supply and delivery of diesel fuel products was awarded to NDC Energy. Both Synterra and NDC are First Nations owned companies.

### 7.3.5 OHRG's Commitments and Responses

OHRG has initiated a number of strategies that will focus on providing benefits to identified Aboriginal communities. These commitments have been under development throughout the exploration phase of the Project and will be administered and prioritized through three resource sharing committees (Figure 7-13).

#### 7.3.5.1 Social and Cultural Commitments

Throughout consultation, OHRG has heard from Aboriginal communities that Aboriginal culture is important. OHRG has worked with Aboriginal communities to respect customs and provide capacity for traditional ceremonies at the Project site and within the communities.

Throughout the construction and operations phases of the Project, the established Social and Cultural Committee will provide oversight and direction for appropriate ceremonies that should take place during Project meetings. The committee will also promote cross cultural awareness and bring forward suggestions for cultural investment opportunities.

#### Incorporation of Traditional Knowledge

Traditional knowledge has been incorporated into the environmental assessment through the provision of capacity for traditional protocols during the consultation process and the consideration of information provided into the Project design. OHRG has routinely followed advice provided by elders to include drumming and dancing in Project meetings.

Information provided by First Nations and Metis have allowed OHRG to avoid placing infrastructure in areas that are recognized as being special or sacred sites. The effluent treatment plant discharge location and tailings management facility location have both been adjusted to minimize potential impacts to areas with environmental value as identified by Aboriginal communities. OHRG also plans to use traditional knowledge to inform the development of appropriate fish relocation plan for Mitta Lake and other fish-bearing water bodies that will be affected by the Project.

#### Ojibway Language

OHRG recognizes that speaking and hearing the Ojibway language is an important part of Aboriginal culture in the identified Aboriginal communities. OHRG is committed to incorporating Ojibway information materials into its consultation program for the Project. OHRG engaged Ojibway translators for the Elders forums, including traditional use study meetings, and worked with the several individuals from First Nations communities to translate a Project Overview into Ojibway. This Ojibway-language video has been shared with the First Nations in community meetings and workshops.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.3.5.1.1 Aboriginal Organizations

OHRG is a supporter of several local Aboriginal organizations, as outlined in the following paragraphs.

#### *Atikokan Native Friendship Centre*

The Atikokan Native Friendship Centre administers a number of social service and cultural programs for Aboriginal members of the community (Atikokan Native Friendship Centre 2011). These include health outreach, lifelong care program for the elderly and disabled, Aboriginal healing and wellness, prenatal nutrition and family support programs. The Atikokan Friendship Centre also administers urban Aboriginal support programs for children and youth at risk, including the Wasa-Nabin Program for at-risk youth the Akwe-go Program for at-risk children aged 7 to 12, and the healthy living program.

#### *Métis Nation of Ontario*

The MNO was established in 1993 through the will of Métis people and Métis communities coming together throughout Ontario to create a Métis-specific governance structure.

The MNO has a province-wide governance structure which includes: an objectively verifiable, centralized registry of over 15,000 Métis citizens; approximately 30 Chartered Community Councils across the province which represent Métis citizens at the local level; a provincial governing body that is elected by ballot box every four years; an Annual General Assembly where regional and provincial Métis leaders are required to report back to Métis citizens yearly between elections; a charitable foundation which promotes and support Métis culture and heritage; and, an economic development arm.

#### *Canadian Aboriginal Minerals Association*

The Canadian Aboriginal Minerals Association (CAMA) is an Aboriginal, non-profit organization which seeks to increase the understanding of the minerals industry, Aboriginal mining and Aboriginal communities' paramount interests in lands and resources. Through increasing this awareness, all parties will benefit. CAMA acts as an instrument for the advancement of Aboriginal community economic development, mineral resource management and environmental protection. CAMA was formed out of the need expressed by Aboriginal communities. By establishing relations, negotiating practical benefits agreements, jointly addressing mineral exploration and development issues, and mitigating negative impacts as partners with mining companies, Aboriginal communities advance to economic self-sufficiency.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT

### CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT

#### VERSION 3

---



#### 7.3.5.2 Environmental Commitments

OHRG will continue to communicate with Aboriginal communities about environmental concerns through the sharing of environmental studies results and assessments. To date, OHRG has provided detailed information to communities, Chiefs and Elders. Throughout the construction and operations phases of the Project, the established Environmental Committee will provide a mechanism for sharing environmental information with First Nations communities.

##### 7.3.5.2.1 Sharing of Reports

The Final EIS/EA Report will be provided to the FFCS, LDMLFN and MNO for review and comment. These identified Aboriginal communities will also be provided reports and results of ongoing monitoring for review. Meetings and discussions will be scheduled to discuss planned report publications as required.

This Final EIS/EA Report is available online at: [www.osisko.com](http://www.osisko.com). Electronic or hard copies (based on preference) will be provided to the following First Nations communities:

- Lac Des Milles Lacs First Nation
- Couchiching First Nation
- Lac La Croix First Nation
- Mitaanjigamiing First Nation
- Naicatchewenin First Nation
- Nigigoonsiminikaaning First Nation
- Rainy River First Nation
- Seine River First Nation
- Wabigoon Lake Ojibway Nation

The Final EIS/EA Report will also be distributed to the four local MNO Community Councils and to the MNO.

##### 7.3.5.2.2 Technical Review of Reports

As shown in Table 7-15, four First Nations communities and the Métis Nation of Ontario were provided funding for participation in the environmental assessment, through the CEA Agency's Aboriginal Funding Program.

##### 7.3.5.2.3 Traditional Use Information

Traditional use information was collected and considered in Project layout and infrastructure alignment. Dietary information and land use patterns were considered in the human health assessment, terrestrial and aquatic biology components and cultural heritage assessment.

Ongoing consideration of traditional use information may contribute to the evaluation of potential effects and their significance, effectiveness of proposed mitigation, and consideration of follow-up monitoring.

The primary use of the Traditional Use information from identified First Nations and Métis communities was by the EA component leads (i.e., terrestrial and aquatic biologists) as part of their component-specific literature review. Technical component leads attended First Nations Traditional Use workshops as part of information collection.

First Nations and Métis participants have asked that the Traditional Use information be kept confidential and not be shared in the EIS/EA Report. OHRG and government regulators have agreed to this approach.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.3.5.3 Economic Commitments

OHRG is committed to providing economic benefits to Aboriginal communities. Initiatives to maximize the benefits the Project will have on Aboriginal communities include:

- Scholarships
- Partnerships with local academic institutions
- On the job training
- A hire local priority policy
- Targeted employment, training and business opportunities

#### 7.3.5.3.1 Information Sharing

OHRG continues to share anticipated workforce and equipment requirement information with Aboriginal communities and economic development corporations. One specific request from the FFCS included preliminary fleet composition details for the Project. Ongoing information sharing about economic opportunities is planned to take place through the Committee.

#### 7.3.5.3.2 Contracts and Partnerships

OHRG aims to promote the utilization of Aboriginal enterprises whenever possible in supplying goods and/or services required during each phase of the project. The criteria used for the evaluation and awarding of all contracts by OHRG include cost competitiveness, continuity of supply, quality of work and timeliness.

There are a number of Aboriginal businesses that are engaged in activities required to supply goods and services to the Project. Examples of these businesses can be seen from the partnerships developed by OHRG in recent years. The partnerships listed below represent an investment of approximately \$23 Million:

- **Eva Lake Mining Ltd.**
  - Mining Exploration
  - Heavy equipment rentals and floating services
  - Excavating and contract labour
- **Rainy Lake Tribal Contracting Ltd.**
  - General contracting
  - Diamond drilling
  - Road construction
- **Naicatchewenin Development Corporation**
  - Diamond drilling
- **Saulteaux Consulting and Engineering**
  - Engineering support and consulting services
- **Synterra Security Solutions**
  - Site security

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.3.5.3.3 Aboriginal Workforce

OHRG will provide employment opportunities for the Project where possible and commercially reasonable. Members of the surrounding local Aboriginal communities will take priority respecting employment opportunities so long as they meet the requisite skills, education, experience and other job qualifications of a particular position. Employment opportunities, and the corresponding job postings, will be communicated to the local Aboriginal communities in a timely manner.

### 7.3.5.3.4 Direct Investment

OHRG provided approximately \$22,050 in direct investments to Aboriginal communities in 2012. Table 7-16 provides some examples of events and organizations that OHRG has sponsored to encourage the promotion of Aboriginal values and way of life. Additional sponsorships of sports events and community gatherings were also provided. These investments represent opportunities for ongoing cultural support of the identified Aboriginal communities throughout Project operations.

## 7.3.6 Ongoing Aboriginal Engagement

OHRG will continue to engage with Aboriginal communities and consider their comments throughout the Project planning process. The following outstanding issues and action items remain at this stage of the Project.

### 7.3.6.1 Notifications

**Notice of Submission of Certified Closure Plan:** OHRG will circulate a formal Notice when the Certified Closure Plan is submitted to the government.

### 7.3.6.2 Community Visits

Throughout the 2012 community open house events OHRG heard questions and concerns from community members. OHRG strives to respond to all community concerns in a timely and meaningful way. Written responses were not been provided for all comments gathered at First Nations community visits as it is not the most appropriate avenue for information sharing with community members.

The concerns include information and clarity requests on the following topics:

- Community Benefits
- Consultation Process
- Culture
- Employment and Training
- EA Process
- Hydrology
- Water Use and Quality
- Mitta Lake
- Tailings Management

Many of these topics have been discussed in Community News Brief publications and are considered in the EIS/EA Report. OHRG plans to suggest to the FFCS that another complete round of Community Open House events take place. The goal of these planned Community Visits will be to share information about the Final EIS/EA Report, and to provide information on the points raised by community members during previous visits.

---

## AMENDED EIS/EA REPORT CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT VERSION 3

---



### 7.3.6.3 *Committee Meetings*

OHRG's goal is to host at least one Resource Sharing Committee meeting per quarter throughout the Project phases. OHRG and the Resource Sharing Committees are currently developing a communications plan to allow for clearer communication and ongoing evaluation of committee objectives.

Upcoming topics of discussion with the Resource Sharing Committees include:

- Environmental Monitoring Planning
- Closure Planning
- Fish Relocation Planning

### 7.3.6.4 *Field Studies and Environmental Monitoring*

OHRG welcomes SRFN to be directly involved in environmental monitoring and sampling programs and will support their participation in our environmental field work.

Although the fish tissue sampling undertaken for the Hammond Reef Gold EA was sufficient for EA purposes, OHRG has committed to providing capacity support to Seine River First Nation (SRFN) to collect additional fish tissue and benthic samples in the spring of 2014 in conjunction with an environmental study being undertaken with their community. Work plans will be developed in cooperation with SRFN, who will also participate in the fieldwork. Data collected will be shared with SRFN, OFAH and the Atikokan Sportsmen's club

### 7.3.6.5 *Technical Information Sharing*

OHRG supports the joint use of data and believes that sharing of data is mutually beneficial to Project proponents and First Nations communities. OHRG has agreed to make environmental data available to SRFN and welcome the receipt of data SRFN has collected.

OHRG understands that water use is a key concern and water management of the Seine River is important. OHRG will work with SRFN to further examine hydrological effects as they affect Aboriginal concerns of SRFN. Further discussions regarding water use and hydrology are anticipated in 2014.

OHRG has collected traditional use information from elders and community members. This information has been shared in a presentation form with the participants of the study; however, OHRG has also committed to providing a report to the communities.

We understand that mercury is a key concern to SRFN. In response to this concern, OHRG prepared a Mercury Fact Sheet to explain why the Project is not anticipated to result in any increase in mercury levels either through exploration, ore processing or mining activities. A copy of the Mercury Fact Sheet is provided in Appendix 7.III.