

Identifier	Topic	Reference to EIS/EA Report	Comment	Proponent's Response	Subsequent Comment
			<i>Date: March 2014</i>	<i>Date: June 2015</i> <i>Same response as <a href="#">MNR-2</a></i>	
MNR-1	Alternative Assessment – Transmission Lines	EIS/EA 4.2.8, 4.2.8.1	<p>Our Ministry perspective is that the EA does not provide an adequate description of all three transmission lines. More detail is required on the physical description and location of where the lines are proposed. There is no description of the water crossings, wetlands, and habitat for any of the alternatives. There is no description of planned maintenance and mitigation that will be applied. (i.e., winter construction, setbacks during herbicide application, mitigation for spills/leaks from machinery, sedimentation controls, working in water timelines, etc.) The EA also does not provide an adequate description of how the transmission line will cross Sawbill Bay.</p>	<p>An evaluation of transmission line alternatives was provided in Chapter 4, Section 4.2.8 and in the Alternatives Assessment TSD including quantification of water crossings. Alternatives were compared against environmental criteria, with a focus on terrestrial ecology as construction will mainly involve clearing of vegetation. The alternatives are not anticipated to affect water quality, air quality, stream flows, or groundwater quality and quantity.</p> <p>The transmission line is included in the Terrestrial Ecology local study area and a description of terrestrial habitat in the study area, including wetlands, is provided in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10 and in the Terrestrial Ecology TSD. Detailed design and construction of supports will avoid watercourses, wetlands and sensitive habitat areas.</p> <p>Water crossings required for the Project were considered as part of the aquatic assessment and included in No Net Loss Plan. Authorization for installation of water crossings will be obtained under the Lakes &amp; Rivers Improvement Act. Figure 5-12 of the Final EIS/EA Report provides the existing and planned water crossings. These water crossings are included in the aquatics assessment and have been considered in the No Net Loss Planning.</p> <p>Design/construction mitigation measures are outlined in Chapter 8 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Vegetated riparian buffers will remain around watercourses crossings to the extent possible</li> <li>■ Avoid vegetation clearing within the breeding bird window where possible.</li> <li>■ Pre-clearing surveys will demark active nests and set up appropriate buffer areas.</li> <li>■ Design transmission lines to minimize collisions and electrocution of birds</li> <li>■ Selectively clear transmission line pathway without grading or stripping or topsoil</li> <li>■ Provide compensation for lost habitat if required (e.g., bats)</li> <li>■ Construction will adhere to erosion and sediment control plans</li> <li>■ Compensate for habitat at stream crossings, if habitat is disturbed</li> </ul> <p>The transmission line will be designed and constructed in consultation with HydroOne following their specifications and the requirements of the Ontario Electricity Safety Code. Canadian Malartic Corporation will work with HydroOne during the design stage to determine an appropriate operation/maintenance plan for the period after construction is complete</p> <p>The transmission line will provide 100 MW of power per year to the Project site and have a total length of approximately 20 km. The length of the transmission line from Highway 622 to Hardtack/Sawbill Road Intersection is approximately 14 km, the length of the transmission line section spanning from the Hardtack/Sawbill Road Intersection to Sawbill Bay is approximately 2.3 km and the final length of the line spanning from the Sawbill Bay Crossing to the Mine Site is an estimated 2.3 km. An estimated 85 towers will be required, the first 14 km of which will be composed of wood (H-frame) structures, and the second 6 km section is planned to include steel towers to allow for the longer spans across Sawbill Bay. A submarine crossing of Sawbill Bay was considered but not identified in the EA as a feasible alternative for the Project due to economic and environmental considerations.</p> <p>Power from the transmission line will be distributed to the Project facilities, including the TMF, TMF pumping stations and the accommodation camp through on-site power distribution systems. The on-site power distribution systems will be located within the identified Project footprint and EA study areas, and will generally follow the same alignment as other linear infrastructure (roads and pipelines). The environmental impact of disturbance within the Project footprint has been considered in the</p>	<a href="#">MNR-1</a>

Version 3 Hammond Reef Gold Project EIS/EA – Addendum (Part B)  
Responses to Provincial Information Requests

1656263

Identifier	Topic	Reference to EIS/EA Report	Comment	Proponent's Response	Subsequent Comment
			<i>Date: March 2014</i>	<i>Date: June 2015</i> <i>Same response as <a href="#">MNR-2</a></i>	
				<p>assessment. The on-site power distribution plan is conceptual at this time. Detailed design has not been undertaken and some flexibility is required.</p> <p>Canadian Malartic Corporation has volunteered for an individual EA based on the understanding that additional approval processes will not be required for power lines and roads. Subjecting on site power distribution to separate approval processes under the Environmental Assessment Act would be contrary to the agreed upon terms of the Voluntary Agreement signed between MOE and Canadian Malartic Corporation in August 2011</p> <p>The auxiliary line is no longer required, and is no longer part of the Project description.</p> <p>Canadian Malartic Corporation acknowledges that additional information is likely to be required for MNR approval of land disposition for the transmission line and substation. An extensive evaluation of alternatives was conducted, and the most suitable option was chosen to move forward with the Project. We are confident in the preferred alternative selected.</p> <p>With respect to upland breeding bird, marsh bird, nocturnal bird, amphibian and turtle surveys, the surveys undertaken for the EA included consideration of the alternative linear infrastructure corridors as shown in Figures 2-1, 2-2 and 2-3 of the Terrestrial Ecology TSD. Survey sites were selected based on the likelihood of habitat presence. We feel that the baseline surveys completed to date are sufficient for the EA and additional surveys are not required.</p> <p>The transmission line corridor has been clearly mapped in Figure 1-3 of the Final EIS/EA report. Figure 5-1 also shows all the Project components along with the transmission line crossing.</p>	