Identifier	Topic	Reference to EIS/EA Report	Summary of Previous Comment	Proponent's Response to Previous Comment	Follow-up comment/ Request for Information	New Proponent Response	Subsequent Comment
			Date: March 2014 *MNR-2*	*Date: June 2015*	*Date: August 2015*		
MNRF 2	Transmission lines		MNRF provided comments that there were data gaps in the areas for the transmission line alternatives.	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. 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. 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 & 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. Design/construction mitigation measures are outlined in Chapter 8 and include: ■ Vegetated riparian buffers will remain around watercourses crossings to the extent possible ■ Avoid vegetation clearing within the breeding bird window where possible. ■ Pre-clearing surveys will demark active nests and set up appropriate buffer areas. ■ Design transmission lines to minimize collisions and electrocution of birds ■ Selectively clear transmission line pathway without grading or stripping or topsoil ■ Provide compensation for lost habitat if required (e.g., bats) ■ Construction will adhere to erosion and sediment control plans ■ Compensate for habitat at stream crossings, if habitat is disturbed 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 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	The preferred alternative for the transmission line crossing Sawmill Bay is included in the LSA, however the concern is that very little research on terrestrial ecology was conducted in this area upon reviewing the plot locations as shown on the maps supplied in the Terrestrial TSD (i.e. on the islands where towers/infrastructure will likely be installed). For this reason, there may be further information requirements for this area in particular at the time of permitting. The transmission line will be constructed on Crown land and will require land tenure from MNRF. We appreciate that CMC has provided further specifics to the alternatives, such as road length. However, this should be reflected with other comparables, (as referenced above) in a revised Table 3-10. EA coverage for MNRF permits and approvals is only as good as the EA that is submitted. Which is why MNRF has identified areas where there is inadequate EA coverage and pointed out the risk to the proponent. There has not been extensive evaluation of alternatives for the transmission line and substation. MNRF's comment on Fig 1-3 was intended to identify that it will be more practical to identify a wider corridor, the road will be constructed within. The line on the map shows little room for flexibility during implementation. _____ The response for additional information regarding plans to cross Sawbill Bay has prompted more questions. Information provided at the face to face meeting of July 8, 2014 showed proposed locations of the towers, as well as drawings of the tower designs. The steel tower structures in those drawings are shown to be 52-63m tall.	Additional information provided in: Supplemental Assessment of Access Road and Transmission Line Routing Alternatives in Part 4 of the Version 3 Alternatives Assessment TSD.	MNRF 2B

Identifier	Topic	Reference to EIS/EA Report	Summary of Previous Comment	Proponent's Response to Previous Comment	Follow-up comment/ Request for Information	New Proponent Response	Subsequent Comment
			Date: March 2014 *MNR-2*	*Date: June 2015*	*Date: August 2015*		
				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. 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 assessment. The on-site power distribution plan is conceptual at this time. Detailed design has not been undertaken and some flexibility is required. 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 The auxiliary line is no longer required, and is no longer part of the Project description. 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. 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. 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.	In discussions with Hydro One, structures to span these distances will need to be very tall (i.e. likely >100m) and will likely require additional requirements such as aviation lighting. Since power will not be able to be supplied from the 230kv line, plans for an auxiliary source for power will be needed. The proponent has responded that the site power distribution system design detail has not been undertaken. This is concerning, as the transmission line is not a small component of the project and the selected alternative is complex. Changes could involve new corridors, additional steel towers, a submarine auxiliary line, etc. which are major additions/changes and would not have EA coverage. The statement that other alternatives such as a submarine crossing was ruled out based on economic and environmental considerations is not acceptable. The alternative selected is also costly. The EA needs to provide more detail on what is being proposed and a better delivery of the alternatives assessment.		