

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
			<i>Date: March 2014</i> MNR-3	<i>Date: June 2015</i>	<i>Date: August 2015</i>	<i>June 2017</i>	
MNRF-3	Access Roads		<p>MNRF identified there was description lacking on the access road alternatives, It is not clear to what degree road upgrades are being planned for both the Raft Lake and the Hardtack/Sawbill roads. That is, there is no description of when and how the right of way (ROW) will expand, when and how the road bed will need to be upgraded, how the existing water crossings will need to be 'extended', and what would be needed for the new crossings.</p>	<p>An extensive evaluation of access road 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>The main rationale for selecting the Hardtack/Sawbill Road is the limited amount of upgrading that would be required, which implies limited incremental terrestrial and aquatic impacts. Further clarification on this has been provided in response to Information Requests MNR-66 and MNR-67 on the Draft EIS/EA. Upgrading of the Hardtack/Sawbill Road has already been done as part of the exploration project. The Hardtack/Sawbill Road has been used and maintained over the past five years and continues to be used by others, including forestry companies. The Raft Lake Road is not well used and would require much more upgrading and the construction of new road sections and new water crossings.</p> <p>Canadian Malartic acknowledges that additional information may be required for MNR approval of construction activities within the linear corridor, such as watercourse crossings.</p> <p>Linear corridor components were described in Chapters 4 and 5 of the Final EIS/EA Report, including figures. Study Area figures for each component are provided in Chapter 2. The fibre optic line and auxiliary power line have been removed and are no longer part of the Project description. The transmission line does not follow the road exactly. This is due to engineering and topographical considerations.</p> <p>The existing Hardtack/Sawbill road will require some widening and realignment to provide safe travel conditions. Feasibility design of the road is currently underway. Horizontal realignment will be required in some locations to provide safe turning radii and to eliminate blind corners. Based on current feasibility design alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ There are 11 road sections that will require horizontal realignment greater than 10 m in extent (see Figure MNR-1 in Attachment 5 of this Addendum); and, ■ The maximum horizontal deviation is about 125 m from the existing road alignment <p>Vertical realignment will be required at locations where the existing grade is too steep for safe travel. Widening is required to provide safe riding surface and shoulder widths. The change in footprint area associated with widening and vertical realignment will be minor compared to sections where horizontal realignment is occurring. Road widening activities may require culvert extension at water course crossings. Culvert design descriptions will be developed in consultation with MNR throughout the permitting process.</p> <p>Chapter 6 provides a summary of mitigation measures for the physical, biological</p>	<p>The additional information provided and the missing information needs to be included in a revised Table 3-8 of the TSD). Activities for both alternatives need to be weighed against one another for all of the potential impacts (i.e. technical, feasibility, environmental, etc.). And any mitigation measures which are considered in the comparison.</p> <p>The information in the No Net Loss Plan is not adequate for the water crossings. There are a limited number of crossings described in the NNLP. And it is likely that most of the crossings will be considered under the Public Lands Act over the LRIA, for which there has not been adequate EA coverage.</p> <p>Water crossing information is important for evaluation and assessment purposes for both the transmission line and road corridors. Not only from an economic and social impact aspect (the number, the type (culvert vs bridge), the disturbance required, the sensitivity of the site, etc.). New and upgraded water crossings are expensive. It is not clear how 7 water crossings are more costly than 14. A brief description of the crossings is needed and identification if they are new, upgraded or existing. For example; there are areas on both alternatives that will need significant crossing structures.</p> <p>The two alternatives were brought forward in the EA. The proponent should identify and consider the potential effects of <u>each</u> alternative with aspects of the environment. The Raft Lake road, was not included in the study area, no baseline work was done and the EA did not present the potential effects and the disadvantages and advantages (as described in our earlier comments). This also includes the feasibility comparison. This demonstrates there has not been an extensive evaluation.</p> <p>Additional information (length of road and water crossings) and the plans for realignments on the</p>	<p>Additional information provided in: Supplemental Assessment of Access Road and Transmission Line Routing Alternatives in Part 4 of the Version 3 Alternatives Assessment TSD</p>	MNRF-3B

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
			<p>Date: March 2014 MNR-3</p>	<p>Date: June 2015</p>	<p>Date: August 2015</p>	<p>June 2017</p>	
				<p>and social environment. Chapter 8 outlines planned management and mitigation measures based on Project aspect (e.g., Table 8-8 provides a commitment to selectively clear transmission line pathway without grading or stripping of topsoil).</p> <p>Terrestrial and Aquatic Local Study Areas considered a width of 1 km along the access road; therefore, the area of potential disturbance has been included in the baseline study area. Habitat losses due to access road water crossings have been included in the No Net Loss Plan (NNLP) which DFO (Fisheries and Oceans Canada) has accepted in principle. Any additional Harmful Alteration, Disruption or Destruction (HADD) of fish habitat due to road upgrade will be included in the Final NNLP. The NNLP states (pp. 48): <i>"Potential for HADDs at each crossing will be assessed once culvert design specifications are developed"</i></p> <p>The Raft Lake Road is not currently planned to be used as an access road for the Project. In the event that use of Raft Lake Road is required for the Project, additional data collection will be undertaken, as required, to support regulatory approvals and required permitting for upgrades and use of the Raft Lake Road.</p> <p>Attachment: Addendum Attachment 5; Figure MNR-1: Access Road Proposed Re-Alignment</p>	<p>Sawbill Rd (Figure MNR 1) is appreciated. However more information and further planning regarding specific works (i.e. lake infilling, blasting, etc.) will be needed at permitting. These activities may also be subject to other permitting requirements from other agencies. These requirements will likely add time to obtaining approvals.</p>		

