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-11*	*Date: June 2015*	*Date: August 2015*	*Date: October 2016*	
MNRF-5	Worker camp		Component was not included in the approved ToR. The EA does not adequately assess alternatives, specifically alternative locations. MNRF had concerns with the camp being located too close to the shores of Marmion Lake and related impacts. MNRF also identified potential socio-economic impacts which have not been identified or addressed. MNRF also requested a description of the land use intent for each of the General Land Use Areas as per the land use direction identified in our Crown Land Use Atlas. I.e. Marmion- easy access to highly productive angling area for Atikokan residents and the tourist industry, forestry and mining will not adversely affect recreational qualities. Greytrout - Logging operations, maintenance of lake trout, moose and deer populations, tourism and recreation opportunities are the priority, Finlayson - timber production, mineral exploration/development, recreation and tourism. The report should also describe how these land use priorities have been considered and addressed, specifically, the 120 m modified management area around Marmion Lake.	The potential effects of the planned accommodation camp have been conservatively considered in the Final EIS/EA Report. The selected approach was to consider an upper-bound ('worst case') occupancy of 1,200 workers for the duration of the Project. 1,200 workers is an upper bound estimate for when the mine is operating at full production. The Socio-economic TSD estimates an actual annual average workforce of 550 and it is expected that many workers will take advantage of incentives provided by Canadian Malartic to live in Atikokan as opposed to the on-site camp. The potential environmental impacts have been predicted based on baseline data collected and data as provided by other agencies including the MNR, and have included substantial public consultation to understand tourism implications, workforce implications, and to weigh impacts and benefits of the proposed mine as described in various sections throughout the EA. The potential environmental impacts have been mitigated through water management measures, restriction of workforce fishing, and investment in tourism and recreation. The effects are not deemed to be significant and are outweighed by the potential economic benefits from creation of jobs, contracts, and services. Further evaluation of additional on-site camp location alternatives has been undertaken, based on advice received by MNR following submittal of the Final EIS/EA. A total of five alternative locations were considered, including	If the EA is presenting a worker camp of 1200 workers, the EA needs to consider impacts of that many workers. The proponent needs to provide the sources of information of where the baseline information was used to determine socio economic impacts. It is not clear where in the EIS and the TSD this information is presented. Table 4.1 of the TSD does not mention impacts to hunting even though it is referenced on pg 107 where it identifies hunting pressure from works at the worker camp as a potential issue. MNRF appreciates that an additional evaluation of the on-site camp location was completed and provided in the addendum. MNRF supports the preferred alternative location. *It should be noted, that for any dispositions that require MNRF approval, additional consultation may be required if not satisfied through the EA process. The description of the General Land Use Area is an important policy that governs land use. It needs	In response to comments from the MNRF, CMC has completed a more detailed assessment of the potential impacts of a 1,200 person camp on fishing and hunting pressure and opportunities in the Local and Regional study areas. The results of this assessment, including sources of baseline data, are provided in the attached memorandum. CMC appreciates the MNRF's support of the preferred alternative camp location. CMC understands that additional consultation with the MNRF may be required for any dispositions that require MNRF approval that may not be satisfied with the information provided in the EA. **Attachment:** Technical Memorandum: Assessment of Potential Impacts to Fishing and Hunting Pressure and Opportunities - Hammond Reef Gold Project	MNRF-5B

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-11*	*Date: June 2015*	*Date: August 2015*	*Date: October 2016*	
				the original alternative, a new location west of the shoreline, two new locations east of the shoreline, and a new location on Reef Road. A memorandum summarizing this evaluation is found in Attachment 1 of the Final EIS/EA Addendum. The comparative evaluation indicates that the alternative located East of Sawbill Bay and West of the TMF (Alternative 5) is the new preferred location for the on-site worker accommodation camp. Therefore, the preferred camp location is no longer within the 120 m modified management area around Marmion Lake. Alternatives 2 and 4 in the Attachment are also considered favourable, however were not selected as the preferred alternative because of social and environmental considerations. Canadian Malartic has been clear and transparent in our communications with public, government and Aboriginal partners over the past three years. Extensive consultation on the Project has taken place as outlined in Chapter 7: • Six public Open House events were undertaken • Aboriginal consultation has been determined as sufficient by First Nations and Métis • More than 25 meetings have taken place with the lead agencies of the EA Process since 2012 Section 5.2.6 of the Final EIS/EA Report, titled "Support and Ancillary	to be included in the EA, as well as how it was considered.		

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-11*	*Date: June 2015*	*Date: August 2015*	*Date: October 2016*	
				Infrastructure" includes the accommodation camp, communications tower, and weather station. A description of the General Land Use Areas are provided in the original response to comment MNR-25, which upon issue became an official component of the Final EIS/EA Report. **Attachment:** Addendum Attachment 1; Assessment of Alternative Camp Locations Technical Memorandum			