Identifier	Topic	Reference to EIS/EA	Summary of Previous Comment	Proponent's Response to Previous Comment	Follow-up comment/ Request for Information	New Proponent Response	Subsequent Comment
		Report					
			Date: March 2014  MOE-GW 1	Date: June 2015	Date: August 2015 Same comment as MOE-GW 2B		
MOE GW 1B	Ground	Hydrdogeology	The water balance approach has been applied to	On April 28, 2014 Canadian Malartic hosted a	The proponent has completed a 3D	Acknowledged	N/A
	water	TSD	assess seepage impacts on Lizard Lake, which has	water quality workshop with the Government	groundwater model for the western		
			been considered separately from the assessment	Review Team. We also initiated	half of the TMF, which has provided an		
			of impacts to Marmion Reservoir. For Lizard Lake,	communications with the Regional	estimate of seepage discharging to		
			it has been assumed that 10% of the seepage	Groundwater Group Leader for MOE's	Lizard Lake. These estimates have then		
			estimated from the water balance will bypass the	Northern Region who stated on May 15, 2014	been used to estimate contaminant		
			seepage collection and will discharge to Lizard	that upon further clarification he is "satisfied	loadings to Lizard Lake from the tailings		
			Lake. Based on this assumption, the proponent	at this time with the estimates of seepage to	discharging through groundwater		
			has determined that seepage from the TMF	Lizard Lake."	seepage. The model also serves to		
			(Tailings Management Facility) will not adversely		provide an estimate of how much		
			impact Lizard Lake. The 10% seepage bypass has	Measures to limit, prevent and collect seepage	seepage will be intercepted by the		
			no basis, and is as stated simply an estimate.	from the Tailings Management Facility (TMF),	proposed seepage collection system. As		
			Further to this, there is little or no hydrogeological	Waste Rock Management Facility (WRMF),	noted by the Environment Canada		
			data for this area; the effectiveness of the	ore, low-grade ore, and overburden stockpiles	reviewer, there continues to be		
			proposed seepage control measurements have	have been developed at the conceptual level	shortcomings with the model that		
			not been assessed; and the topography indicates	only at this time and consist of a series of	should be addressed:		
			that the TMF is very likely to drain towards Lizard	collection ditches, and pumping stations.	<ul> <li>The model only covers the</li> </ul>		
			Lake. There is insufficient data provided to	There are many proven ways to intercept	western half of the TMF, based		
			properly assess the potential impact to Lizard	seepage from a given site. During the detailed	on the proponent's assumption		
			Lake, and it is therefore insufficient for the EA.	design stage for the Project additional drilling	that Lizard Lake is the primary		
				will be undertaken along the dam alignments,	receptor for seepage from the		
				ditch alignments and near the edges of	TMF. Although this assumption		
				proposed stockpiles, and at that time it will be	is reasonable, a more		
				appropriate to further specify the details of	expansive model is required to		
				the seepage collection system design.	quantify the total seepage from		
				Considerations during detailed design will	the TMF, identify if their are		
				include bedrock and depth of overburden	receptors other than Lizard		
				conditions, and use of pumping, however it is	Lake, and quantify the seepage		
				not possible for Canadian Malartic to fully	losses that may migrate		
				define these measures at a detailed design	directly to the Marmion		
				level without appropriate funding and Project	reservoir.		
				EIS/EA approval.	The assumption that the		
				The water quality of seenage has been	vertical hydraulic conductivity		
				The water quality of seepage has been	of the overburden is 10 times		
				predicted and assessed in the EIS/EA Report.  All infiltration from Project facilities was	less than the horizontal		
				assigned a water quality (as identified and	conductivity is not supported		
				discussed in the responses to information	by limited soil information		
				requests from the Draft EIS/EA Report) and	(boreholes) available at the		
				direct discharge of this water from the	location. This requires both		
				facilities was evaluated. Infiltration water is	some further investigation, and determination of the model's		
				expected to be compliant with applicable			
				expected to be compilant with applicable	sensitivity to this parameter.		

## 1656263

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 <u>MOE-GW 1</u>	Date: June 2015	Date: August 2015 Same comment as <u>MOE-GW 2B</u>		
				MMER and O. Reg 560/94 criteria. In addition,	Despite these shortcomings, it is my		
				concentrations for each potential point source	opinion that the modelling that has		
				were considered (as part of IR-MOE-NR-GW-	been done is suitable for the purposes		
				16 in Appendix 1.IV of the Final EIS/EA Report)	of the EA as the work done has		
				and it was found that direct discharge of these	quantified the risk to the surface water		
				concentrations into a water body would not	receiver and identified effective		
				result in adverse aquatic impacts.	mitigation and contingency measures.		
					As such, the outstanding concerns can		
				At the request of the Government Review	be addressed in the MOECC's		
				Team, additional 3D groundwater modelling	permitting, which should consider the		
				efforts were undertaken for the eastern	seepage and loading rates reported in		
				portion of the TMF. The preliminary 3D	the EA as commitments that could be		
				groundwater model was constructed using	recognized as limits in an ECA. To		
				available information and, through this	address the outstanding concerns, the		
				evaluation, it was shown that capture of	MOECC will require the proponent		
				greater than 90% of seepage could be	carry out further work to support		
				achieved by the proposed control system	permit applications, which will include		
				given the current TMF design configuration	(but not necessarily be limited to)		
				and the current understanding of the tailing	additional boreholes and monitoring		
				properties and geologic conditions of the site.	wells in the area of the TMF to provide		
				Further details of this modelling evaluation are provided in the memorandum entitled	a better understanding of the area		
				Tailings Management Facility, 3D	hydrogeology and improve the model calibration; expansion of the model to		
				Groundwater Modelling' provided in Part D of	encompass all of the TMF and thereby		
				the Addendum to the Version 3 EIS/EA. as a	identify additional receptors and		
				supplemental to the Final EIS/EA Report.	quantify seepage losses to all		
				Supplementar to the Final Els/ EA Report.	receptors, including Marmion		
				In light of the results of the newly undertaken	Reservoir; detailed design of the		
				groundwater modelling, it is considered that	proposed mitigation measures;		
				the assumed seepage capture efficiency is	updated modelling reflecting the final		
				realistically achievable based on the	design of the mitigation measures; and		
				conceptual design. During the detailed design	calibration and sensitivity analysis of		
				stage additional information collected will be	the model(s). Typically, the proponent		
				used to develop a more robust modelling	should be consulting with MOECC staff		
				evaluation to refine and optimize the design of	to determine the additional		
				the seepage collection system.	information that will be required to		
					support applications for approvals and		
				It is the intent of Canadian Malartic to work	permits.		
				with the design engineers and the applicable			
				regulatory agencies to ensure that future data			
				collection and the development of predictive			
				models will meet both the requirements of			

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

## 1656263

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 <u>MOE-GW 1</u>	Date: June 2015	Date: August 2015 Same comment as MOE-GW 2B		
				engineering design and needs of the agencies with respect to permitting requirements.			