

**Table A - IR2: Information Requests Derived from the Canadian Malartic Corporation’s Responses to Information Request #1 (IR1) on the Final Environmental Impact Statement /Environmental Assessment Report for the Federal Environmental Assessment of the Hammond Reef Gold Mine Project**

Reference #	Link to IR1	Ecosystem Topic	Reference to EIS Guidelines	Reference to EIS	Summary of Comment/ Rationale	Information Request Response to Information Request
T(2)-01	T-13, T-14	Air Quality  Aboriginal Interest and Land and Resource Use	10.2.1	AE TSD	<p>The proponent indicated that receptor locations for both air quality and noise were evaluated based on the “points of reception [PORs]” as defined in the Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change’s noise guideline NPC 300. Given that these guidelines are for noise, it is unclear why these same PORs were used in the air quality evaluation. Relevant human receptors for air quality and noise may vary and therefore excluding receptors from the air quality assessment based on a noise guideline may not be appropriate. Also, areas used by Aboriginal peoples for traditional purposes (including plant harvesting, cultural sites, teaching areas, etc.) may be overlooked by this approach to selecting receptor locations.</p> <p>The EIS indicates that public access cannot be restricted (i.e. people can and likely will continue to use these sites) and several points of reception were predicted to have elevated particulate matter and noise levels. It is unclear why the proponent would remove the twenty PORs as they may represent worst-case exposure scenarios.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clarify whether areas used by Aboriginal groups for traditional purposes (e.g. plant harvesting, cultural sites, teaching areas, etc.) were included in the selection process of the sensitive receptor locations. If they were not considered, justify the decision to exclude these areas and provide their proximities to the Project.</li> <li>2. Provide a rationale to explain why a noise guideline was used to exclude receptors from an evaluation of air quality. If an explanation cannot be provided, incorporate these additional PORs in the air quality assessment and the responses to <a href="#">T(2)-02</a>.</li> </ol> <p><b>Response:</b> All areas within the RSA where humans are likely to be present were included in the Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment. The discrete receptor locations were identified as part of the Socio-Economic assessment and included locations of recreational uses such as camping, hunting, fishing, gathering etc.. Aboriginal traditional areas, if any, were included.</p> <p>Throughout the course of the EA, clarification was required with respect to the areas that were chosen as receptors for the HHERA. Following the clarification, some receptors were removed from the HHERA after it was identified that these areas are not likely to have human activity. As a precautionary measure, in addition to the discrete receptors as illustrated on Figure 3-5 of the EA, the receptors that were removed within 10 km of the Mine Study Area were assessed for short term exposure (i.e. a few hours to a few weeks) and no area was found to pose a risk of any health concerns.</p> <p>NPC-300 was specifically referenced in previous responses to explain why certain receptors (like camp grounds) were not assessed for noise.</p>