

---

## HAMMOND REEF GOLD PROJECT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON FINAL EIS/EA

---

### COMMENT – T-24

**Source:** Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency

---

#### Summary of Comment

Table 6-56 of the EIS under the activities of “Development of the Open Pits” and “Operation of Processing Plant” the column entitled “Residual Environmental Effect” it is stated that there are “predicted risks to some human receptors close to site” and then in the “Significance of Residual Effect” column it is stated “Low: no impacts predicted for human health and ecological receptors”. Given that some risks were predicted for human receptors close to the site, it is unclear how the conclusion would be that there were no impacts predicted for human receptors.

#### Proposed Action

For these two activities, explain how the conclusion was reached that there would be no impacts predicted for human receptors given that some predicted risks were identified.

#### Reference to EIS

Chapter 6, Table 6-56

---

#### Response

While residual effects were identified for human health receptors close to the Site, based on considerations of extent, duration, frequency, reversibility and magnitude, the significance of the residual effects is considered to be low.

The statement under “Significance of Residual Effect” is incorrect and should not state “Low: no impacts predicted.” The correct conclusion is that the effects are not expected to be significant: “Low: predicted effects on human health or ecological receptors are not expected to be significant.”