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

COMMENT –T- 64

Source: Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency

Summary of Comment

It is noted in MTCS' comment (MTCS-6) that "Potential archaeological monitoring is needed". Submerged archaeological/cultural resources may be encountered during the draining of Lake Mitta and they may be significant and require evaluation/mitigation.

Proposed Action

Provide confirmation on whether an archaeological monitoring program will be incorporated to occur during the draining of Mitta Lake.. .

Reference to EIS

Cultural Heritage Resources TSD

Response

Canadian Malartic Corporation intends to comply with the conditions of the relevant work permits required for the draining of Mitta Lake; however, archaeological monitoring during the drainage is not being considered at this time. Archaeological monitoring during the drainage of Mitta Lake was not recommended in the Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment report. During the Stage 1 property inspection, it was observed that much of the area surrounding the lake was wetland and that the only areas to have archaeological potential near the lake were small pockets of land on the east side of Mitta Lake. This area was test pit surveyed, where possible and no artifacts (Aboriginal or Euro-Canadian) were recovered. Furthermore, Section 7.0 – Advice on Compliance with Legislation indicates:

Should previously undocumented archaeological resources be discovered, they may be representative of a new archaeological site or sites and therefore subject to Section 48(1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990 c.O.18 (Government of Ontario 1990a). The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a licensed consultant archaeologist to carry out archaeological fieldwork, in compliance with Section 48(1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.