

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
			<i>Date: March 2014</i> <a href="#">MTCS-7</a>	<i>Date: June 2015</i>	<i>Date: September 2015</i>	<i>Date: August 2016</i>	
MTCS-7B	Physical and cultural heritage	EIS/EA Executive Summary, V.2, Potential Effects on the Social Environment pg. ES-26	Suggested revisions to the first and last sentence in "Physical and Cultural Heritage Resources section as the regulatory requirements under section VI of the Ontario Heritage Act still have not been met as the Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessment report for the project has still not been reviewed/commented on by MTCS. Therefore, the statements of "no significant archaeological sites were found" and "As both of these sites date well into the 20th century the information potential related to archaeological is considered to be low" require editing.	The Stage 1 Baseline Study and Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Report were included for review in the Supplemental Information Package to the Version 2 Cultural Heritage Resources TSD. These reports have been reviewed by MTCS and comments were received in a letter dated June 4, 2014.	Supplementary data provided in the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Heritage Impact Assessment revise the original assertion in the archaeological assessment that both sites date well into the 20th century, and identify them both as having cultural heritage value (p44 of the HIA).  When mitigation measures related to the conservation or removal of each mine site are taken, industrial archaeology related to their built heritage and cultural heritage landscape components is to be addressed.  Please note the caveat in the attached Ministry letter of October 9, 2014, for the Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment:  1 In no way will the ministry be liable for any harm, damages, costs, expenses, losses, claims or actions that may result: (a) if the Report(s) or its recommendations are discovered to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent; or (b) from the issuance of this letter. Further measures may need to be taken in the event that additional artifacts or archaeological sites are identified or the Report(s) is otherwise found to be	The Stage 1 background research was completed in 2010. The Stage 2 property survey was completed in 2012. The Stage 1 and 2 archaeological report was originally received and acknowledged by MTCS on May 23, 2013, one year prior to documentation provided by the 2014 main Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), and the supplementary Photographic Documentation and Options for Mitigation of Heritage Impacts appendices added in 2015.  The Stage 2 property survey documents two sites – the Hammond Gold Reef Mine Site and the Sawbill Mine site. It is the location and documentation of these sites that laid the grounds for the 2014 Heritage Impact Assessment. More correctly, the HIA should reference the Archaeological Assessment. While the two sites retain cultural heritage value or interest from a heritage perspective, both sites date well into the 20th century and the information potential related to archaeological studies is considered to be low and no further archaeological assessment is recommended.  A Heritage Impact Assessment is not an archaeological assessment and is not associated with a Project Information Form and therefore cannot be reviewed as an archaeological assessment. Archaeological information pertaining to the project should be consulted through the Archaeological Assessment report completed under PIFs PIF P218-336-2012, P243-069-2010, and P243-277-2011.  Prior to commencement of the construction phase of the project, CMC will prepare and submit to the MTCS a detailed conservation plan for the heritage features that will be avoided by the mine development. As project progresses towards detailed engineering design and construction, design optimization studies may result in minor modifications to the alignment and/or footprint of some of the project facilities. For example, the footprint of the waste rock stockpile may be reduced slightly. As a result, features such as the Sawbill Mine Shaft #3 and former mill foundation, which are currently planned for partial or complete removal, may be avoided entirely as a result of the ongoing design optimization process. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to develop the heritage conservation plan	

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
			<i>Date: March 2014</i> <a href="#">MTC-7</a>	<i>Date: June 2015</i>	<i>Date: September 2015</i>	<i>Date: August 2016</i>	
					inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent.	after the detailed engineering phase of the project has been completed (i.e., prior to construction) when it will be known with more certainty which features will be avoided. The commitment to prepare the cultural heritage conservation plan will be added to project commitments registry.	