



Canadian Environmental
Assessment Agency

Ontario Regional Office
55 St. Clair Avenue East,
Room 907
Toronto, ON M4T 1M2

Agence canadienne
d'évaluation environnementale

Bureau régional de l'Ontario
55, avenue St-Clair est,
bureau 907
Toronto (Ontario) M4T 1M2

October 05, 2017

Sent by E-mail

Robert MacDonald
Vice President
Treasury Metals Inc.
130 King Street West, Suite 3680
Toronto, ON
M5X 1B1

Dear Mr. MacDonald,

SUBJECT: Outcome of completeness check of the responses provided by Treasury Metals Inc. to Information Request #1 on the *Goliath Gold Project Environmental Impact Statement*

Thank you for the response, dated September 06, 2017, to Information Request #1 (IR#1) on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Goliath Gold Project (the Project). The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (the Agency) has conducted a completeness check, to form an opinion on whether the information requested has been provided to enable the Agency to proceed with the environmental assessment (EA), and has concluded that the response is incomplete.

For this Project, the Agency reviewed to the completeness of the response to IR#1 to determine whether the responses provided by Treasury Metals Inc. (Treasury) contained sufficient details and were consistent with the direction provided in IR#1 and companion sheet (Annex B). IR#1, including the companion sheet, itemized a number of technical questions. Responses to these questions are necessary for the Agency to draw conclusions to support advice to the federal Minister of Environment and Climate Change on whether the Project, taking into account the implementation of any mitigation measures, is likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects, as described in Section 5 of *the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012). In addition to potential environmental effects, as described in CEAA 2012, with respect to Indigenous peoples, IR#1 also included questions to support the Agency's advice to the Minister on potential for the Project to impact Aboriginal and/or Treaty rights in accordance with the *Constitution Act*.

Upon review of the response to IR#1, the Agency has concluded that the response does not meet the requirements of IR#1, including Annex B. The primary deficiencies relate to three areas:

- the format and content of the revised Environmental Impact Statement (EIS);
- the requirement for engagement with potentially affected Indigenous groups on aspects of the EA has not been met, based on the information presented in the Aboriginal Engagement Report and the revised EIS, as well as in responses to specific information requests (IRs) related to this topic;

.../2



- the requirements of Annex B (the companion sheet) have not been met; and
- responses to 287 of the 859 questions in IR #1 (contained in Annexes A1 to A4 of IR#1), were found to be incomplete.

For the Agency to confirm that the responses are complete to proceed with the EA, all deficiencies in the response to IR#1, which are further detailed in the attached **Annex 1** and **Annex 2**, must be corrected prior to resubmission. Based on the nature of the comments, the Agency has determined that Treasury must resubmit:

- a fully revised EIS that includes insertions or changes made throughout the EIS main text, Addenda, and EIS Summary;
- a revised Aboriginal Engagement Report; and
- a revised IR#1 response package that addresses the original IR#1 by correcting all identified deficiencies.

The outcome of this completeness check, including this letter and Annexes, will be shared with federal authorities and Indigenous groups and will be posted on the Canadian Environmental Assessment Registry Internet Site. Upon your submission of a revised response to IR#1, the Agency may take up to a maximum of 30 days to complete another completeness check without the timeline for the EA resuming. The timeline will resume if the Agency has not come to a conclusion after 30 days.

Following the second completeness check, the Agency will notify you in writing about the outcomes and next steps. If the Agency determines that the revised response to IR#1 has addressed the deficiencies identified in Annex 1 and Annex 2, the Agency will begin a technical review of the response and will notify Indigenous groups of the outcome. If the deficiencies are not addressed, the Agency will notify you of the information required.

The Agency welcomes the opportunity to discuss the outcome of this completeness check with you and provide further advice on how to best address the information requirements identified. If you wish to schedule a meeting, or have questions about this completeness check, please contact me at 437-993-2243 or via email at Goliath@ceaa-acee.gc.ca.

Sincerely,
<Original signed by>

Marcelle Phaneuf
Project Manager

Attachments (1)

1. Annex 1: Outcome of completeness check of the responses provided by Treasury Metals Inc. to Information Request #1 on the *Goliath Gold Project Environmental Impact Statement*
2. Annex 2: Completeness check of the response to IR#1 for the *Goliath Gold Project Environmental Impact Statement*

cc: Mark wheeler – Director, Projects, Treasury Metals Inc.

Annex 1

Outcome of completeness check of the responses provided by Treasury Metals Inc. to Information Request #1 on the *Goliath Gold Project Environmental Impact Statement*

The Agency has determined that the response to IR#1 is not complete and does not sufficiently meet the requirements of IR#1 and Annex B. The primary deficiencies relate to three areas:

- A. the format and general content of the revised EIS;
- B. Aboriginal engagement; and
- C. the responses to all Annex A1 to Annex A4 information requests.

A. Format and content of the revised EIS

The review of the revised Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) found the following deficiencies that will impede the technical review:

- The assessment of changes to the environment on Aboriginal peoples, required under section 5 (1)(c) of CEAA 2012, is insufficient to allow a technical review. Information on potential impacts to Indigenous groups is not presented with adequate evidence and rationale. Information pertaining to and gathered from Indigenous groups to facilitate analysis of these effects is extremely minimal and the assessment provided is not done in a manner enabling the Agency to determine what mitigation measures apply to which Indigenous group.
- There is little to no information provided in the EIS for each Indigenous group's Aboriginal and Treaty rights or an assessment of impacts to those rights. Rather, the Agency is directed to the assessment of changes to the environment on Aboriginal people. While information collected for the assessment of changes to the environment on Aboriginal peoples can overlap with information describing Aboriginal and Treaty rights, they are separate requirements and cannot be proxies for each other. Sections 9.2 and 10.2 of the EIS guidelines require Treasury to collect baseline information and conduct an assessment of impacts on Aboriginal and Treaty rights.
- The assessment of effects of changes to the environment that are directly linked or necessarily incidental to federal decisions in Section 6.23 of the revised EIS, is insufficient to meet requirements of Section 5(2) of CEAA 2012. Please note that there may be potential impacts to other valued components (such as to non-Indigenous peoples or flora or fauna not explicitly identified in Section 5 of CEAA 2012).
- The methodology of the cumulative effects assessment (Section 7) is flawed such that the conclusions of this assessment are scientifically unreliable. The section is not written as a stand-alone section, as required in the EIS Guidelines. No assessment criteria were defined for valued components (VCs) that may be affected by other past, present, or future activities within the determined spatial and temporal boundaries. Some activities are screened out although they are indicated as overlapping in temporal and spatial terms. Finally, consideration of traditional knowledge and information provided by Indigenous groups has not been adequately demonstrated or incorporated into the assessment of cumulative effects.
- It is difficult to validate water models and effects predictions based on geochemical information due to confusion in supporting information. The geochemistry and geochemical modelling information used to support water modelling and effects predictions is spread out between various documents in both the original and the revised EIS (Appendix C of Appendix F in the original EIS; Appendix K, Appendix JJ, and geochemical effects assessment in the revised EIS).

It is not clear how the data and information between documents is related, and whether it was all considered in the water modelling and effects predictions.

- The water management plan (Appendix F) from the original EIS was re-written for the revised EIS. However, this resulted in a substantial reduction of information in this appendix, which may prevent the validation of models and effects predictions. It is unknown whether this information has been moved to other sections or appendices of the EIS, removed from the EIS altogether or superseded.
- A summary of mitigation measures should provide a snapshot of how potential project effects will be mitigated. However, it is not possible to understand the link between the list of mitigation measures found in Table 6.22-1, the list of commitments found in Table 10.0-1, and the Project as a whole. The mitigation measures and commitments are presented without organizing them in accordance with clear links to the potential effects, including valued component, they are intended to mitigate, the project phase when they would be applied, the regulatory or legislative authority or the addressee of the commitment that would ensure its standard. The link between potential effects, application of mitigation measures for each specific effect, and the resultant residual effect should also be clear. Further, there is no distinction or differentiation made between mitigation measures and commitments, how they are described or how they are to be applied and followed. Without this information, the mitigation and commitment tables are of no use as a summary or a reference.
- The conceptual closure plan is necessary at the EA stage to validate assumptions underlying changes to the environment, and understand potential effects, the feasibility of mitigation measure and the development of monitoring and follow-up programs. This EA is for the following phases of the Project: construction, operation, decommissioning and abandonment. The conceptual closure plan previously in section 11 of the original EIS was modified and integrated as section 3.14 of the revised EIS and renamed as "Closure and Decommissioning". It is unclear if all the original information was retained, and whether additional information from the IRs related to this topic was incorporated into the revised plan.

B. Aboriginal engagement

The information presented in the Aboriginal Engagement Report and the revised EIS indicates that the requirement for engagement with potentially affected Indigenous groups on aspects of the EA has not been met. The purpose of Indigenous engagement is to obtain information on current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes and information on potential and established Aboriginal and Treaty rights, and demonstrate that effects of changes to the environment on Aboriginal peoples and the potential adverse impacts on Aboriginal and Treaty rights and related interests have been considered and validated. The Agency needs this information to arrive at an accurate, informed assessment of effects on Aboriginal peoples and impacts on Treaty rights, which the Minister also requires in order to come to a conclusion on the EA.

- Treasury's approach to engagement was not well articulated. It is not possible to verify whether engagement activities took place to address aspects of the EA (e.g. baseline conditions, residual effects, development of mitigation measures) or comments on the EIS. Meetings seemed to be "show-and-tell" sessions centered on certain concerns, or Project updates. Engagement should take the form of a dialogue, rather than directed presentations, to allow Treasury to validate information and conclusions with Indigenous groups and to lead to the resolution of outstanding issues as well as identification of mitigation measures to address any impacts to those

Indigenous groups. It should also help ensure that groups have the information they require to understand how the Project may impact them (as per the EIS Guidelines, section 11.2);

- It is not possible to verify the nature of the documentation and materials shared with Indigenous groups during engagement sessions, such as plain language summaries, as this information was not provided in the final response;
- It is not evident how/if feedback was incorporated into the revised EIS. A list of comments and concerns was provided, however the disposition thereof is limited to a response addressing the concern, a vague commitment to deal with concern, or no direct response;
- The responses to specific IRs related to Aboriginal engagement should be reflected in the Aboriginal Engagement Report and the revised EIS, such that there is congruity between the Report and the IR; and,
- Many IR responses contain a vague commitment to engage with Indigenous groups throughout the life of the Project, with no further details. This is not presented as a mitigation measure or official commitment measure. It must be noted that commitments to ongoing engagement throughout the life of the Project are not a substitute to conducting engagement during the EA in order to inform decisions under CEEA 2012 as well as the Crown's understanding of potential adverse impacts of the Project on Aboriginal or Treaty rights. Therefore, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response. The companion sheet to IR#1 (Annex B in 2015) as well as several IRs detailed specific requirements for additional engagement to be completed prior to submission of a response.

C. Responses to Annex A1 to Annex A4 information requests

Of the 859 responses to the information requests (IRs) in Annexes A1 to A4, 287 were found to be incomplete (see Annex 2). The main reasons for the determination of incompleteness were:

- incomplete information provided (the question was not responded to in its entirety);
- the response contained insufficient information to allow a technical review;
- the response was too vague to allow a determination; and
- a lack of incorporation of the information into the revised EIS.

Each information request must be answered directly and specifically. For information request with multiple parts, the response must address each part separately. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

When detailed design work is pending, conceptual information (including alternatives still being entertained) must be used to inform and complete the effects analysis with conclusions drawn for each alternative under consideration, where applicable. Deferral to later stage of the regulatory process to provide information such as conceptual or final designs, monitoring plans, or other requested information is not acceptable.

When information requests or comments were provided by a specific Indigenous group, effort should be made to not only refer back to documents in the EIS but also respond directly and respectfully to the group who initiated the comment.

With respect to Indigenous groups, as part of the EA a complete effects analysis including impacts assessment, mitigation measures and significance analysis must be completed for each individual group (rather than a single overarching analysis). Commitments to ongoing engagement cannot be a proxy for completing these requirements.

Annex 2: Completeness check of the response to IR#1 for the Goliath Gold Project Environmental Impact Statement

ID:

1

IR-1 Reference #:

EA(1)-01

Complete:

- A. No
- B. No
- C. No
- D. No

Context and Rationale:

The response to Parts A and B contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Parts C and D were not addressed in the answer.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to each question contained in information request EA(1)-01. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

2

IR-1 Reference #:

EA(1)-02

Complete:

- A. Yes
- B. Yes

ID:

3

IR-1 Reference #:

EA(1)-03

Complete:

- A. Yes
- B. Yes
- C. Yes
- D. Yes
- E. Yes
- F. Yes
- G. Yes
- H. Yes

ID:

4

IR-1 Reference #:

EA(1)-04

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not address the question(s). The response does not refer to Section 8 of the revised EIS for the significance determination.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request EA(1)-04.

ID:

5

IR-1 Reference #:

EA(1)-05

Complete:

Yes

ID:

6

IR-1 Reference #:

EA(1)-06

Complete:

A. No

B. No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

While the response says that Section 13 of the revised EIS outlines the proposed follow-up monitoring programs, the information in Section 13 does not meet the requirements outlined in the question.

Monitoring is a data gathering exercise that can be scoped to meet many purposes. A follow-up program, on the other hand, determines the accuracy of the conclusions of the environmental assessment and the effectiveness of the mitigation measures.

For further detail see the former Operational Policy Statement on follow-up programs: <https://www.canada.ca/en/environmental-assessment-agency/news/2011/12/follow-programs-under-canadian-environmental-assessment-act.html>

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request EA(1)-06 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue (create a follow-up program that is separate from monitoring). Include the information required as per the information request and the EIS Guidelines.

ID:

7

IR-1 Reference #:

EA(1)-07

Complete:

Yes

ID:

8

IR-1 Reference #:

EA(1)-08

Complete:

A No

B No

C No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not directly address the question.

The response contains a reference to the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find information relevant to the question. Such references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

The Agency is aware of subsection 6.23.3.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request EA(1)-08.

ID:

9

IR-1 Reference #:

EA(1)-09

Complete:

A. No

B. No

C. Yes

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.

The response to Part A requested information that is not found in either Section 6 or Section 8.

The response to Part B is incomplete. There are two separate mitigation and commitment tables, however it is not clear how these are related to each other, to the potential/residual effects, or to whom the commitments are made.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request EA(1)-09.

Update Table 6.22-1 Summary of Mitigation Measures to include the information requested in Part A of EA(1)-09.

Update Table 10.0-1 Commitments for the Project to include the information requested in Part B of EA(1)-09.

Provide details on the link between these two tables and their contents.

ID:

10

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-01

Complete:

A. No

B. No

C. No

D. No

E. No

Context and Rationale:

None of the requests were addressed in the response. There were five (5) requests made by the Agency as part of AC(1)-01, and instead of responding to each one individually, one blanket response was provided. Despite making references to several sections of the revised EIS, the requested information has not been provided.

The Aboriginal Engagement Report does not meet Part A of the information request. While a summary of activities related to Indigenous engagement are listed, they are limited to sending letters and conducting presentations, with Q & A's. There also does not appear to be a sample of the kinds of materials used and distributed at Aboriginal engagement events. It is not clear how Indigenous groups were engaged on baseline conditions, alternatives assessments, project components and activities, or any of the other topics outlined in Part A of the information request.

The summary of concerns by valued component, required in Part B of the information request, was not completed properly in the Aboriginal Engagement Report. Table 5.1-1 of the Aboriginal Engagement Report reveals that the concerns were organized by an assortment of 28 different "concern topics", rather than the valued components. Also, many of the concerns remain "Open", without a response and/or mitigation measure provided. Many of the responses provided are also insufficient.

It has not been demonstrated for Part D that plain language summaries were made available to Indigenous groups, and meetings appear to be sparse and limited to a few groups. Presentations and site tours do not alone constitute meetings, or meaningful engagement.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to each Part of information request AC(1)-01. Ensure the information being requested is organized in a way that reflects what is being asked, to allow reviewers to verify the request has been met. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

11

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-02

Complete:

A. No

B. No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

The response to Part A (including the references to the EIS) does not describe the potential adverse impacts on potential or established Aboriginal and Treaty rights and related interests that have not been fully mitigated.

The response to Part B refers to Section 9.8 of the revised EIS, which does not exist and /or cannot be found in Section 9 "Public and Indigenous Engagement."

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

A. Review information request AC(1)-02 Part A and revise the response to provide a description of potential adverse impacts on potential or established Aboriginal and Treaty rights and related interests that have not been fully mitigated.

B. Review information request AC(1)-02 Part B and provide a correct reference to the EIS or revise response to provide a description of outstanding public concerns related to potential environmental effects as described in section 5 of *CEAA 2012* that have not been resolved as a result of changes to the project, mitigation measures, or public participation activities.

ID:

12

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-03

Complete:

A. No

B. No

C. No

Context and Rationale:

None of the questions posed in this information request were addressed in the response.

Instead of addressing the request for additional engagement with groups on SAR in the area, TMI describes past engagement and makes vague commitments to ongoing engagement.

The response also contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-03 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue of verifying spatial boundaries for SAR with Indigenous groups. Keep in mind that an approach to dealing with this issue without meaningful engagement with the Indigenous group is insufficient.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (e.g. reference to a chapter or Aboriginal Engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

13

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-01

Complete:

A. Yes

B. No

C. No

Context and Rationale:

B. The information provided does not answer the question directly or provide sufficient information.

C. The response to Part C should be partly linked to that of Part B. In addition, the response does not demonstrate how any new information was incorporated into the revised EIS.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request PC(1)-01 Part B and revise the response to more specifically address the question and provide a complete and detailed response.

Revise the response to Part C to provide additional information.

ID:

14

IR-1 Reference #:

PD(1)-01

Complete:

A. Yes

B. Yes

C. No

Context and Rationale:

The response provided for Part C is incomplete. Part C requested the names and a map of the location of the water bodies that may require a federal permit. This is required to determine potential 5(2) effects under CEAA 2012.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request PD(1)-01 Part C.

ID:

15

IR-1 Reference #:

PD(1)-02

Complete:

Yes

ID:

16

IR-1 Reference #:

PD(1)-03

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information request was for a map with all “water crossings and culvert replacements associated with the project”. This is required to determine permits and any potential 5(2) effects under CEAA 2012.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request PD(1)-03.

ID:

17

IR-1 Reference #:

PD(1)-04

Complete:

- A. Yes
- B. No

Context and Rationale:

The response to question B contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request PD(1)-04. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

18

IR-1 Reference #:

PD(1)-05

Complete:

Yes

ID:

19

IR-1 Reference #:

PD(1)-06

Complete:

Yes

ID:

20

IR-1 Reference #:

AA(1)-01

Complete:

Yes

ID:

21

IR-1 Reference #:

AA(1)-02

Complete:

- A. Yes
- B. No

Context and Rationale:

In the response to Part B, the updated section of the EIS does not demonstrate that input from Aboriginal groups has been incorporated in the weighting factor used in the quantitative analysis.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to Part B of information request AA(1)-02 and demonstrate attempts to obtain information from Aboriginal groups with respect to the weighting factor used in the quantitative analysis.

ID:

22

IR-1 Reference #:

AA(1)-03

Complete:

Yes

ID:

23

IR-1 Reference #:

AA(1)-04

Complete:

Yes

ID:

24

IR-1 Reference #:

AA(1)-05

Complete:

A. Yes

B. Yes

C. Yes

ID:

25

IR-1 Reference #:

AA(1)-06

Complete:

A. Yes

B. Yes

C. No

D. No

Context and Rationale:

The response to Part C does not demonstrate how/whether the ponds are cross referenced in the EIS, i.e. if the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS.

Part D was not addressed in the answer. Treasury indicates that "... a full description of each pond, along with their capacity and retention times will be developed closer to the permitting stage of the Project." However, this information is necessary at least at a conceptual level for assessment of water and contaminant movement and hence effects assessment.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

While the response to information request AA(1)-06 Part C may answer the information request, integration of this request into the revised EIS (and demonstration thereof) is required, including clarification that all related elements of the EIS were accordingly updated.

Provide a complete and detailed answer to Part D. If specific data is not available at this stage, conservative assumptions and conceptual concepts should be provided at a minimum.

ID:

26

IR-1 Reference #:

AA(1)-07

Complete:

Yes

ID:

27

IR-1 Reference #:

AA(1)-068

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

There are no figures within Appendix JJ (Section 2) with respect to the amount of water required during construction, operation, decommissioning and abandonment phases in cubic metres/day for each water source, including the irrigation ponds (Thunder Lake Tributary 3) and any additional sources. Only the amount of water required during operations has been calculated (Table 4-12).

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AA(1)-08 and provide additional information.

ID:

28

IR-1 Reference #:

AA(1)-09

Complete:

A. Yes

B. Yes

C. Yes

ID:

29

IR-1 Reference #:

AA(1)-10

Complete:

A. Yes

B. Yes

ID:

30

IR-1 Reference #:

AA(1)-11

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how/whether the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS.

The response includes an update of Tables 4.1 through 4.9 which are provided within TMI_34-AA(1)-15_Attachment_2. However, it is unclear what equivalent of these tables is, in the revised EIS. The response also refers to seven other IRs (TMI_32 to TMI_38). However, it is unclear whether the information in the responses to those IRs was incorporated into the update to the alternatives assessment in section 2, Appendix D or Appendix X of the revised EIS. As Appendix D and X have been rewritten, the new information from the responses should be incorporated so as to provide a reader or reviewer for the most concise source of information and avoid confusion or inconsistency of information.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

While the response may answer the information request, integration of the information contained in responses TMI_30 and TMI_32 to TMI_38 into the revised EIS (and demonstration thereof) is required, including clarification that all related elements of the EIS were accordingly updated.

ID:

31

IR-1 Reference #:

AA(1)-12

Complete:

Yes

ID:

32

IR-1 Reference #:

AA(1)-13

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

See the context and rationale and the specific information required for response # TMI_30

ID:

33

IR-1 Reference #:

AA(1)-14

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

See the context and rationale and the specific information required for response # TMI_30

ID:

34

IR-1 Reference #:

AA(1)-15

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

See the context and rationale and the specific information required for response # TMI_30

ID:

35

IR-1 Reference #:

AA(1)-16

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

See the context and rationale and the specific information required for response # TMI_30

ID:

36

IR-1 Reference #:

AA(1)-17

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

See the specific information required for response # TMI_30

ID:

37

IR-1 Reference #:

AA(1)-18

Complete:

No.

Context and Rationale:

The response indicates that "An update to Table 4.1 to 4.9 of Appendix D is provided in TMI_34-AA(1)-15_Attachment_2. These tables have additionally been updated in Appendix D of the revised EIS." However, the tables in Appendix D do not appear to have been updated.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

While the response may answer the information request, integration of this response into the revised EIS is required. See also the context and rationale and the specific information required for response # TMI_3

ID:

38

IR-1 Reference #:

AA(1)-19

Complete:

Yes

ID:

39

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-01

Complete:

Yes

ID:

40

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-02

Complete:

Yes

ID:

41

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-03

Complete:

Yes

ID:

42

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-04

Complete:

A. Yes

B. No

C. Yes

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

Part B "Provide maps that overlay the proposed mine waste options with the local water bodies and specify which water bodies are deemed to be fish frequented." was responded by TMI_42-MW(1)-04_Figure_1. However this figure does not show the individual mine waste options and only identifies a few major waterbodies. For example, the answer to Part C notes that the TSF will be placed over a waterbody but that is not demonstrated on this map. No information on fish-bearing waters is presented.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request MW(1)-04 Part B.

ID:

43

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-05

Complete:

Yes

ID:

44

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-06

Complete:

Yes

ID:

45

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-07

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

Information was provided on the low-grade ore stockpile, but not on any other project component. The response referred to section 3.16 of the revised EIS for additional information. However, such information was not found.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request MW(1)-07 to provide additional technical information.

ID:

46

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-08

Complete:

A. Yes

B. No

C. No

D. No

E. Yes

Context and Rationale:

Part B was not addressed in the answer.

The information provided in Question C is incomplete. The EIS refers to separation of waste rock according to acid generation potential. Information about this separation will inform the waste management plan and the assessment of effects.

Part D was not addressed in the answer. This information is required to fully assess potential effects of the project.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request MW(1)-08 Parts B and C regarding the separation of PAG and NAG waste rock.

Provide a complete and detailed response to Part D, describing the potential effects associated with sourcing aggregate material offsite.

ID:

47

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-09

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question directly. Risks associated with ARD/ML are significant and details need to be provided at this phase of the project such that potential environmental impacts can be adequately assessed.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request MW(1)-09 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue.

Ideally, analyze and describe the chemical stability of the overburden material and any potential environmental effects associated with the overburden stockpile, including feasible mitigation methods and conceptual decommissioning (closure) options, as per the original IR. At a minimum, describe the geochemical work done to date with a discussion of the results, and outline the plan moving forward, including ongoing work and feasible ARD/ML contingency measures.

ID:

48

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-10

Complete:

A. No

B. No

C. Yes

D. Yes

Context and Rationale:

The information provided in the response to Part A is incomplete.

Part B was not addressed in the response.

The response refers to sections which provide little new or relevant information. The proponent does not provide a conceptual design as requested, but discusses the need for a final design at a later stage of the regulatory process. While it is not expected that the final cover design be provided at this time, the proponent must show the capacity to develop adequate cover onsite, from both a conceptual design and materials availability perspective. The conceptual design requested will allow the validation of the assumptions underlying the changes to the environment and resulting potential effects.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to Parts A and B of information request MW(1)-10.

ID:

49

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-11

Complete:

Yes

ID:

50

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-12

Complete:

Yes

ID:

51

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-13

Complete:

Yes

ID:

52

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-14

Complete:

Yes

ID:

53

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-15

Complete:

A. Yes

B. Yes

C. No

Context and Rationale:

The response to Part C is mainly constituted of a reference to section 5 of Appendix JJ of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. This reference should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response. Overall, the response does not provide a direct answer to the question.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request MW(1)-15 Part C. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

54

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-16

Complete:

A. No

B. No

Context and Rationale:

A: The information provided does not answer the question directly. The response discusses the choice of scaling factor rather than how this factor was arrived at.

B: The response to Part B contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request MW(1)-16 Part A: "Provide supporting information on how the expected weight percentage [...] was obtained."

Provide a complete and detailed response to Part B, including weight percentage used and justification thereof.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

55

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-17

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

It is unclear how the different documents referred to in this response relate to each other and to the effects assessment in the revised EIS as a whole. The information request pertained to Appendix K. However, the response discusses geochemical calculations in Appendix C of Appendix F as well as in Appendix JJ. The response indicates that the information referred to in the question is "no longer part of the EIS" however the proponent did not supersede or otherwise revise Appendix K. It is unknown which of these calculations or documents are carried forward for use in effects determination and development of monitoring programs.

See also TMI_59 – MW(1)-21.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

As part of a complete response to information request MW(1)-17, explain the relation between the various geochemistry documents (Appendix C of Appendix F in the original EIS; Appendix K, Appendix JJ; geochemical effects assessment in the revised EIS). Clarify whether Appendix K should be superseded; if so, indicate why and where a similar level of detail is found.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

56

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-18

Complete:

Yes

ID:

57

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-19

Complete:

Yes

ID:

58

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-20

Complete:

Yes

ID:

59

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-21

Complete:

- A. No
- B. No
- C. No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

It is unclear how the different calculations in different documents relate to each other (and to the information request) in Parts A and B. The information request pertained to Appendix K, which the proponent indicates is unchanged. However, the response in Part A discusses calculations in Appendix C of Appendix F and in another geochemistry evaluation in an unspecified location. The response to Part B suggests that the geochemical modelling in Appendix K is “outdated” however the proponent did not supersede or otherwise revise it. The response to Part B also refers to an assumption in Section 5 (assumed to be in Appendix JJ) that was not found. It is unknown which of these calculations or documents are carried forward for use in effects determination and development of monitoring programs.

The response to Part C contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS (Section 5 of Appendix JJ) which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

See also TMI 55.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to Parts A, B and C of information request MW(1)-21.

The geochemistry evaluation should be presented in a cohesive and integrated manner.

As part of a complete response, explain the relation between the various geochemistry documents:

- Appendix C of Appendix F
- Appendix K
- Appendix JJ (section 5)
- Geochemistry assessment in Section 6 of the revised EIS

Clarify whether Appendix K should be superseded; if so, indicate why and where a similar level of detail is found.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

60

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-22

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review. The confirmation requested was not provided, nor was the justification found.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request MW(1)-22 to provide additional technical information. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

61

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-23

Complete:

A. No

B. No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete. The response refers to a conceptual closure plan in section 3.14 of the revised EIS. However, this plan does not contain any information specific to Parts A and B.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request MW(1)-23 Parts A and B and revise the response to provide a more complete and detailed response.

ID:

62

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-24

Complete:

Yes

ID:

63

IR-1 Reference #:

MW(1)-25

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete. The proponent has not provided a description of feasible contingencies that will ensure adequate water cover is maintained until the dry cover is to be administered.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request MW(1)-25 to provide additional information on feasible contingencies that will ensure that adequate water cover is maintained until the dry cover is administered.

ID:

64

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-01

Complete:

Yes

ID:

65

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-02

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

Figure 13.10.2-1 “Proposed Groundwater Monitoring Network” is missing in the revised EIS. In addition, the response does not address seepage volume or travel time.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request GW(1)-02 to provide additional technical information related to the justification of the location of groundwater monitoring wells.

ID:

66

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-03

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

The seepage water quality described in Appendix JJ, Section 6 is sufficient to allow a technical review. However, the IR also required the proponent to “*Include conservative estimates of loadings to surface water, predicted effects to offsite groundwater and feasible mitigation measures.*” The response provided does not include this information.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request GW(1)-03 to provide additional information on seepage water quality and loadings to surface water features.

ID:

67

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-04

Complete:

Yes

ID:

68

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-05

Complete:

A. Yes

B. No

C. No

Context and Rationale:

The response to Parts B and C contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS (in this case the entire section 5 of t appendix JJ) which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to Parts B and C of information request GW(1)-05. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

69

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-06

Complete:

Yes

ID:

70

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-07

Complete:

Yes

ID:

71

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-08

Complete:

Yes

ID:

72

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-09

Complete:

Yes

ID:

73

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-10

Complete:

Yes

ID:

74

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-11

Complete:

Yes

ID:

75

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-12

Complete:

Yes

ID:

76

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-13

Complete:

Yes

ID:

77

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-14

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information request was not addressed in the response. The proponent refers to the updated WRSA design and advancement of engineering for the project, but does not directly address the information request asking that they explain how vertical infiltration from the WSRAs will be controlled. The proponent's response seems to have been cut off mid-sentence.

In addition, the response contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request GW(1)-14 to explain how vertical infiltration from the WSRAs will be controlled. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

78

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-15

Complete:

A. Yes

B. No

C. Yes

D. No

E. No

Context and Rationale:

The response provided for Parts B is not sufficiently specific regarding mitigation measures for wells affected by pit dewatering.

The response provided for parts D and E do not directly address the questions.

In addition, the response contains references to sections of the revised EIS which are too vague to allow one to find information relevant to the questions. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the responses to Parts B of information request GW(1)-15 to provide additional information.

Provide a complete and detailed response to Parts D and E of information request GW(1)-15.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

79

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-16

Complete:

Yes

ID:

80

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-17

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.

The information request is to “provide a mitigation/contingency plan in the event of exceedances to prevent the spread of contaminants to receiving environments”. However, the response refers to Table 6.22-1, which is a summary of all measures to mitigate the potential adverse effects of the project. This is not sufficiently specific to the question nor does it constitute a plan.

In addition, the response contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request GW(1)-17 to provide additional information regarding a mitigation and contingency plan. Be specific as to the mitigation measures and implementation thereof. Confirm whether there will be a commitment to employ techniques such as seepage collection wells in the event that contaminated groundwater is found to be seeping from the TMA and WRSA.

Note that Figure 13.10.2-1 “Proposed Groundwater Monitoring Network” is missing in the revised EIS.

ID:

81

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-18

Complete:

Yes

ID:

82

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-19

Complete:

Yes

ID:

83

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-20

Complete:

Yes

ID:

84

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-21

Complete:

Yes

ID:

85

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-22

Complete:

Yes

ID:

86

IR-1 Reference #:

GW(1)-23

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete. In discussing the source of groundwater, the response refers to both the original and the revised EIS, including sections of the original EIS that have been superseded. The response does not address effects and mitigation measures related to groundwater quality and quantity.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request GW(1)-23 to provide additional technical information.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

87

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-01

Complete:

Yes

ID:

88

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-02

Complete:

Yes

ID:

89

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-03

Complete:

Yes

ID:

90

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-04

Complete:

A. Yes

B. Yes

C. Yes

91

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-05

Complete:

Yes

ID:

92

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-06

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response is incomplete the proponent did not assess the potential effect of seepage upon surface water quality through to the abandonment phase.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request SW(1)-06.

ID:

93

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-07

Complete:

Yes

ID:

94

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-08

Complete:

Yes

ID:

95

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-09

Complete:

Yes

ID:

96

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-10

Complete:

Yes

ID:

97

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-11

Complete:

Yes

ID:

98

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-12

Complete:

Yes

ID:

99

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-13

Complete:

A. Yes

B. Yes

ID:

100

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-14

Complete:

A. Yes

B. Yes

ID:

101

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-15

Complete:

Yes

ID:

102

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-16

Complete:

A. Yes

B. Yes

C. Yes

D. No

Context and Rationale:

The response to Part D is lacking some of the details originally requested. The applicable standards and action levels that may trigger mitigations were not described in the monitoring plan.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request SW(1)-16 and provide additional information.

ID:

103

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-17

Complete:

- A. Yes
- B. Yes

ID:

104

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-18

Complete:

- A. Yes
- B. Yes
- C. Yes
- D. Yes

ID:

105

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-19

Complete:

- A. Yes
- B. Yes
- C. Yes
- D. Yes
- E. Yes

ID:

106

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-20

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The proponent has not provided a water quality monitoring framework. An understanding of the proposed monitoring is required at the EA stage.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request SW(1)-20.

ID:

107

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-21

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The proponent did not develop a plan to monitor and mitigate for increases in TSS, turbidity and erosion.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request SW(1)-21.

ID:

108

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-22

Complete:

Yes

ID:

109

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-23

Complete:

Yes

ID:

110

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-24

Complete:

A. Yes

B. Yes

ID:

111

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-25

Complete:

A. Yes

B. No

C. Yes

Context and Rationale:

Part B required that the proponent "Quantify and assess potential impacts to surface water from the pit lake and TSF discharges. Provide a monitoring program and a contingency plan, and include trigger criteria and feasible mitigation and remediation measures." The response provided does not answer the question directly.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request SW(1)-25 Part B and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue of monitoring program, contingency plan, trigger criteria and mitigation and remediation .

ID:

112

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-26

Complete:

A. Yes

B. Yes

ID:

113

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-27

Complete:

Yes

ID:

114

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-28

Complete:

Yes

ID:

115

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-29

Complete:

Yes

ID:

116

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-30

Complete:

Yes

ID:

117

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-31

Complete:

Yes

ID:

118

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-32

Complete:

Yes

ID:

119

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-33

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response directed the reader to look in an Appendix and does not answer the question of evaporative rates used in the analysis.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request SW(1)-33.

ID:

120

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-34

Complete:

Yes

ID:

121

IR-1 Reference #:

SW(1)-35

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response to information request SW(1)-35 contains a reference to Section 6 of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request SW(1)-35 to provide additional technical information. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand (flow and fish habitat), provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

122

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-01

Complete:

Yes

ID:

123

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-02

Complete:

A. No

B. No

C. No

D. Yes

E. Yes

Context and Rationale:

The response states that the project's laydown areas ..."will not impact fish and fish habitat resources" but Appendix II page 12 table 2 identifies that there will be an impact to fish habitat from the laydown areas. This discrepancy must be resolved.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request FH(1)-02 to address the discrepancy. Revise the responses to Parts A, B and C if there is indeed an impact to fish habitat from the laydown areas.

ID:

124

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-03

Complete:

Yes

ID:

125

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-04

Complete:

A. No

B. Yes

C. No

D. Yes

Context and Rationale:

The response to Part A does not demonstrate the types of fish habitat that will be impacted by the proposed mine works. Additionally, it is unclear where the answer to the question is in the revised EIS due to a lack of proper reference.

The response to Part C contains a reference to a table (Table 1) that does not exist, and therefore leaves the question unanswered.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request FH(1)-04 Part A to provide additional technical information.

Provide a complete and detailed response to Part C.

ID:

126

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-05

Complete:

A: Yes

B: No

Context and Rationale:

The response to Part B does not directly address the question of monitoring of groundwater input to streams and potential impacts to fish and fish habitat.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request FH(1)-05 Part B and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue and provide additional technical information.

ID:

127

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-06

Complete:

A. Yes

B. No

C. No

D. Yes

E. No

F. No

G. Yes

H. Yes

I. No

Context and Rationale:

The response is incomplete.

The response to Part B referenced tables that quantify impacts to fish habitat, but impacts were not identified according to mine component. As fish habitat compensation/offsetting was not quantified. As addressed in the response to Parts B, E, and F, no fish habitat compensation/offsetting plans have completed. Without a fish habitat compensation/offsetting plan, it is difficult to determine the overall impacts to fish and fish habitat.

The response to Part C references figure TMI_127-FH(1)-06_Figure_1. This figure was not found in the Annex 1 Figures document.

For Parts E and F, the information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.

The response to Part G (found in Section 6 of the revised EIS) does not clarify the types of fish habitat that will be impacted by the proposed works.

The response to Part I states that no Environmental Monitoring Plan has been finalized for the proposed works. Without any plans in place, it is difficult to determine if monitoring practices are appropriate. In addition, the request is broader than the MMER and EEM and hence the information provided does not answer the question directly.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request FH(1)-06 Part B to provide additional information. Provide updated tables that identify the fish habitat effects by mine component, the amount of habitat created or restored to offset the loss of fish habitat, a summary breakdown of project components with consideration under Fisheries Act section 35(2) and the Metal Mining Effluent Regulations Schedule 2 amendment.

Revise the response to information request FH(1)-06 Part C to provide additional technical information.

Revise the response to information request FH(1)-06 Parts D, E, F to provide additional information regarding a fish compensation/offsetting plan.

Revise the response to information request FH(1)-06 Part G to provide additional information on the types of fish habitat that will be impacted by the proposed works, including maps.

Revise the response to information request FH(1)-06 Part I to provide additional information on monitoring practices.

ID:

128

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-07

Complete:

A. No

B. No

C. Yes

Context and Rationale:

The response to Part A does not provide detailed erosion and sediment control measures. Detailed erosion and sediment control measures are necessary to determine if the proposed measures will be effective in preventing the release of a deleterious substance into a waterbody.

The response to Part B indicates that no monitoring plans have been finalized. Without any plans in place, it is difficult to determine if monitoring practices are appropriate.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request FH(1)-07 Parts A and B to provide additional detail.

For Part A, provide details on specific erosion and sediment control measures that may be employed during the proposed works.

For Part B, provide detail on proposed monitoring plan, include duration (years), data collection methods (Sampling methods), and means of analyzing data which will be implemented to detect ongoing or potential adverse effects. Includes the proposed mitigation strategies or adaptive management strategies that will be used if adverse effects are detected.

ID:

129

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-08

Complete:

Yes

ID:

130

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-09

Complete:

A No

B No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided in response to Part A does not answer the question of water management plans for water diversions.

The information provided in response to Part B does not directly address the issue of identification of the mitigation.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request FH(1)-09 Parts A and B to provide additional technical information.

ID:

131

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-10

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question. Information request FH(1)-10 asked for "... a summary of fish and fish habitat information collected for the Project both within and outside of the Local Study Area". There is no reference to such a summary in the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to provide additional technical information.

ID:

132

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-11

Complete:

A. No

B. Yes

C. No

D. No

E. No

Context and Rationale:

For Part A, the information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.

For Part C, the information provided is incomplete requested information was on the wetlands.

For Part D, the information provided does not answer the question directly.

For Part E, the request was broader than the MMER and EEM and Blackwater Creek (see FH(1)-07) and hence the information provided does not answer the question directly.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the responses to information request FH(1)-11 to more specifically address the main issue of the effects to wetlands and monitoring in general broader than MMER.

ID:

133

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-12

Complete:

Yes

ID:

134

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-13

Complete:

A. Yes

B. No

C. No

Context and Rationale:

The response is incomplete.

The response to Part B indicates that the pit-lake will provide some fish habitat and further information is found in section 6. However, section 6 provides no predictions of the contaminant concentrations in fish that may have access to the pit-lake following decommissioning.

The response to Part C fails to predict contaminant concentrations in fish as a result of pit lake water entering Blackwater Creek and Wabigoon Lake following decommissioning of the mine. Section 6 provides no predictions of the contaminant concentrations in fish in the affected waterbodies.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request FH(1)-13 and revise the response to Parts B and C to provide additional information.

ID:

135

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-14

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete. The response does not provide information about the effect of change of water temperature on fish and fish habitat, other than offering a nonspecific reference to the entire revised EIS. This reference is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request FH(1)-14. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible.

Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

136

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-15

Complete:

Yes

ID:

137

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-16

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

It was noted that the only impact to fish assessed for significance in the revised EIS was associated with overprinting of Blackwater Creek tributaries and fish mortality. As a result, impacts to fish associated with changes in water quality due to a release of a deleterious substance was not assessed for significance. In addition, it was noted that the significance for timing on fish mortality was assessed as level III in section 8.14.2.3, but in table 8.14.2.7-1 timing on fish mortality was assessed as level I.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request FH(1)-16 to provide additional information.

Clarify why changes in water quality was not assessed for significance in regards to fish and fish habitat.

Clarify if timing on fish mortality was assessed as level I or level III for significance, and ensure that there is consistency between the document and table.

ID:

138

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-17

Complete:

Yes

ID:

139

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-18

Complete:

Yes

ID:

140

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-19

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question directly, as the fish salvage plan is not yet available.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide information on when the fish salvage plan will be ready.

ID:

141

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-20

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question directly. The relevant section of the revised EIS does not explain how the boundaries of the LSA and RSA take into account the spatial extent and scale of potential environmental effects on fish and fish habitat, community and Aboriginal traditional knowledge, current land and resource use by Aboriginal groups, or ecological, technical, social, and cultural considerations.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request FH(1)-20 and revise the response to more specifically address the question.

ID:

142

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-21

Complete:

A. No

B. No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not specifically answer Part A or Part B. Additionally, the response refers to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request FH(1)-21 and provide a complete and detailed response to Parts A and B.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

Keep in mind that an approach to dealing with this issue without meaningful engagement with the Indigenous group is insufficient.

ID:

143

IR-1 Reference #:

FH(1)-22

Complete:

Yes

ID:

144

IR-1 Reference #:

WL(1)-01

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.

The response states that the “LSA was defined as lands and waters of the watershed in which the proposed development footprint is located.” Defining study areas based on the project footprint is not a suitable method to capture appropriate habitat for wildlife species, including birds and SAR, to carry out life cycles processes. As indicated in IR WL(1)-01, the scale of the ecological matrix is different for many species because of their specific requirements (e.g. home range).

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request WL(1)-01 to provide additional technical information that justifies the use of a 5 km radius circle (buffer) centered on the existing portal to define the local study area and a small watershed (~145 Km²) to define the regional study area which is used to assess the project effects on wildlife.

ID:

145

IR-1 Reference #:

WL(1)-02

Complete:

Yes

ID:

146

IR-1 Reference #:

WL(1)-03

Complete:

Yes

ID:

147

IR-1 Reference #:

WL(1)-04

Complete:

Yes

ID:

148

IR-1 Reference #:

WL(1)-05

Complete:

A. No

B. Yes

C. Yes

Context and Rationale:

A. The information provided is incomplete.

The IR response states that “the use of the TSF by birds, ungulates, species at risk and other wildlife will not present an immediate threat to their health and well-being.” However, the response provides no description and analysis of the possibility of wildlife using the TSF for drinking water. Further, there is no indication in the response as to whether effects assessment was conducted which would allow the reviewer to draw links between the results of the ecological risk assessment evaluated in Appendix W and quality of drinking water assessment in the TSF.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request WL(1)-05. Provide a revised assessment of significant adverse effects on wildlife that includes a description and analysis for the use of TSF by wildlife and a link to the ecological risk assessment for accessing the TSF and using it for drinking.

ID:

149

IR-1 Reference #:

WL(1)-06

Complete:

A. Yes

B. Yes

ID:

150

IR-1 Reference #:

WL(1)-07

Complete:

- A. No
- B. Yes

Context and Rationale:

The information provided in response to Part A is insufficient to allow a technical review and the reference provided is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. The reference should be specific to the information requested such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request WL(1)-07 Part A to provide additional technical information. Describe the anticipated effects of water takings on the wetlands that are located within anticipated zone of influence (ZOI).

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

151

IR-1 Reference #:

WL(1)-08

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.

The information request required that data be collected for moose aquatic feeding areas (MAFAs), calving areas, mineral licks, and animal denning sites. MAFA data were collected in wetlands, but otherwise, data on the other features were still relying on existing databases (i.e. DFMC also uses MNRF data, and NHIC has not surveyed this area for those features) where information has not been collected in this area.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request WL(1)-08 to provide additional information. Collect data (using thorough ground search) on moose aquatic feeding areas, calving sites, mineral licks, and animal denning sites to determine if Significant Wildlife Habitat features occur in the local and regional study areas. Include a map showing the sites within the LSA and RSA that were searched and analyze results from the data collected on moose aquatic feeding areas, calving sites, mineral licks, and animal denning sites to identify potential impacts on the ability of Aboriginal peoples to exercise traditional land use practices.

ID:

152

IR-1 Reference #:

WL(1)-09

Complete:

Yes

ID:

153

IR-1 Reference #:

WL(1)-10

Complete:

Yes

ID:

154

IR-1 Reference #:

WL(1)-11

Complete:

Yes

ID:

155

IR-1 Reference #:

WL(1)-12

Complete:

Yes

ID:

156

IR-1 Reference #:

WL(1)-13

Complete:

- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. No

Context and Rationale:

The response to Parts B and C contains an incorrect reference to a section of the revised EIS. The reference should be accurate to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a detailed and complete response to information request WL(1)-13 Parts B and C. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

157

IR-1 Reference #:

WL(1)-14

Complete:

Yes

ID:

158

IR-1 Reference #:

WL(1)-15

Complete:

Yes

ID:

159

IR-1 Reference #:

WL(1)-16

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete to allow a technical review.

TMI indicates that an IGF and AAF have been submitted to the Dryden District of the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) office. However, according to MNRF neither has been received as of September 12, 2017. In addition, the information requested in the information request should be included in the revised EIS. The reference provided in the response is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request WL(1)-16 and provide additional information.

For Part A, submit the IGF and AAF form to the Dryden District MNRF Office. Include the information from the IGF in the revised EIS and the revised response to this IR.

For Part B, confirm whether the effects assessment and follow-up program were amended. If so, provide additional information.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

160

IR-1 Reference #:

WL(1)-17

Complete:

Yes

ID:

161

IR-1 Reference #:

WL(1)-18

Complete:

Yes

ID:

162

IR-1 Reference #:

WL(1)-19

Complete:

Yes

ID:

163

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-01

Complete:

A. Yes

B. No

Context and Rationale:

Part B was not addressed in the answer.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AE(1)-01 Part B.

ID:

164

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-02

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the information request directly.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AE(1)-02 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, "provide a comprehensive follow-up monitoring plan for air quality," as required for CEAA 2012 at the EA phase and during the regulatory phase.

ID:

165

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-03

Complete:

Yes

ID:

166

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-04

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided in the response is incomplete.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

As requested in information request AE(1)-04, provide sample calculations and methodology for determining air quality thresholds.

ID:

167

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-05

Complete:

Yes

ID:

168

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-06

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise information request AE(1)-06 to provide additional information. Clarify whether the predicted impacts of the mine at the property line already include the mitigation measures proposed. If so, additional mitigation measures are still recommended given that some contaminants of potential concern (COPCs) are above the threshold (or contribute a significant amount compared to the existing conditions for the non-threshold COPCs). Refer to Health Canada's 2017 Guidance for Evaluating Human Health Impacts in Environmental Assessment: Air Quality (<https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/healthy-living/guidance-evaluating-human-health-impacts-air-quality.html>)

Also, see response TMI_172 on choice of most-impacted receptor.

ID:

169

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-07

Complete:

A. No

B. No

C. No

D. No

Context and Rationale:

For Parts A, B, C, and D the information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review. The response does not provide sufficient information to validate the assessment of health risks during the construction phase.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AE(1)-07 Parts A and B and revise the response to provide a complete and detailed response to the main issue, "model and assess potential air quality impacts during construction/site preparation and decommissioning/restoration phases of the project." This includes a dispersion modeling of short term air quality impacts from site preparation and construction activities.

Revise the response to Part C, and justify how higher concentrations on site would be offset by shorter exposure periods for the Aboriginal land users.

Revise the response to Part D to provide additional information. The response currently only covers emissions from equipment extracting aggregate and not from the overall operations of the aggregate pit.

ID:

170

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-08

Complete:

Yes

ID:

171

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-09

Complete:

Yes

ID:

172

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-10

Complete:

A: Yes

B: Yes

C: Yes

D: Yes

E: Yes

ID:

173

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-11

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AE(1)-11. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

174

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-12

Complete:

Yes

ID:

175

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-13

Complete:

Yes

ID:

176

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-14

Complete:

Yes

ID:

177

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-15

Complete:

Yes

ID:

178

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-16

Complete:

Yes

ID:

179

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-17

Complete:

Yes

ID:

180

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-18

Complete:

Yes

ID:

181

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-19

Complete:

Yes

ID:

182

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-20

Complete:

Yes

ID:

183

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-21

Complete:

A. No

B. Yes

Context and Rationale:

The information provided in response to Part A is incomplete.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise information request AE(1)-21 Part A to provide a definition of the LSA and RSA based on quantitative analysis.

ID:

184

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-22

Complete:

Yes

ID:

185

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-23

Complete:

Yes

ID:

186

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-24

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question directly.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AE (1)-23 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, “include traffic to and from the project site in the noise modelling.”

ID:

187

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-25

Complete:

Yes

ID:

188

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-26

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response implies that the lack of traditional land use studies prevents them from obtaining the necessary information. The requested information does not need to come from TLU studies.

The response does not demonstrate how TMI intends to fulfill the request. The comment is regarding lack of engagement with Indigenous groups in identifying noise sensitive receptor locations; however it appears TMI’s engagement with Indigenous groups to-date has been inadequate.

The response contains a confusing remark: “As defined by MOECC, the current use of the lands and resources for traditional purposes would not be recognized as a sensitive receptor.”

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a detailed response to information request AE(1)-26 explaining how TMI intends to address the concerns presented and incorporate the information into a revised EIS, keeping in mind previous engagement by TMI was inadequate.

ID:

189

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-27

Complete:

Yes

ID:

190

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-28

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AE(1)-28 to provide additional technical information, such as using proper guidance on noise as requested in information request AE(1)-28.

ID:

191

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-29

Complete:

A. Yes

B. No

Context and Rationale:

Part B was not addressed in the response. The rationale provided does not address concerns regarding noise impacts to surrounding receptors.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AE(1)-29 Part B.

ID:

192

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-30

Complete:

Yes

ID:

193

IR-1 Reference #:

AE(1)-31

Complete:

A: Yes

B: No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer Part B directly. Information about a noise monitoring program is required as part of the effects analysis, to verify modeled sound levels during all phases of the project.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AE(1)-31 Part B to provide a noise monitoring program.

ID:

194

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-01

Complete:

A. Yes

B. Yes

C. No

D. Yes

E. Yes

F. Yes

G. No

Context and Rationale:

The Information provided with respect to Aboriginal Engagement activities regarding site-specific data is incomplete. The response to Part C has indicated that "Treasury Metals has made extensive efforts to engage and elicit input from Aboriginal peoples." However, no information can be found whether site-specific data was acquired or communicated during engagement activities as requested.

For Part G, the information provided is incomplete.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request HE(1)-01 to provide additional information.

For Part C, engage Aboriginal groups to obtain site-specific consumption data, including water resources, species, rates, and specific parts that are consumed for fish, wildlife, and plants. If this information cannot be obtained, provide a rationale why, and indicate any public sources of information that could be used as an alternative.

For Part G, identify which Aboriginal groups will be engaged in the Annual Monitoring Report.

ID:

195

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-02

Complete:

A. No

B. No

C. No

Context and Rationale:

A. The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.

Information request HE(1)-02 requires a justification for excluding any COPCs identified in waste rock and tailings for the operational phase of the project. However, the response only states the justification for carrying forward lead and mercury in the SLRA. No detailed rationale, such as a discussion of "relative toxicity and abundance" or the inclusion of screening criteria, has been provided for the COPCs that were not retained for further assessment. Several of these COPCs may pose health effects and are at concentrations above those identified for mercury and/or lead. For example, concentrations of zinc are approximately 4 times higher than lead within the waste rock and approximately 2 times higher than lead in soils. Arsenic and cadmium are also considered carcinogenic.

B. The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.

The response states that “the HQs were summed per Health Canada guidance” for lead and mercury. However, it appears that the total hazard quotients (HQs) for the sum of mercury and lead were only provided for country foods (Table U); individual HQs are provided for mercury and lead within Tables V to W. Therefore, Tables V to W should be revised to include the total HQs for mercury and lead.

C. The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.

The response does not provide an explanation, for the uncertainties surrounding the excluded COCs and the relevance of the exclusions to the conclusion of the HHRA.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request HE(1)-02 to provide additional information.

A. Provide a justification for excluding any COCs identified in waste rock and tailings for the operational phase of the project. Include details regarding the “relative toxicity and abundance” of the COCs that were not retained for further assessment.

B. Revise Tables V to W to include the total HQs for mercury and lead.

C. In cases where COCs are screened out, explain the uncertainties and relevance of the exclusions to the conclusion of the HHRA.

ID:

196

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-03

Complete:

A. Yes

B. Yes

C. Yes

ID:

197

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-04

Complete:

A. Yes

B. No

C. Yes

Context and Rationale:

The information provided in response to Part C is incomplete.

Section 13.10, Figure 13.10.2-1 is missing from the page.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request HE(1)-04, As part of the response, provide Figure 13.10.2-1 referenced in Section 13.10 of the Revised EIS.

ID:

198

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-05

Complete:

A. Yes

B. Yes

ID:

199

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-06

Complete:

Yes

ID:

200

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-07

Complete:

Yes

ID:

201

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-08

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided in the response is dependent on the answer to information request HE(1)-02.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to HE(1)-08 in light of the revised response to HE(1)-02. If additional COPCs are retained that are considered carcinogenic, specify the age group considered for the food ingestion rates provided in table J or provide justification for not using adults or multiple age groups.

ID:

202

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-09

Complete:

Yes

ID:

203

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-10

Complete:

A. Yes

B. No

Context and Rationale:

Insufficient information provided in the response to Part B to allow a technical review.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review the response to information request HE(1)-10 Part B to provide additional information. Specify whether waste rock and tailings are the only sources of mercury expected at the site.

ID:

204

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-11

Complete:

Yes

ID:

205

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-12

Complete:

A. Yes

B. No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided in the response to Part B is dependent on the answer to information request HE(1)-02.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

B. Revise the response to HE(1)-08 in light of the revised response to HE(1)-02. Explain why metals other than lead and mercury are excluded and discuss the impacts of this in terms of human exposure and risk.

ID:

206

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-13

Complete:

A. Yes

ID:

207

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-14

Complete:

A. No

B. Yes

C. No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided in the response to Part A is insufficient to allow for a technical review as no details regarding biological monitoring was provided. Furthermore, the response directs the reader to Section 12.4.2 of the original EIS for the overview of the biological monitoring plan. This reference does not work for the revised Section 12. This is important information for determining whether baseline data collection has been adequate.

The response To Part C contradicts the new information incorporated into the revised EIS.

Section 13.14.2.2 of the revised EIS specifically states that monitoring of mercury in fish is not expected to be required in several water bodies. However, the response to Part C notes that "Treasury Metals is aware of concerns regarding mercury levels in the region, and have proposed a monitoring program aimed at addressing these specific concerns."

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request HE(1)-14 Part A to provide details on the monitoring plan, including objectives and questions to be answered.

Revise the response to information request HE(1)-14 Part C to provide additional information. Section 13.14.2.2 should be revised to include the proposed monitoring program. In addition, justify the plan to only measure mercury (i.e. no other contaminants) in fish tissue.

ID:

208

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-15

Complete:

A. No

B. No

Context and Rationale:

The response to Parts A and B does not demonstrate how/whether the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

While the response to HE(1)-15 may answer the information request, integration of this response into the revised EIS (and demonstration thereof) is required, including clarification that all related elements of the EIS were accordingly updated.

ID:

209

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-16

Complete:

A. Yes

B. Yes

ID:

210

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-17

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.

The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) Table 2 Site condition Standards (SCS) for both residential and agricultural soils for antimony are based on ingestion and dermal contact for human health receptors. An additional rationale should be provided to determine whether antimony should be retained as a contaminant of concern in tailings to ensure potential health risk is not underestimated.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request HE(1)-17 and provide additional information related to the health risk of antimony.

ID:

211

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-18

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question directly.

The response provides the waste rock concentrations used within the DQRA spreadsheet. However, it is unclear why mercury concentrations in dust were not calculated and/or provided in the same manner as those for lead.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request HE(1)-18 to more specifically address the main issue and provide additional technical information.

ID:

212

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-19

Complete:

Yes

ID:

213

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-20

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.

The response states that the "inclusion of background concentrations does not result in any other parameters exceeding their respective Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) POI limits and therefore does not alter the conclusions of the HHRA." There is no technical information provided to support this claim.

Additionally, The response provides the waste rock concentrations used within the DQRA spreadsheet. However, it is unclear why mercury concentrations in dust were not calculated and/or provided in the same manner as those for lead.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request HE(1)-20. Revise the assessment to screen the total air concentrations (i.e. maximum incremental POI concentrations + background), where possible, against health-based air quality standards and guidelines (e.g. AAQC or CAAQS).

ID:

214

IR-1 Reference #:

HE (1)-21

Complete:

Yes

ID:

215

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-22

Complete:

A. Yes

B. No

Context and Rationale:

Part B was not addressed in the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to Part B of information request HE(1)-22.

ID:

216

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-23

Complete:

Yes

ID:

217

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-24

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.

The response provided a rationale for not evaluating total exposures, while at the same time granting that “it is understood that health risk is dependent on total exposure”. The response also relies on mitigation rather than addressing the question.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request HE(1)-24 to provide additional technical information. The SLRA should be revised to use total concentrations of mercury and lead to calculate hazard quotients, so potential health risks are not underestimated.

ID:

218

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-25

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.

The response only provides a worked example for the consumption of plant tissue. Worked examples for the remaining exposure pathways should also be provided, as per Health Canada’s preliminary quantitative risk assessment guidance (Health Canada 2012b).

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request HE(1)-25 to provide additional technical information.

ID:

219

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-26

Complete:

Yes

ID:

220

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-27

Complete:

Yes

ID:

221

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-28

Complete:

Yes

ID:

222

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-29

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question directly.

Treasury Metals was requested to revise the assessment for the screening level human health risk assessment to ensure parameters and calculations performed on the DQRA are in accordance with current guidance on preliminary quantitative risk assessment and DQRA for chemicals (Health Canada 2010c; 2012b). However, the response does not provide what is requested.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request HE(1)-29 and revise the response to more specifically address the question.

ID:

223

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-30

Complete:

Yes

ID:

224

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-31

Complete:

Yes

ID:

225

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-32

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided contains errors which make it insufficient to allow for a technical review.

If Scenario 3 does not include dust inhalation (only country food ingestion), a hazard quotient for inhalation would not be provided. It appears that inhalation of fugitive dust was selected as 'Yes' for the country foods modeling scenario (Scenario 3).

Additionally, there appears to be a discrepancy between the country food concentrations provided in-text tables (Tables P and T) and the values entered within the country food DQRA models, including the following:

- Concentration inorganic mercury in fish in the operational model; and
- Concentration of inorganic mercury in fish and wild game for the post-closure model.

As such, the calculations should be reviewed and revised accordingly.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request HE(1)-32 and provide additional technical information.

Provide a rationale for why an inhalation of fugitive dust was selected as 'yes' for the country foods modelling scenario (Scenario 3). Additionally, address the discrepancies between the country food concentrations provided in tables P and T and the values entered within the country food DQRA models.

ID:

226

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-33

Complete:

A. Yes

B. No

C. No

D. No

Context and Rationale:

Parts B, C, and D were not addressed in the answer.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request HE(1)-33 Parts B, C and D. The data must be provided.

ID:

227

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-34

Complete:

Yes

ID:

228

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-34

Complete:

- A. No
- B. No
- C. No
- D. No

Context and Rationale:

The response to HE (1)-34 Part A contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Parts C and D were not addressed in the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request HE (1)-34. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

229

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-36

Complete:

- A. Yes
- B. Yes
- C. No

Context and Rationale:

The response to Part C is incomplete. The response does not demonstrate how mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to Aboriginal peoples.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request HE(1)-36 Part C to provide additional information.

ID:

230

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-37

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request HE (1)-37. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

231

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-38

Complete:

- A. No
- B. No
- C. No
- D. No

Context and Rationale:

- A. The reviewer was unable to find the response referred to in the EIS.
 - B. The response does not demonstrate how existing information with respect to Aboriginal groups was integrated into the description or baseline conditions and effects assessment sections.
 - C. The response does not demonstrate that baseline information was collected related to potential impacts to Aboriginal peoples by the Project.
 - D. No input from Aboriginal groups has been collected or documented or evidence that engagement attempts have been undertaken.
- The response overall is too vague and does not provide information about Aboriginal groups' land use, which therefore would not be integrated into the effects assessments.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review the response to information request HE(1)-38 and revise response to demonstrate the engagement with Aboriginal groups to collect baseline information about land use and Aboriginal and Treaty rights and where that baseline information is provided incorporate it into the effects and impacts assessments.

ID:

232

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-39

Complete:

Yes

ID:

233

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-40

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how/whether the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

While the response to information request HE(1)-40 may answer the information request, integration of this response into the revised EIS (and demonstration thereof) is required, including clarification that all related elements of the EIS were accordingly updated.

ID:

234

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-41

Complete:

A. No

B. No

Context and Rationale:

The response to Part A contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. In addition, a cursory review of the sections of the EIS that are referred to in the response does not reveal the information requested. For example, the response states "The Aboriginal Engagement report provides a listing of the disaggregate comments from Aboriginal peoples, and how those were addressed in the Project design and EIS." The listing being referred to contains comments from Indigenous groups, however the Agency requested information about Indigenous land and resource use activities that could be affected by the project.

The response to Part B does not directly address the request.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request HE(1)-41 Part A to provide additional technical information. If the information requested is contained in the revised EIS, provide references to specific sections where it can be found (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient). Otherwise, provide the requested information in the response, and provide rationales for missing information.

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request HE(1)-41 Part B.

ID:

235

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-42

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question directly. The response contains links to sections of the EIS that either do not answer the question, or refers the reader to yet another section of the EIS.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request HE(1)-42 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been addressed. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

236

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-43

Complete:

- A. No
- B. No
- C. No
- D. No

Context and Rationale:

The response to Parts A and B contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Parts C and D were not addressed in the answer, and if the information is included in the revised EIS, it is unclear where it can be found.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Address each Part of information request HE(1)-43 individually (i.e. A, B, C, and D), with a clear reference(s) to the EIS, if applicable. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

237

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-44

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question directly, and the response does not demonstrate how/whether the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS. A description of potential effects resulting from a specific action, applicable mitigation measures and resulting significance was required; a discussion of general engagement to date is not a sufficient response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request HE(1)-44 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue

Integration of this response into the revised EIS (and demonstration thereof) is also required, including clarification that all related elements of the EIS were accordingly updated.

ID:

238

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-45

Complete:

- A. No
- B. No

Context and Rationale:

The response to Parts A and B contains a reference to a section(s) of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request HE(1)-45 Parts A and B to provide a complete and detailed technical response. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

239

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-46

Complete:

Yes

ID:

240

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-47

Complete:

- A. No
- B. Yes
- C. No
- D. Yes
- E. Yes

Context and Rationale:

A. The response does not demonstrate how TMI intends to fulfill the request. While the comment is regarding lack of engagement with Aboriginal groups on potential cultural heritage resources, the response provides only a vague commitment to future engagement with Aboriginal peoples.

C. The information provided is incomplete. The map of the LSA is unclear and difficult to relate to the Project site; no information is provided about the RSA.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request HE(1)-47 Part A; revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been addressed.

Revise the response to Part C to provide additional technical information.

ID:

241

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-48

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response contains a general reference to the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request HE(1)-48. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

242

IR-1 Reference #:

HE(1)-49

Complete:

Yes

ID:

243

IR-1 Reference #:

AM(1)-01

Complete:

- A. Yes
- B. Yes
- C. No

Context and Rationale:

For Part C, the information provided does not answer the question directly.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AM(1)-01 Part C, to describe contingency and emergency response procedures if spills and releases, and cyanide-related accidents and malfunctions occur.

ID:

244

IR-1 Reference #:

AM(1)-02

Complete:

- A. Yes
- B. No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

The response to Part B includes a definition of the terms “moderate environmental impact, medium term environmental impact and severe long term environmental impact” however does not include a definition for “major regulatory violations versus severe breach of regulations with operation suspended”.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AM(1)-02 Part B to provide additional technical information. Define the term “major regulatory violations versus severe breach of regulations with operation suspended”.

ID:

245

IR-1 Reference #:

AM(1)-03

Complete:

A. No

B. No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

The response states the likelihood that there would be a potential slope failure of the open pit, waste rock and low-grade ore stockpiles and failures of the seepage collection system, the tailings or effluent pipeline, and then provides an overview of design features. However the response does not provide a description of the potential environmental effects if the identified accidents and/or malfunctions were to occur, or a description of the contingency and emergency response procedures that would be implemented in such an event.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AM(1)-03.

A. Describe the potential environmental effects from potential slope failures of the open pit, waste rock and low-grade ore stockpiles and failures of the seepage collection system, the tailings or effluent pipeline on fish and fish habitat, migratory birds, current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes, Aboriginal health and socio-economic conditions, Aboriginal physical and cultural heritage, and any structure, site, or thing of historical, archaeological, paleontological or architectural significance to Aboriginal groups.

B. Describe contingency and emergency response procedures for the potential effects noted above if accidents and/or malfunctions occur.

ID:

246

IR-1 Reference #:

AM(1)-04

Complete:

A. No

B. No

C. No

Context and Rationale:

A. The information provided is insufficient to validate the conclusions.

As stated in the rationale of AM(1)-04, “there is a risk high water levels and velocities such as spring freshet would remobilize the settled particles and affected the water quality in Wabigoon Lake and acid generation condition may also begin.”

B. The information provided is insufficient.

Part B requires a description of the effects, and their duration, if particulate materials remobilize with heavy rainfall or spring freshet prior to mitigation measures being implemented.

C. The information provided is insufficient.

Although “the quality of water released into Blackwater Creek will meet the water quality authorized limits in the federal *Metal Mining Effluent Regulations* (MMER), with the exception of lead”, these are only authorized under controlled conditions and not meant for during an unlikely event of a TSF failure. Furthermore, the response states that “none of the tailings present within the TSF were predicted to reach Wabigoon Lake during the modelled failure event.” However, heavy rainfalls during the failure event may cause the tailings to reach Wabigoon Lake.

Nevertheless, Part C is a follow-up to Parts A and B. Since the responses to A and B are insufficient, Part C will need to be addressed again.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AM(1)-04 Part A to provide additional information. Provide an analysis of what the contaminant levels would be within the sediment and within the aquatic food web following a tailings storage facility failure, with a focus on contaminants that persist in the environment, bioaccumulate in fish or are toxic to fish, migratory birds or Aboriginal people.

Revise the response to Part B to provide additional information. Describe the effects and their duration if particulate materials remobilize with every heavy rainfall or spring freshet.

Revise the response to Part C to provide additional information. Describe detailed contingency and emergency response procedures, for a tailings storage facility failure to address effects to fish and fish habitat, migratory birds, and effects to Aboriginal peoples including, but not be limited to, country foods, current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes, and health and socio-economic conditions.

ID:

247

IR-1 Reference #:

AM(1)-05

Complete:

Yes

ID:

248

IR-1 Reference #:

AM(1)-06

Complete:

A. Yes

B. Yes

ID:

249

IR-1 Reference #:

AM(1)-07

Complete:

A. No

B. No

C. No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete. The proponent has not responded directly to the information request outlining the risk of large landslides in clay units.

The response states that "...further geotechnical studies..." will be done, and that "...Treasury Metals will complete an Engineered design for all components of the Project including the waste rock storage area (WRSA) and Overburden storage area." The information requested in AM(1)-07 was not provided.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AM(1)-07.

A. Document the physical and mechanical properties of the glaciolacustrine clays (e.g. liquidity index to assess the capacity of these soils to flow once mobilized by a failure; piezocone tests to obtain a more detailed stratigraphy and more representative strength parameters).

B. Provide information of the possibility that down-hill progressive landslides (e.g. Bernander, 2008) could be induced by the weight of the two storage areas (Waste Rock Storage Area and the Overburden Storage Area, e.g. Fig. 3.01 (EIS)).

C. Provide results of slope stability analyses and mitigation measures if required in (Appendix HH)

ID:

250

IR-1 Reference #:

AM(1)-08

Complete:

Yes

ID:

251

IR-1 Reference #:

CE(1)-01

Complete:

A. No

B. Yes

C. No

D. Yes

Context and Rationale:

A. The information provided is insufficient to allow for a technical review.

C. The map provided in Section 7 does not define the spatial boundaries that encompass the potential environmental effects on the selected valued components of the Project in combination with other physical activities that have been or will be carried out, including the additional projects listed in TMI_252 - CE(1)-02. Additionally, Section 7.2.2 makes numerous references to figures found in other sections of the EIS.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request CE(1)-01 Part A to provide additional technical information regarding the effects rating criteria and the method by which criteria were combined and weighted.

Revise the response to Part C to provide additional technical information.

ID:

252

IR-1 Reference #:

CE(1)-02

Complete:

A: Yes
B: Yes
C: No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

Although a map has been provided in Section 7.2.5, Figure 7.2.5-1, not all of the information requested in comment C was provided. The map does not show all of the locations of past, existing, certain and reasonably foreseeable physical activities.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request CE(1)-02 Part C to provide additional technical information.

ID:

253

IR-1 Reference #:

CE(1)-03

Complete:

Yes

ID:

254

IR-1 Reference #:

CE(1)-04

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided in Section 7 of the Revised EIS is insufficient to allow a technical review.

The response indicates that the “revised EIS is organized in a manner that corresponds with the requirements described in the EIS Guidelines, and specifically addresses issues identified in the IR Round 1 relating to the evaluation of cumulative effects”. However, the information provided appears to be limited in quantitative data, qualitative rationale, and analysis to substantiate the conclusions of the assessment of cumulative effects in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities in the study areas.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request CE(1)-04 to provide additional information. Provide quantitative data and analysis to substantiate the conclusions of the assessment of cumulative effects in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities in the study areas. If no quantitative data is available provide a rationale clearly explaining the reasons why the data is not readily available and, provide a qualitative assessment to substantiate the conclusions.

ID:

255

IR-1 Reference #:

CE(1)-05

Complete:

Yes

ID:

256

IR-1 Reference #:

CE(1)-06

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

The response indicates that for “accidents and malfunctions that are likely to occur (13 failure modes), and for which residual effects are predicted, have been included in an updated cumulative effects assessment presented as part of the revised EIS.” No information regarding accidents and malfunctions can be found in the Cumulative Effects Assessment (Section 7).

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request CE(1)-06 to provide additional information and analysis related to how effects from accidents and malfunction scenarios may interact in a cumulative manner with the residual effects from the project. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

257

IR-1 Reference #:

CE(1)-07

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

The details requested in information request CE(1)-07 were not provided in the answer. Furthermore, the required information cannot be found in the referenced sections (Section 6.21 and 7 of the Revised EIS) provided in the answer.

According to table 7.3.2-1 several future activities appear to have an overlap in their spatial extents and temporal boundaries when considering Aboriginal Peoples as valued components. However, no details are provided as to what type of assessment was taken into account when concluding that the activities considered are too minor to have measurable cumulative effects.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

As required in information request CE(1)-07, provide additional technical detail to describe the potential cumulative effects of water quality and health effects, gathering of country foods, and hunting and trapping, and fishing pertaining to Indigenous groups. Include future activities that overlap spatially and temporally, or provide a rationale for their exclusion.

ID:

258

IR-1 Reference #:

EE(1)-01

Complete:

Yes

ID:

259

IR-1 Reference #:

EE(1)-02

Complete:

Yes

ID:

260

IR-1 Reference #:

EE(1)-03

Complete:

Yes

ID:

261

IR-1 Reference #:

EE(1)-04

Complete

Yes

ID:

262

IR-1 Reference #:

EE(1)-05

Complete:

Yes

ID:

263

IR-1 Reference #:

EE(1)-06

Complete:

Yes

ID:

264

IR-1 Reference #:

EE(1)-07

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question directly.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request EE (1)-07 to provide details on how beavers and beaver dams will be monitored and managed, including the perspective on Aboriginal peoples. Requires more technical information.

ID:

265

IR-1 Reference #:

PB(1)-1

Complete:

Yes

ID:

266

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-01

Complete:

Yes

ID:

267

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-02

Complete:

Yes

Context and Rationale:

DFO notes that the response to Part A stated that no Fish Compensation/Offsetting Plans have been completed. Without any plans in place, it is difficult to determine if offsetting measures are appropriate. DFO expects these plans in the future.

ECCC notes that the fish habitat compensation plan has not been developed and costs have not been estimated as requested. To streamline the approvals process this information should be provided to regulators during the EA.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

ID:

268

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-03

Complete:

Yes

Context and Rationale:

The response to Part A stated that no Fish Compensation/Offsetting Plans have been completed. Without any plans in place, it is difficult to determine if offsetting measures are appropriate. This has been noted by DFO, and plans are anticipated in the future.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

ID:

269

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-04

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response refers the reader to two appendices and one section of the revised EIS as sources of information to fulfill the information request. These references are too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. References should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request RG(1)-04. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

270

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-05

Complete:

Yes

ID:

271

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-06

Complete:

Yes

ID:

272

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-07

Complete:

Yes

ID:

273

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-08

Complete:

Yes

ID:

274

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-09

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete. In addition, the response refers to an appendix of the revised EIS (Appendix D-2) which is too broad to allow one to find the information relevant to the question.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request RG(1)-09 and revise the response to more specifically address the specific information requests.

ID:

275

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-10

Complete:

Yes

ID:

276

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-11

Complete:

Yes

ID:

277

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-12

Complete:

Yes

ID:

278

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-13

Complete:

Yes

ID:

279

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-14

Complete:

Yes

ID:

280

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-15

Complete:

Yes

ID:

281

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-16

Complete:

Yes

ID:

282

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-17

Complete:

Yes

ID:

283

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-18

Complete:

Yes

ID:

284

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-19

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete to allow a technical review.

TMI indicates that an IGF and AAF has been submitted to the Dryden District of the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) office. However, according to MNRF neither has been received as of September 12, 2017.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Submit the IGF and AAF form to the Dryden District MNRF Office. Also provide information relevant to the information request in a self-contained response.

ID:

285

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-20

Complete:

Yes

ID:

286

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-21

Complete:

Yes

ID:

287

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-22

Complete:

Yes

ID:

288

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-23

Complete:

Yes

ID:

289

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-24

Complete:

Yes

ID:

290

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-25

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete. The references included in the responses were not found.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request RG(1)-25 and provide the appropriate technical information.

ID:

291

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-26

Complete:

Yes

ID:

292

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-27

Complete:

Yes

ID:

293

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-28

Complete:

Yes

ID:

294

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-29

Complete:

Yes

ID:

295

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-30

Complete:

Yes

ID:

296

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-31

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how/whether the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request RG(1)-31 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue.

ID:

297

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-32

Complete:

Yes

ID:

298

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-33

Complete:

Yes

Context and Rationale:

MOECC would like to remind Treasury Metals that meeting MMER discharge limits for cyanide will likely not be adequate to meet provincial permitting requirements.

ID:

299

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-34

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate whether the information was incorporated into the revised EIS.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

While the response to information request RG(1)-34 may acknowledge the information request, integration of this into the revised EIS (and demonstration thereof) is required.

ID:

300

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-35

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate whether the information was incorporated into the revised EIS.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

While the response to information request RG(1)-35 may acknowledge the information request, integration of this into the revised EIS (and demonstration thereof) is required.

ID:

301

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-36

Complete:

Yes

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

ID:

302

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-37

Complete:

Yes

ID:

303

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-38

Complete:

Yes

ID:

304

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-39

Complete:

Yes

ID:

305

IR-1 Reference #:

RG(1)-40

Complete:

Yes

ID:

306

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-01

Complete:

Yes

ID:

307

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-02

Complete:

Yes

ID:

308

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-03

Complete:

Yes

ID:

309

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-04

Complete:

Yes

ID:

310

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-05

Complete:

Yes

ID:

311

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-06

Complete:

Yes

ID:

312

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-07

Complete:

Yes (duplicate to SD(1)-06)

ID:

313

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-08

Complete:

Yes

ID:

314

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-09

Complete:

Yes

ID:

315

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-10

Complete:

Yes

ID:

316

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-11

Complete:

Yes

ID:

317

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-12

Complete:

Yes

ID:

318

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-13

Complete:

Yes

ID:

319

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-14

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

Figure 4 – Site Plan (Appendix E Traffic Study) has not been updated to reflect the same boundaries and infrastructure placement as Figure 3.0-1A (Section 3 – Project Description). Both figures represent the same information; therefore these Figures need to be comparable.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

While the response to information request SD(1)-14 may answer the information request, integration of the information into the revised EIS in a consistent manner must be demonstrated. Revise figures containing boundaries and infrastructure placement where this information is relevant so that the information is consistent across the EIS.

ID:

320

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-15

Complete:

Yes

ID:

321

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-16

Complete:

Yes

ID:

322

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-17

Complete:

Yes

ID:

323

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-18

Complete:

Yes

ID:

324

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-19

Complete:

Yes

ID:

325

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-20

Complete:

Yes

ID:

326

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-21

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request SD(1)-21. Additional justification for the exclusion of analytes without screening criteria should be provided.

ID:

327

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-22

Complete:

Yes

ID:

328

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-23

Complete:

Yes

ID:

329

IR-1 Reference #:

SD(1)-24

Complete:

Yes

ID:

330

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-04

Complete:

Yes

ID:

331

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-05

Complete:

Yes

ID:

332

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-06

Complete:

Yes

ID:

333

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-07

Complete:

Yes

ID:

334

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-08

Complete:

Yes

ID:

335

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-09

Complete:

Yes

ID:
336
IR-1 Reference #:
AC(1)-10
Complete:
No
Context and Rationale:
Unclear if the information about baseline migratory bird and bird habitat conditions was incorporated into the revised EIS.
Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:
Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AC(1)-10.

ID:
337
IR-1 Reference #:
AC(1)-11
Complete:
Yes

ID:
338
IR-1 Reference #:
AC(1)-12
Complete:
Yes

ID:
339
IR-1 Reference #:
AC(1)-13
Complete:
Yes

ID:
340
IR-1 Reference #:
AC(1)-14
Complete:
Yes

ID:
341
IR-1 Reference #:
AC(1)-15
Complete:
Yes

ID:
342
IR-1 Reference #:
AC(1)-16
Complete:
Yes

ID:
343
IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-17

Complete:

Yes

ID:

344

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-18

Complete:

Yes

ID:

345

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-19

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete. The response did not address the concern about overflow potential.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-19 to provide information about "overflow potential and containment of potential acid generating material" and potential for contamination should overflow occur.

ID:

346

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-20

Complete:

Yes

ID:

347

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-21

Complete:

Yes

ID:

348

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-22

Complete:

Yes

ID:

349

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-23

Complete:

Yes

ID:

350

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-24

Complete:

Yes

ID:

351

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-25

Complete:

Yes

ID:

352

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-26

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how/whether the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS. While the response claims that the effects assessment includes effects to Indigenous people on and off reserve, it does not explain how, or if, this information is presented more clearly in the revised EIS.

The response also contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a detailed response to information request AC(1)-26 explaining how TMI intends to address the concerns presented and incorporate the information into a revised EIS, keeping in mind previous engagement by TMI was inadequate. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

353

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-27

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

There is no specific evidence or rationale provided indicating Naotkamegwanning First Nation was contacted and their respective information provided in the comment relating to sacred aspects of the environment was incorporated into the updated EIS.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-27 and provide a revised response that demonstrates engagement with Naotkamegwanning First Nation and consideration of the information related to sacred aspect of the environment provided in the comment in the EIS.

ID:

354

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-28

Complete:

Yes

ID:

355

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-29

Complete:

Yes

ID:

356

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-30

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does answer the request to remove text related to the interpretation of Treaty 3.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review the response to information request AC(1)-30 to provide additional information. Confirm removal of the text relating to the interpretation of Treaty or provide a rationale for the continued inclusion.

ID:

357

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-31

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not describe mitigation measures or refer to sections of the EIS that present the mitigation measures.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-31 and provide a revised response that describes or refers to proposed mitigation measures for the Project in the revised EIS.

ID:

358

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-32

Complete:

Yes

ID:

359

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-33

Complete:

Yes

ID:

360

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-34

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how the information provided in the comment was considered and incorporated in the assessment.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-34 and provide a revised response that demonstrates how the information provided in Wabigoon Lake Ojibway Nation's comment was considered and incorporated in the EIS.

ID:

361

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-35

Complete:

Yes

ID:

362

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-36

Complete:

Yes

ID:

363

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-37

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate that follow-up engagement was done with Wabauskang First Nation to understand their concerns with the gaps in the understanding of current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-37 and provide a revised response that: 1) demonstrates engagement with Wabauskang First Nation to understand their concerns with gaps in the understanding of current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes; and 2) incorporates any comments received into the assessment for current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes.

ID:

364

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-38

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response provided does not answer the request. The EIS should include a complete impact analysis of Treaty rights.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-38 and revise the response to demonstrate that an analysis was taken to assess impacts (including infringement) on Aboriginal and Treaty rights.

See also TMI_540.

ID:

365

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-39

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response provided does not answer the request.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-39 and revise the response to demonstrate engagement with Aboriginal groups regarding potential Project impacts and mitigation measures. In addition, demonstrate that any feedback on potential impacts and mitigation measures for Aboriginal and Treaty rights has been considered in the assessment

ID:

366

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-40

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not directly address the issue properly. The commitments to “ongoing engagement with Aboriginal people throughout the life of the Project” are not a substitute to conducting full and meaningful consultation during the EA, as directed by this Agency. Engagement with Indigenous groups is done, in part, so they have meaningful input into the design and development of mitigation measures and follow up programs for those project effects that might impact them and that will be included as part of the impacts assessment. The response only makes a vague commitment to engage with Grassy Narrows First Nation “for the life of the Project”.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a detailed response to information request AC(1)-40 explaining what actions TMI has taken to address the concerns of Grassy Narrows First Nations, and how TMI has incorporated the information into a revised EIS. As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

367

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-41

Complete:

Yes

ID:

368

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-42

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not indicate that the updated EIS has included the Dryden Area referred to by Naotkamegwanning First Nation as part of the related assessments for impacts on traditional hunting or attempts to acquire related traditional knowledge from Naotkamegwanning First Nation.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-42 and provide a revised response that demonstrates the updated EIS considers the Dryden Area as part of the related assessments for impacts on traditional hunting. In addition demonstrate attempts to acquire related traditional knowledge from Naotkamegwanning First Nation.

ID:

369

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-43

Complete:

Yes

ID:

370

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-44

Complete:

Yes

ID:

371

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-45

Complete:

Yes

ID:

372

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-46

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

The response references compliance with the International Cyanide Code, but does not describes safeguards and response plans.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AC(1)-46. Describe the safeguards and the response plans in the event of water contamination during the transport and handling of cyanide.

ID:

373

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-47

Complete:

Yes

ID:

374

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-48

Complete:

Yes

ID:

375

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-49

Complete:

Yes

ID:

376

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-50

Complete:

Yes

ID:

377

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-51

Complete:

Yes

ID:

378

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-52

Complete:

Yes

ID:

379

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-53

Complete:

Yes

ID:

380

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-54

Complete:

Yes

ID:

381

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-55

Complete:

Yes

ID:

382

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-56

Complete:

Yes

ID:

383

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-57

Complete:

Yes

ID:

384

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-58

Complete:

Yes

ID:

385

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-60

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question directly. This is a request from Eagle Lake First Nation to tour the project site, however the response does not explain if, when, or how TMI will fulfill this request, and does not mention ELFN.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a detailed response to information request AC(1)-60 explaining how TMI intends to address the concerns presented and incorporate the information into a revised EIS.

ID:

386

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-61

Complete:

Yes

ID:

387

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-62

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response to the information request contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Additionally, a cursory review of the EIS sections referenced in the response shows that some of the concerns raised in this IR request remain outstanding. For example, Section 6.0 of the Aboriginal Engagement Report reveals that concerns about Indigenous engagement on baseline studies, traditional knowledge and traditional land use, and potential environmental effects remains outstanding.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AC(1)-62. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

Please note: commitments to “ongoing engagement with Aboriginal people throughout the life of the Project” are not a substitute to conducting full and meaningful consultation during the EA, as directed by the Agency. Such commitments, while welcome, are not relevant to this IR. See comments on the Aboriginal Engagement Report, Annex 1 for further guidance on how to address this Information Requirement.

ID:

388

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-63

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response to the information request contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

The IR request presents a number of issues raised concerning Indigenous consultation, and almost all of these issues were not directly addressed in the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AC(1)-63. Ensure that each issue raised in the IR request is addressed in the response, individually. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

389

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-64

Complete:

Yes

ID:

390

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-65

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

While the response addresses the issue of TK/TLU studies, it does not address the issue of capacity for technical review of the EIS.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-65 and revise the response to more specifically address each issue/request raised.

ID:

391

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-66

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not directly address the information request in full, and does not explain in detail how TMI intends to fulfill the request.

Additionally, the response to the question contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a detailed response to information request AC(1)-66 explaining how TMI intends to address the concerns presented. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

392

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-67

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how/whether the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS. The response also does not directly address the issue raised, only providing a vague, generalized response.

The response also contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a detailed response to information request AC(1)-67 explaining how TMI intends to address the concerns presented and incorporate the information into a revised EIS. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

Review the information request and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been addressed.

ID:

393

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-68

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how/whether the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS. The response also does not directly address the issue raised, only providing a vague, generalized response. While the issue raised was concerning the lack of responses to questions, the response by TMI does not address this at all, and raises an irrelevant point about trying to gather land use information from Indigenous groups.

The response also contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-68 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been addressed. Provide a detailed response explaining how the issue has been addressed and/or incorporated into a revised EIS. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

394

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-69

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate the engagement requested in the information request and in “Annex B – Goliath Gold Project IR-1 Companion Sheet”.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-69 and revise the response in accordance with “Annex B – Goliath Gold Project IR-1 Companion Sheet”.

ID:

395

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-70

Complete:

Yes

ID:

396

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-71

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response provided does not answer the request.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-71 and revise the response including information provided in the EIS to demonstrate that the Engagement and Accommodation Protocol has been considered. Provide a response that contains an analysis of impacts of the Project on Wabauskang First Nation’s Aboriginal and Treaty rights.

ID:

397

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-72

Complete:

Yes

ID:

398

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-73

Complete:

Yes

ID:

399

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-74

Complete:

Yes

ID:

400

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-75

Complete:

Yes

ID:

401

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-76

Complete:

Yes

ID:

402

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-77

Complete:

Yes

ID:

403

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-78

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

The response states that "...Treasury Metals will be undertaking more detailed studies to evaluate the economic potential of the Project..." but does not respond to how the project would cover a disaster.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AC(1)-78 - How would the Project cover a disaster?

ID:

404

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-79

Complete:

Yes

ID:

405

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-80

Complete:

Yes

ID:

406

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-81

Complete:

Yes

ID:

407

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-82

Complete:

Yes

ID:

408

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-83

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question directly. The question asked about the level of engagement; however the response does not answer this at all.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-83 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been addressed.

ID:

409

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-84

Complete:

Yes

ID:

410

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-85

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the information request directly.

The request states that "the executive summary does not contain enough information on the removal of the dams as currently written." The response does not contain the information that was requested.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-85 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue.

ID:

411

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-86

Complete:

Yes

ID:

412

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-87

Complete:

Yes

ID:

413

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-88

Complete:

Yes

ID:

414

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-89

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response provides vague details regarding efforts to obtain input on in-design mitigation measures. For example, the response states “No Project-specific traditional knowledge and traditional land use studies were prepared for, or shared with, Treasury Metals; limited information was obtained about concerns regarding the in-design mitigation.”

The response to the question contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response. Additionally, Table 5.1-1. of the Aboriginal Engagement Report (Issues and Concerns raised by Aboriginal Groups) does not list in-design mitigation measures as a concern, so it is unclear how TMI intends to address the issue if it is not recorded as a concern.

Finally, commitments to ongoing engagement throughout the life of the project are not a substitute to conducting full and meaningful consultation during the EA, as directed by the Agency.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a detailed response to information request AC(1)-89 explaining how TMI intends to address the concerns presented. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

415

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-90

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The references to sections of the EIS in the response provided do not answer the question asked by Métis Nation of Ontario.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-90 and provide a revised response that provides specific details on the assessment and subsequent process for identification of mitigation related to the use of private land and mitigating traditional lands.

ID:

416

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-91

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not directly address the issue raised, providing only a vague, generalized response about efforts to engage Indigenous peoples.

Additionally, commitments to ongoing engagement throughout the life of the project are not a substitute to conducting full and meaningful consultation during the EA, as directed by the Agency.

The response also contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-91 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been addressed. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

417

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-92

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not directly address the issue raised, only providing a vague, generalized response about efforts to engage Indigenous peoples.

Additionally, commitments to ongoing engagement throughout the life of the project are not a substitute to conducting full and meaningful consultation during the EA, as directed by the Agency.

The response also contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-92 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been addressed. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

418

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-93

Complete:

Yes

ID:

419

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-94

Complete:

Yes

ID:

420

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-95

Complete:

Yes

ID:

421

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-96

Complete:

Yes

ID:

422

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-97

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how/whether the required information was incorporated into the revised EIS. Additionally, the response to the question contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

The response also does not address the issue directly. The issue is regarding the need for a traditional land use study with MNO to determine receptors for vibration levels. Vibration levels were not discussed in the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-97 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

423

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-98

Complete:

Yes

ID:

424

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-99

Complete:

Yes

ID:

425

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-100

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question directly. While the IR was related to lack of TK/TLU study AND engagement related to vegetation, the response does not address the comment regarding lack of engagement on this topic.

Additionally, commitments to ongoing engagement throughout the life of the project are not a substitute to conducting full and meaningful consultation during the EA, as directed by the Agency.

The response also contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Furthermore, when an issue such as species in the LSA is the comment from an Indigenous group, the approach to engagement could involve meeting with the group and explain the work of Treasury to examine how the Project may impact species, the mitigation proposed and the conclusion proposed for inclusion in the EIS. This type of engagement validates the work Treasury has completed and would inform the response submitted to the Agency.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-100 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been addressed.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

426

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-101

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question directly. While the IR was related to lack of TK/TLU study AND engagement related to wildlife, the response does not address the comment regarding lack of engagement on this topic.

Additionally, commitments to ongoing engagement throughout the life of the project are not a substitute to conducting full and meaningful consultation during the EA, as directed by the Agency.

The response also contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-101 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been addressed. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

427

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-102

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question directly. While the IR was related to lack of TK/TLU study AND engagement related to aquatic biology, the response does not address the comment regarding lack of engagement on this topic.

Additionally, commitments to ongoing engagement throughout the life of the project are not a substitute to conducting full and meaningful consultation during the EA, as directed by the Agency.

The response also contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-102 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been addressed. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

428

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-103

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how/whether the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS. The response also does not directly address the issue raised, only re-stating the lack of TK/TLU study with MNO.

The response also contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Additionally, commitments to ongoing engagement throughout the life of the project are not a substitute to conducting full and meaningful consultation during the EA, as directed by the Agency.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-103 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been addressed. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

429

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-104

Complete:

Yes

ID:

430

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-105

Complete:

Yes

ID:

431

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-106

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

While the content of the response appears to address the issue, it is not explained how/if this information is incorporated into the revised EIS. This is important, considering the issue is regarding the Proponent's wording in the EIS.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-106. Explain in detail how the request/information is incorporated into a revised EIS.

ID:

432

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-107

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

Appendix II indicates that engagement on the fish habitat offset plan will be with First Nations only while the response indicates that Treasury will engage more broadly with Aboriginal people. Since this comment came from the MNO, there should be clarification within Appendix II about engagement with Metis nations.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-107 to provide additional technical information. Integration of this response into the revised EIS (and demonstration thereof) is required.

ID:

433

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-108

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how/whether the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS. The response also does not directly address the issue raised.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-108; revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been addressed.

ID:

434

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-109

Complete:

Yes

ID:

435

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-110

Complete:

Yes

ID:

436

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-111

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not fully address the comment from MNO. It does not address the issue that the determination of berry picking locations was made “without sufficient credible information from the MNO”, and does not address the apparent lack of supporting information to make this determination.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-111; revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been addressed. Provide supporting information for determinations made, and explain how input from MNO has been sought and/or incorporated.

ID:

437

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-112

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how/whether the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS. Blueberries remain the only example of berries picked by Indigenous groups in the EIS Summary, so it remains unclear how TMI concludes that “the Project is not expected to adversely impact the gathering of plants or berries within the general area.”

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-112. Explain in detail how the request/information is incorporated into a revised EIS.

ID:

438

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-113

Complete:

Yes

ID:

439

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-114

Complete:

Yes

ID:

440

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-115

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response provided does not answer the request and does not provide a rationale for the characterization of and scope used to assess impacts to Métis Nation of Ontario’s Aboriginal rights.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-115 and provide a revised response that includes a rationale for the scope used to assess impacts to Métis Nation of Ontario’s Aboriginal rights and demonstrates engagement with Aboriginal groups on the characterization and assessment of those Métis Nation of Ontario’s Aboriginal rights.

ID:

441

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-116

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how/whether the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS. Specifically, the request to “make provisions for the potential information” in the revised EIS was not addressed.

The response also does not directly address the issue raised, which was related to trails and travelways.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-116 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into the revised EIS.

ID:

442

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-117

Complete:

Yes

ID:

443

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-117b

Complete:

Yes

ID:

444

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-118

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete. The response refers the reader to the response to another information request (IR), which only discusses the waste rock stockpile. However, this IR requests additional information on visual aesthetics in general (which may not be limited to the waste rock stockpile).

The information provided also does not address the issue directly. This IR requests additional information on Indigenous concerns regarding visual aesthetics and potential impacts. The response does not contribute further to this understanding.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-118 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS. Include concerns from Indigenous groups related to visual aesthetics in your response, and how those concerns have been addressed.

ID:

445

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-119

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not address the issue directly. While the issue is concerning lack of engagement on identifying species of importance to MNO, the response instead vaguely describes efforts to engage Indigenous groups and commitments to ongoing engagement.

The response also states that the MNO "have not identified, in this information request, any species of importance to them." No supporting information is provided, such as efforts to engage MNO on this information request.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-119 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS. Since the issue is related to lack of engagement with MNO on this topic, explain in detail how this has been addressed.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

446

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-120

Complete:

Yes

ID:

447

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-121

Complete:

Yes

ID:

448

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-122

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response, including the references does not demonstrate that it considered Aboriginal and Treaty rights.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-122 and revise response to incorporate consideration of Aboriginal and Treaty rights into the alternative assessment.

ID:

449

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-123

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response refers the reader to two appendices and one section of the revised EIS as sources of information to fulfill the information request, as well as responses to 6 other IRs. These references are too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. References should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AC(1)-123.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

450

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-124

Complete:

Yes

ID:

451

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-125

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete. The response refers to Figure 13.8.2-1 to identify surface water monitoring locations. However, this figure is missing in the revised EIS. In addition, no information is provided about frequency of monitoring. It is therefore not possible to evaluate the appropriateness of the monitoring plan.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-125 to provide additional information. Provide a map of the surface water monitoring locations as well as proposed frequency of monitoring.

ID:

452

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-126

Complete:

Yes

ID:

453

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-127

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review. The information request was for an alternatives assessment, but the response only restated the conclusions thereof, as was already found in the EIS.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to AC(1)-127, including but not limited to which site alternatives were considered, the criteria for inclusion/exclusion, and an assessment of potential effects of the alternatives in question.

ID:

454

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-128

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question directly. The information request pertained to information related to First Nation Reserves and Communities or Traditional Land Use within the alternative assessment of hazardous solid waste management, domestic sewage management, and the explosives storage facility. While the response discussed the alternatives assessment of these project components, it did not address First Nation related information.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-128 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue.

ID:

455

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-129

Complete:

Yes

ID:

456

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-130

Complete:

Yes

ID:

457

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-131

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response refers the reader to two appendices and one section of the revised EIS as sources of information to fulfill the information request (IR), as well as responses to 6 other IRs. These references are too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. References should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AC(1)-123.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

458

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-132

Complete:

Yes

ID:

459

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-133

Complete:

Yes

ID:

460

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-134

Complete:

Yes

ID:

461

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-135

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response refers the reader to seven other responses to information requests (IRs) as sources of information to fulfill the IR, without indicating which one(s) correspond to any of the five specific topics in the IR. In addition, the response does not address the question directly, which is the amendment of a table listing the project elements for which an alternatives assessment was performed.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AC(1)-123.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

462

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-136

Complete:

Yes

ID:

463

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-137

Complete:

Yes

ID:

464

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-138

Complete:

Yes

ID:

465

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-139

Complete:

Yes

ID:

466

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-140

Complete:

Yes

ID:

467

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-141

Complete:

Yes

ID:

468

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-142

Complete:

Yes

ID:

469

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-143

Complete:

Yes

ID:

470

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-144

Complete:

Yes

ID:

471

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-145

Complete:

Yes

ID:

472

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-146

Complete:

Yes

ID:

473

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-147

Complete:

Yes

ID:

474

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-148

Complete:

Yes

ID:

475

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-149

Complete:

Yes

ID:

476

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-150

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

Although the response has addressed part of the information request, it has not demonstrated whether traditional knowledge of the MNO or current land and resource use by MNO was incorporated.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-150 to demonstrate how traditional knowledge of the MNO and current land and resource use by MNO was integrated into the baseline section for vegetation in the revised EIS.

ID:

477

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-151

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information request was not addressed in the answer.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AC(1)-151.

ID:

478

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-152

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

Although the response has addressed part of the information request, it has not demonstrated whether traditional knowledge of the MNO or current land and resource use by MNO was incorporated.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response information request AC(1)-152 to demonstrate how traditional knowledge of the MNO and current land and resource use by MNO was integrated into the baseline section for wetlands in the revised EIS.

ID:

479

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-153

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

Although the response has addressed part of the information request, it has not demonstrated whether traditional knowledge of the MNO or current land and resource use by MNO was incorporated.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-153 to demonstrate how traditional knowledge of the MNO and current land and resource use by MNO was integrated into the baseline section for mammals in the revised EIS.

ID:

480

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-154

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

Although the response has addressed part of the information request, it has not demonstrated whether traditional knowledge of the MNO or current land and resource use by MNO was incorporated.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-154 to demonstrate how traditional knowledge of the MNO and current land and resource use by MNO was integrated into the baseline section for birds in the revised EIS.

ID:

481

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-155

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

Although the response has addressed part of the information request, it has not demonstrated whether traditional knowledge of the MNO or current land and resource use by MNO was incorporated.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-155 to demonstrate how traditional knowledge of the MNO and current land and resource use by MNO was integrated into the baseline section for significant wildlife habitat in the revised EIS.

ID:

482

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-156

Complete:

Yes

ID:

483

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-157

Complete:

Yes

ID:

484

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-158

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

Although the response has addressed part of the information request, it has not demonstrated whether traditional knowledge of the MNO or current land and resource use by MNO was incorporated.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-158 to demonstrate how traditional knowledge of the MNO and current land and resource use by MNO was integrated into the baseline section for Species at Risk in the revised EIS.

ID:

485

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-159

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not address the issue directly, and is incomplete. The request to disaggregate the information to reveal which Indigenous groups use wild rice, for example, was not addressed. The request for additional information on traditional food sources for Indigenous groups was also not addressed. There is an absence of information on what TMI has done to specifically address this IR. Instead, the response contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-159 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

ID:

486

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-160

Complete:

Yes

ID:

487

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-161

Complete:

Yes

ID:

488

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-162

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how the new information received with respect to Aboriginal traditional knowledge was incorporated into the revised EIS.

The response indicates that Treasury Metals received the Aboriginal traditional knowledge following the submission of the original EIS. However, a rationale has not been provided for why the information received from MNO was not taken into account when developing the spatial boundaries for the human environment in the revised EIS.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-162 to provide additional information. Determine whether Aboriginal traditional knowledge or current land and resource use by MNO was taken into account during the development of spatial boundaries for human environment. If not, provide a rationale for why the information was not incorporated.

ID:

489

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-163

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete. The response commits to providing the information requested in the future, however at this time the request remains incomplete.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Directly address information request AC(1)-163, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

490

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-164

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

It is acknowledged that TMI will update the baseline socio-economic data with information from the 2016 Census. The response should be updated to include the information when it becomes available.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-164 and provide additional technical information.

ID:

491

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-165

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

It is acknowledged that TMI will update the baseline socio-economic data with information from the 2016 Census. The response should be updated to include the information when it becomes available.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-165 and provide additional technical information.

ID:

492

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-166

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

It is acknowledged that TMI will update the baseline socio-economic data with information from the 2016 Census. The response should be updated to include the information when it becomes available.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-166 and provide additional technical information. If this information regarding crime and justice are not added to this section, provide a rationale why.

ID:

493

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-167

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

It is acknowledged that TMI will update the baseline socio-economic data with information from the 2016 Census. The response should be updated to include the information when it becomes available.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-167 and provide additional technical information. If information regarding poverty or social issues is not added to this section, provide a rationale why.

ID:

494

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-168

Complete:

Yes

ID:

495

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-169

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not respond to the question from Métis Nation of Ontario.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-169 and provide a response that includes an explanation of the use of the title of section 5.11.5 of the original EIS or if possible how the updated EIS has changed to in response to this comment.

ID:

496

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-170

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response only provides disaggregated information with respect to engagement not the description of Aboriginal and Treaty rights and potential impacts.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-170 and provide a revised response that provides desegregated information for Aboriginal and Treaty rights and potential impacts. The effects analysis should be done regarding individual groups with applicable mitigation measures identified.

ID:

497

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-171

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not provide sufficient information to make a determination that this issue was addressed. Specifically, the response states “MNO did not share any Project-specific information or knowledge with Treasury Metals before the original EIS was filed and has not provided any additional information in this IR.” However, there is no supporting information on TMI’s attempts to engage with MNO to gather the information for this IR.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to more specifically address information request AC(1)-171, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

498

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-172

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not address the issue directly. Instead, the response provides vague details about previous engagement efforts, and does not include information regarding efforts to engage MNO on this specific IR.

The response also contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-172; revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

499

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-173

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not address the issue directly. The response addresses blueberry picking sites and effects to existing blueberry picking sites, however the main concern regarding mischaracterization of blueberry crops as transient was unaddressed.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-173; revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

500

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-174

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not address the issue. The issue is related to the variety of species of plants gathered by the MNO, but the response only goes on to explain past efforts and future commitments to engage Indigenous groups. It also appears the offer by MNO to “provide Treasury with an amended listing of vegetation species preferred by the MNO to update this section of the EIS” was not seized upon.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-174; revise the response to specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

501

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-175

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not address the issue at all. The issue is related to the lack of cultural foods and interests of the MNO being represented in the EIS, but the response only goes on to explain past efforts and future commitments to engage Indigenous groups.

The response also contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-175; revise the response to specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

502

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-176

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not address the issue directly. Specifically, the issue relates to engagement on identifying game species, yet the response does not sufficiently address this. Instead, the response discusses previous efforts and future commitments to engage Indigenous groups generally.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review the information request and revise the response to specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

503

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-177

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete. The response discusses previous efforts and future commitments to engage Indigenous groups generally, and includes the statement “MNO did not share any Project-specific information or knowledge with Treasury Metals before the original EIS was filed and not provided any information about active Metis hunters in this information request.” However, there is no supporting information on TMI’s attempts to engage with MNO to gather the information for this IR.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to more specifically address information request AC(1)-177, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

504

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-178

Complete:

Yes

ID:

505

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-179

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not address the issue directly. The response discusses previous efforts to engage MNO, and does not go on to demonstrate how/whether the requested information was incorporated into the revised EIS.

The response also contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to more specifically address information request AC(1)-179, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

506

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-180

Complete:

Yes

ID:

507

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-181

Complete:

Yes

ID:

508

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-182

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not address the issue directly. There is no clarification of whether Indigenous engagement was considered as an undertaking for the assessment, and no indication of whether clarification was provided in the EIS. The response only goes on to explain past efforts and future commitments to engage Indigenous groups.

The response also contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to more specifically address information request AC(1)-182, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

509

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-183

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

Not all of the issues raised in this IR were addressed in the response. For example, MNO states "this section mischaracterizes the lack of TK information. Treasury has not offered MNO sufficient capacity to complete a TK study." The response does not address how/if this apparent mischaracterization was addressed in the revised EIS.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to more specifically address information request AC(1)-183, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

ID:

510

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-184

Complete:

Yes

ID:

511

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-185

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not respond to the question from Métis Nation of Ontario.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-185 and provide a response that demonstrates the methodology used in assessment of impacts to Aboriginal and treaty rights and how Métis Nation of Ontario's comment for a holistic ecosystems approach was incorporated. If it was not, provide a rationale.

ID:

512

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-186

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not address the issue directly. Instead, the response discusses previous efforts and future commitments to engage Indigenous groups generally.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-186; revise the response to specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

513

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-187

Complete:

Yes

ID:

514

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-188

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question of the development process of avoidance, minimization and mitigation (a procedural question).

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-188 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue.

ID:

515

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-189

Complete:

Yes

ID:

516

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-190

Complete:

Yes

ID:

517

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-191

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how/whether the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS. Specifically, if/how knowledge from MNO was used in determining effects on wildlife and wildlife habitat was not addressed. The response vaguely describes previous efforts and future commitments to Indigenous engagement, however no information is provided on efforts to engage with MNO on this particular IR.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-191; revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

518

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-192

Complete:

Yes

ID:

519

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-193

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how/whether the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS. Specifically, if/how knowledge from MNO was used in determining effects on fish and fish habitat was not addressed. The response vaguely describes previous efforts and future commitments to Indigenous engagement, however no information is provided on efforts to engage with MNO on this particular IR.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-193; revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

520

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-194

Complete:

Yes

ID:

521

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-195

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not address the issue directly. Specifically, the issue relates to engagement on effects to wetlands and vegetation and how it informs the analysis, yet the response does not address this. Instead, the response discusses previous efforts and future commitments to engage Indigenous groups generally.

The response also contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-195 and revise the response to specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

522

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-196

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not address the issue directly, and does not demonstrate how/whether the requested information was incorporated into the revised EIS. Instead, the response discusses previous efforts and future commitments to engage Indigenous groups generally.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-196 and revise the response to specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

As engagement with Indigenous groups is required during the EA, commitments to future engagement after the EA are not a suitable response.

ID:

523

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-197

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response provided does not answer the request. The response and reference to sections of the revised EIS do not provide conclusions specific to impacts of the Project on Métis Nation of Ontario, incorporate baseline information (including publically available information) or demonstrate that Métis Nation of Ontario's views have been sought or incorporated.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-197 and provide a revised response that includes an assessment and conclusions for Métis Nation of Ontario, contains baseline information (including publically available information) and the views of Métis Nation of Ontario.

ID:

524

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-198

Complete:

Yes

ID:

525

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-199

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The reference to “description of project effects and linkages” cannot be found.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-199 and provide a complete and detailed response.

ID:

526

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-200

Complete:

Yes

ID:

527

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-201

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information presented does not directly address any of the issues presented. Specifically, the issues are concerning lack of linkage between Indigenous rights and interests and several VC assessments. The response does not demonstrate how/whether the requested information was incorporated into the revised EIS, and also contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-201 and revise the response to specifically address each issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

528

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-202

Complete:

Yes

ID:

529

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-203

Complete:

Yes

ID:

530

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-204

Complete:

Yes

ID:

531

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-205

Complete:

Yes

ID:

532

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-206

Complete:

Yes

ID:

533

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-207

Complete:

Yes

ID:

534

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-208

Complete:

Yes

ID:

535

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-209

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not address the issue at all. Specifically, the IR states “the VC must represent a vulnerable component under Land and Resource Use instead of just repeating the section title.” Instead of explaining or correcting this approach, the response just states “Treasury Metals acknowledges that there are a number of questions from the Agency and other reviewers related to the approach used in the EIS for organizing and presenting information regarding the potential effects of the Project.” It then goes on to refer the reader to the revised EIS without explaining how it has addressed the issue, if at all.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-209; revise the response to specifically address each issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

ID:

536

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-210

Complete:

Yes

ID:

537

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-211

Complete:

Yes

ID:

538

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-212

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response refers to Section 6.0 for information. However, this section is blank.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-199 and provide a complete and detailed response. Include an interaction matrix of project activities by project phase and VC.

ID:

539

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-213

Complete:

Yes

ID:

540

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-214

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the information request directly. The issue raised in the IR is the lack of linkage between the results of the effects assessment and Aboriginal interests and/or rights. However, the response states that the revised EIS links changes to the environment to “effects on Aboriginal peoples”, which is not the same as effects on rights and interests.

Additionally, the response contains references to Sections 6.21 and 6.23.4 of the revised EIS. These sections do not link biophysical effects to impacts on Aboriginal rights or interests. It simply lists the biophysical effects that could impact Aboriginal peoples in the area, without consideration of rights.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-214 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue. In this case, there should be assessment of the Aboriginal and treaty rights that exist and how they are exercised, with direct links to potential effects of the Project and where they intersect with these rights. This assessment should be as specific as possible to the groups potentially impacted, and not generalized to “Aboriginal groups”.

See also TMI_364.

ID:

541

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-215

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

The response provides an overview of the design features for the TSF, but does not provide a description of the effects, potential mitigation measures, characterization of residual effects, determination of significance or information related to the proponent’s confidence and risk.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AC(1)-215, that includes additional information on the potential effect including a more comprehensive description of the effects including specific data related to the potential scenarios, information about potential mitigation measures, characterization of residual effects, determination of significance and information related to Treasury’s confidence and risk.

ID:

542

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-216

Complete:

Yes

ID:

543

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-217

Complete:

Yes

ID:

544

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-218

Complete:

Yes

ID:

545

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-219

Complete:

Yes

ID:

546

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-220

Complete:

Yes

ID:

547

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-221

Complete:

Yes

ID:

548

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-222

Complete:

Yes

ID:

549

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-223

Complete:

Yes

ID:

550

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-224

Complete:

Yes

ID:

551

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-225

Complete:

Yes

ID:

552

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-226

Complete:

Yes

ID:

553

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-227

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.

The information request requires a fulsome assessment of a catastrophic failure of the TSF. The response provides references to sections of the Revised EIS, however, based on the response in TMI_246-AM(1)-04, the analysis for TSF is incomplete. A fulsome assessment must be conducted in the event of a catastrophic failure of the TSF which addresses effects on fish and fish habitat, migratory birds, and effects on Aboriginal peoples including, but not be limited to, country foods, current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes, and health and socio-economic conditions.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-227 to provide additional information. The information request requires a fulsome assessment of a catastrophic failure of the TSF.

ID:

554

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-228

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not address the issue at all. Specifically, the IR states that there is no linkage between Aboriginal rights and interests and land use in the Land Use section of the EIS. The response, however, states "The revised EIS clear linkages that have been considered between physical and biological effects of the Project, the effects on land use, and ultimately the effects on Aboriginal peoples in Sections 6.16 and 6.21." Linkages to "Aboriginal peoples" are not the same as linkages to rights held by Aboriginal peoples.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-228 and revise the response to specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

ID:

555

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-229

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how/whether the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS. Specifically, clarification is needed to ensure the comment "This section does not even characterize effects and instead jumps directly to "potential direct residual effects"" has been addressed in the relevant section of the EIS.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

While the response may answer information request AC(1)-229, integration of this response into the revised EIS (and demonstration thereof) is required, including clarification that all related elements of the EIS were accordingly updated.

ID:

556

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-230

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how/whether the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS. Specifically, it is not demonstrated that the "lack of detail" regarding exceedances of deleterious substances has been addressed in the revised EIS.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

While the response may answer information request AC(1)-230, integration of this response into the revised EIS (and demonstration thereof) is required, including clarification that all related elements of the EIS were accordingly updated.

ID:

557

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-231

Complete:

Yes

ID:

558

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-232

Complete:

Yes

ID:

559

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-233

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question of impacts to the water level of Wabigoon Lake or Thunder Lake.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-233 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue.

ID:

560

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-234

Complete:

Yes

ID:

561

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-235

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response to the information request contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

The information provided does not answer the question directly. While the comment was regarding the gathering of plants and berries, there is no mention of this in the response.

Additionally, Table 5.1-1 in the Aboriginal Engagement Report (Issues and Concerns raised by Aboriginal Groups) does not list "Traditional Plant and Berry Gathering" as a concern topic/valued component. As the comment was specifically about this valued component, the revised EIS does not address this concern.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-235 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal Engagement Report is not sufficient). If the required information cannot be provided, provide a rationale.

ID:

562

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-236

Complete:

Yes

ID:

563

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-237

Complete:

Yes

ID:

564

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-238

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response to the information request contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

The response does not demonstrate how the specific concern/request was incorporated into the revised EIS. Furthermore, the response contains the comment "Based on the guidance from the Agency, and knowledge from past assessments in the region, potential impacts on hunting trapping and fishing was relatively obvious issue to identify as being important to consider in the assessment". This does not address the comment raised, which was regarding the disaggregation of comments related to potential impacts on hunting, trapping, and fishing. Additionally, Table 5.1-1 in the Aboriginal Engagement Report (Issues and Concerns raised by Aboriginal Groups) does not list Hunting, Trapping, and Fishing as a Valued Component. As the comment was specifically about this valued component, the revised EIS does not address this concern.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-238 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal Engagement Report is not sufficient). If the requested information cannot be provided, provide a rationale.

ID:

565

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-239

Complete:

Yes

ID:

566

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-240

Complete:

Yes

ID:

567

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-241

Complete:

Yes

ID:

568

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-242

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

The map provided in Section 7 does not define the spatial boundaries that encompass the potential environmental effects of the selected valued components of the Project in combination with other physical activities that have been or will be carried out, including the additional projects listed in IR CE(1) – 02. Additionally, Section 7.2.2 makes numerous references to figures found in other sections of the EIS. As indicated by the EIS Guidelines, Cumulative Effects should be treated as a stand-alone section which includes all associated figures and referenced information within the section.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-242 to provide additional information. Provide a map that clearly defines the spatial boundaries that encompass the potential environmental effects on the selected valued components of the Project in combination with other physical activities that have been or will be carried out, including the additional projects listed in information request CE(1)-02.

ID:

569

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-243

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not answer the question and state whether or not the information Métis Nation of Ontario provided is included in the updated EIS.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-243 and provide a response that indicates if the information referred to by Métis Nation of Ontario has been considered in the updated EIS and provide references. If the information has not been incorporated provide a rationale as to why it has not.

ID:

570

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-244

Complete:

Yes

ID:

571

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-245

Complete:

Yes

ID:

572

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-246

Complete:

Yes

ID:

573

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-247

Complete:

Yes

ID:

574

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-248

Complete:

Yes

ID:

575

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-249

Complete:

Yes

ID:

576

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-250

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how/whether the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS. Specifically, the question asks which baseline studies relate to which concerns, and which measures address which concerns. The response refers the reader to the Aboriginal Engagement Report, without being specific about where these questions are answered, if at all.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-250 and revise the response to specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

577

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-251

Complete:

Yes

ID:

578

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-252

Complete:

Yes

ID:

579

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-253

Complete:

Yes

ID:

580

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-254

Complete:

Yes

ID:

581

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-255

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not answer the question of where in the EIS are there conclusions specifically on impacts to Métis Nation of Ontario's Aboriginal rights. It only refers to potential effects of the project on Aboriginal peoples through health, country foods, and hunting, trapping and fishing and does not break it down by Aboriginal group.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-255 and provide a response that includes an assessment of potential impacts of the Project on Métis Nation of Ontario's Aboriginal rights.

ID:

582

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-256

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not answer the question of where in the EIS are there conclusions specifically on impacts to Métis Nation of Ontario's Aboriginal rights within a Regional Study Area and information on how much previously unoccupied Crown land will be taken up by the Proposed project. It only refers to potential effects of the project on Aboriginal peoples through health, country foods, and hunting, trapping and fishing and does not break it down by Aboriginal group.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-256 and provide a response that includes an assessment of potential impacts of the Project on Métis Nation of Ontario's Aboriginal rights within a Regional Study Area and information on how much previously unoccupied Crown land will be taken up by the Proposed project.

ID:

583

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-257

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question directly. The question asks "What assessment was undertaken to reach this conclusion? What information from MNO was used in the determination?" Instead of answering this, the response points the reader to a section of the original EIS, which only summarizes predicted effects.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-257 and revise the response to specifically address the question(s), and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

ID:

584

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-258

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response provided does not answer the request to demonstrate impacts to Métis Nation of Ontario's Aboriginal rights or engagement efforts as the information provided in the referenced sections of the updated EIS are too vague and not Aboriginal group specific.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-258 and provide a revised response that answers the question specifically.

ID:

585

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-259

Complete:

Yes

ID:

586

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-260

Complete:

Yes

ID:

587

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-261

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not provide a specific reference of where the updated EIS specifically looks at access or if the conclusion in the original EIS is still correct.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-261 and provide a response that clarifies if the conclusion in the original EIS is still accurate and that includes a specific reference in the updated EIS where access effects are assessed for Métis Nation of Ontario.

ID:

588

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-262

Complete:

Yes

ID:

589

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-263

Complete:

Yes

ID:

590

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-262

Complete:

Yes

ID:

591

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-265

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not address the issue directly, and does not demonstrate how/whether the requested information was incorporated into the revised EIS. The response has almost nothing to do with the comment, only referring to the creation of a revised EIS and referring the reader to various sections of the revised EIS.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-265; revise the response to specifically address each issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

Ensure the response responds directly to the question.

ID:

592

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-266

Complete:

Yes

ID:

593

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-267

Complete:

Yes

Context and Rationale:

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

ID:

594

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-268

Complete:

Yes

ID:

595

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-269

Complete:

Yes

ID:

596

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-270

Complete:

Yes

ID:

597

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-271

Complete:

Yes

ID:

598

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-263b

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response which is a reference to the updated EIS does not answer the question of the impacts to the exercise of Métis Nation of Ontario Aboriginal rights.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-263b and provide a response that includes an assessment of impacts to the exercise of Métis Nation of Ontario Aboriginal rights.

ID:

599

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-272

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not answer the question of where in the EIS is there a rationale for the claim that there are fewer impacts on Métis Nation of Ontario as the Project is located mostly on private lands or information on how much previously unoccupied Crown land will be taken up by the Proposed project.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-272 and provide a response that includes a rationale of why there are less impacts from Project on Métis Nation of Ontario's Aboriginal rights and information on how much previously unoccupied Crown land will be taken up by the Proposed project.

ID:

600

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-273

Complete:

Yes

ID:

601

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-274

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how/whether the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

While the response may answer information request AC(1)-274, integration of this response into the revised EIS (and demonstration thereof) is required, including clarification that all related elements of the EIS were accordingly updated.

ID:

602

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-275

Complete:

Yes

ID:

603

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-276

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate how/whether the new information was incorporated into the revised EIS. Specifically, it does not answer how TKLUS will be used to identify potential impacts on MNO citizens now that the EIS is already filed without this information.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

While the response may answer information request AC(1)-276, integration of this response into the revised EIS (and demonstration thereof) is required, including clarification that all related elements of the EIS were accordingly updated.

ID:

604

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-277

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is insufficient to verify the question has been answered. Specifically, there are no details on how TMI will implement the "next steps" with MNO, other than to encourage "open communication with the Company".

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-277 to provide additional details.

ID:

605

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-278

Complete:

Yes

ID:

606

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-279

Complete:

Yes

ID:

607

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-280

Complete:

Yes

ID:

608

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-281

Complete:

Yes

ID:

609

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-282

Complete:

Yes

ID:

610

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-283

Complete:

Yes

ID:

611

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-284

Complete:

Yes

ID:

612

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-285

Complete:

Yes

ID:

613

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-286

Complete:

Yes

ID:

614

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-287

Complete:

Yes

ID:

615

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-288

Complete:

Yes

ID:

616

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-289

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

Although the comment does not require technical information, the response provided does not address the comment. The comment lists values and beliefs central to ELFN and by not acknowledging these, the response is incomplete. References back to the Engagement Report and future engagement are inappropriate.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-289 to respectfully address the comment by demonstrating how TMI has acknowledged and took in to consideration the comment . Keep in mind that showing respect for traditional values and belief systems, and a willingness to understand how these can be incorporated into the EA, is an invaluable step towards meaningful engagement.

ID:

617

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-290

Complete:

Yes

ID:

618

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-291

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not address the issues directly. There are several specific concerns, such as wild rice, archaeological sites, and Lola Nature Reserve, which were not addressed in the response.

The response contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-291; revise the response to specifically address each issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

619

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-292

Complete:

Yes

ID:

620

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-293

Complete:

Yes

ID:

621

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-294

Complete:

Yes

ID:

622

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-295

Complete:

Yes

ID:

623

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-296

Complete:

- A. Yes
- B. Yes
- C. Yes
- D. No

Context and Rationale:

The response to information request AC(1)-296 contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

For Part D, the response refers to Section 2 of the EIS, Appendix X and IR responses, however does not provide a summary response to the specific question.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AC(1)-296 Part D, which includes whether Best Available Technology has been considered in the alternatives assessment, and whether economic factors were considered.

ID:

624

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-297

Complete:

Yes

ID:

625

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-298

Complete:

Yes

ID:

626

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-299

Complete:

Yes

ID:

627

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-300

Complete:

Yes

ID:

628

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-301

Complete:

Yes

ID:

629

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-302

Complete:

Yes

ID:

630

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-303

Complete:

Yes

ID:

631

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-304

Complete:

Yes

ID:

632

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-305

Complete:

Yes

ID:

633

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-306

Complete:

Yes

ID:

634

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-307

Complete:

Yes

ID:

635

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-308

Complete:

Yes

ID:

636

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-309

Complete:

Yes

ID:

637

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-310

Complete:

Yes

ID:

638

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-311

Complete:

Yes

ID:

639

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-312

Complete:

Yes

ID:

640

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-313

Complete:

Yes

ID:

641

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-314

Complete:

Yes

ID:

642

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-315

Complete:

Yes

ID:

643

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-316

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response provided did not answer the request or demonstrate how the EIS has addressed the concerns raised by Naotkamegwanning First Nation.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-316 and provide a revised response that demonstrates how the EIS has addressed concerns raised by Naotkamegwanning First Nation.

ID:

644

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-317

Complete:

Yes

ID:

645

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-318

Complete:

Yes

ID:

646

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-319

Complete:

Yes

ID:

647

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-320

Complete:

Yes

ID:

648

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-321

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information request was not addressed in the response

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-321 and provide a complete and detailed response.

ID:

649

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-322

Complete:

Yes

ID:

650

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-323

Complete:

Yes

ID:

651

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-324

Complete:

Yes

Context and Rationale:

ID:

652

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-325

Complete:

Yes

ID:

653

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-326

Complete:

Yes

ID:

654

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-327

Complete:

Yes

ID:

655

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-328

Complete:

Yes

ID:

656

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-329

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

The response also does not demonstrate how TMI intends to fulfill the request. While the comment is regarding lack of engagement with Naotkamegwanning First Nation (NFN) on the development of fundamental components of the EA, the response provides a vague commitment to future engagement with NFN “throughout the life of the project”.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-329 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been addressed. See comments on the Aboriginal Engagement Report, Annex 1 for further guidance on how to address this Information requirement.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal Engagement Report is not sufficient). If the requested information cannot be provided, provide a rationale.

ID:

657

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-330

Complete:

Yes

ID:

658

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-331

Complete:

Yes

ID:

659

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-332

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not answer the question of addressing the lack of baseline information for Naotkamegwanning First Nation’s current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes and related Treaty rights.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-332 and provide a response that answers whether baseline information for Naotkamegwanning First Nation’s current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes and related Treaty rights has been considered in the assessment and demonstrate where it has been considered.

ID:

660

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-333

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

The response also does not address the issue directly. While the issue is about the lack of non-aggregated baseline studies to address section 5(1)c effects, the response only touches on socio-economic baseline studies. Additionally, the approach proposed by TMI is not collaborative and does not commit to developing baseline data with the Indigenous group, but implies that any baseline studies will be conducted solely by TMI. For example, the response states “Any updating of the socio-economic baseline should be delayed until the results of the 2016 Census are released by Statistics Canada, which are scheduled to be released between February and November 2017.” The update will include primary research (i.e., in-community interviews) for the purposes of validating secondary information and developing a comprehensive profile of the socio-economic conditions within the community at that point in time.” The response refers to an update including primary data, without indicating whether this information was obtained or, if it was, how it was incorporated into the revised EIS.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-333 and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been addressed. Keep in mind that an approach to dealing with this issue without meaningful engagement with the Indigenous group is insufficient.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response. (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal Engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

661

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-334

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not address the issue directly. Specifically, the issue is regarding lack of mitigation and follow-up measures from NFN, however the response makes no mention of NFN or explain why input, if any, from NFN on these measures was not included.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-334 and revise the response to specifically address each issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

662

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-335

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not address the issue directly. The response makes no mention of NFN and does not address the issues they raised.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-335 and revise the response to specifically address each issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

663

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-336

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

Not all of the issues raised in this IR were addressed in the response. Specifically, one of the comments states “The report sections related to First Nations are entirely desktop exercises that do not provide an adequate basis for assessing CEAA 2012 s. 5 (1)(c) effects.” This statement was not addressed in the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-336 and revise the response to specifically address each issue, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS.

ID:

664

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-337

Complete:

Yes

ID:

665

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-338

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response provided including reference to Appendix DD does not respond to the request of engagement with Aboriginal on the selection of Valued Components.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-338 and provide a revised response that is in accordance with the “Annex B – Goliath Gold Project IR-1 Companion Sheet.”

ID:

666

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-339

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review. Specifically, the section of the revised EIS the response points to does not provide an answer to the question of which Indigenous groups were engaged on VCs, and how the information was used, if at all.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-339 to provide additional technical information. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

667

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-340

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not answer the question of if or where baseline information provided by Naotkamegwanning First Nation is included in the updated EIS. Additionally, it is not clear if the 'go elsewhere' approach is still being used in the methodology in the updated EIS or if there is a rationale for the methodology used in the updated EIS for effects to Aboriginal peoples.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-340 and provide a response that answers whether baseline information provided by Naotkamegwanning First Nation is included in the updated EIS and if the 'go elsewhere approach' is being used in the methodology in the updated EIS for effects to Aboriginal peoples.

ID:

668

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-341

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response contains a reference to the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find information relevant to answer the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AC(1)-341.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

669

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-342

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete and the reviewer cannot determine if commercial fishing has been incorporated into the EIS in the Baseline or in the Effects Assessment.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AC(1)-342.

ID:

670

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-343

Complete:

Yes

ID:

671

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-344

Complete:

Yes

ID:

672

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-344b

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

The response also does not address the issue directly. The issue is regarding the lack of traditional land use studies conducted with Indigenous groups. The response is vague and states that more information about potential effects on Indigenous groups is provided in the revised EIS, which is not what is being requested here. For example, the response states "An expanded evaluation of the potential effects of the Project on Aboriginal peoples is provided in Section 6.21".

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-344b and revise the response to more specifically address the main issue, and explain in detail how it has been addressed. Keep in mind that an approach to dealing with this issue without meaningful engagement with the Indigenous group is insufficient.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal Engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

673

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-345

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

The response also does not provide concrete steps outlining how/if TMI has incorporated the information into the revised EIS.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a detailed response to information request AC(1)-345 explaining how TMI intends to address the concerns presented. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient). If the requested information cannot be provided, provide a rationale.

ID:

674

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-346

Complete:

Yes

ID:

675

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-347

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not answer if the proponent is considering a Traditional Knowledge or Traditional Use Study with Naotkamegwaning First Nation or how the proponent will attempt to get information with respect to Naotkamegwaning First Nation's Aboriginal and Treaty rights or uses in the Project-affected area.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-347 and revise response to answer if the proponent is considering a Traditional Knowledge or Traditional Use Study with Nootkamegwanning First Nation and how the proponent will attempt to get information with respect to Nootkamegwanning First Nation's Aboriginal and Treaty rights or uses in the Project-affected area.

ID:

676

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-348

Complete:

Yes

ID:

677

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-349

Complete:

Yes

ID:

678

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-350

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

The response describes the potential environmental effects of the Tailings Storage Facility (TSF) but does not identify or address any potential adverse effects of a TSF breach on the treaty rights, current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes and the socio-economic conditions of NFN (and other Treaty 3 Nations).

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AC(1)-350.

ID:

679

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-351

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided in Section 7 of the revised EIS is insufficient as it currently stands to allow a technical review. Revisions are required to address comments made in the completeness check to allow for the commencement of technical review of responses provided in Round 1 of IRs regarding the cumulative effects assessment.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Address the comments and information requested in related IRs for Cumulative Effects to address the current information request AC(1)-351:

TMI_251 – CE(1)-01

TMI_252 – CE(1)-02

TMI_254 – CE(1)-04

TMI_256 – CE(1)-06

TMI_257 – CE(1)-07

TMI_568 – AC(1)-242

ID:

680

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-352

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-352. Provide an assessment on how the conclusion that “the Project will provide an economic net benefit to the local, Aboriginal, regional, and provincial economies and will not result in adverse impact to Aboriginal and Treaty Rights or related interests,” was made in relation to the Nootkamegwanning First Nation.

ID:

681

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-353

Complete:

Yes

ID:

682

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-354

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is incomplete.

The response describes the potential environmental effects of the Tailings Storage Facility (TSF) but does not identify or address any potential adverse effects of a TSF breach on the treaty rights of NFN.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AC(1)-354.

ID:

683

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-355

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not answer the question as it is not apparent in the revised EIS where Nootkamegwanning First Nation’s baseline information is described and incorporated into the assessments on human VCs and treaty rights.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-355 and provide a response that demonstrates Nootkamegwanning First Nation’s baseline information is described and incorporated into the assessments on human VCs and treaty rights.

ID:

684

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-356

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not answer the question as the reference used is the Aboriginal Engagement Report, Appendix DD and the question states to undertake an assessment for:

- a. socio-economic conditions;
- b. health conditions;
- c. current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes;
- d. cultural heritage resources.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-356 and provide a response that demonstrates an assessment for effects to Nootkamegwanning First Nation’s:

- a. socio-economic conditions;
- b. health conditions;
- c. current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes; and
- d. cultural heritage resources;

is undertaken.

ID:

685

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-357

Complete:

Yes

ID:

686

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-358

Complete:

Yes

ID:

687

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-02

Complete:

Yes

ID:

688

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-03

Complete:

Yes

ID:

689

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-04

Complete:

Yes

ID:

690

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-05

Complete:

Yes

ID:

691

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-06

Complete:

Yes

ID:

692

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-07

Complete:

Yes

C

ID:

693

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-08

Complete:

Yes

ID:

694

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-09

Complete:

Yes

ID:

695

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-10

Complete:

Yes

ID:

696

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-11

Complete:

Yes

ID:

697

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-12

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question directly.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request PC(1)-12.

ID:

698

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-13

Complete:

Yes

ID:

699

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-14

Complete:

Yes

ID:

700

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-15

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The question about faults and draining of Thunder Lake was not addressed in the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request PC(1)-15.

ID:

701

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-16

Complete:

Yes

ID:

702

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-17

Complete:

Yes

ID:

703

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-18

Complete:

Yes

ID:

704

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-19

Complete:

Yes

ID:

705

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-20

Complete:

Yes

ID:

706

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-21

Complete:

Yes

ID:

707

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-22

Complete:

Yes

ID:

708

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-23

Complete:

Yes

ID:

709

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-25

Complete:

Yes

ID:

710

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-25

Complete:

Yes

ID:

711

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-26

Complete:

Yes

ID:

712

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-27

Complete:

Yes

ID:

713

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-28

Complete:

Yes

ID:

714

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-29

Complete:

Yes

ID:

715

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-30

Complete:

Yes

ID:

716

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-31

Complete:

Yes

ID:

717

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-32

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not address all the questions in information request PC(1)-32.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request PC(1)-32 and provide additional information to respond to questions related to monitoring results, compensation, and delayed effects.

ID:

718

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-33

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not address the questions related to sampling in private wells.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request PC(1)-33 and provide additional information to respond to the questions related to sampling in private wells.

ID:

719

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-34

Complete:

Yes

ID:

720

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-35

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The question about the potential interaction of cyanide destructions and the availability of mercury was not addressed in the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request PC(1)-35.

ID:

721

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-36

Complete:

Yes

ID:

722

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-37

Complete:

Yes

ID:

723

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-38

Complete:

Yes

ID:

724

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-39

Complete:

Yes

ID:

725

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-40

Complete:

Yes

ID:

726

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-41

Complete:

Yes

ID:

727

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-42

Complete:

Yes

ID:

728

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-43

Complete:

Yes

ID:

729

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-44

Complete:

Yes

ID:

730

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-45

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided on impacts to water quality and country foods is incomplete.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request PC(1)-45.

ID:

731

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-46

Complete:

Yes

ID:

732

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-47

Complete:

Yes

ID:

733

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-48

Complete:

Yes

ID:

734

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-49

Complete:

Yes

ID:

735

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-50

Complete:

Yes

ID:

736

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-51

Complete:

Yes

ID:

737

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-52

Complete:

Yes

ID:

738

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-53

Complete:

Yes

ID:

739

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-54

Complete:

Yes

ID:

740

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-55

Complete:

Yes

ID:

741

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-56

Complete:

Yes

ID:

742

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-57

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information request was not addressed in the response.

The information request states that "nothing is included to address whether there are potential impacts to historical travel routes to Mavis Lake and if so how those will be addressed." However, the response is generic and does not address the comment made.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request PC(1)-57.

ID:

743

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-58

Complete:

Yes

ID:

744

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-59

Complete:

Yes

ID:

745

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-60

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question directly.

The comment required Treasury Metals to address potential effects in the historical area called “Blueberry Camp” where people harvested blueberries for food and income and where medicinal plants grow. Although the response indicates that “specific information regarding the ‘blueberry camp’, and its location relative to the project has been shared with Treasury Metals”, it does not directly address the potential effects in the area known as “blueberry camp” but instead references blueberry harvesting areas in a general sense. It is unclear whether the 17 ha of “blueberry harvesting areas presented in appendix EE” includes the “Blueberry Camp”.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request PC(1)-745 and revise the response to specifically address the area of concern known as the “Blueberry Camp” used for medicinal plants, food and income.

ID:

746

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-61

Complete:

Yes

ID:

747

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-62

Complete:

Yes

ID:

748

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-63

Complete:

Yes

ID:

749

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-64

Complete:

Yes

ID:

750

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-65

Complete:

Yes

ID:

751

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-66

Complete:

Yes

ID:

752

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-67

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response refers to the entire alternatives assessment for mine waste disposal alternatives as well as seven additional IRs. This is too vague to allow one to find the direct response to the question. References should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request PC(1)-67.

The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response.

ID:

753

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-68

Complete:

Yes

ID:

754

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-69

Complete:

Yes

ID:

755

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-70

Complete:

Yes

ID:

756

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-71

Complete:

Yes

ID:

757

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-72

Complete:

Yes

ID:

758

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-73

Complete:

Yes

ID:

759

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-74

Complete:

Yes

ID:

760

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-75

Complete:

Yes

ID:

761

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-76

Complete:

Yes

ID:

762

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-77

Complete:

Yes

ID:

763

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-78

Complete:

Yes

ID:

764

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-79

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided does not answer the question directly. The question asks if concerns from Aboriginal communities were used to determine effects for VCs outlined in Section 12.2 Table 6.4.1-6. The response gives a vague response, and contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request PC(1)-79; revise the response to specifically address the question, and explain in detail how it has been incorporated into a revised EIS. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

765

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-80

Complete:

Yes

ID:

766

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-81

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review. Specifically, the response vaguely states the section in questions provides information “related to Aboriginal rights and claims that could be relevant to the Project”, without explaining why this information may be relevant to the Project. Additionally, the response contains a reference to a section of the revised EIS which is too vague to allow one to find the information relevant to the question. These references should be specific to the question at hand such that the reviewer can immediately find a direct link to expanded technical details supporting the response.

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request PC(1)-81 to provide a specific answer. The response should be self-contained to the extent possible. Where references to the revised EIS are used in the response, they should be focused to the issue at hand, provide only additional information to support the response, and be summarized within the response (reference to a chapter or Aboriginal engagement Report is not sufficient).

ID:

767

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-82

Complete:

Yes

ID:

768

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-83

Complete:

Yes

ID:

769

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-84

Complete:

Yes

ID:

770

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-85

Complete:

Yes

ID:

771

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-86

Complete:

Yes

ID:

772

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-87

Complete:

Yes

ID:

773

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-88

Complete:

Yes

ID:

774

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-89

Complete:

Yes

ID:

775

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-90

Complete:

Yes

ID:

776

IR-1 Reference #:

PC(1)-91

Complete:

Yes

ID:

777

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-359

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not answer how or where an assessment of impacts to Wabauskang First Nation's Aboriginal and Treaty rights has been conducted.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-359 and provide a response that demonstrates an assessment of impacts to Wabauskang First Nation's Aboriginal and Treaty rights was conducted.

ID:

778

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-360

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

Specific Information Required to Meet Completeness Check Requirements:

ID:

779

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-361

Complete:

Yes

ID:

780

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-362

Complete:

Yes

Context and Rationale:

Note there is a misnumbering issue, the reference in the table is 781 which is a duplicate.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

ID:

781

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-363

Complete:

Yes

ID:

782

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-364

Complete:

Yes

ID:

783

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-364b

Complete:

Yes

ID:

784

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-365

Complete:

Yes

ID:

785

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-366

Complete:

Yes

ID:

786

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-367

Complete:

Yes

ID:

787

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-368

Complete:

Yes

ID:

788

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-369

Complete:

Yes

ID:

789

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-370

Complete:

Yes

ID:

790

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-371

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not answer how or where an assessment of impacts to Wabauskang First Nation's Aboriginal and Treaty rights or uses, and how the gaps in information that Wabauskang First Nation noted have been addressed.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-371 and provide a response that demonstrates an assessment of impacts to Wabauskang First Nation's Aboriginal and Treaty rights was conducted and where possible information gaps were addressed. If unable, provide a rationale as to why the information was unable to be gathered.

ID:

791

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-372

Complete:

Yes

ID:

792

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-373

Complete:

Yes

ID:

793

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-374

Complete:

Yes

ID:

794

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-375

Complete:

Yes

ID:

795

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-376

Complete:

Yes

ID:

796

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-377

Complete:

Yes

ID:

797

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-378

Complete:

Yes

ID:

798

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-379

Complete:

Yes

ID:

799

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-380

Complete:

Yes

ID:

800

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-381

Complete:

Yes

ID:

801

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-382

Complete:

Yes

ID:

802

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-383

Complete:

Yes

ID:

803

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-384

Complete:

Yes

ID:

804

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-385

Complete:

Yes

ID:

805

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-386

Complete:

Yes

ID:

806

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-387

Complete:

Yes

ID:

807

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-388

Complete:

Yes

ID:

808

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-389

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The question about the Seepage Management Plan and effects to Thunder Lake was not addressed in the answer.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Provide a complete and detailed response to information request AC(1)-389.

ID:

809

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-390

Complete:

Yes

ID:

810

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-391

Complete:

Yes

ID:

811

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-392

Complete:

Yes

ID:

812

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-393

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is insufficient for a technical review. The references provided in the response do not lead to technical information answering the question.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to provide additional technical information.

ID:

813

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-394

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The information provided is insufficient for a technical review. The references provided in the response do not lead to technical information answering the question.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Revise the response to information request AC(1)-394 to provide additional technical information.

ID:

814

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-395

Complete:

Yes

ID:

815

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-396

Complete:

Yes

ID:

816

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-397

Complete:

Yes

ID:

817

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-398

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

Responses # TMI_817, 818, 832, and 836 may contradict each other.

Response # TMI_817 and # TMI_832 indicate that: "Rather than develop phase specific plans, Treasury Metals intends to develop a comprehensive list of management plans that will be implemented through all phases of the development of the Goliath Gold Project." However

Response 818 says that there will be a plan for each phase of the project.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review responses # TMI_817, 818, 832 and 836 and revise the responses to ensure consistency.

ID:

818

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-399

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

See the Context and Rationale for response # TMI_817

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

See the Specific Information Required for response # TMI_817

ID:

819

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-400

Complete:

Yes

ID:

820

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-401

Complete:

Yes

ID:

821

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-402

Complete:

Yes

ID:

822

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-403

Complete:

Yes

ID:

823

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-404

Complete:

Yes

ID:

824

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-405

Complete:

Yes

ID:

825

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-406

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

The response does not demonstrate that baseline information has been collected or incorporated into the assessment of impacts to Wabauskang First Nations' Aboriginal and Treaty rights. The Agency does not require proponents to undertake Traditional Use and Knowledge Studies; however there are other methods and opportunities to collect baseline information for example, engagement with Indigenous groups and publically available sources.

The response should document efforts to collect the data including engagement with Wabauskang First Nation. This should be documented in relation to all potentially impacted groups.

Additionally, commitments to ongoing engagement throughout the life of the project are not a substitute to conducting full and meaningful consultation during the EA, as directed by the Agency.

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

Review information request AC(1)-406 and revise the response to demonstrate attempts to collect and incorporate baseline information and impacts to Wabauskang First Nations' Aboriginal and Treaty rights.

ID:

826

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-407

Complete:

Yes

ID:

827

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-408

Complete:

Yes

ID:

828

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-409

Complete:

Yes

ID:

829

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-410

Complete:

Yes

ID:

830

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-411

Complete:

Yes

ID:

831

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-412

Complete:

Yes

ID:

832

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-413

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

See the Context and Rationale for response # TMI_817

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

See the Specific Information Required for response # TMI_817

ID:

833

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-414

Complete:

Yes

ID:

834

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-415

Complete:

Yes

ID:

835

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-416

Complete:

Yes

ID:

836

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-417

Complete:

No

Context and Rationale:

See the Context and Rationale for response # TMI_817

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

See the Specific Information Required for response # TMI_817

ID:

837

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-418

Complete:

Yes

ID:

838

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-419

Complete:

Yes

ID:

839

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-420

Complete:

Yes

ID:

840

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-421

Complete:

Yes

ID:

841

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-422

Complete:

Yes

ID:

842

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-423

Complete:

Yes

ID:

843

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-424

Complete:

Yes

ID:

844

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-425

Complete:

Yes

ID:

845

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-426

Complete:

Yes

ID:

846

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-427

Complete:

Yes

ID:

847

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-428

Complete:

Yes

ID:

848

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-429

Complete:

Yes

ID:

849

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-430

Complete:

Yes

ID:

850

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-431

Complete:

Yes

ID:

851

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-432

Complete:

Yes

Context and Rationale:

Specific Information Required to meet Completeness Check Requirements:

See the Specific Information Required for response # TMI_817

ID:

852

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-433

Complete:

Yes

ID:

853

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-434

Complete:

Yes

ID:

854

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-435

Complete:

Yes

ID:

855

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-436

Complete:

Yes

ID:

856

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-437

Complete:

Yes

ID:

857

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-438

Complete:

Yes

ID:

858

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-439

Complete:

Yes

ID:

859

IR-1 Reference #:

AC(1)-440

Complete:

Yes