

Identifier	Topic	Reference to EIS/EA Report	Summary of Comment	Proponent's Response	Subsequent Comment
			<i>Date: March 2014</i>	<i>Date: June 2015 Same response as MNR-1</i>	
MNR-2	Transmission Line and Power		<p>As raised previously during the draft EA review, it is not clear how the Tailings Management Area, pumping stations, and accommodation camp will be powered. The response provided by Osisko [Canadian Malartic Corporation] to this question was that the power would be supplied to any required areas within the mine study area through appropriate overhead or over ground wiring as will be determined in the detailed design stage of the project. This is not an acceptable response.</p> <p>The EA does not provide a description of the auxiliary line. There is more detail required to support the claim that utilizing an ROW will not result in additional biophysical or socioeconomic impacts. Table 3-9 of the TSD, the conclusions of 'yes' need to be substantiated further. The comparisons made in sections 3.7.1 are not adequate. For Table 3-10, the statement that all the alternatives will not affect water quality, that all alternatives will avoid aquatic habitats, needs a thorough and transparent rationalization of how that conclusion was made.</p> <p>The comparison of impacts to the terrestrial environment, as presented, also needs much more detail and rationalization. MNR would like to see indicators such as the number and type of water crossings, wetlands, presence or absence of pawning/calving/nesting sites, foot print of the alternative, proximity to people, etc. in the analysis for comparison.</p> <p>The EA identified that only one available alternative is feasible for the auxiliary line and that is to source the power from Atikokan Generating Station. But the EA does not suggest there has been an agreement or how they plan to source the power from the Atikokan Generating Station and if there is current and future capacity. Where it has been deemed that there is a single feasible alternative for the auxiliary power line, the EA needs to provide more assurance the single feasible alternative will deliver, and more detail to support why there is only one option.</p> <p>The third alternative (the preferred alternative) was presented after the ToR was approved. There has not been a clear delivery of the consultation process that occurred before the additional alternative was presented in the draft and final EA. The letter and presentations that were presented to the public showed the addition of the fibre optic line to follow the new proposed transmission line, but not the three transmission line alternatives. MNR was not consulted on the preferred alternative before the</p>	<p>An evaluation of transmission line alternatives was provided in Chapter 4, Section 4.2.8 and in the Alternatives Assessment TSD including quantification of water crossings. Alternatives were compared against environmental criteria, with a focus on terrestrial ecology as construction will mainly involve clearing of vegetation. The alternatives are not anticipated to affect water quality, air quality, stream flows, or groundwater quality and quantity.</p> <p>The transmission line is included in the Terrestrial Ecology local study area and a description of terrestrial habitat in the study area, including wetlands, is provided in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10 and in the Terrestrial Ecology TSD. Detailed design and construction of supports will avoid watercourses, wetlands and sensitive habitat areas.</p> <p>Water crossings required for the Project were considered as part of the aquatic assessment and included in No Net Loss Plan. Authorization for installation of water crossings will be obtained under the Lakes & Rivers Improvement Act. Figure 5-12 of the Final EIS/EA Report provides the existing and planned water crossings. These water crossings are included in the aquatics assessment and have been considered in the No Net Loss Planning.</p> <p>Design/construction mitigation measures are outlined in Chapter 8 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Vegetated riparian buffers will remain around watercourses crossings to the extent possible ■ Avoid vegetation clearing within the breeding bird window where possible. ■ Pre-clearing surveys will demark active nests and set up appropriate buffer areas. ■ Design transmission lines to minimize collisions and electrocution of birds ■ Selectively clear transmission line pathway without grading or stripping or topsoil ■ Provide compensation for lost habitat if required (e.g., bats) ■ Construction will adhere to erosion and sediment control plans ■ Compensate for habitat at stream crossings, if habitat is disturbed <p>The transmission line will be designed and constructed in consultation with HydroOne following their specifications and the requirements of the Ontario Electricity Safety Code. Canadian Malartic Corporation will work with HydroOne during the design stage to determine an appropriate operation/maintenance plan for the period after construction is complete</p> <p>The transmission line will provide 100 MW of power per year to the Project site and have a total length of approximately 20 km. The length of the transmission line from Highway 622 to Hardtack/Sawbill Road Intersection is approximately 14 km, the length of the transmission line section spanning from the Hardtack/Sawbill Road Intersection to Sawbill Bay is approximately 2.3 km and the final length of the line</p>	MNR-2

Identifier	Topic	Reference to EIS/EA Report	Summary of Comment	Proponent's Response	Subsequent Comment
			<i>Date: March 2014</i>	<i>Date: June 2015</i> <i>Same response as MNR-1</i>	
			<p>EA and could have provided additional suggestions for possibly more practical alternatives. MNR has expressed concern that other alternative methods such a submarine approach to crossing Sawbill Bay were not considered or presented.</p> <p>There are data gaps in the terrestrial assessment for the linear corridors, including the preferred alternative. Specifically for upland breeding bird surveys, marsh bird and nocturnal bird surveys, and amphibian and turtle surveys. Prior to implementation of upgrades and road construction as well as construction of the transmission line, these surveys will have to be completed.</p> <p>There needs to be section (table) in the report that clearly identifies ALL the alternatives that have been considered, and are being considered and those that are being brought forward as preferred. This includes the alternatives that were presented in the ToR and in the Project Description, those that were not deemed feasible or deemed to have only one possible alternative. The report does not clearly do this.</p> <p>Sawbill Bay crossing and Auxiliary Power Line were additional to the approved ToR. The EA does not include alternatives such as a submarine option or new corridor. Data gaps exist in the baseline data.</p> <p>Fig 1-3 does not adequately demonstrate this information. The preferred power transmission line corridor is not shown and there is not enough detail for any of the mine site components. As in comment MNR-11, an overall map is required that shows all components of the proposed project. We would like to see a map at the scale of Fig 4-6, but including the entire project. There is still confusion as to how the TMA, pumping stations and the mine facilities will be powered.</p>	<p>spanning from the Sawbill Bay Crossing to the Mine Site is an estimated 2.3 km. An estimated 85 towers will be required, the first 14 km of which will be composed of wood (H-frame) structures, and the second 6 km section is planned to include steel towers to allow for the longer spans across Sawbill Bay. A submarine crossing of Sawbill Bay was considered but not identified in the EA as a feasible alternative for the Project due to economic and environmental considerations.</p> <p>Power from the transmission line will be distributed to the Project facilities, including the TMF, TMF pumping stations and the accommodation camp through on-site power distribution systems. The on-site power distribution systems will be located within the identified Project footprint and EA study areas, and will generally follow the same alignment as other linear infrastructure (roads and pipelines). The environmental impact of disturbance within the Project footprint has been considered in the assessment. The on-site power distribution plan is conceptual at this time. Detailed design has not been undertaken and some flexibility is required.</p> <p>Canadian Malartic Corporation has volunteered for an individual EA based on the understanding that additional approval processes will not be required for power lines and roads. Subjecting on site power distribution to separate approval processes under the Environmental Assessment Act would be contrary to the agreed upon terms of the Voluntary Agreement signed between MOE and Canadian Malartic Corporation in August 2011</p> <p>The auxiliary line is no longer required, and is no longer part of the Project description.</p> <p>Canadian Malartic Corporation acknowledges that additional information is likely to be required for MNR approval of land disposition for the transmission line and substation. An extensive evaluation of alternatives was conducted, and the most suitable option was chosen to move forward with the Project. We are confident in the preferred alternative selected.</p> <p>With respect to upland breeding bird, marsh bird, nocturnal bird, amphibian and turtle surveys, the surveys undertaken for the EA included consideration of the alternative linear infrastructure corridors as shown in Figures 2-1, 2-2 and 2-3 of the Terrestrial Ecology TSD. Survey sites were selected based on the likelihood of habitat presence. We feel that the baseline surveys completed to date are sufficient for the EA and additional surveys are not required.</p> <p>The transmission line corridor has been clearly mapped in Figure 1-3 of the Final EIS/EA report. Figure 5-1 also shows all the Project components along with the transmission line crossing.</p>	