

Identifier	Topic	Reference to EIS/EA Report	Summary of Previous Comment	Proponent's Response to Previous Comment	Follow-up comment/ Request for Information	New Proponent Response	Subsequent Comment
			<i>Date: March 2014</i> MNR-1	<i>Date: June 2015</i>	<i>Date: August 2015</i>		
MNRF 1	Transmission lines	EIS/EA 4.2.8, 4.2.8.1	<p>MNRF identified that more information was required on the physical description and location of where the lines are proposed and better description of how the transmission line will cross Sawbill Bay. MNRF identified that the third alternative did not have adequate consultation.</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</p>	<p>The amended AAR did include two additional comparisons which were length of the road and number of water crossings for each alternative, but no other comparatives were used such as presence or absences of wetlands, sensitive nesting sites, spawning sites etc.</p> <p>With the information provided, the proponent has prematurely concluded 'the alternatives are not anticipated to affect water quality, air quality, stream flows, or ground water. It is well recognized that there are potential environmental impacts with construction and maintenance of transmission lines. Activities that are often associated with transmission lines include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access. There will need to be new access to much of the proposed corridor area to allow construction of the line. - Tree clearing and vegetation clearing. - Blasting may be required for foundation construction. - Excavation of overburden. <p>All of these activities have some potential for environmental effect. It is expected the assessment of alternatives would consider these types of potential effects in the assessment as well as social/aesthetic concern <u>and have them presented on the Comparisons Evaluation Table.</u></p> <p>The alternative that crosses Sawbill bay was added after the baseline studies were done and there are data gaps. As well, there has been no data collected on the Alternative 2 (Raft Lake Road), which has been excluded in the study area.</p>	<p>Additional information provided in: Supplemental Assessment of Access Road and Transmission Line Routing Alternatives supplied in Part 4 of Version 3 Alternative Assessment TSD</p>	MNRF 1B

Identifier	Topic	Reference to EIS/EA Report	Summary of Previous Comment	Proponent's Response to Previous Comment	Follow-up comment/ Request for Information	New Proponent Response	Subsequent Comment
			Date: March 2014 MNR-1	Date: June 2015	Date: August 2015		
				<p>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 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>	<p>An alternative of a submarine option was not considered.</p> <p>The information in the No Net Loss Plan is not adequate for the water crossings. There are a limited number of crossings described. And it is likely that most of the crossings will be considered under the <i>Public Lands Act</i>, not the <i>LRIA</i>, for which there has not been adequate EA coverage.</p> <p>Water crossing information is important for evaluation and assessment purposes for both the transmission line and road corridors. Not only from an environmental aspect (the number, the type (culvert vs bridge), the disturbance required, the sensitivity of the site, etc, but also from an economic and social impact aspect.</p> <p>Fig. 1-3, Fig 2-1, Fig 2-2 and Fig 2-3 do not show the three alternatives.</p> <p>Regarding more information about how the proponent plans to cross Sawbill Bay, the addendum continues to lack information. Information provided at the face to face meeting of July 8, 2014 showed proposed locations of the towers, as drawings of the tower designs. The steel tower structure in those drawings are shown to be 52-63m tall. In discussions with Hydro One, structures to span these distances will need to be very tall (i.e. likely greater than >100m) and will likely require additional requirements such as aviation lighting.</p>		