

Table B - IR2: Regulatory Requests and Suggested Actions Derived from the Canadian Malartic Corporation's Responses to Information Request #1 (IR1) on the Final Environmental Impact Statement /Environmental Assessment Report for the Federal Environmental Assessment of the Hammond Reef Gold Mine Project

Reference #	Link to IR1	Ecosystem Topic	Reference to EIS Guidelines	Reference to EIS	Summary of Comment/ Rationale	Regulatory Request/ Suggested Action
R(2)-02	T-7, T-10s	Alternatives Assessment	7.4	Appendix 4.1 Mine Waste Disposal Alternatives Assessment Version 2	<p>The proponent stated that detailed hydrogeological information necessary to evaluate the suggested metrics is only available for one final alternative, TMF-3 (the base case). As such, the proponent opted to evaluate the final alternatives (TMF-1, TMF-2, and TMF-3) for impacts to groundwater based on the complexity of the seepage collection system rather than the suggested metrics (e.g., hydraulic conductivity, depth to the bedrock, groundwater depth, etc.)</p> <p>This basis of comparison does not consider impacts to groundwater quality in the alternatives analysis. In the absence of the adequate hydrogeological information, it is difficult to assess the merits of the alternative locations to the base case location in the context of impacts to groundwater in the Multiple Accounts Analysis (MAA).</p> <p>Hydrogeological characterization is required for the other two final alternative locations (i.e. TMF-1 and TMF-2) to evaluate and compare impacts to groundwater of these alternatives with the base case.</p> <p>This information is requested for possible inclusion in the <i>Metal Mining Effluent Regulations</i> Schedule 2 Amendment regulatory process,</p>	For the final alternative locations, TMF-1 and TMF-2, provide detailed hydrogeological characterizations and evaluate and compare TMF-1 and TMF-2 impacts to groundwater with the base case alternative location, TMF-3.