Table A - IR2: Information Requests 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference #</th>
<th>Link to IR1</th>
<th>Ecosystem Topic</th>
<th>Reference to EIS Guidelines</th>
<th>Reference to EIS</th>
<th>Summary of Comment/ Rationale</th>
<th>Information Request</th>
<th>Response to Information Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T(2)-17 (originally R(2)-07 – brought forward to Table A)</td>
<td>T-35, T-39, T-40, T-43, A-11</td>
<td>Water Quality Environmental Management Planning</td>
<td>10.2.3.1, 10.9.4</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Sections 5.1.2, 5.2.1.3, 5.2.3</td>
<td>In the review of the draft EIS, it was noted in the Hydrogeology Technical Supporting Document (TSD), dated February 2013 that a trough of granular material was encountered to depths of approximately 25m at the southwest section of the tailings management facility (TMF). Groundwater elevations at the monitoring well (BRH-0020) are about 2 metres above those of the Upper Marmion Reservoir. This suggests that overburden groundwater in this area readily discharges to Upper Marmion Reservoir through a permeable pathway in granular materials. The proponent plans to collect seepage from the TMF along the downstream toe of the TMF dams but did not consider seepage from the base of the TMF. Thus, it was requested that the proponent provide an evaluation of the potential seepage to groundwater underneath the TMF and assessment of the potential effect the seepage could have on groundwater quality and the resultant surface water quality in Lizard Lake and Upper Marmion Reservoir.</td>
<td>1. Drill additional boreholes to obtain borehole and stratigraphic logs to characterize the permeability of the base of the entire TMF. Develop a plan for the additional boreholes and stratigraphic logs in discussion with relevant government agencies to ensure adequate characterization of baseline conditions within the proposed TMF footprint.</td>
<td>2. If the results indicate that the base of the TMF is permeable (as compared to thick sequences of laterally continuous clay), provide responses to and action on questions 3-7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference #</td>
<td>Link to IR1</td>
<td>Ecosystem Topic</td>
<td>Reference to EIS Guidelines</td>
<td>Reference to EIS</td>
<td>Summary of Comment/ Rationale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Effects from seepage losses from the base of the TMF are on surface water quality and fish and fish habitat in Lizard Lake and in Upper Marmion Reservoir. The entire TMF needs to be modeled with sufficient monitoring well data and the use of particle tracking in order to determine the groundwater flow paths and the fate of chemical constituents in the TMF seepage water. The 3D groundwater modeling must be re-run and the sensitivity analysis and model results provided.

  - Based on the review of the Technical Memorandum on the 3D groundwater Modelling (dated May 21, 2014), the following deficiencies were noted:

    - The model is not calibrated properly nor was a detailed conceptual model presented. The conceptual model provides a visual depiction of the existing groundwater system including stratigraphic layers (shown in cross sections or block diagrams) and information on groundwater flow directions.

    - Hydraulic conductivity for the overburden is poorly characterized and based on limited single-well response tests and estimates based on grain-size distribution. Hydraulic conductivity is an important model parameter that can significantly affect model outcomes.

    - The assumption of horizontal:vertical = 1:0.1 is not supported by the borehole data. The borehole logs do not show thick sequences of clay that are continuous across the TMF site.

    - The proponent’s response to previous comments about seepage effects on Lizard Lake have focused on the operating phase of the mine, or the immediate post-operating phase when human intervention is still available to manage seepage. Seepage loss during post-closure phase could be a concern if permeability of units underneath TMF is higher than modeled, even with revegetation. The proponent needs to adequately model the post-closure (abandonment) phase to assess the long-term effects of seepage losses to Lizard Lake and the Upper Marmion Reservoir.

  - The proponent indicates that there are many additional options to intercept seepage but does not identify other possible mitigation measures. The proponent indicated that the current plan for the seepage collection systems is in the conceptual stage only and that ditching and pumping stations will be utilized. However, no further details are provided. It is important to provide details on the seepage collection systems, taking into consideration the results of the 3D groundwater model for the entire TMF, in order to assess not only the effectiveness and suitability of the proposed mitigation measures, but also the comparative suitability of the proposed site itself. Furthermore, it is important to have information on the framework of the follow-up program to monitor seepage and to identify the response actions that would be undertaken in the event that a malfunction were to occur or in the event seepage beneath the TMF is greater than predicted.

  - This information will assist the Agency in assessing the adverse environmental effects of seepage losses from the TMF, the magnitude and geographic extent (direction and distance) of any seepage that may pass underneath the TMF to Lizard Lake and Upper Marmion Reservoir and the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures. This information is required in order for the Agency to provide a recommendation to the federal Minister of Environment on whether the project is likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects.

**Information Request**

**Response to Information Request**

**Response:**

To complete the requested undertaking would require a level of effort commensurate with the detailed feasibility and design phases of a project.

The EIS/EA must adequately address potential for impact to the environment at a level that allows for appropriate decision making with respect to the potential for impacts of a given project. The current assessment is suitable and appropriate to make these decisions for the following reasons as documented in the TSD and subsequent IR Responses as provided in the Final EIS/EA Report Addendum (June 2015):

1. All water and chemical mass load placed on the TMF is accounted for in the discharge, and is used in analysis of basin impact, with no resulting aquatic effects (see TSDs as identified and T-R-34, T-39 and IR MOE-NR-GW-16 from the first round of IRS)

   - To state this differently, we assign water the same concentration, based on the chemistry of the tailings, weather it leaves as surface water or groundwater, and both of these waters report to Maimion Basin in our assessment – if we increase groundwater discharge, then there will be more infiltration, and less surface runoff so the total amount of water, and mass load, will be the same – regardless of the outcome of any groundwater modeling.

2. Even at full predicted concentrations of the tailings water (i.e. groundwater reporting directly to surface water in the basin) there are no resulting aquatic impacts (IR MOE-NR-GW-16 from the first round of IRS)

Therefore it follows that

3. As a result of points 1, and 2, above it is inconsequential weather the water (or chemical mass) reports via a surface water pathway or groundwater pathway, it is all accounted for, and at full concentrations (and full mass loads) does not cause aquatic impacts, either as a point source, or overall mass load to the basin.

Based on the above CMC submits that:

- there is ample evidence and analyses completed to reasonably conclude there will be no impact to human health, terrestrial life, or aquatic life, regardless of the outcome of any proposed groundwater modelling conducted.

- as a result CMC further submits that the current groundwater analyses and model is sufficient to reasonably make decisions regarding potential project impacts at the Hammond reef property.

CMC did conduct some supplemental modelling in response to regulator concerns (see IR T-40 located in Appendix 1.V of the Final EIS/EA Report), it was directed at responding to questions related to the North and West sides of the TMF, and demonstrating that seepage capture was feasible under typical conditions, as was requested by the reviewers. The intent was not to model the entire basin at the level of detail design.
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CMC acknowledges that understanding the groundwater will be important during construction and operation of the facility, such that appropriate seepage reduction or collection measures can be incorporated into the final design.

CMC is willing to commit to the following course of action (as a condition of approval of the EIS/EA), but only as part of the detailed design engineering work to be completed prior to construction:

- Collection of the requested additional drilling data in Item 1 of the request during the detailed design phase of the project through installation of 3 to 5 monitoring wells within the central area of the impoundment.
- Collection of additional data through drilling, including depth to bedrock, and sediment profiles along all proposed dam alignments.
- Re-evaluation of all potential seepage pathways for each proposed dam of the facility, including 2D seepage models (or a 3D model if needed depending on the results of drilling in the center of the impoundment), in order to produce:
  - Phreatic surface detail and seepage rates for dam stability analysis
  - Detailed design drawings for each dam
  - Construction specifications and material specifications for the dam proper
  - Construction specifications for seepage interception and collection, including depths of ditches, pumping requirements, and interception well requirements as needed to achieve the seepage design objectives.
  - This will satisfy the overall request, and in particular Item 7 of the above request

To be clear CMC believes that seepage capture objectives as stated in the EIS/EA document are effectively achievable through engineering controls that will be put in place for the project, additional data will be collected and modelling will be completed during the detailed design phase, and CMC is willing to accept these requirements as conditions of EIS/EA approval, however given the cost of the proposed course of action in the request it is not realistic or feasible for CMC to undertake this at this time.