
HAMMOND REEF GOLD PROJECT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON FINAL EIS/EA

COMMENT – T-6

Source: Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency

Summary of Comment

It was noted that there are several indicators where the score is the same for all options (e.g., section 3.5.2.1.7 Dam Hazard Classification).

Proposed Action

Clarify why an indicator that had the same score for all alternatives was used.

Reference to EIS

Appendix 4.1 Mine Waste Disposal Alternatives Assessment Version 2

Response

Where the potential existed for an indicator to differ between alternatives, it was evaluated and included in the multiple accounts analysis to document that the indicator had been considered. (This is in contrast to the non-differentiating indicators that are discussed in Section 3.4.5, which are indicators where no difference between the candidate sites is even possible, given the general site conditions.) In the example cited in the comment (Dam Hazard Classification), the indicator considers localized factors such as the potential for loss of life and loss of infrastructure, therefore the potential existed for this indicator to differ among alternatives. For this reason, it was evaluated and included in the assessment. The inclusion of indicators with the same score does not affect the final ranking of the alternatives because the indicator scoring contributes equally to the final score for each alternative. Potential indicators that were truly non-differentiating (e.g., potential for acid rock drainage, potential for metal leaching, seismic risk) were not included in the multiple accounts analysis.