

| 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> MTCS-6 | <i>Date: June 2015</i> | <i>Date: September 2015</i> | <i>Date: July 2016</i> | |
| MTCS-6B | Monitoring | EIS/EA §8.2, p. 8-5 | Potential archaeological monitoring is needed. | <p>Canadian Malartic will comply with the conditions of the relevant work permits required for the draining of Mitta Lake; however, archaeological monitoring during the drainage is not being considered at this time. Archaeological monitoring during the drainage of Mitta Lake was not recommended in the Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment report. During the Stage 1 property inspection, it was observed that much of the area surrounding the lake was wetland and that the only areas to have archaeological potential near the lake were small pockets of land on the east side of Mitta Lake. This area was test pit surveyed, where possible and no artifacts (Aboriginal or Euro- Canadian) were recovered. Furthermore, Section 7.0 – Advice on Compliance with Legislation indicates: Should previously undocumented archaeological resources be discovered, they may be representative of a new archaeological site or sites and therefore subject to Section 48(1) of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>, R.S.O. 1990 c.O.18 (Government of Ontario 1990a). The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a licensed consultant archaeologist to carry out archaeological fieldwork, in compliance with Section 48(1) of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>.</p> <p>Canadian Malartic will comply with the legislation.</p> | <p>The Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment report provided no documentation nor included any discussion on the drainage of waterbodies within the study area. Review of archaeological assessment reports submitted in 2013 by Ministry staff was based solely on documentation provided in the Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment report at that time and, not being made aware of this factor, could offer no guidance on this matter. As prior water levels for Mitta Lake are not yet documented, archaeological monitoring is required.</p> <p>Please note the caveat in the attached Ministry letter of October 9, 2014, for the Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment:</p> <p>1 In no way will the ministry be liable for any harm, damages, costs, expenses, losses, claims or actions that may result: (a) if the Report(s) or its recommendations are discovered to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent; or (b) from the issuance of this letter. Further measures may need to be taken in the event that additional artifacts or archaeological sites are identified or the Report(s) is otherwise found to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent.</p> | <p>The information provided in the Stage 1 and 2 report was the information that was provided to the archaeologist at the time of initial writing of the report.</p> <p>The Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessment was completed under the 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTCS 2011). As per Section 2.1 of the Stage 1 and 2 archaeological report, in accordance with the MTCS' 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Section 1.3.1), the following are features or characteristics that indicate archaeological potential:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previously identified archaeological sites; • Water sources, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Primary water sources (lakes, rivers, streams, creeks) - Secondary water sources (intermittent streams and creeks; springs; marshes; swamps) - Features indicating past water sources (e.g. glacial lake shorelines indicated by the presence of raised gravel, sand, or beach ridges; relic river or stream channels indicated by clear dip or swale in the topography; shorelines of drained lakes or marshes; and cobble beaches) - Accessible or inaccessible shoreline (e.g. high bluffs, swamps or marsh fields by the edge of a lake; sandbars stretching into marsh); • Elevated topography (eskers, drumlins, large knolls, plateaux); • Pockets of well drained sandy soil, especially near areas of heavy soil or rocky ground; • Distinctive land formations that might have been special or spiritual places, such as waterfalls, rock outcrops, caverns, mounds, | |

| 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 |
|------------|-------|----------------------------|---|--|--|--|--------------------|
| | | | <p>Date: March 2014 MTCS-6</p> | <p>Date: June 2015</p> | <p>Date: September 2015</p> | <p>Date: July 2016</p> | |
| | | | | | | <p>and promontories and their bases (there may be physical indicators of their use, such as burials, structures, offerings, rock paintings or carvings);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource areas including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Food or medicinal plants - Scarce raw minerals (e.g. quartz, copper, ochre or outcrops of chert) - Early Euro-Canadian industry (fur trade, mining, logging); • Areas of Euro-Canadian settlement; and • Early historical transportation routes. <p>Additionally, as indicated in the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists, Section 1.3.3, survey areas in the Canadian Shield may be reduced and recommended for alternative strategies for Stage 2 survey. More specifically Section 1.3.3, Standard 2 indicates that there may be small pockets (sand plains, clay plains, glacial beach ridges, etc) that possess a higher degree of potential and differing characteristics from most of the surrounding environment that should be considered to have potential. Where such areas of higher potential are identified, undertake a complete assessment and systematic surveys.</p> <p>Based on this information, archaeological potential, as specifically stated in the Stage 1 and 2 report, centred on water sources, potential ancient shorelines and relic beach ridges, drumlins, and small pockets of sand plains or clay plains, where identified in the Stage 1 background research and property inspection.</p> <p>Background information conducted in 2010 does not indicate that Lake Mitta has any additional significance than any other water body within the study area. The Stage 2 property survey conducted in 2012 surveyed and/or documented the entire area surrounding Lake Mitta. The majority of the area could not be surveyed as it was steeply sloped</p> | |

| 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 MTCS-6 | Date: June 2015 | Date: September 2015 | Date: July 2016 | |
| | | | | | | <p>(please see figure 11Q). Given the steeply sloped nature of the shoreline, archaeological potential under water is highly unlikely. Rather, archaeological potential would be further away for the current Lake Mitta, in the documented disturbed areas. Based on the topography of the shoreline of the lake and based on the identification of archaeological potential based on MTCS' Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists, there is no rationale for recommending archaeological monitoring during the draining of Lake Mitta.</p> <p>During construction, advice on compliance with legislation as documented in Section 7.0 of the Stage 1 and 2 report, and reiterated below, will be adhered to.</p> <p>Should previously undocumented archaeological resources be discovered, they may be representative of a new archaeological site or sites and therefore subject to Section 48(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990 c.O.18 (Government of Ontario 1990a). The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a licensed consultant archaeologist to carry out archaeological fieldwork, in compliance with Section 48(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act.</p> <p>Although the archaeological potential under the water in Mitta Lake is highly unlikely, based on recommendations from the MTCS, remote archaeological monitoring will be conducted during the draining of Mitta Lake. This remote monitoring will consist of scheduled review of photo documentation taken by staff on-site to determine if closer examination is required. The commitment to undertake this monitoring will be added to project commitments registry.</p> | |