

**Attachment 1**  
**Lynn Lake Gold Project**  
**Information Requirements for Environmental Impact Statement Technical Review**

On August 23, 2021 the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada commenced Round 2 technical review of the Environmental Impact Statement and responses to Round 1, Package 3 Information Requests for the Lynn Lake Gold Project. The table below is to assist in the preparation of Information Requests that support full understanding of the Project’s potential for significant adverse environmental effects and potential impacts to rights.

Reference IR#	Expert Dept. or group	EIS Guideline Reference	EIS Reference	Context and Rationale	The Proponent is Required to ...
<b>Topic or Valued Component (e.g. Project Overview; Environmental Assessment Methodology; Fish Habitat; etc.)</b>					
Nation or department name – IR number (Ro e.g. IAAC-01)	Nation or department Name e.g. IAAC	Reference the section(s) of the EIS Guidelines that relate to your comment, concern, or information request.  e.g. Part 2, Section 7.1.5 Fish and Fish Habitat	Reference the section(s) of the EIS that speak to your comment, concern, or information request.	Identify what the EIS Guidelines require and/or the link to the <i>Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012</i> (section 5 or section 19).  Briefly identify what the EIS presents and the information gap, inconsistency, or challenge.  Explain why filling that information gap is necessary to understanding potential significant adverse environmental effects to areas of federal jurisdiction or impacts to rights.	Describe the information required. Focus on the essential information, explanation, or justification required.

IAAC-148	DFO 7	6.1.6 Fish and fish habitat; 6.2.3 Changes to riparian, wetland and terrestrial environments; 6.3.1 Fish and fish habitat	11.2.2 Overview 11.4.2.3 Project Residual Effects	<p>Based on the response to IAAC-148, the proponent makes the assumption that swamps (i.e., treed and shrubby) are nonfish bearing if they "they are not connected to any fish-bearing watercourse, as determined by field surveys conducted in the summers of 2016 and 2019 and in the spring and summer of 2020, and if they are sufficiently shallow to freeze to the bottom in winter (i.e., &lt; 50 cm)."</p> <p>Based on the response to IAAC-148, the proponent states that "Of these, only the 'shrubby swamps' around East Pond and adjacent to the East Pond outlet channel will be affected by the Project (due to water draw-down caused by development of the open pit). The spatial area of these 'shrubby swamps', and their use by brook stickleback for spawning, rearing, and potential overwintering, will be included in the calculation of harmful alteration, disruption, or destruction (HADD)".</p> <p>See Appendix A.2, Attachment IAAC-148, Map 1 and Map 2. KEE3-B2 was confirmed to be fish bearing in 2016 and 2020; COC2-LOB2-MIN5-C1 and COC2-LOB2-MIN5 were confirmed fish-bearing in 2020; FAR7-A1 and FAR5-CA were confirmed fish bearing in 2016.</p> <p>See Appendix A.2, Attachment IAAC-147. Gordon site has 1.8 ha of 'shrubby swamp' and 2.3 ha of 'treed swamps' that will be permanently destroyed during construction through to mine closure within the PDA. MacLellan site has 9.2 ha of 'shrubby swamp' and 59.8 ha of 'treed swamp' that will be permanently destroyed during construction through to mine closure within the PDA.</p>	<p>DFO does not agree with the rationale the proponent has made to identify the fish-bearing status of wetlands, specifically as it pertains to wetlands that will be directly impacted (i.e., destroyed) as a result of the MSRA and TMF construction. Currently, impacts related to fish-bearing wetlands are only being accounted for around East Pond.</p> <p>In order to characterize potential effects to fish and fish habitat, the proponent should undertake additional fisheries inventories for a subset of the shrubby and treed wetlands. The subset of wetlands is based on the criteria that: 1) wetlands are located upland of a fish-bearing waterbody, and 2) that wetlands will be directly overprinted by PDA infrastructure works (i.e., MRSA or TMF). Therefore, additional fisheries data are required for wetlands upland of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- KEE3-B2 which is located within the footprint of the MRSA and TMF (MacLellan Site),</li> <li>- COC2-LOB2-MIN5-C1 and COC2-LOB2-MIN5 located within the footprint of the MRSA (MacLellan Site)</li> <li>- FAR7-A1 located within the footprint of the MRSA (Gordon Site)</li> <li>- FAR5-CA located within the footprint of the MRSA (Gordon Site).</li> </ul> <p>Provide photo evidence of these sites, including sites where fish sampling could not be conducted due to limited habitat availability.</p> <p>Alternatively, the Proponent could take the precautionary approach and assume that all treed and shrubby wetlands which directly overlap the MRSA and TMF support fish and include these as part of the total impacts to fish and fish habitat.</p>
----------	-------	---	--	---	---