## Attachment 1 – Technical Review of Round 2 Information Request Responses – Lynn Lake Gold Project

**Information Request Responses - Technical Review Optional Feedback Form**

**Objective:** Taking into account the information provided in the Round 2 Information Request responses from Alamos Gold Inc., please identify any areas in the responses to the Information Requests that require further information to understand the potential environmental effects of the Project, and the significance of those effects to the components of the environment.

**Please provide us with your comments on the Information Request responses by June 23, 2022**

| Reference IR# | Expert Dept. or group | EIS Guideline Reference | EIS Reference | Context and Rationale | The Proponent is Required to … |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Cumulative Effects** | | | | | |
| IAAC-R2-51 | HC | 4.2.2 Community Knowledge and Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge<br><br>6.2.1 Changes to the atmospheric environment<br><br>6.2.3 Changes to riparian, wetland, and terrestrial environments<br><br>6.3.4 Indigenous peoples<br><br>6.6.3 Cumulative Effects Assessment | 4.3.2.1 Spatial Boundaries<br><br>4.3.2.2 Temporal Boundaries<br><br>7.4.1.1 Analytical Assessment Techniques<br><br>Map 7-1<br><br>EIS Volume 5, Appendix A Tables 8.1 and 8.3 Figures G1 to G25<br><br>Federal IR Responses, Round 1, Package 1, Response to | **Statements on the dustfall and metals accumulation baseline data used in the cumulative effects assessment on soils and country foods are inconsistent.**<br><br>The response to IAAC-R2-51, part d), indicates that "the 95% upper confidence limit (UCLM) prediction of dust fall, and metal accumulation in soil within the LAA" was used to assess potential risks of direct exposure via soil and country foods in the cumulative effects assessment. However, based on the response to IAAC-R2-86, the baseline dustfall rate used in the human health risk assessment was a *mean* calculated from the 2016 sampling dataset (n=7 samples) as opposed to the 95% UCLM. | Health Canada suggests that the Agency request the following information from the Proponent:<br><br>a) Confirm whether the prediction of dustfall, and metal accumulation in soil within the LAA was based on the 95% upper confidence limit (UCLM) or median values for both the *HHRA*, and the *cumulative effects assessment*, and why these might be different. Discuss whether the values used are protective of human receptors, including traditional harvesters, under current and future use scenarios. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | IAAC-<br>18 | | |
| **Noise and Vibration** | | | | | |
| IAAC-R2-96 | IAAC<br>HC | 6.1.1 Atmospheric environment<br><br>6.2 Predicted changes to the physical environment | 7.1.4.1 Spatial boundaries<br><br>7.3 Project interactions with noise and vibration<br><br>7.4.1. Noise<br><br>Volume 5, Appendix C: Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Technical Modelling Report<br><br>Federal IR Responses, Round 1, Package 2, Response to IAAC-132 | **It is unclear how the timing of vehicle-generated noise has been accounted by the noise model.**<br><br>a) The response to IAAC-R2-96 indicates that the model assumed that traffic volume along PR-391 would be consistent for each hour of the day, and does not account for particular times of the day when vehicle counts may be higher (e.g., deliveries are most likely to occur during the day). This could, therefore, underestimate truck traffic at certain times of the day, and overestimate truck traffic at other times. It is particularly important to consider traffic counts during the night-time hours along the vehicle routes, given that night-time noise can be more annoying and may also result in short and long-term sleep disturbance.<br><br>**The previous response to IAAC-132 appears to omit key receptors.**<br><br>b) The response to IAAC-132 indicated that, "construction sound level results presented in Table 7-7 and 7-8 (Chapter 7 of the EIS) include the current noise from PR 391 at receptors. Operational sound level results presented in Table 7-11 and 7-12 of the EIS include the current noise from PR 391 at receptors. Results for the potentially most affected receptors (i.e. ID#81 and 104) located closest to PR 391 are included in the tables. Therefore, Project-related traffic noise is sufficiently represented in the assessment."<br><br>However, in reviewing the specified tables in the EIS, neither receptor 81 nor 104 (i.e., receptors located along PR-391) is presented. In order to evaluate the potential impact of project-related road traffic noise on nearby human receptors, this information is required. | Health Canada suggests that the Agency request the following information from the Proponent:<br><br>a) Clarify the volume of night-time vehicular traffic along PR-391, including a description of the time periods when increased traffic is expected to occur at the identified receptor locations, and confirm it has been incorporated into the noise assessment. Discuss any uncertainty introduced into the noise assessment by assuming consistent traffic volumes throughout the day and night and using this as a model input.<br><br>b) Provide quantitative estimates of baseline and future Ld, Ln, and Ldn at receptors 81 and 104, or clarify whether receptor locations are no longer relevant to the noise assessment. |