



## **SUMMARY REPORT**

### **Public Information and Engagement Session Environmental Impact Statement – Valentine Gold Project**

#### **BACKGROUND**

On September 29, 2020, Marathon Gold Corporation (the proponent), submitted its Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada (the Agency). The Agency held a 50-day public comment period on the EIS from November 3, 2020 to December 23, 2020.

In addition to the public comment period and as part of the consultation and engagement approach for the EIS phase of the environmental assessment (EA) process, the Agency hosted two virtual meetings. The Agency held the first session on November 25 exclusively for Indigenous groups and held the second session on November 26 for the public. Both sessions were held from 12:00 to 2:00 pm Newfoundland Standard Time.

This report is a summary of the November 26 public session, including highlights of the information shared by the Agency and Marathon Gold; comments and questions asked by the public participants; and the responses provided.

#### **SESSION FORMAT/PURPOSE**

The Agency used the Zoom platform for the session. The public notice for the information session was included in the media news release and posted on the Agency's Registry website on November 3. The Agency notified members of the public, who had previously engaged on the Valentine Gold Project (the Project), of the session via e-mail on November 3. The Agency emailed instructions for accessing the virtual session to anyone that expressed an interest in participating.



The session included:

- An Agency presentation on the EA process.
- A proponent presentation on the summary of the EIS including project effects, proposed mitigation measures and conclusions.
- An opportunity for comments, questions and feedback from participants on potential environmental effects of the Project as well as suggestions and recommendations for avoiding or mitigating any adverse impacts.

Eight participants attend the session. See Attachment A for a complete list of participants, including those representing the federal authorities and Marathon Gold Corporation.

### **PRESENTATION BY THE AGENCY**

The Agency opened the session by presenting an update on the EA process; tasks completed to date and the next steps leading up to the Minister's decision. See the document titled "Impact Assessment Agency of Canada Virtual Engagement Session Presentation" posted on the Registry at <https://iaac-aeic.gc.ca/050/evaluations/document/138134?culture=en-CA>.

### **PRESENTATION BY MARATHON GOLD CORPORATION**

The Proponent presented an overview of content in the EIS, with a focus on the valued components (VCs) selected for inclusion; highlights of the effects assessment/analysis and examples of proposed mitigation measures. See the document titled "Proponent Virtual Engagement Session Presentation" posted on the Registry at <https://iaac-aeic.gc.ca/050/evaluations/document/138135?culture=en-CA>

### **FACILITATED DISCUSSION**

For approximately the last 45 minutes of the session, the Agency facilitated a discussion with the participants.

A summary of the comments/questions raised, responses from the Agency, federal authorities and the Proponent, and items for follow up is provided in the table below.



Questions/ Comments	Agency, Federal Authorities and Proponent- Responses	Follow up/Action Items
What happens if comments are submitted after the comment deadline?	<b>Agency:</b> We will do our best to include the comments that we receive after the deadline. Since the holidays are after the comment period, there are a few days in which late comments will not detrimentally impact the legislated timeline.	None.
I could not find any consideration of interactions between stressors in the EIA. Which means that using caribou as an example, habitat loss x change in mortality x change in movement could result in more than additive (synergistic) impacts. How were these considered in the EIA process?	<b>Proponent:</b> The Cumulative Effects assessment is primarily an assessment of the project effects cumulatively with other projects within the area. Synergistic impacts can be found in the Valued Component sections (for example, in the caribou section of the EIS). Those synergistic conclusions can be found in the conclusions section of each Valued Component section.	None.
Why/how was blasting included in the acoustic assessment? Blasting will be one of the main acute sources of noise at the mine site, but the only reference was found regarding application of best practices from the “Blasters’ Handbook” in the EIA documents.	<b>Proponent:</b> The maximum values and durations from the outputs of the acoustic assessments (including blasting, heavy equipment, the mill) were used as inputs for the noise assessment for each of the Valued Component chapters (for example, caribou). Note that blasting events for a gold mine are generally smaller and have less intensity than for most open pit mine operations.	None.
How was the acoustic assessment geared towards estimating impacts on wildlife?	<b>Proponent:</b> The acoustic modelling considers receptors at fixed locations, and at increasing distances from the source.	None.



Questions/ Comments	Agency, Federal Authorities and Proponent- Responses	Follow up/Action Items
<p>The EIS mentioned adverse impacts on human health and wildlife but the assessment was conducted considering human receptors only. There is a large body of literature on the impacts of noise on wildlife, but the EIA does not consider them.</p>	<p>The results of the acoustic assessment were considered within the individual Valued Component chapters. In addition to noise, avoidance of the project area due to other disturbances (such as light and activity level / presence of workers and equipment) was also considered.</p>	
<p>Is there a parallel provincial environmental assessment process or have these been merged?</p>	<p><b>Agency:</b> Although we are coordinating as much as possible, the provincial and federal environmental assessment processes are separate.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Why are public comments requested only on the summary document and not the more detailed statement and appendices</p>	<p><b>Agency:</b> The federal government must operate within both official languages, and only the summaries are available in both languages. We welcome comments on the EIS document as well.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Should a member of the public submit comments to both the federal and provincial governments?</p>	<p><b>Agency:</b> Comments should be submitted to both processes. However, we will coordinate with Newfoundland and Labrador as much as possible.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Are all appendices, studies available for comment and is there access to the</p>	<p><b>Proponent:</b> All the baseline reports appear in the baseline study appendices and the EIS appendices. The only thing that is not available is the raw caribou data</p>	<p>None.</p>



Questions/ Comments	Agency, Federal Authorities and Proponent- Responses	Follow up/Action Items
background data used by Marathon?	from the province, which is the province's data and is considered confidential. All the data inputs for air quality and noise modelling may not appear in the appendices; however, the information is summarized in the appendices. Example, wind data from ECCC, there may be a table to show how the raw data was used.	
It is our understanding that the only access to the southern overwintering sites for the Buchans Herd of the Woodland Caribou is located within the site. We would like to see maps and don't understand why this is not available. Any thoughts as to why?	<b>Proponent:</b> Probability mapping, migration routes (based on collaring and data provided by the province) and path information for summer and winter grounds is present in the full EIS, not the EIS summary document. There is a caribou baseline report in the appendices.	None.



**Attachment A: List of Participants – November 26, 2020**  
**Virtual Engagement Session**

*Public participants:*

<b>Organization/Community</b>	<b>Participating Representative(s)</b>
Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society	Suzanne Dooley
PearTree	Jared Shilson
Mi'kmaq Matters	Glenn Wheeler
Mi'kmaq Matters	Brian McLaren
Mi'kmaq Matters	Richard Wang
Mining Watch	Jamie Kneen
Newfoundland and Labrador Outfitters Association	Cory Foster
General public	W. Duggan

*Participants from Federal Authorities:*

<b>Department/Agency Name</b>	<b>Participating Representative(s)</b>
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	Tonya Warren, Roger Johnson, Dwayne Reddick
Health Canada	Sara Rumbolt, Dae Young Lee, Pierre Pelletier, Rick O'Leary
Transport Canada	Jason Flanagan, Sylvie DesRoches
Environment and Climate Change Canada	Michael Hingston, Brian Drover, Jerry Pulchan
Natural Resources Canada	Walker Smith, Richard Goulet; Jennifer Cole

*Marathon Gold Corporation- Participants/Presenters:*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
James Powell	VP Regulatory and Government Affairs (presenter)
Tara Oak	Manager of Environmental Assessment (presenter)
Mary Hatherly	Manager of Stakeholder Engagement
Katherine Fleet	



*Agency- Participants/Presenters:*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title and Role in Session</b>
Jill Adams	Head, NL Satellite Office (Introduction)
Joanna Tombs	Senior Consultation Analyst (session facilitator)
Brent Keeping	Project Manager for the Valentine Gold Project (presenter)
Nicole Scotney	Senior Policy Analyst, Engagement Division (technical support)
Micheline Savard	Project Manager (note taking)
Jennifer Baldson	Project Manager (note taking)
Gehan Mabrouk	Team Lead, NL Satellite Office (observer)
Amanda Parks	Project Manager (observer)
Kathryn MacCarthy	Project Manager (observer)
Lauchlan Maclean	Project Manager (observer)
Leslie Kieley	Project Manager (observer)