

Fall Consultations Feedback

Area of Discussion: Exploration Plans and Permits

Dates and Locations that topic was presented / discussed:

- Kitchenuhmaykoosib Inninuuwag (KI), Sioux Lookout, August 17, 2010
- Wabun Tribal Council, Orillia, September 28, 2010
- Nishnawbe Aski Nation (NAN), Thunder Bay, September 29-30
- Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO), Kenora, October 2-3 & Sudbury, October 30-31, 2010
- Thunder Bay Multi-Stakeholder meeting, October 19, 2010
- Timmins Multi-Stakeholder meeting, October 27, 2010
- Wahgoshig First Nation, October 28, 2010
- Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO), Sudbury, October 30-31, 2010
- Toronto Multi Stakeholder meeting, November 3, 2010
- One written submission was received

| Q: What are the must have activities which should be included on the list of Plan Activities? Why? | |
|--|---|
| Feedback | Multi-Stakeholder & First Nations/Métis Sessions |
| <p>Proposed activities are appropriate;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line cutting • “Systematic Sampling” Hand tools/field sampling (portable drills for core) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Hand sampling should change to systematic sampling and differentiate by grid sampling. Anything that does not require a grid should not be prescribed. ○ Industry - doesn’t believe that geochemical sampling should be included in the plans activity list, nor do they think that geophysics should be planned (they shouldn’t be prescribed at all). • Limited stripping – below a certain threshold or hand stripping • Till sample: 3 ft hole for till sample (Best Practice: Handheld, remediate) • Preparatory activities • Mode of transportation (Air, etc.) <p>Existing sites with a Closure Plan should be excluded from requiring a plan or a permit.</p> | <p>MNO – Sudbury / NAN Thunder Bay/ Timmins / Toronto</p> |

For Discussion Purposes Only

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| <p>Difference between stakeholder groups as to what is nil to low impact</p> <p>Sensitive and sacred sites should be identified and deemed no go, then build the activities in a plan</p> <p>Gridlines and baselines have a substantial impact on the land and should be a permitted activity.</p> | |
| <p>Plans are to be triggered by the physical cutting of a grid.</p> | <p>Written Submission</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Q: Given the proposed scheme for nil to low level potential impact activities, what information needs to be included in a Plan submission so it is meaningful while still providing industry flexibility?</p> | |
| <p>Feedback</p> | <p>Multi-Stakeholder & First Nations/Métis Sessions</p> |
| <p>MNDMF should be the party sending out the plans and permits – to ensure that First Nations and Métis and surface rights owners receive a copy.</p> | <p>NAN</p> |
| <p>Seasonal issues were a common concern across each session.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rules – as proposed • Reasonable attempt to restore distributed ground to original conditions • 1.5m lines OK • Shoreline setbacks – best practice • Videotape of the area to see a “before” picture • Leave it as you found it • Seasonal use of thumping seismic surveys <p>There is not universal agreement on some of these points.</p> | <p>MNO – Sudbury / Thunder Bay/ Timmins / Toronto</p> |

For Discussion Purposes Only

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Some stakeholders feel that geophysical surveys do impact communities and it is an exploration activity. The government shouldn't wash hands of regulation.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to have the template be Q&A type to obtain the information needed. (i.e. how many people will be working on site?)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written description of what is to be done in PLAIN LANGUAGE • Name of company and contact information • Start and duration of work and claim area (claim numbers) • Any knowledge of burial or archaeological sites in area • Cumulative impact of previously disturbed lands • How much clearing, cutting, trenching • Describe what they will do to restore site to original condition • Number of people on site working • What permits from other Ministries are required/obtained • Any need for 'goods and services' communities may be able to provide • Map, access route and method/Equipment used | <p>MNO – Sudbury / Thunder Bay / Timmins / Toronto</p> |
|---|--|

| <p>Q: What are the must have activities which should be included on the list of <u>Permit</u> Activities? Why?</p> | |
|---|--|
| <p>Feedback</p> | <p>Multi-Stakeholder & First Nations/Métis Sessions</p> |
| <p>General consensus that there was a fair to decent approach to areas covered anything mechanized below advanced exploration</p> <p>Under permitting, ancillary activities should be bumped up on private land and leased land and mining leases</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heavy equipment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Backhoe ○ Excavator ○ Dump truck • Mechanical / Diamond drilling • Cut off for geophysical survey / # of people? • Diamond drilling • Power stripping • Grid? Provides access? • Baseline cutting is a good line to draw between activities for a plan or a permit as most planned activities cannot occur without grid lines. | <p>MNO -Sudbury / Thunder Bay / Timmins/ Toronto</p> |

| Q: Given the proposed activities are low to moderate potential impact, what are the must have rules we need to consider? Why? | |
|--|---|
| Feedback | Multi-Stakeholder & First Nations/Métis Sessions |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First Nations and Métis will still need access to withdrawn areas that affect Aboriginal and treaty rights. • Seasonal terms and conditions access withdrawn areas. Must be provided to First Nations and Métis community • Existing codes of conduct – drillers PDAC • Organic matter to be returned in holes • Identification (sacred site, time->) • Timelines • Remediation plan • Acid drainage possibilities • Overburden clearing – salvage material • Video tape site (documentation) prior to permit issuance (before and after) • Extensions of time on permits | MNO – Kenora/ Thunder Bay Timmins / Toronto |

| Q: Given the proposed scheme on low to moderate potential for impact activities, is it reasonable and sufficient for the application to identify areas of potential activity and areas of non activity? If so, what size should the areas be? Hectares? Claim Unit? Other? | |
|--|---|
| Feedback | Multi-Stakeholder & First Nations/Métis Sessions |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to be leeway given for flexibility • How much specificity is required for enforceability • There is an opportunity to use values info from Forest Management Plans (FMP), NRVIS, Community Land Use Planning | MNO / Thunder Bay Toronto |

For Discussion Purposes Only

| General Comments | Multi-Stakeholder & First Nations/Métis Sessions |
|---|--|
| Early engagement is recommended to ensure fluid exploration even before proponent conducts any exploration work. | All Sessions |
| Education and Capacity is needed at the community level if timelines are expected to be met. | Wabun Tribal Council / NAN / MNO / |
| Desire for a “one-window approach” for the issuance of permits. Proponents need to understand what consultation is. (i.e. Review MNO protocol) | MNO – Kenora & Sudbury |
| <p>Are the existing protocols developed by First Nations and Métis communities going to be incorporated in the regulations?</p> <p>Importance of contextual information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit is useless unless it recognized those impacts • Risks of uranium and acid drainage need to be dealt with <p>There is no guarantee that that industry is going to do what they are supposed to. You will need to ensure compliance.</p> <p>You have to be sure about how much you’re delegating because the quality of the consultation will vary according to who’s doing it. We should be reported.</p> <p>MNDMF can’t wash its hands of activities that aren’t covered by their legislation</p> | Toronto |
| Airborne surveys – low level aerial surveys scare off waterfowl, moose and other game and should be included in planned activities. | MNO – Sudbury / NAN Thunder Bay/ Timmins / Toronto |
| <p>Financial assurance should be collected to ensure rehabilitation of the site.</p> <p>Will there be consideration to the assessment date for claims as a function of the plans, permitting and consultation process?</p> | Timmins |
| <p>Term/Duration of a Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation for one year • Two years or two of each seasons to account for the unforeseen. • There is also a need to discuss the potential for overlap of a plan duration and a permit duration. If a plan expires but they still have a permit, does that cover planned activities as well? | MNO / Toronto |
| <p>Term/Duration of a Permit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation for one year with a mechanism to reapply. Reapplication would depend upon the conduct of the company. • Two years or two of each season to account for the unforeseen. | MNO |
| No independent Prospector will need to submit a PLAN. | Written Submission |

For Discussion Purposes Only