P.O. Box 360
Kugluktuk, NU X0B 0B0
Telephone: (867) 982-3310
Fax: (867) 982-3311
www.kitia.ca

Kugluktuk

Bathurst Inlet
Kingaok

Bay Chimo
Umingmaktok

Cambridge Bay
Ikaluktutiak

Gjoa Haven
Okhoktok

Taloyoak

Kugaaruk

Phyllis Beaulieu
Manager of Licencing
Nunavut Water Board
P.O. Box 119
Gjoa Haven, NU, X0B1J0

October 30th, 2015

Re: KIA Comments on TMAC's response to KIA's IRs Concerning Amendment of Project Certificate N0. 003 and Water Licence AM-DOH1323 for Doris North Project.

Dear Phyllis Beaulieu, KIA and our consultants had met with TMAC Resources Inc. and their consultants concerning the amendment application of Project Certificate No. 003 and Water Licence AM-DOH1323 for the Doris North Project. This meeting was held on October 20th, 2015 in Edmonton, Alberta.

Several of the significant data gaps identified by KIA previously were addressed in this meeting and on-going collaboration between KIA and TMAC has been established to address the remaining data gaps in preparation for an in depth technical review that we will undertake in November.

Enclosed are our consult comments on TMAC's responses to particular KIA IRs. The comments on KIA IRs are in the format as originally submitted to both the NWB and NIRB using TMAC's numbering system in their response table.

Yours Truly

John Roesch

John Roesch, P.Eng.
Senior Hope Bay Project Officer
Department of Lands and Environment
Kitikmeot Inuit Association

P.O. Box 360
Kugluktuk, NU X0B 0B0
Telephone: (867) 982-3310
Fax: (867) 982-3311
www.kitia.ca

Comments on TMAC's Response to Information Requests for Amendment to Project Certificate 003 and Water Licence 2AM-DOH1323 for Doris North Mine Site.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 5
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Zoetica Wildlife Research Services
Subject:	Effect of potential caribou migration over or near tailings facilities.
Reference:	Rykaart, M and Hockley, D. 2009. Mine Waste Covers in Cold Regions. MEND Report 1.61.5a.
Issue/Concern:	We feel it is important to test the original alternate hypotheses that grizzly bears (and/or caribou) are attracted to or avoid the project. TMAC's camera monitoring program, however, has not been set up in a way that could detect attraction or avoidance of wildlife. We feel that improved methodology and camera placement could correct this issue. At present: • Control cameras are not set sufficiently far from the project to act as true controls based on current literature of known zones of influence from other projects; • Cameras face different directions and show different amounts of land- those that are have a larger field of view will capture more wildlife; • Cameras are clustered unevenly, meaning there is a difference in the probability of repeat counting of individuals in certain areas than in others; observation error can be equalized by space cameras at equivalent distances close to and at increasing distances from the project; • Cameras are currently placed in different habitat types, which increase the number of variables being considered and decreases power. As the question is about probability of detecting animals based on the distance from the project, we suggest placing all cameras in the same habitat type for addressing this objective (and using separate cameras for addressing site specific infrastructure/wildlife interaction objectives); • We suggest a nested approach to camera placement design, as nesting cameras within zones (NW, NWW, SW, S, SE, SEE, etc.) would keep comparisons to probability of detection by distance rather than adding variation due to the relative area; • We suggest placing marker posts at set distances from cameras, and only counting animals within the zone between camera and post for consistency at each camera (equivalent area per camera considered); • We suggested a nested, zero-inflated modeling approach for the final analysis
IR Status:	We feel this objective can be done, with the aforementioned improvements to camera placements and methodologies. Thus far, we feel that the "inability to find a ZOI due to low sample sizes" is not the case, and that the problem has been the use of a study design that is not supported by literature for avoidance distances or statistical study design protocols. We request that the updated WMMP plan be provided for review.

P.O. Box 360
Kugluktuk, NU X0B 0B0
Telephone: (867) 982-3310
Fax: (867) 982-3311
www.kitia.ca

	New IR: What is the predicted salinity of the dry tailings to be deposited sub-aerially?

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA – 14 / 30 - KIA
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Palmer Environmental Consulting Group Inc.
Subject:	Fish and Fish Habitat – Inconsistencies in predicted effects.
Reference:	Package (P) 1, pg. 1; P2, pg.v; P4, pg I; P4 p2-26
Issue/Concern:	Inconsistencies in predicted effects on fisheries were noted throughout the Amendment applications. This seems to be due to data gaps in baseline information and subsequent uncertainties in predicted effects. TMAC's response outlines that additional field data collection was completed during 2015 and will be summarized in Q4 2015. This information will be important in confirming predicted effects on fisheries, and has not yet been presented. Biologists from PECG and ERM will meet to discuss the updated baseline data, if available.
IR Status:	Incomplete. An updated effects assessment should be provided including new data collected in 2015.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA – 15 / 31 - KIA
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Palmer Environmental Consulting Group Inc.
Subject:	Fish and Fish Habitat – Amendment to AEMP.
Reference:	P4, section 4.5.8, pg 4-65
Issue/Concern:	Further details were requested on the AEMP. TMAC doesn't specifically address the IR to provide details on the components of the AEMP that will monitor fish and fisheries, but does state that the AEMP will follow the appropriate Guidelines and will establish a multi-stakeholder Working Group to review drafts. Timeline for the first draft of the AEMP is Q1 2016.
IR Status:	Complete.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA – 16 / 32 – KIA
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Palmer Environmental Consulting Group Inc.
Subject:	Fish and Fish Habitat – Spur road connecting vent raise and float plane dock.
Reference:	P2, section 3.8.1, pg 23
Issue/Concern:	Additional work was completed in summer 2015 to determine baseline conditions and whether the road crossing would cause Serious Harm (as defined by the Fisheries Act). This information was not presented as part of the Amendment application nor the effects assessment. As this data and self-assessment should now be complete, we

P.O. Box 360
Kugluktuk, NU X0B 0B0
Telephone: (867) 982-3310
Fax: (867) 982-3311
www.kitia.ca

	recommend that the results are shared with KIA for review and information on the potential effects and mitigation measures at this road crossing.
IR Status:	Details on the additional baseline work and effects assessment for this activity should be provided.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA – 17 / 33 - KIA
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Palmer Environmental Consulting Group Inc.
Subject:	Fish and Fish Habitat – Culvert crossing on Doris central access road.
Reference:	P2, section 3.8.2, pg 24
Issue/Concern:	There is one water feature that will be crossed by the Doris Central Access Road. The fish habitat at this location was not presented in the Amendment applications and further field studies were to be completed. TMAC have confirmed that additional work was completed in summer 2015 and no fish habitat exists at this location. Site-specific management plans will be used to protect fish habitat in Doris Lake during construction.
IR Status:	Complete.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA – 18 / 34 - KIA
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Palmer Environmental Consulting Group Inc.
Subject:	Fish and Fish Habitat – Drilling and blasting to anchor vent raise fan.
Reference:	P2, section 3.8 pg 23-24
Issue/Concern:	Additional details on blasting activities and proximity to fish habitat were requested. TMAC confirmed that the vent Connector and Central vent raises are 100m and 200m respectively from the shoreline of Doris Lake. TMAC states that maximum vibration velocities and blasting rounds will be designed to achieve compliance and protect fish habitat.
IR Status:	Complete.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA – 19 / 35 - KIA
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Palmer Environmental Consulting Group Inc.
Subject:	Fish and Fish Habitat – Data gaps in fish habitat.
Reference:	P3-1, Table 1
Issue/Concern:	In the Amendment applications, there were noted-data gaps in baseline fish habitat that are needed to support a comprehensive effects assessment. TMAC notes that this additional information is necessary and assessments were completed in summer

P.O. Box 360
Kugluktuk, NU X0B 0B0
Telephone: (867) 982-3310
Fax: (867) 982-3311
www.kitia.ca

	2015. These data and assessment have not yet been provided for review, and updated an effect assessment not completed that incorporates the updated-baseline information.
IR Status:	Incomplete. Details on the additional baseline work and effects assessment should be provided.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA – 20 / 36 - KIA
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Palmer Environmental Consulting Group Inc.
Subject:	Fish and Fish Habitat – Aquatic baseline conditions.
Reference:	P4, pg2-16
Issue/Concern:	Data was requested on the tissue concentrations of metals to provide an indication of baseline levels and implications for fish health. TMAC states that the species sampled, tissue types collected, and methods used have varied and therefore direct comparisons among years are impossible. However, in the Amendment applications, it is stated that metal concentrations in tissue from Lake Trout, Lake Whitefish and Ninespine Stickleback remained relatively consistent from 1995 to 2010. This contradicts the response to the IR. It is noted that this component of the AEMP will be a valuable tool in assessing fish health, and if the existing baseline is insufficient to determine scientific trends, then additional baseline data should be considered.
IR Status:	Incomplete. Additional details on the baseline data and values should be provided.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA – 21 / 37 - KIA
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Palmer Environmental Consulting Group Inc.
Subject:	Fish and Fish Habitat – Hydrological assessment.
Reference:	P4, section 2.5.3
Issue/Concern:	The hydrological assessment concludes that the levels in Doris Lake will decrease by 0.23m during the winter. Potential effects noted include exposing Lake Trout eggs to desiccation. Additional data was collected during 2015 and therefore these results were not available to be included in the Amendment application. It is recommended that the results of the assessment are shared and an updated effects assessment be undertaken, including on other relevant fish species, and an assessment on any potential on fisheries, as outlined in the IR. Biologists from PECG and ERM will meet and clarification will hopefully be provided on the results of the updated assessment.
IR Status:	Incomplete. Details on the additional baseline work and effects assessment for this activity should be provided.

P.O. Box 360
Kugluktuk, NU X0B 0B0
Telephone: (867) 982-3310
Fax: (867) 982-3311
www.kitia.ca

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA – 22 / 38 - KIA
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Palmer Environmental Consulting Group Inc.
Subject:	Fish and Fish Habitat – Reduction in discharge from Doris Lake.
Reference:	P4, section 2.5.3
Issue/Concern:	There will be a reduction in flow in Doris Outflow and Doris Creek throughout the open water season resulting from a decrease in Doris Lake available volume. Further work (additional modeling and characterization) is required and will be undertaken in 2016. This work should be provided for review when available, and detailed effects assessment updated. It is acknowledged that the approach to the DFO self-assessment and Fisheries Offsetting is sound, and that once additional data is available, the effects assessment will be more comprehensive. Biologists from PECG and ERM will discuss the potential effects and plans for further work at an additional meeting.
IR Status:	Incomplete.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA – 23 / 39 - KIA
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Palmer Environmental Consulting Group Inc.
Subject:	Fish and Fish Habitat – Reduction in outflow from Little Roberts Lake.
Reference:	P4, section 2.5.3
Issue/Concern:	There will be a reduction in the total number of flow days in Little Roberts Outflow with a maximum reduction of 10.8% in mean annual lake discharge. Further details were provided on the supporting rationale for alterations of 10% of the magnitude of flow having a low probability of detectable negative impacts, and this seems to be a conservative estimate. However, no site-specific information on potential effects on fisheries was provided. Further work is proposed in 2016 to quantify impacts and offsetting (if required). Biologists from PECG and ERM will discuss the plans for further work, as well the margin of error in these predicted effects, at an additional meeting.
IR Status:	Incomplete. When available, please provide further site-specific assessment on the potential effects on fish habitat, including on a seasonal basis.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA – 24 / 50 - KIA
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Palmer Environmental Consulting Group Inc.
Subject:	Fish and Fish Habitat – Roberts Bay pipeline and diffuser decommissioning.
Reference:	P3, Table 2. P4, section 4.5.5.2

P.O. Box 360
Kugluktuk, NU X0B 0B0
Telephone: (867) 982-3310
Fax: (867) 982-3311
www.kitia.ca

Issue/Concern:	Further clarification was requested on the activities associated with pipeline decommissioning, including potential effects on fish. This information was provided.
IR Status:	Complete.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA – 25 / 51 - KIA
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Palmer Environmental Consulting Group Inc.
Subject:	Fish and Fish Habitat – Diffuser impact on marine fish.
Reference:	P4, section 4.5.5
Issue/Concern:	The review comment noted that entrapment of fish at the diffuser at end of pipe should be considered during the detail design phase. TMAC acknowledges the comment and commits to incorporating best management practices during construction.
IR Status:	Complete.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA – 26 / 52 - KIA
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Palmer Environmental Consulting Group Inc.
Subject:	Fish and Fish Habitat – Pipeline and diffuser self-assessment.
Reference:	P3, Table 2, P4 section 4.5.5.2
Issue/Concern:	Further clarifications on the avoidance and protection measures were requested as part of the marine pipeline and berm. TMAC acknowledges comment and notes that further detailed assessment will be undertaken as engineering and construction schedules are determined. This assessment will outline protection and mitigation measures.
IR Status:	Complete.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 27
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Hutchinson Environmental Sciences Ltd.
Subject:	TIA expansion capacity
Reference:	Package 1, Section 1.7.1; Package 6-13, Appendix B
Issue/Concern:	Our concern will be raised during the technical review.
IR Status:	No additional IR.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 28

P.O. Box 360
Kugluktuk, NU X0B 0B0
Telephone: (867) 982-3310
Fax: (867) 982-3311
www.kitia.ca

Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Hutchinson Environmental Sciences Ltd.
Subject:	Cyanide destruction through SO2-Air Process
Reference:	Package 2, Section 3.5, Package 6-13
Issue/Concern:	IR response is adequate.
IR Status:	No additional IR.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 29
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Hutchinson Environmental Sciences Ltd.
Subject:	Mixing zone delineation
Reference:	Package 2, Section 3.6.2, Package 6-6 Section 5
Issue/Concern:	The IR Response states that "... a 9.2:1 dilution ... will be reached within 1 m of the diffuser portals, and given this parameter requires the greatest dilution, the 'CCME mixing zone' will be 1 m. Modelling results for the 3 requested scenarios during summer and winter can be provided during the technical review portion of the Amendment review process." Some elaboration was provided by TMAC at the October 20 meeting but we have not seen any substantiation of the estimate of the initial mixing zone or of the initial dispersion of effluent away from the diffuser in Roberts Bay.
IR Status:	Please provide a technical rationale for the conclusion on initial mixing of effluent in Roberts Bay. Please provide the "Modelling results for the 3 requested scenarios during summer and winter" for review by the KIA.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 30
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Hutchinson Environmental Sciences Ltd.
Subject:	Robustness of discharge infrastructure
Reference:	Package 2, Section 3.6.3, Package 6-7; Package 6-8
Issue/Concern:	The IR Response states "A preliminary engineering assessment on the overall feasibility of the outfall serves as the basis of the information contained in the Application. Engineering planning has been completed at a level consistent with the expectations for Water Licence applications". But does not provide reference to the assessment or the planning.
IR Status:	Please provide the engineering assessment on feasibility of the outfall.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 31

P.O. Box 360
Kugluktuk, NU X0B 0B0
Telephone: (867) 982-3310
Fax: (867) 982-3311
www.kitia.ca

Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Hutchinson Environmental Sciences Ltd.
Subject:	Potential interaction with freshwater environment
Reference:	Package 2, Section 3.6.2; Package 3; Package 4, Section 2.5.1, Section 3.4.1; Package 5-3, Section 4; Package 6-10, Section 2.2, Section 7
Issue/Concern:	IR response is adequate.
IR Status:	No additional IR.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 32
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Hutchinson Environmental Sciences Ltd.
Subject:	Saline discharges to Roberts Bay
Reference:	Package 4, Section 4.3.3, Table 4.3-1, Figure 4.3-3, Figure 4.3-4, Figure 4.5-1
Issue/Concern:	IR response is adequate.
IR Status:	No additional IR.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 33
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Hutchinson Environmental Sciences Ltd.
Subject:	Increasing contaminants of potential concern concentrations in Roberts Bay
Reference:	Package 4, Figure 4.5-1, 4.5-2, 4.5-3
Issue/Concern:	Our concern will be raised during the technical review.
IR Status:	No additional IR.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 34
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Hutchinson Environmental Sciences Ltd.
Subject:	Fugitive dust monitoring
Reference:	Package 5-1, Section 3.3, Figure 3-1
Issue/Concern:	IR response is adequate.
IR Status:	No additional IR.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 35
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Hutchinson Environmental Sciences Ltd.

P.O. Box 360
Kugluktuk, NU X0B 0B0
Telephone: (867) 982-3310
Fax: (867) 982-3311
www.kitia.ca

Subject:	NPAG tailings cover depth
Reference:	Package 5-2 Section 3.7; Package 6-10, Section 4.2.6
Issue/Concern:	IR response is adequate.
IR Status:	No additional IR. We will assess the response during the technical review.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 36
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Hutchinson Environmental Sciences Ltd.
Subject:	Elevated parameters of potential concern in the TIA post closure
Reference:	Package 5-2, Section 6, Section 10.1; Package 6-10 Table 6-2, Appendix B
Issue/Concern:	IR response is adequate.
IR Status:	No additional IR. We will assess the response during the technical review.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 37
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Hutchinson Environmental Sciences Ltd.
Subject:	Alternative explosives for use under wet conditions
Reference:	Package 5-4 Section 2.3
Issue/Concern:	IR response is adequate.
IR Status:	No additional IR.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 38
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	Hutchinson Environmental Sciences Ltd.
Subject:	Hydraulic connection between Tail Lake and Doris Lake
Reference:	Package 6-3, Package 6-13
Issue/Concern:	The IR Response states "This issue has been addressed during the original water licence application in 2007."
IR Status:	Please provide the supporting documentation from the 2007 submission

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 39
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	BGC Engineering Inc.
Subject:	Hydrogeological Modelling of the Proposed Doris North Project, Hope Bay, Nunavut
Reference:	Report Statement: Section 1.1, P1

P.O. Box 360
Kugluktuk, NU X0B 0B0
Telephone: (867) 982-3310
Fax: (867) 982-3311
www.kitia.ca

Issue/Concern:	BGC Comment: Given the statement above, is there a ground water collection and treatment plan associated with the project? TMAC Answer: Notes collection in the mine and suitable management and discharge as outlined in Document P6-6. Meeting discussed their discharge plan.
IR Status:	No further questions currently.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 40
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	BGC Engineering Inc.
Subject:	Hydrogeological Modelling of the Proposed Doris North Project, Hope Bay, Nunavut
Reference:	Report Statement: Section 2.3.3.1, P8
Issue/Concern:	BGC Comment: Given the significant thickness of soft lakebed sediments, what is the expected settlement of the intermediate dike or can dike stability be assured? What happens if Intermediate Dike fails? TMAC Answer: Notes stability assessment and likely consequence.
IR Status:	No further questions currently.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 41
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	BGC Engineering Inc.
Subject:	Hydrogeological Modelling of the Proposed Doris North Project, Hope Bay, Nunavut
Reference:	Report Statement: Section 5, P36
Issue/Concern:	BGC Comment: Given the amount of inflow water expected from Doris Lake, what is the expected impact on the water level in the lake from these losses? TMAC Answer: TMAC estimated 23 cm winter drawdown. Meeting discussion indicated that this modelling result was highly dependent upon till permeability assumptions used which may have been lower than expected.
IR Status:	No addition information required now but additional review may occur.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	Report Statement: Section 5, P36
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	BGC Engineering Inc.
Subject:	Hydrogeological Modelling of the Proposed Doris North Project, Hope Bay, Nunavut
Reference:	KIA - 42
Issue/Concern:	BGC Comment: Given the above statement on water quality, will the mine inflows require treatment prior to disposal? TMAC Answer: Groundwater discharge to Roberts Bay.
IR Status:	No further questions.

P.O. Box 360
Kugluktuk, NU X0B 0B0
Telephone: (867) 982-3310
Fax: (867) 982-3311
www.kitia.ca

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 43
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	BGC Engineering Inc.
Subject:	Water and Load Balance Report
Reference:	Report Statement: P40, Section 6.3.1
Issue/Concern:	BGC Comment: Given the exclusion of these parameters in the study, are they accommodated in water quality predictions in another way? TMAC Answer: Mercury included in water quality effects monitoring. No CCME criteria for selenium.
IR Status:	No further questions.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 44
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	BGC Engineering Inc.
Subject:	Water and Load Balance Report
Reference:	Report Statement: P46, Section 7
Issue/Concern:	BGC Comment: Given the water quality exceedances noted above, is there a plan for water treatment? TMAC Answer: No plan for post closure treatment. Noted exceedances are marginal. Impacted water stored in TIA.
IR Status:	No further questions.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 45
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	BGC Engineering Inc.
Subject:	Expanded Laydown Area (Pad U)
Reference:	Report Statement: P5, Section 4.5
Issue/Concern:	BGC Comment: Have boreholes been drilled under the U Pad? TMAC Answer: Dedicated boreholes will be drilled later prior to construction.
IR Status:	No further questions.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 46
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	BGC Engineering Inc.
Subject:	Expanded Laydown Area (Pad U)

P.O. Box 360
Kugluktuk, NU X0B 0B0
Telephone: (867) 982-3310
Fax: (867) 982-3311
www.kitia.ca

Reference:	Report Statement: P5, Section 4.5
Issue/Concern:	BGC Comment is with respect to liner location. TMAC Answer: Revised drawing now provided. BGC will review that drawing detail later.
IR Status:	No further questions.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 47
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	BGC Engineering Inc.
Subject:	Doris North Pad U Ore Stockpile Stability Analysis
Reference:	Report Statement: Table 1, P1, Section 1
Issue/Concern:	BGC Comment: Confirm the basis for the parameters used. TMAC Answer: Parameters confirmed from previous design work.
IR Status:	No further questions.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 48
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	BGC Engineering Inc.
Subject:	Tailings Management Strategies Alternatives Assessment
Reference:	Report Statement: P3, Section 3.1
Issue/Concern:	BGC Comment: Since the sub-aerial tailings will take a significant amount of time to freeze back post closure, the dam will retain saturated tailings for a significant period of time following closure. How is this accommodated in the design and closure of the facility? The GCL liner only at the South Dam will be potentially leaky until beach is fully developed. TMAC Answer: Meeting discussion indicated positive drainage gradient away from South Dam face. Response notes thermal freeze back assessment has been done. BGC will later review freeze back assessment.
IR Status:	No further questions currently.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 49
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	BGC Engineering Inc.
Subject:	Tailings Management Strategies Alternatives Assessment
Reference:	Report Statement: P3, Section 3.3
Issue/Concern:	BGC Comment: What is the contingency plan should the North Dam be required to stay in service longer than expected? When does the foundation start to thaw? TMAC Answer: North Dam can remain frozen for 20 years with full head of water,

P.O. Box 360
Kugluktuk, NU X0B 0B0
Telephone: (867) 982-3310
Fax: (867) 982-3311
www.kitia.ca

	including climate warming.
IR Status:	No further questions.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 50
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	BGC Engineering Inc.
Subject:	Tailings Management Strategies Alternatives Assessment
Reference:	Report Statement: P4, Section 3.3
Issue/Concern:	BGC Comment: What are the impacts on the thermal state of the dam if the tailings take a significant amount of time to freeze back? If the tailings covers are only terrestrial covers, then infiltration will occur into the tailings until they freeze. Does the freeze back rate include increasing moisture content in the tailings? TMAC Answer: A thermal freeze back analysis of the tailings was undertaken in document P6-10. BGC will review these analyses.
IR Status:	No further comment currently.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 51
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	BGC Engineering Inc.
Subject:	Tailings Management Strategies Alternatives Assessment
Reference:	Report Statement: P4, Section 3.3
Issue/Concern:	BGC Comment: Have temporary measures such as surficial cover material been considered to control dusting? In addition, high capital costs for these measures are offset by the lack of dam construction dry stack may be overall cheaper upon full life cycle assessment. Comments? TMAC Answer: Dust mitigation measures and tailing selection was provided in document P6-13. Meeting discussion revolved around doing best management dust practices.
IR Status:	BGC will review document P6-13 at later time with no further questions currently.

Source:	Kitikmeot Inuit Association
IR Number:	KIA - 52
Request to:	TMAC Resources Inc.
Reviewer:	BGC Engineering Inc.
Subject:	Tailings Management Strategies Alternatives Assessment
Reference:	Report Statement: P5, Section 3.3
Issue/Concern:	BGC Comment: Have alternative locations for the dry stack be evaluated? TMAC Answer: Tailings alternative assessment done in 2005. No other alternative dry stack locations were considered necessary for this application.

P.O. Box 360
Kugluktuk, NU X0B 0B0
Telephone: (867) 982-3310
Fax: (867) 982-3311
www.kitia.ca

IR Status:	No further questions currently.