

Appendix 1 Questions and comments

QC-1. The developer must indicate if they have evaluated other options than the transportation of contaminated soils to authorized sites (e.g. biodegradation treatment on-site or to a nearby site) and justify why off-site transportation is the final choice.

They must also indicate if they have considered other uses for the less-contaminated soils (ex: filling material in landfills on the territory (ex: Radisson)), and, if not, justify why.

Yes, different options have been considered, however:

- On-site treatment is not an option, due to the small the small quantities of soils to be rehabilitated, the concentrations of contaminants in place and the rehabilitation level that must be attained.
- The engineered landfill in Radisson does not have the required authorisations to received theses contaminated soils. This hypothesis could not be retained.
- Some discussions were held between the public corporation Hydro-Québec (HQ) and the contractor to see if it would be possible to treat the soils in their contaminated soil treatment sites (LG3 or LG4). However, HQ refused to receive those soils since the site's capacity was already met for the year 2022.

Due to the delay caused by the exemption request process, the MRNF decided to report the project to the year 2023. Following this decision, the MRNF and HQ held discussions to see if it would be possible to treat the contaminated soils at their sites (LG3 or LG4) in the year 2023. HQ's representative confirmed that the treatment of the contaminated soils in their LG3 or LG4 installations is possible. This method will be favoured to the one of moving the soils to the nearest authorized treatment center, situated in Abitibi.

QC-2. The developer must indicate if they have some agreements with the soil burial sites and/or the treatment sites authorized by the *ministère de l'Environnement et de la Lutte contre les changements climatiques* to receive the contaminated soils and indicate the name and location of each of those sites.

An agreement was signed between the company GFI Terrapure located in Val d'Or. However, as specified in QC-1, the preferred site is HQ's contaminated treatment centers located near LG3 or LG4.

QC-3. The developer indicates that the soils used for filling the site will be taken from a borrow pit having already been used, if possible. The developer must confirm that the material will indeed be taken from an existing borrow pit and locate it. If the

material must be taken from a new borrow pit, the developer must include this new component in its exemption request.

A request to reopen an existing borrow pit is ongoing by the MERN with a nonexclusive lease. The borrow pit is located at ± 10 km southwest of the site, at the coordinates 579424 EAST 5946530 NORTH NAD 83.

We are also currently validating the possibility of buying filling material from outside, in the event that it would be impossible to reopen the borrow pit in time for the work.

- QC-4.** The developer indicates having informed the Crie Nation Government and the tallyman of the project to dismantle the previous Nouchimi outfitting camp. No consultation seems to have been made specifically for the current project. The developer must indicate if any meetings have been held with Chisasibi Crie First Nation and the tallymen affected by this project and, if applicable, provide a table listing the persons consulted and a summary of the discussions that outlines their questions and preoccupations and the provided answers.

No meeting with the Chisasibi Crie First Nation was held. No such request was made to the MRNF by the Chisasibi Crie First Nation when they were informed of the project to rehabilitate the site of the previous Nouchimi outfitting camp.

The tallyman is the previous owner of the Nouchimi outfitting camp and its installations. He had the legal responsibility to proceed with the dismantling and the rehabilitation of the site. The tallyman did not make any particular demands when asked by the MRNF about our site rehabilitation project.

- QC-5** Was the installation of a contaminated water treatment unit considered by the developer to not have to install and monitor observation wells? Note that the installation of a contaminated water treatment unit would require an authorization due to article 22 of the *Loi sur la qualité de l'environnement* (Environment Quality Act), with the *direction régionale de l'analyse et de l'expertise de l'Abitibi-Témiscamingue du Nord-du-Québec*. The actual proposition, to install observation wells and to monitor the quality of groundwater over three years, would not require such an authorization.

We do not plan to treat the groundwater. The monitoring of groundwater is required by the regulations.

We are planning sealed containers to stockpile the water from the excavation floor. This water will be temporarily stocked to be analysed and determine how to best handle them.

The data currently available on the water contamination leads us to believe that the water after stockpiling and analysis could be released in the ditch while still conforming to the current regulations.

No continuous treatment will be performed, but if required a filtration on filters of activated carbon and clay could be done from one tank to another. Analyses before their release will also be performed to ensure their conformity prior to release.

Offsite release is also planned if these waters do not respect the applicable criteria.

- QC-6.** The developer was planning to begin work in summer 2022, and should be ongoing between June and September 2022. The developer must provide a revised schedule.

The detailed schedule is attached. We are hoping to start in summer 2023, or September 2023 at the latest.