

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS**RE: GOLDEN POCKET RESOURCES LTD. - GOLDEN POCKET****OVERVIEW**

On November 28, 1995, the Manitoba Environment received a Proposal dated November 28, 1995, to develop and set into operation a mining development identified as the "Gold Stream" (later changed to "Golden Pocket") located about 7 radial kilometres south-east of the Town of Bissett.

The Proposal is to surface mine areas within Mining Lease #322 for gold and silver using trenching methods at a rate of about 8 tons per day. The ore would be crushed on-site, ground and put through gravity separation processes using water, centrifuges and sluices to extract the free gold as well as any gold tied up in pyrite and chalcopyrite. The pyrite and chalcopyrite concentrate containing gold and silver would be barreled and shipped off-site for refining by others. The proposal is to use no chemicals and to operate the mill in a closed circuit with no release of wastewater into the environment. Tailings from the mill would be directed into an adjacent existing pit, with periodic transfers of the solids from this pit as backfill material into mined out trenches. The site has been previously disturbed by exploration activities, and most of the facilities to be used would be located in existing structures.

No public concerns were received in response to the advertisement of this proposal in the Lac du Bonnet Leader, the Pine Falls Community Voice and the Brokenhead River Review on December 12th to 14th, 1995. Comments raised by interdepartmental Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) were brought to the attention of the proponent and were considered in the draft Licence.

SUMMARY OF TAC COMMENTS ON THE EIA

<u>Comments were requested from the following TAC members:</u>		<u>Replies Rec'd:</u>
B. Gossen	Rural Development	Yes
G. Baker	Natural Resources	Yes
W. Everett	Manitoba Hydro	No
K. McGill	Agriculture	No
J. Romeo	Highways	Yes
G. Dickson	Historical Resources	Yes
A. Ball	Energy & Mines	Yes
B. Dilay	Industry, Trade and Tourism	No
J. Popplow	Health	Yes
G. Bawden	Labour	No
E. Troniak	Sustainable Development	No
M. Morelli	Environment/Environmental Q/S	Yes

D. Brown	Environment/Eastern-Interlake Region	Yes*
D. McNaughton	Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	Yes

TAC response statistics:

Response by deadline date =	57.1%
* Response after deadline date =	<u>07.1%</u>
Total response rec'd =	64.2%

Comments received from the TAC were:

Rural Development commented that they have no concerns.

Natural Resources commented that:

- The proponent will be required to meet with regional and/or district staff well in advance of the proposal start-up and possibly during the construction phase. At such a meeting the proponent should be prepared to address:
 - the frequency and timing of heavy truck traffic on the Caribou Lake Road;
 - the road or trail improvements required to access and haul from the site;
 - whether there would be any clearing and aggregate removal / use requirements;
 - cleanup and rehabilitation methods for this site; and
 - further safety concerns.

Disposition

The comments were forwarded to the proponent for his information.

Historical Resources commented that they have no concerns.

Energy and Mines commented that they have no environmental concerns, but listed several other safety and rehabilitation concerns.

Disposition

The comments were forwarded to the proponent for his information.

Health commented that they have no concerns.

Water Quality Management commented that:

- In the event that future grades of gold in the pyrite and chalcopyrite are marginal such that this concentrate is not stored for shipment and refinement off-site, then the issue of acid generation from this waste material needs to be re-examined.
- The statement that "...virtually no arsenic..." is present in the tailings is subjective and should be quantified.
- The proposal provides no plans regarding site rehabilitation in the event of closure.

Disposition

The comments were forwarded to the proponent for response, but were later discussed at a meeting with the Proponent on January 22, 1996, and were taken into consideration in the draft Licence.

Environmental Operations commented that:

- Regulations 97/88R and 95/88R should be referenced in the Licence.
- The Licence should require a two week notification of the Director prior to start-up.

Disposition

The comments were considered in the draft Licence.

Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency commented that based on their survey of various federal departments potentially having an interest in this development, the application of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act will not be required. However, Fisheries and Oceans (F&O) expressed some concerns which they want to have addressed before determining whether an Authorization pursuant to Section 35(2) of the Fisheries Act will be required. The additional information they asked for is:

- The location and size of the trenches, the potential for water to accumulate in the trenches, anticipated quality of trench water, and if the trenches need to be pumped out, to where the water would be pumped.
- A characterization of the regional hydrology for the direction of surface and groundwater movement. The identification of creeks and lakes that might provide fish and fish habitat within the mine site and mill site. Also, a more complete description of the swamp at the edge of the project.
- Acid-base accounting on an appropriate number of samples for each type of host rock, and if the tests reveal a potential for acid generation, then the environmental impacts and mitigation plans should be identified.
- The source of the mill water or make-up water. A water balance should be conducted to assist in determining the net loading to water bodies in the project site.
- The impact that the concentrate being removed off the site will have on the tailings management facility of the other site in terms of its ability to meet effluent criteria.

Disposition

The comments were forwarded to the proponent for his information. A meeting was arranged with the proponent and F&O to discuss and narrow the issues. Following the meeting on January 22, 1996, the proponent submitted some additional information regarding the arsenic content of the ore and where the barreled concentrate would be shipped for refinement. Also, F&O's concerns were alleviated and they sent a revised letter acknowledging that the proposal will not result in harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of fish habitat, and that therefore an authorization pursuant to Section 35(2) would not be required.

A draft Environment Act Licence is enclosed for the Director's consideration. It is recommended that the Licence, if approved, be assigned to the Eastern-Interlake Region for surveillance and monitoring, ongoing compliance evaluation and enforcement responsibilities.

PREPARED BY:

C. H. Moche, P. Eng.
Environmental Engineer
Municipal & Industrial Approvals
January 31, 1996