**Response to Comments from Draft Report Version (as Received September 23, 2015).**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Comment No.** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Response** |
| 1 | 1 | Please add label for the Haul Road on Fig. 1-1. | Label for Haul Road has been added to Figure 1-1. |
| 2 | 2 | Can we add a sentence in this section up front that states that samples were successfully collected 77 of the wells? | The text has been updated to include this information. |
| 3 | 10 | Table 3-1 note#2 mentions a Hanna 991300 field meter. Under which circumstances was this instrument used? | This text has been corrected. A Hanna 991300 was used at some wells after one of the program YSI Pro Plus units malfunctioned, and was the only alternate meter used for general parameters. The reference to the PC35 Tester has been removed. |
| 4 | 17 | Can we be confident in the field measurements recorded from P01-01A? I noticed that the temperature was recorded at -8.8oC | We feel that only conductivity, ORP, and turbidity are considered reliable from this well due to a meter malfunction. Accordingly, other parameter readings have been removed from the field data table so as to prevent any potential misinterpretation. |
| 5 | 18 | Rather than “exceeded the CCME…” where the pH (field and/or lab) were measured <6.5, use instead “did not meet minimum guideline” or similar. I’ve highlighted these instances in the text below. | The text has been updated to better describe the result as per your comment – we have reviewed all results to ensure they are consistent. |
| 6 | 20 | I think only 12 of the wells were below CCME guidelines for pH? Please confirm. | We have checked and it appears that pH was below guideline for 14 wells (<6.5). The report has not been changed at this time. |
| 7 | 21 | Not clear, there were 17 wells sampled? All four samples where the Hanna 991300 wasn’t used? | This statement has been clarified to reflect the number of samples where Turbidity exceeded 50 NTU (there were 5), and it is now not described in relation to the total number of wells sampled. |
| 8 | 21 | Why was this considered unreliable? Do we have confidence in other in-situ measurements collected from V35? | We have updated the text. All equipment was working well at the time and the well had been allowed time to recharge, therefore there we have no reason to consider the other readings to be unreliable despite the apparent elevated temperature. It is not known whether a brief time on the surface may have resulted in increased temperature for the field parameters, or otherwise why the temperature appears elevated. A note has also been added to Table 3-1 to reflect these observations. |
| 9 | 24 | Would you include S2A in this list? See top of page 21, describes some damage. | Yes, S2A has been added to the recommended list for well repairs. |