**Response to Comments from Draft Report Version (as Received January, 2016)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Comment No.** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Response** |
| 1 | 10 | What does this mean; briefly elaborate why this minimizes field parameter variability. | A description of the benefits of using flow-through cells for field parameter collection has been added to the text (Section 2.4).  |
| 2 | 18 | GENERAL COMMENT FOR SECTION:Please include a bit more specifics when discussing the results; specifically, please identify the number of stations for each parameter where an exceedance has occurred in each area (i.e. avoids the ambiguity of stating “one or more”). You could also include the specific stations where exceedance has occurred; although this is not absolutely necessary. | An additional table has been added to the report summarizing CCME FAL guideline exceedances (refer to Table 3-3). The text in Section 3.2 has also been updated to provide more detail concerning the number of exceedances reported within each area/site. |
| 3 | 21 | What was this condition and why did it prevent repair? | The text in Section 3.2.6 has been updated. Well repairs could not be completed at site MW09-01 due to a mis-calculation as to the required materials (diameter of PVC).  |
| 4 | 22 | Where the measured values so small that even a small (practical) difference may be reported as being largely different in the RPD analysis? If so please indicate. | After review the information listed in Section 3.3.2.1 was found to be correct. Sulfate concentrations in this duplicate and duplicate pair were 5.34 and 3.07 mg/L. Although these values are considered relatively low for the program, concentrations are well above the RDL (0.03 mg/L). RPD values for this pair are expected to be within the acceptable range of variability (<20%).  |
| 5 | 22 | Were samples collected below the 50 NTU (i.e. as indicated in Section 3.2.4)? | Groundwater at this site was relatively clear during the time of sampling (2.38 NTU). Field notes indicate that Pony Creek surface water was significantly more turbid compared to previous site visits, likely due to the placer mining operation directly upstream. Field notes also indicate a variation in sample turbidity during the purging process. Surface water turbidity and purge water variability may have contributed to RPD variability between the duplicate and duplicate pair, despite sample turbidity being within acceptable limits. |
| 6 | 22 | Where the measured values so small that even a small (practical) difference may be reported as being largely different in the RPD analysis? If so please indicate. | TKN and dissolved zinc concentrations were high enough above the detection limits that the RPD values were considered valid for these samples.  |
| 7 | 26 | Please include brief discussion of this scope/purpose in the introduction and/or methods section. | We have provided a discussion of the scope and purpose of filtered alkalinity testing is provided in the methods Section 2.5.  |
| 8 | 27 | Include recommendation for not collecting filtered alkalinity. | Recommendations have been updated. A recommendation to discontinue the collection of filtered alkalinity samples at the Mount Nansen site has been added to the text. |