



EAGLE GOLD PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING, SURVEILLANCE AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN

VERSION 2015-01

MARCH 2015

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Project Overview	1
1.2	Project Location and Background	2
1.3	Project Schedule	3
1.4	Scope and Objectives.....	4
1.5	Adaptive Management Approach	4
	WATER RESOURCES	8
2	Surface Water Hydrology.....	9
2.1	Introduction	9
2.2	Previous Work	9
2.3	Methods	10
2.3.1	General	10
2.3.2	Discharge Measurements.....	10
2.3.3	Locations.....	11
2.3.4	Frequency	12
2.3.5	Data Analysis and Reporting	12
2.4	Adaptive Management.....	13
2.4.1	Performance Objectives.....	13
2.4.2	Construction	13
2.4.3	Operations, Closure and Post Closure	14
2.4.3.1	Reduction in Flow	14
2.4.3.2	Increase in flow.....	15
2.4.3.3	New water flow and flow paths	15
3	Surface Water Quality	19
3.1	Introduction	19
3.2	Previous Work	19
3.3	Methods	21
3.3.1	Field Sampling and Protocols	21
3.3.2	Water Quality Parameter List and Detection Limits.....	22
3.3.3	Sampling Quality Assurance/Quality Control.....	23
3.4	Construction.....	24
3.4.1	Locations and Frequency	24
3.4.2	Data Analysis and Reporting	27
3.5	Operations	27

Table of Contents

3.5.1	Locations and Frequency	28
3.5.2	Data Analysis and Reporting	29
3.6	Early Closure	30
3.6.1	Locations and Frequency	30
3.6.2	Data Analysis and Reporting	31
3.7	Late and Post-Closure Phase.....	32
3.7.1	Locations and Frequency	32
3.7.2	Data Analysis and Reporting	33
3.8	Adaptive Management.....	34
3.8.1	Performance Objectives - Water Quality Criteria.....	34
3.8.2	Construction	36
3.8.3	Operations, Closure and Post Closure	37
4	Groundwater Quantity.....	48
4.1	Introduction	48
4.2	Previous Work	48
4.2.1	Existing Monitoring Program.....	48
4.3	Methods	52
4.3.1	Overview	52
4.3.2	Construction	52
4.3.3	Operations	57
4.3.4	Closure and Post Closure Monitoring	59
4.4	Data Analysis and Reporting	59
4.5	Adaptive Management.....	59
5	Groundwater Quality	64
5.1	Introduction	64
5.2	Previous Work	64
5.3	Methods	67
5.3.1	Field	67
5.3.2	Quality Control / Quality Assurance	67
5.3.3	Data Analysis	68
5.3.4	Construction	68
5.3.4.1	Locations and Frequency	68
5.3.5	Operations	68
5.3.5.1	Locations and Frequency	68
5.3.6	Closure and Post Closure	68
5.4	Adaptive Management.....	69

	5.4.1	Construction	69
	5.4.2	Operations	69
6		Geochemical Monitoring.....	71
	6.1	Introduction and Objectives	71
	6.2	Previous Work	71
	6.3	Methods	71
	6.3.1	Construction Rock.....	71
	6.3.2	Additional Waste Rock Characterization	73
	6.3.3	Waste Rock Contact Water	75
	6.4	Reporting	77
	6.5	Adaptive Management.....	77
	6.5.1	Construction Rock.....	77
	6.5.2	Operations and Post Closure.....	78
		AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT	79
7		Stream Sediment	80
	7.1	Introduction	80
	7.2	Previous Work	80
	7.3	Methods	84
	7.3.1	Field Collection	84
	7.3.2	Laboratory.....	84
		7.3.2.1 Parameter List and Detection Limits.....	84
		7.3.2.2 Quality Assurance/Quality Control.....	85
	7.4	Construction.....	85
	7.4.1	Locations and Frequency	85
	7.4.2	Data Analysis and Reporting	86
	7.5	Operations Phase.....	87
	7.5.1	Locations and Frequency	87
	7.5.2	Data Analysis and Reporting	87
	7.5.3	Early Closure Phase	87
	7.5.4	Locations and Frequency	88
	7.5.5	Data Analysis and Reporting	88
	7.6	Late Closure Phase	88
	7.6.1	Locations and Frequency	89
	7.6.2	Data Analysis and Reporting	89
	7.7	Adaptive Management.....	90
8		Benthic Macroinvertebrates	96

Table of Contents

8.1	Introduction	96
8.2	Previous Work	96
8.3	Methods	98
8.3.1	Field	98
8.3.2	Data Analysis and Reporting	99
8.4	Construction.....	100
8.4.1	Locations and Frequency	100
8.5	Operations	101
8.5.1	Locations and Frequency	101
8.6	Early Closure Phase.....	101
8.6.1	Locations and Frequency	101
8.7	Late Closure Phase	102
8.7.1	Locations and Frequency	102
8.8	Adaptive Management.....	103
9	Fish and Fish habitat.....	109
9.1	Introduction	109
9.2	Previous Work	109
9.2.1	Fish-bearing Watercourses.....	109
9.2.2	Fish Species Distribution	110
9.2.3	Fish Relative Abundance	111
9.2.4	Habitat Usage	111
9.3	Methods	112
9.3.1	Survey Areas	112
9.3.2	Fish Abundance	113
9.4	Reporting	113
9.5	Adaptive Management.....	113
	METEOROLOGICAL AND ATMOSPHERIC	117
10	Climate.....	118
10.1	Introduction	118
10.2	Previous Work	118
10.3	Methods	119
10.3.1	Locations.....	119
10.3.2	Frequency	119
10.3.3	Data Analysis and Reporting	119
11	Air Quality.....	122
11.1	Introduction	122

11.2	Methods	123
11.2.1	Locations.....	123
11.2.2	Frequency	123
11.2.3	Data Collection and Analysis	123
11.3	Adaptive Management.....	124
TERRESTRIAL		126
12	Vegetation	127
12.1	Introduction and Objectives	127
12.2	Previous Work	127
12.2.1	Trace Metal Concentrations in Vegetation.....	127
12.3	Methods	128
12.3.1	Locations.....	128
12.3.2	Frequency	129
12.3.3	Data Analysis	129
12.4	Adaptive Management.....	129
13	Soils	132
13.1	Introduction and Objectives	132
13.2	Previous Work	132
13.3	Methods	134
13.3.1	Soil Sampling	134
13.3.2	Locations.....	134
13.3.3	Frequency	135
13.3.4	Data Analysis	135
13.3.5	Test Method	135
13.4	Adaptive Management.....	136
14	Noise	137
14.1	Introduction	137
14.2	Previous Work	138
14.3	Methods	139
14.3.1	Location	139
14.3.2	Frequency	139
14.4	Data Analysis and Reporting	139
14.5	Adaptive Management.....	140
INFRASTRUCTURE AND FACILITIES.....		141
15	Permafrost.....	142

Table of Contents

15.1	Introduction	142
15.2	Previous Work	142
15.3	Methods	142
15.3.1	Locations.....	143
15.3.2	Frequency	144
15.3.3	Data Analysis	144
15.4	Adaptive Management.....	144
16	Open Pit	147
16.1	Introduction	147
16.2	Methods	147
16.2.1	Locations.....	148
16.2.2	Frequency	148
16.3	Reporting	148
16.4	Adaptive Management.....	148
17	Material Storage and Stockpile Management Areas	150
17.1	Introduction	150
17.2	Methods	150
17.2.1	Locations.....	151
17.2.2	Frequency	151
17.3	Reporting	151
17.4	Adaptive Management.....	152
18	Heap Leach and Process Facilities	153
18.1	Introduction	153
18.2	Heap Leach Facility	153
18.2.1	Inspection Methods.....	153
18.2.1.1	Routine Inspections	153
18.2.1.2	Annual Inspections	154
18.2.1.3	Event-Driven Inspections.....	154
18.2.1.4	Comprehensive Dam Safety Review.....	154
18.2.2	Locations and Frequency	155
18.3	Processing Facilities (ADR Plant)	156
18.3.1	Methods	156
18.3.2	Frequency	157
18.4	Reporting	158
18.4.1	Documentation.....	158
18.4.2	Reporting	159

18.5	Adaptive Management.....	159
19	References	161

List of Tables

Table 1.3-1:	Tentative Project Schedule	4
Table 2.2-1:	Baseline Hydrology Automated Station Locations	9
Table 2.3-1:	Project Automated Hydrology Stations during Construction	11
Table 2.3-2:	Project Automated Hydrology Stations during Operations, Closure and Post Closure	11
Table 3.2-1:	Baseline Water Quality Site Locations, Rationale and Number of Sampling Dates, 2007–2012	20
Table 3.3-1:	Summary of Eagle Gold Project Water Quality Samples, Treatment Protocols and Parameter List	21
Table 3.3-2:	Water Quality Parameters and Detection Limits	22
Table 3.4-1:	Surface Water Quality Monitoring Locations and Frequency – Construction	25
Table 3.5-1:	Operations Phase Surface Water Quality Monitoring Locations and Frequency	28
Table 3.6-1:	Early Closure Phase Surface Water Quality Monitoring Locations and Frequency	31
Table 3.7-1:	Late Closure Phase and Post-closure Phase Surface Water Quality Monitoring Locations and Frequency	33
Table 3.8-1:	Proposed Water Quality Objectives for Haggart Creek at W29	35
Table 3.8-2:	Proposed Water Quality Objectives for Dublin Gulch	35
Table 3.8-3:	Effluent quality standards (mg/L) for the MWTP	38
Table 4.2-1:	Existing Groundwater Monitoring Well Network Used for Baseline Data Collection	50
Table 4.3-1:	Groundwater Monitoring Well Network – Construction	53
Table 4.3-2:	New Nested Monitoring Wells Needed Prior to Operations	57
Table 4.3-3:	Proposed Groundwater Monitoring Network for Measurement of Groundwater Levels during Operations	58
Table 5.2-1:	Groundwater Quality Monitoring Program (2012)	65
Table 5.2-2:	Groundwater Quality - Monitored Parameters	67
Table 6.3-1:	Construction Rock Monitoring Test Methods and Detection Limits	73
Table 6.3-2:	Anticipated Waste Rock Production and Proposed Annual Sample Size	75
Table 6.3-3:	Geochemical Water Monitoring Parameters and Corresponding Detection Limits	76
Table 7.2-1:	Baseline Site Locations, Rationale, and Number of Stream Sediment Sampling Dates, 1976 – 2010	81

Table 7.2-2:	Stream Sediment Metal Concentrations (mean values, N=3 to 11), 2007 – 2010.....	83
Table 7.3-1:	Stream Sediment Quality Parameters and Detection Limits.....	84
Table 7.4-1:	Construction Phase Stream Sediment Quality Monitoring Locations and Frequency	86
Table 7.5-1:	Operations Phase Stream Sediment Quality Monitoring Locations and Frequency	87
Table 7.5-2:	Early Closure Phase Stream Sediment Quality Monitoring Locations and Frequency	88
Table 7.6-1:	Late Closure Phase Stream Sediment Quality Monitoring Locations and Frequency	89
Table 8.2-1:	Benthic Invertebrate Sample Locations, 1995, 2007, 2009, and 2010	96
Table 8.4-1:	Construction Phase Benthic Invertebrate Monitoring Locations and Frequency	100
Table 8.5-1:	Operations Phase Benthic Invertebrate Monitoring Locations and Frequency.....	101
Table 8.6-1:	Early Closure Phase Benthic Invertebrate Monitoring Locations and Frequency	102
Table 8.7-1:	Late Closure Phase Benthic Invertebrate Monitoring Locations and Frequency....	102
Table 10.3-1:	Project Climate Station Locations	119
Table 11.1-1:	Yukon Ambient Air Quality Standards ^{ab}	122
Table 13.2-1:	Surface Soil Sample Metal Exceedances	133
Table 13.2-2:	Overburden Sample Metal Exceedances.....	133
Table 18.5-1:	Emergency Levels.....	159

List of Figures

Figure 1.1-1:	Site General Arrangement.....	6
Figure 1.1-2:	Process Flow Sheet	7
Figure 2.2-1:	Existing Hydrometric Monitoring Stations	17
Figure 2.3-1:	Hydrometric Monitoring Stations during Construction, Operations and Closure	18
Figure 3.2-1:	Existing Surface Water Quality Monitoring Stations	43
Figure 3.4-1:	Surface Water Quality Monitoring Stations - Construction.....	44
Figure 3.5-1:	Surface Water Quality Monitoring Stations - Operations	45
Figure 3.6-1:	Surface Water Quality Monitoring Stations - Early Closure	46
Figure 3.7-1:	Surface Water Quality Monitoring Stations - Late Closure and Post Closure.....	47
Figure 4.1-1:	Existing Groundwater Monitoring Network.....	61

Eagle Gold Project

Environmental Monitoring, Surveillance and Adaptive Management Plan

Table of Contents

Figure 4.3-1:	Groundwater Monitoring Network - Construction	62
Figure 4.3-2:	Groundwater Monitoring Network - Operations, Closure and Post Closure	63
Figure 7.2-1:	Stream Sediment Monitoring Stations - Baseline	92
Figure 7.4-1:	Stream Sediment Monitoring Stations - Construction	93
Figure 7.5-1:	Stream Sediment Monitoring Stations - Operations.....	94
Figure 7.6-1:	Stream Sediment Monitoring Stations - Closure	95
Figure 8.2-1:	Benthic Invertebrate Monitoring Stations – Baseline	105
Figure 8.4-1:	Benthic Invertebrate Monitoring Stations – Construction	106
Figure 8.5-1:	Benthic Invertebrate Monitoring Stations – Operations	107
Figure 8.7-1:	Benthic Invertebrate Monitoring Stations – Closure.....	108
Figure 9.2-1:	Fish and Fish Habitat Baseline Sampling Sites in Immediate Project Area.....	115
Figure 9.3-1:	Fish and Fish Habitat Monitoring Locations	116
Figure 10.3-1:	Climate Monitoring Station Locations.....	121
Figure 12.3-1:	Vegetation and Soil Monitoring Plot Layout	130
Figure 12.3-2:	Vegetation and Soil Monitoring Locations.....	131
Figure 15.2-1:	Existing Thermistors – Monitoring Network.....	146

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW

StrataGold Corporation (SGC), a directly held, wholly owned subsidiary of Victoria Gold Corp., has proposed to construct, operate, close and reclaim a gold mine in central Yukon. The Project is located 85 km from Mayo, Yukon using existing highway and access roads. The Project will involve open pit mining at a production rate of approximately 10 million tonnes per year (Mt/y) ore, an average strip ratio (amount of waste: amount of ore) of 1.45:1.0 and gold extraction using a three stage crushing process, heap leaching, and a carbon adsorption, desorption, and recovery system over a 10 year mine life.

Construction of the mine will occur over approximately two years from Q2 2015 – Q2 2017 pending issuance of required licences and permits. The construction phase has been divided into two stages to accommodate permitting assumptions and seasonal constraints.

During operations, the open pit will be developed using standard drill and blast technology. Ore will be transported from the open pit by haul truck and delivered to the first stage crushing plant (the primary crusher), situated on the north side of the open pit rim. Waste rock will be removed from the open pit by haul truck and delivered to one of two waste rock storage areas (Platinum Gulch or Eagle Pup WRSAs) or will be used as haul road and infrastructure construction material. Figure 1.1-1 shows the General Site Arrangement for the Project.

Figure 1.1-2 provides the overall process flow sheet for the Project. Ore will be crushed to a passing 80 percent (P80) particle size of 6.4 mm in a 3-stage crushing process. All three crushing stages will be located north of the open pit. Ore will be conveyed between the primary crushing station and the secondary and tertiary crushing stations by covered conveyor or enclosed conveyor gallery. After the tertiary crushing stage, ore will be transported by covered conveyor to the Heap Leach Facility (HLF) area where the ore will be stacked on the heap leach pad via a series of portable conveyors and finally a radial stacking conveyor.

Gold extraction will utilize cyanide heap leaching technology as described in the Project Proposal. Similar technology was employed in Yukon at the Brewery Creek mine in the late 1990s, and has been employed successfully in other cold climates such as the United States of America (Alaska), Chile, Argentina, Turkey and Russia. Process solution containing cyanide will be applied to the ore to extract gold and then collected by the HLF leachate collection and recovery system.

Gold-bearing “pregnant” solution (pregnant leach solution [PLS]) will be pumped from the heap to the gold recovery plant. Gold will be recovered from the PLS by activated carbon adsorption and desorption, followed by electro-winning onto steel cathodes, and on-site smelting to gold doré. This process is referred to as the adsorption, desorption, and recovery (ADR) process. The gold-barren leach solution that remains after passing through the carbon columns will be re-circulated back to the HLF.

1.2 PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND

The proposed Project is located in central Yukon in the Traditional Territory of the FNNND, approximately 350 km north of Whitehorse, and 45 km north-northeast of the Village of Mayo (85 km using existing access roads). Ecologically the Project is situated within the Yukon Plateau North Ecoregion, in the Boreal Cordillera Ecozone, which encompasses the Stewart, MacMillan and Pelly plateaus and southern part of the Selwyn Mountains. The majority of the Project site lies within the Dublin Gulch watershed. The Dublin Gulch watercourse is a tributary to Haggart Creek which flows to the South McQuesten River within the Stewart River sub-basin of the Yukon River Watershed. Elevations in the vicinity of the Project range from 765 m above sea level near the confluence of Dublin Gulch and Haggart Creek, to 1,525 m above sea level at the base of the Potato Hills, which forms the eastern boundary of the Dublin Gulch watershed.

Historically, Yukon and the Tintina Gold Belt specifically, has been a productive region for gold. The Dublin Gulch area has a rich history of exploration and mining since 1898. As a result, Dublin Gulch watershed and the upper reaches of the Haggart Creek watershed have been heavily impacted by placer mining activity. The ecological function of the Project area has been altered by this previous activity and is well documented via past environmental studies that date back to the mid-1990s. From this extensive baseline work, the existing environmental and socio-economic conditions are well known and documented in the Project Proposal submitted to the Yukon Environmental and Socio-Economic Assessment Board (YESAB) in July 2011. Figure 1.2-1 provides a Property Location Map and Photo 1.2-1 depicts the site location and existing conditions including SGC's advanced exploration camp and historic placer mining areas.



Photo 1.2-1: Site Location

1.3 PROJECT SCHEDULE

To support the phased licensing of the Project, construction has been planned in two stages. In general, Stage 1 represents construction activities that do not require a Type A Water Use Licence. Stage 1 activities are those that are currently authorized by QML-0011 for the Project and that involve the use of water, alteration of watercourses and/or discharge of a waste to waters which require a Type B Water Use Licence. Stage 2 includes all remaining construction of infrastructure and facilities that involves the use of water, alteration of watercourses and/or discharges of a waste to waters which require a Type A Water Use Licence.

Stage 1 Construction activities are currently scheduled to begin Q2 2015 and include camp expansion, access road and bridge upgrades, site road construction, diversions and ditching, clearing and grubbing, civil earthworks, concrete foundations, septic system upgrade, and borrow source development. The remaining construction activities that will commence after issuance of a Type A Water Use Licence and approval of development and operations plans as required under the *Quartz Mining Act* with a target construction completion date and mine commissioning in 2017.

A summary of the Project schedule is provided in Table 1.3-1.

Table 1.3-1: Tentative Project Schedule

Phase	Schedule
Construction	Q2 2015 – Q2 2017
Operations (9.2 years) ¹	Q2 2017 – Q1 2027
Reclamation and Closure (10 years) ²	Q2 2027 – Q2 2037
Post-Closure Monitoring	Q3 2037 – TBD

NOTE:¹ limited to active mining operations (ore loading) and does not include residual leaching phase prior to HLF drain-down² includes drain-down of HLF to steady state seepage – estimated to be approximately 10 years conservatively estimated to allow for active water treatment. Reclamation earthworks such as re-contouring, revegetation and facility capping will be complete within 2-3 years of start of reclamation phase.

1.4 SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

SGC has developed this Environmental Monitoring, Adaptive Management, and Reporting Plan in support of an application for a Type A Water Use License application and Quartz Mining License. The plan includes environmental monitoring and surveillance objectives, work completed to date, methods, adaptive management, and reporting for environmental resources and Project facilities for the construction, operations, closure and post closure phases of the Project. The plan has been developed to adhere to the terms and conditions in the YESAA Decision Documents and to meet the Yukon Water Board guidelines for Type A and B Quartz Mining Undertakings (February 2012) and the Plan Requirements for Quartz Mine Licensing from Yukon Government Energy Mines and Resources in coordination with the Yukon Water Board (August 2013).

Due to the characteristic and idiosyncratic nature of delineating a study area for each discipline, Local Study Area (LSA) delineations may not be the same across all the disciplines; thus the physical study areas as measured in square kilometers and reported below are generally unique to each discipline.

1.5 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT APPROACH


Adaptive management is a systematic approach to continuous improvement of management policies and practices by learning from the intended and unintended outcomes of actions. It is a logical way of dealing with uncertainty. Typically adaptive management includes four major steps:

- 1) Assessment – evaluation of the proposed or existing systems to identify uncertainties in modeled predictions and efficacy of mitigation measures.
- 2) Monitoring plan design and performance objectives – development of a monitoring plan that will provide data to assess performance of infrastructure and mitigation measures against pre-determined thresholds that will serve as action levels.
- 3) Monitoring – collection and analysis of data and evaluation of project performance compared to performance objectives.

- 4) Project change – implementation of solutions that may include changes to project design, operating procedures, performance objectives, monitoring methods, and/or other mitigation measures to achieve performance objectives.

Results of the monitoring programs described in this report will be evaluated throughout all Project phases to determine if adverse environmental impacts occur or there are unacceptable risks to facility and infrastructure. If the results indicate that there are no adverse environmental impacts, the frequency and length of monitoring and maintenance would continue as planned. Additional or alternative mitigation measures will be implemented to respond to negative trends that are observed or when performance objectives are exceeded.

Performance objectives have been developed for each environmental resource or major Project facility. Performance objectives serve as thresholds to require mitigative action if exceeded. Action will also be taken if trends are observed that indicate a high likelihood of exceedance of an objective in the future. Adaptive mitigation measures are provided; however these are considered draft and will be refined after consideration of their efficacy and ease of integration with Project operations.



Legend:

- Main Process Flow
- Carbon
- Intermittent Flow
- Equipment Package
- Future



Projection:

N/A

Drawn By:

SS

**EAGLE GOLD PROJECT
YUKON TERRITORY**

Date:

2014/06/14

Figure:

1.1-2

Process Flow Sheet

WATER RESOURCES

2 SURFACE WATER HYDROLOGY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The objective of the hydrology data collection program is to maintain streamflow records in the Project area to support water management design, update operational water balance and water quality parameters, as well as to facilitate reporting of flow data associated with Water Use License requirements. Hydrology data collection has been developed in accordance with accepted standardized practices and procedures, as outlined by the British Columbia Resource and Inventory Standards Committee (RISC) (2009).

2.2 PREVIOUS WORK

Historically, baseline hydrology information has been collected in the Project area for two periods: from 1993 to 1996 and 2007 to present. The more recent baseline hydrology data collection was established in August 2007 with the installation of automated and manual hydrology stations in the Dublin Gulch, Haggart Creek and Lynx Creek basins. Field methods and data summaries are provided in Stantec (2010a, 2011a and 2012a) and Knight Piesold (2013). The objective of the baseline program was to characterize the seasonal and annual streamflow trends in the Project area prior to Project development. The automated station installations included a pressure transducer and datalogger to continuously measure water level during the open water season, whereas the manual stations included only point discharge measurements taken over a range of flows throughout the season.

The locations of the existing automated stations are summarized in the Table 2.2-1 and shown on Figure 2.2-1. These stations are typically removed at the end of each open water season (end of October or early November) and re-installed prior to the freshet in the following year. Discharge measurements at both the automated and manual stations were generally conducted using either the velocity-area method using a current flow meter or salt dilution method (during freeze-up or under ice conditions) using a conductivity probe.

Table 2.2-1: Baseline Hydrology Automated Station Locations

Site	Location Description	Coordinates		
		Zone	North	East
W1	Dublin Gulch above Stewart Gulch	8V	7101545	460249
W4	Haggart Creek below Dublin Gulch	8V	7101223	458144
W5	Haggart Creek above Lynx Creek	8V	7095888	457814
W6	Lynx Creek above Haggart Creek	8V	7095964	458099
W22	Haggart Creek above Dublin Gulch	8V	7101378	458319
W26	Stewart Gulch	8V	7101443	460331
W27	Eagle Creek near camp	8V	7100997	458235
W29	Haggart Creek below Eagle Creek	8V	7099583	458225

2.3 METHODS

The hydrology monitoring program will collect continuous streamflow data in the Dublin Gulch and Haggart Creek watersheds. This will be achieved by maintaining the eight existing automated hydrology stations and manual stage and discharge measurements. Automated stations that will continue to be monitored during the first year of construction include W1, W4, W5, W6, W22, W26, W27 and W29.

In the second year of construction, some of the monitoring locations will change, be decommissioned and/or new stations will be added to account for changes to watercourses. The existing automated stations W1, W26 and W27 will be decommissioned. A new automated station (W1A) will be installed downstream of W1 on Dublin Gulch below Stewart Gulch and directly upstream of the Dublin Gulch Diversion Channel (DGDC).

2.3.1 General

For the hydrology data collection program, water level will be recorded continuously with a pressure transducer and datalogger at each automated station location, with discharge measurements conducted at a range of flows during scheduled site visits. Continuous data are preferable to characterize seasonal and inter-annual patterns. Regular site visits to the stations will be conducted by a technician to ensure the instrumentation is in good working order and to perform discharge measurements.

During each visit, the technician will undertake the following general tasks:

- Perform routine maintenance on the instrumentation, and verify that no damage has occurred to the installation. All instrumentation will be in good working order, including datalogger batteries and desiccant.
- Download stage data from datalogger, checking for any signs of erratic behaviour.
- Select a suitable location to conduct a discharge measurement based on current flow conditions.
- Perform a high accuracy discharge measurement, and if deemed appropriate due to changing flow conditions, perform an additional high accuracy discharge measurement.
- Record gauge height during site visit and estimate uncertainty.
- Record observations of any change in hydraulic control at the stream gauge site.
- Bench mark surveying will be conducted at each station on as-needed basis to verify staff gauge elevations and calibrate gauging instrumentation.
- Document all activities of the visit with concise field notes and photos of all relevant observations.

2.3.2 Discharge Measurements

Discharge measurements at the automated stations will be performed using the velocity-area method using a current meter. Guidelines that will be followed for obtaining good quality discharge measurements are as follows:

- The entire measurement section will be broken into a minimum of ~20 sub-sections, if practical.
- These sub-sections will be selected based on the velocity distribution in the stream, and are not required to be equidistant.
- The primary goal is to measure 5% of the total flow in each sub-section, with preferably no more than 10% in each sub-section.

For example, if the wetted stream width is six metres wide with the majority of the flow in the middle 4 metres of the channel, the measurement interval will be approximately 0.25 metres in the flowing segment, and 0.5 metres in the slower sections. This distribution will have the majority of the flow measured in the centre 16 sections with the remainder in the other four closest to the stream banks.

2.3.3 Locations

The station locations for the hydrology data collection program for each phase of the Project are shown in Figure 2.3-1 and summarized in Table 2.3-1. Table 2.3-2 lists the stations that will remain throughout the end of construction, operations, closure and post closure. The stations in Haggart Creek were chosen to coincide with key monitoring locations for water quality. The relocated station (W1A) in Dublin Gulch will monitor total flow entering the Dublin Gulch Diversion Channel upstream of Project facilities.

Table 2.3-1: Project Automated Hydrology Stations during Construction

Station	Location Description	Year -2	Year -1	Coordinates		
				Zone	North	East
W1	Dublin Gulch above Stewart	X		8V	7101545	460249
W1A	Dublin Gulch above Dublin Gulch Diversion Channel		X	8V	7101447	460118
W4	Haggart Creek below Dublin	X	X	8V	7101223	458144
W22	Haggart Creek above Project Influence	X	X	8V	7101378	458319
W5	Haggart Creek above Lynx Creek	X	X	8V	7095888	457814
W6	Lynx Creek above Haggart Creek	X	X	8V	7095964	458099
W26	Stewart Gulch	X		8V	7101443	460331
W27	Eagle Creek near Camp	X		8V	7100997	458235
W29	Haggart Creek below Eagle Creek and Platinum Gulch	X	X	8V	7099583	458225
W45	Eagle Creek above Haggart Creek		X	8V	7099684	458243

Table 2.3-2: Project Automated Hydrology Stations during Operations, Closure and Post Closure

Station	Location Description	Coordinates		
		Zone	North	East
W1A	Dublin Gulch above Dublin Gulch Diversion Channel	8V	7101447	460118

Station	Location Description	Coordinates		
		Zone	North	East
W4	Haggart Creek below Dublin	8V	7101223	458144
W22	Haggart Creek above Project Influence	8V	7101378	458319
W5	Haggart Creek above Lynx Creek	8V	7095888	457814
W6	Lynx Creek above Haggart Creek	8V	7095964	458099
DG*	Dublin Gulch Diversion Channel below LDSP	8V	TBD	TBD
W29	Haggart Creek below Eagle Creek and Platinum Gulch	8V	7099583	458225
W45	Eagle Creek above Haggart Creek	8V	7099684	458243

* During closure and post closure only

2.3.4 Frequency

Hydrology stations are subject to winter freeze, and subject to freezing to the bottom in places, and therefore will only be operated during mostly ice-free portions of the hydrologic year. The ice-free period varies year over year but is assumed to be May to November for the purposes of this Plan. Three site visits per year per station will be completed during ice-free periods to ensure quality data are collected, and to perform routine maintenance and discharge measurements; however, if the existing rating curves require additional quality points to establish a relationship between stage and discharge, more sampling visits will be added.

Site visits will be made during and immediately after freshet, during summer and at the onset of freeze up. The objective will be to observe a range in flows when the stage is unaffected by ice, which will support continued development of stage-discharge ratings. It is expected that a more continuous onsite presence will enable technicians to select more opportune periods that are reflective of the range of discharges.

Discharge measurements that are to be used for rating curve development will be conducted at times when the hydrologic control is unaffected by ice or snow.

During snow and ice-affected periods hydrology data will be collected at each station with the following frequency:

- Spring snowmelt period (freshet): weekly discharge measurements until the dataloggers in continuous stations are installed.
- Bi-monthly winter low flow measurements will be collected, if flow is measureable, to characterize baseflow conditions.

Once water level dataloggers are deployed at ice off (late April/May), data collection will be continuous.

2.3.5 Data Analysis and Reporting

During every site visit the available recorded water level and discharge measurement data will be compiled and reviewed to ensure quality data collection and enable proactive solutions to causes of anomalous recorded water level or discharge readings. Following the end of the open water season, thorough quality assurance and

quality control (QA/QC) will be completed with the goal of producing a meaningful and scientifically credible streamflow record.

To develop good quality measured streamflow records for each station, stage-discharge rating curves will be periodically reviewed and revised, as required due to changing channel bed and/or bank conditions. The rating curves for each station will be applied to the corrected continuous stage data to produce a continuous flow record for the open water season. The winter discharge measurements will be used to infill gaps (interpolate) in the flow record during the periods when the transducer sensors are not installed.

The following data will be included for each station in a summary report following each data collection year:

- corrected water level records;
- discharge measurements;
- rating curves;
- calculated maximum, minimum and mean monthly and annual flows; and
- hydrographs of daily streamflow records.

This data will be used to meet water use license criteria, and inform operational water management during operations and post closure of mine facilities.

2.4 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

2.4.1 Performance Objectives

Large variations in surface water flow downstream of the Project are not predicted during typical and normal operating conditions. The Project has been designed with adequate non-contact water, contact water, treatment effluent, and process solution storage for a wide range of climatic and operating conditions. However, while minimal, residual risk remains with respect to water storage capacity and water management infrastructure. A significant increase or decrease in monitored flow can be indicative of upstream accidents or malfunctions. Threshold targets for both increased and decreased flow at each monitored station are heavily dependent on seasonal climatic, watershed and site-specific channel conditions, and thus there is no specific threshold value for flow or stage at any particular time of year. Rather, because there will be continuous streamflow monitoring gauges established throughout the site and regular visual inspections of ditches, ponds and channels, a particular threshold will be dependent on the prevailing condition during freshet, an unusual rain event (or wet season) or an upset event. Thus, it is important to increase the frequency of visual observations of streams and ditches and other water conveyance facilities during unusual weather conditions, or in response to an identified upset event.

2.4.2 Construction

The construction of watercourse diversions is predicted to have nominal effects to water flow in Haggart Creek downstream of the Project. The implementation (after construction) of the DGDC (and/or its temporary

precursor) will divert flows and result in slight (<10%) changes to flows along a short reach in Haggart Creek, and also slight changes of wetted usable area by fish within this same reach. Also, flows in the DGDC could be higher than what Dublin Gulch normally conveys as it may also contain some or all of Eagle Creek flow which typically amounts to approximately 20-50% of Dublin Gulch flow, depending on season. Thus, Haggart Creek could experience a slight increase in flow (<5%) and wetted useable area downstream of the temporary connector to the current Eagle Creek-Haggart Creek confluence.

Continuous streamflow monitoring in Dublin Gulch, Eagle Creek and Haggart Creek provides data to examine any potential effects of construction activities on flow in Haggart Creek. No significant adverse effects from much larger reductions in flow (up to 25%) were concluded in the YESAB decision document. In the event a large change in water flow that cannot be attributed to seasonal or natural climatic variability, a phased adaptive management response will be initiated.

- Examination of upstream water conveyance infrastructure to determine if any impedance to surface water flow exists via ice dam, plug, bank failure, diversion ditch breach, discharge to ground, etc.
- Repairs to any water flow blockage will be completed including ice plug melting, removal of physical blockage and potential reconstruction or lining of water conveyance infrastructure.

2.4.3 Operations, Closure and Post Closure

2.4.3.1 Reduction in Flow

There is the potential for a very small reduction in overall flow in Haggart Creek as a result of the withdrawal of runoff (from the Project catchment sub-basins) and groundwater (from open pit dewatering) used for heap leach process water. Further, reduced recharge to groundwater in the HLF and WRSA footprints may cause a very small reduction in baseflow to Haggart Creek. It is estimated that the mean monthly stream flow in Haggart Creek, as measured at station W5 may be reduced by approximately 1% from May to October to up to 3% to 6% from December through April during mine operations. During active, passive and post closure, the reduction in baseflow and increase in stream leakage are estimated to reduce stream flow at W5 by less than 1% to 2% from May through November, and by 2% to 5% from December to April (BGC 2014).

In the event flow in Haggart Creek downstream of the confluence with Eagle Creek at monitoring station W29 is reduced by greater than 36% of baseline flows adaptive management measures will be implemented.

Adaptive management measures:

- Evaluation of the water management system to determine the cause of the reduction of streamflow. Possible causes are blockages from debris, ice, or beaver activity and reduced groundwater recharge from process water demands.
- Removal of blockage to restore flow.
- Additional process water supplies via fresh water storage on site, collection of additional surface water runoff, collection of waste rock seepage, conveyance of pit dewatering contact water, or additional wells outside of the immediate area.

- Implementation of water conservation efforts such as operational changes to offset seasonal make up water demands.

2.4.3.2 Increase in flow

There is low risk of increases to flow larger than predicted by the stormwater and water balance modeling due to effects from the Project such that the water management system infrastructure is undersized. Additionally, there is a very low probability that rare climatic events could increase flow exceeding treatment and storage capacity of the water management system for contact and non-contact water respectively.

A discussion of process solution storage capacity and upset events related to excess precipitation is provided in the Facilities and Infrastructure monitoring section dedicated to the HLF (see the Heap Leach and Facilities Process Management Plan).

Contact and non-contact water diversions have been designed to accommodate the 1:100 year 24 hour event or in the case of the DGDC, the 1:500 year 24 hour event. Precipitation events that exceed these design criteria could result in damage to water conveyance infrastructure, physical instability of project facilities or the surrounding environment, or increased constituent loading in downstream watercourses from exceeding water treatment capacity.


2.4.3.3 New water flow and flow paths

Existing water flow pathways on site and in the vicinity of the Project are well known. However new water flow pathways are possible as a result of the construction and operation of Project facilities that trigger changes in hydrologic conditions in Project sub-basins. For example, waste rock storage areas will alter infiltration rates in the Eagle Creek and Platinum Gulch sub-basins that may result in seeps and springs adjacent to waste rock storage areas. Adaptive management measures will be implemented in the event new water flow pathways are established.


Adaptive management measures:

- Characterization and documentation of the new water flow pathway. This will include mapping the emergence of a seep and extent of the flow path, quantification of discharge (volume), water quality analysis (in-situ and ex situ laboratory analysis for metals and other constituents – discussed in following section), and physical attributes and stability of new flow path (contact with mined waste rock or overburden, facilities or otherwise, loose soils, gradient, risk of erosion, etc.).
- Design and construction of new conveyance channel. If flows are observed for more than 30 days depending on climatic conditions or if flows are creating erosion and sediment, physical instability of existing watercourses or infrastructure or if water quality parameters exceed site specific objectives and are discharging to the environment a new channel will be designed and constructed to collect and convey water to the appropriate system prior to use or discharge.
 - o If the flow consists of mine influenced contact water, channel to convey flows to process circuit or water treatment will be constructed to integrate with existing water management system.

- o If the flow consists of non-contact water, channel will convey flows to sediment control / detention system prior to discharge to area watercourses.
- Monitoring for additional new water flow and sources. Predicting new sources is not possible, however, routine monitoring of existing facilities and the site in general will provide the means of detection of new flow paths. In addition to flowing water, the signs of water flow will be observed and recorded including scour, channelization, debris rafting and erosion rilling.



Legend: Hydrometric Monitoring Station Watercourse (ephemeral) Watercourse (perennial) Watercourse (intermittent) Dublin Gulch Basin Boundary Eagle Project Access Road Eagle Creek Basin Upper Haggart Creek Basin Boundary Contour (100ft) Waterbody				 Scale = As Shown		Projection: NAD83 UTM Zone 8N Date: 2014/07/02	Drawn By: SS Figure: 2.2-1	EAGLE GOLD PROJECT YUKON TERRITORY Existing Hydrometric Monitoring Stations
---	--	--	--	--------------------------	--	--	-------------------------------------	--



3 SURFACE WATER QUALITY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The surface water quality monitoring program during construction includes monitoring of water quality of watercourses within the Project area at strategic locations. The water quality monitoring plan has been designed to meet the following objectives:

- Continue to collect water quality data in the receiving environment as the Project transitions from environmental baseline characterization and into construction at stations upstream and downstream of Project influences.
- Collect water quality data to verify compliance with Type A Water Use License criteria once issued.
- Provide a continuous water quality database to support adaptive management strategies to meet water quality compliance criteria and protect aquatic life.

Surface water quality monitoring has two main focuses: compliance monitoring and environmental effects. Environmental effects monitoring will focus on the following key Project watersheds, namely:

- Haggart Creek from below the confluence of Fisher Gulch to immediately downstream of the confluence of Lynx Creek;
- Dublin Gulch from Bawn Boy Gulch to its confluence with Haggart Creek;
- Eagle Creek;
- Lynx Creek; and
- South McQuesten River at the confluence of Haggart Creek

Compliance monitoring will target specific stream locations in the receiving environment. The water quality monitoring program will not be a static program; stations will be added or removed according to the conditions and adaptive management as required.

3.2 PREVIOUS WORK

Historic surface water quality monitoring in the Project area commenced in 1993 and continued until 1996. More continuous monitoring was initiated again in 2007 and has continued to the present to establish a robust baseline water quality dataset. Water quality data collected since 2007 has focused on the monitoring of seasonal water quality in streams and rivers of the Project area using methodology consistent with environmental assessment standards under Yukon and federal legislation. Prior to 2011, generally monthly sampling occurred but was limited to the ice-free period of April to October; however, beginning in 2011, winter sampling commenced in January. Since January 2011 and continuing to the present sampling was conducted

Eagle Gold Project

Environmental Monitoring, Surveillance and Adaptive Management Plan

Section 3 Surface Water Quality

each month, except for July 2011, and January and February 2012. Previous work is described in JWA (2008), Stantec (2011b), Stantec (2012b) and Lorax (2013).

The existing baseline water quality monitoring program targets Project watersheds that have the potential to be affected by Project activities and includes the Haggart Creek, Dublin Gulch and Eagle Creek drainages. Water quality monitoring stations in each of these basins were established to monitor seasonal water quality upstream and downstream of the Project activities. In addition, water quality monitoring stations were established in Lynx Creek, a pristine drainage basin to the immediate south of the local Project area, and selected as reference stations recognizing that Lynx Creek will not be affected by Project activities. Two sites were added in late 2011 at the confluence of Haggart Creek with the South McQuesten River to establish baseline conditions 20 km downstream in far field areas.

Table 3.2-1 provides details of the existing baseline water quality monitoring program including the location, rationale and number of samples collected for the period of 2007 to October 2012 for each station. Figure 3.2-1 illustrates the existing baseline surface water quality monitoring station locations; this monitoring network was used as a basis for the proposed monitoring stations during the construction phase.

Table 3.2-1: Baseline Water Quality Site Locations, Rationale and Number of Sampling Dates, 2007–2012

Site	Location Description	Coordinates		Rationale	No. of Samples
		Northing	Easting		2007 to 2012
Haggart Creek Drainage Basin					
W22	Haggart above Dublin Gulch	7101377	458319	Above Project influence	42
W4	Haggart below Dublin Gulch	7101223	458144	Below Project influence	34
W29	Haggart below Eagle Creek	7099583	458225	Below Project influence	38
W5	Haggart above Lynx Creek	7095887	457815	Below Project influence	27
W23	Haggart below Lynx Creek	7095682	457790	Below Project influence	29
W39	Haggart above S. McQuesten River	7086504	449780	Far field Below Project	5
Dublin Gulch Drainage Basin					
W20	Bawn Boy Gulch	7101961	461945	Above Project influence	9
W1	Dublin Gulch above Stewart Gulch	7101545	460249	Above Project influence	46
W26	Stewart Gulch	7101443	460331	Above Project influence	23
W21	Dublin Gulch above Haggart Creek	7101261	458359	Below Project influence	42
Eagle Creek Drainage Basin					
W9	Eagle Pup	7101052	459630	Below Project influence	33
W10	Suttles Gulch	7100841	459161	Below Project influence	9
W61	Eagle Creek below Suttles Gulch	7100895	459139	Below Project influence	12
W27	Eagle Creek midway	7100997	458235	Below Project influence	42

Site	Location Description	Coordinates		Rationale	No. of Samples 2007 to 2012
		Northing	Easting		
W61	Platinum Gulch at road	7099624	458896	Below Project influence	2
W45	Eagle Creek above Haggart Creek	7099684	458243	Below Project influence	10
Lynx Creek Drainage Basin					
W13	Lynx Creek above Ray Creek	7098295	464770	No Project influence	4
W6	Lynx Creek above Haggart Creek	7095964	458099	No Project influence	22
South McQuesten Drainage Basin					
W49	S. McQuesten below Haggart Creek	7085495	449221	Far field below Project	12

3.3 METHODS

3.3.1 Field Sampling and Protocols

The surface water quality monitoring program will continue to use the sampling methods and analyses established during baseline characterization programs. Specifically, water samples will be collected using the methods outlined in the BC Freshwater Biological Sampling Manual (BC Ministry of Water, Land Air Protection 2003). For stream sampling, water samples will be collected in mid-stream from below the surface film and facing upstream while wearing powderless vinyl gloves.

Samples will be collected in narrow mouth, clean plastic containers; each container will be rinsed three times with sample water with the rinse contents disposed of downstream of the sampler. Sample bottles for cyanide analysis will not be rinsed prior to complete filling as each bottle contains NaOH preservative from the laboratory. After collection, sample bottles will be kept cool and in the dark for transport to the laboratory (in a cooler). Both dissolved metals and nutrient samples will be filtered within a few hours of collection, either in the field, if conditions permit, or indoors on a clean lab surface. Cyanide and total metals samples will be left unfiltered and preserved with NaOH and concentrated HNO₃, respectively. Physical/anion samples will be unfiltered and unpreserved and these bottles will be filled to capacity to minimize headspace and degassing. Total organic carbon and dissolved organic carbon samples will be collected in clean glass amber jars and preserved with HCl. All samples and blanks (both laboratory and field) will be kept in coolers with ice packs until arrival at the laboratory.

Table 3.3-1 provides a summary of the bottle volumes, sample handling (including preservative and filtration), and parameters for each sample collected as part of Eagle Gold water quality monitoring program.

Table 3.3-1: Summary of Eagle Gold Project Water Quality Samples, Treatment Protocols and Parameter List

Bottle Volume	Preservative	Filter	Parameter(s)
1 L	None	NO	Physical (conductivity, hardness, pH, TSS, TDS, Turbidity) + Anions

Eagle Gold Project

Environmental Monitoring, Surveillance and Adaptive Management Plan

Section 3 Surface Water Quality

			(Alkalinity, Br, Cl, F, SO ₄)
125 mL	HCl (glass amber)	YES	Total Organic Carbon, dissolved Organic Carbon
250 mL	None	YES	Nutrients (NH ₃ -N, NO ₃ -N, NO ₂ -N, TKN, Total N, dissolved orth-PO ₄ , total diss. PO ₄ , Total PO ₄)
250 mL	HNO ₃	NO	Total Metals
250 mL	HNO ₃	YES	Dissolved Metals
145 mL	NaOH	YES	Total CN

3.3.2 Water Quality Parameter List and Detection Limits

The suite of water quality parameters to be monitored during construction for the Project is essentially the same as used for baseline monitoring program. As the Project proceeds from baseline, through construction and into operations, the Water Use License will establish compliance criteria that consider the Project stage. After receipt of the Water Use License, criteria will be established and it is expected that the only criteria will be TSS given the scope of activities during construction. Additional parameters are expected to be added for compliance criteria for the operations and closure stages of the Project. Although the list of compliance parameters varies through the project stages, the construction environmental monitoring program includes the analysis of physical parameters (pH, conductivity, turbidity, TSS, TDS and hardness); field parameters (pH, conductivity, temperature, dissolved oxygen); total and dissolved organic carbon; major anions and nutrients (alkalinity, total nitrogen, total Kjeldahl nitrogen (TKN), ammonia-N, nitrate-N, nitrite-N, total dissolved phosphate-P, ortho-phosphate-P, total phosphate-P, sulphate, bromide, chloride, fluoride); and, total and dissolved metals (Al, Sb, As, Ba, Be, Bi, B, Cd, Ca, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Li, Mg, Mn, Mo, Hg, Ni, P, K, Se, Si, Ag, Na, Sr, Tl, Sn, Ti, U, V, Zn).

The analytical detection limit for each parameter is summarized in Table 3.3-2. The sampling, handling, preservation, parameter list and analytical detection limits are applicable to all monitoring phases.

Table 3.3-2: Water Quality Parameters and Detection Limits

Parameter		Units	Detection Limit	Parameter		Units	Detection Limit
Physical Parameters	Conductivity	µS/cm	2.0	Total and Dissolved Metals	Barium	mg/L	0.00005
	Hardness (as CaCO ₃)	mg/L	0.5		Beryllium	mg/L	0.0005
	pH	—	0.1		Bismuth	mg/L	0.0005
	TSS	mg/L	3.0		Boron	mg/L	0.01
	TDS	mg/L	10		Cadmium	mg/L	0.000017
	Turbidity	NTU	0.1		Calcium	mg/L	0.05
Organic/ Inorganic Carbon	DOC	mg/L	0.5		Chromium	mg/L	0.0005
	TOC	mg/L	0.5		Cobalt	mg/L	0.0001

Parameter		Units	Detection Limit	Parameter		Units	Detection Limit
Major Anions and Nutrients	Alkalinity, Total (as CaCO ₃)	mg/L	2	Copper	Copper	mg/L	0.0005
	Ammonia as N	mg/L	0.005		Iron	mg/L	0.03
	Bromide	mg/L	0.05		Lead	mg/L	0.00005
	Chloride	mg/L	0.5		Lithium	mg/L	0.005
	Fluoride	mg/L	0.02		Magnesium	mg/L	0.1
	Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	0.005		Manganese	mg/L	0.00005
	Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	0.001		Mercury	mg/L	0.00001
	TKN	mg/L	0.05		Molybdenum	mg/L	0.00005
	Total Nitrogen	mg/L	0.0025		Nickel	mg/L	0.0005
	Ortho Phosphate as P	mg/L	0.001		Phosphorus - Total	mg/L	0.3
	Total Dissolved Phosphate as P	mg/L	0.002		Potassium	mg/L	2
	Total Phosphate as P	mg/L	0.002		Selenium	mg/L	0.001
	Sulphate	mg/L	0.5		Silicon	mg/L	0.05
Cyanide	Cyanide, Weak Acid Dissociable	mg/L	0.005		Silver	mg/L	0.00001
	Cyanide, Total	mg/L	0.005		Sodium	mg/L	2
Field Parameters	pH	—	0.01		Strontium	mg/L	0.0001
	Temperature	°C	0.1		Thallium	mg/L	0.0001
	Conductivity	µS/cm	1		Tin	mg/L	0.0001
	Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	0.01		Titanium	mg/L	0.01
Total and Dissolved Metals	Aluminum	mg/L	0.003		Uranium	mg/L	0.00001
	Antimony	mg/L	0.0001		Vanadium	mg/L	0.001
	Arsenic	mg/L	0.0001		Zinc	mg/L	0.003

3.3.3 Sampling Quality Assurance/Quality Control

The quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) program involves the analysis of field blanks and duplicates, filter blanks, laboratory replicates, and certified reference materials. All blank samples will be composed of distilled de-ionized water, of known composition, supplied by the analytical laboratory. Field blanks will be exposed to the same conditions and treatment as the water samples collected, and are intended to monitor any contamination that may occur in the field. Field replicates will be obtained by collecting two samples at the same time from a single station for the purpose of monitoring natural variability. Blanks will be processed through filters used in the preparation of dissolved metals samples collected to detect any contamination potentially introduced during the filtration process.

Laboratory replicates, comprising sample splits, will be analyzed to determine precision of the analytical techniques used. Method blanks will be analyzed to detect any contamination that may have been introduced due to the analytical equipment. Finally, certified reference materials will be analyzed to determine the accuracy of the analytical techniques and equipment used.

The criterion used to determine the quality of duplicate QA/QC data is the relative percent difference (RPD), calculated as:

$$RPD = \left| 2 * \left(\frac{A - B}{A + B} \right) \right| * 100$$

Where A and B are duplicate samples, relative percent difference values are generally considered valid if they are less than 25%. However, relative percent difference values of up to 100% are considered acceptable at concentrations less than five times the detection limit.

3.4 CONSTRUCTION

Construction activities planned for Stage 1 include site clearing and grubbing, road upgrades, civil earthworks, concrete foundations, building erection, Dublin Gulch Diversion Channel, and camp expansion. The remaining Stage 2 construction activities including heap leach pad preparation, waste rock storage area rock drains, pit pre-stripping, buildings, crushing and screening plant and other activities are planned to take place over the following year.

3.4.1 Locations and Frequency

The surface water quality monitoring program for the first year of the construction phase will be on a monthly basis for many of the monitoring stations previously established as part of the baseline monitoring program. The surface water quality monitoring program for the second year of the construction phase will focus on environmental effects monitoring and compliance monitoring associated with the WUL.

In the second year of construction, water quality compliance monitoring stations will be added below each of the proposed waste rock storage facilities when construction of the starter embankment and rock drain is scheduled. These include the outflows from the Eagle Pup pond (station EP) and the Platinum Gulch pond (station PG).

Figure 3.4-1 illustrates the construction phase surface water quality monitoring locations. Table 3.4-1 provides a summary of each monitoring station, location, coordinates, rationale and monitoring frequency for the approximate 2-year construction period.

The majority of the surface water quality monitoring stations will be monitored on a monthly basis during construction. Only the far-field monitoring stations W39 and W49, adjacent to the confluence of Haggart Creek with the South McQuesten River, will be monitored on a quarterly basis.

Table 3.4-1: Surface Water Quality Monitoring Locations and Frequency – Construction

Site	Location Description				Coordinates		Rationale	Frequency of Sampling
			Year -2	Year -1	Northing	Easting		
		Haggart Creek Drainage Basin						
W22	Haggart above Dublin Gulch		X	X	7101377	458319	Above Project influence	Monthly
W4	Haggart below Dublin Gulch		X	X	7101223	458144	Below Project influence	Monthly
W29	Haggart below Eagle Creek		X	X	7099583	458225	Below Project influence	Monthly
W5	Haggart above Lynx Creek		X	X	7095887	457815	Below Project influence	Monthly
W23	Haggart below Lynx Creek		X	X	7095682	457790	Below Project influence	Monthly
W39	Haggart above S. McQuesten River		X	X	7086504	449780	Far field below Project	Quarterly
		Dublin Gulch Drainage Basin						
W20	Bawn Boy Gulch		X	X	7101961	461945	Above Project influence	Monthly
W1	Dublin Gulch above Stewart Gulch		X		7101545	460249	Above Project influence	Monthly prior to station decommissioning
W1A	Dublin Gulch below Stewart Gulch and above DGDC			X	TBD	TBD	Above Project Influence	Monthly after station commissioning
W26	Stewart Gulch		X		7101443	460331	Above Project influence	Monthly prior to station decommissioning
		Eagle Creek Drainage Basin						
EP	Eagle Pup Pond			X	7101052	459630	Below Project influence	Monthly after commissioning; turbidity daily when discharging ¹

Eagle Gold Project

Environmental Monitoring, Surveillance and Adaptive Management Plan

Section 3 Surface Water Quality

Site	Location Description			Coordinates		Rationale	Frequency of Sampling
		Year -2	Year -1	Northing	Easting		
LDSP	Lower Dublin South Pond flow into Eagle Creek		X	TBD	TBD	Below Project influence	Monthly after commissioning; turbidity daily when discharging ¹
W27	Eagle Creek	X		7100997	458235	Below Project influence	Monthly in year one only until DGDC commissioned
PP	Platinum Gulch Pond		X	7099624	458896	Below Project influence	Monthly after PG Pond commissioned; turbidity daily when discharging ¹
W45	Eagle Creek above Haggart Creek	X		7099684	458243	Below Project influence	Monthly in year one only until DGDC commissioned
Lynx Creek Drainage Basin							
W6	Lynx Creek above Haggart Creek	X	X	7095964	458099	No Project influence	Quarterly
South McQuesten Drainage Basin							
W49	S. McQuesten below Haggart Creek	X	X	7085495	449221	Far field below Project	Quarterly

1 –full parameter list on a monthly basis; turbidity only on a daily basis when discharging during construction

2 – TBD indicates new stations to be active during construction; final UTM coordinates to be determined after site selection

3.4.2 Data Analysis and Reporting

Surface water quality data collected during the construction phase of the Project will be compared to two key benchmarks:

- baseline water quality; and
- surface water quality criteria established by the Yukon Water Board.

Data will be managed in a water quality database and updated on a monthly basis following receipt of the final analytical reports from the laboratory. Data will be tabulated and compared to existing baseline water quality for each Project receiving stream and any WUL criteria for the construction phase. For stations that have no existing baseline data (e.g. EP and PG), these results will be compared to relevant Project water quality criteria.

Surface water quality monitoring QA/QC results for field blanks, filter blanks, field replicates, laboratory replicates, and certified reference materials will be reported for each month of the sampling program. Statistical analysis will be performed on the monitoring data and compared directly to the baseline results to determine if any statistically significant changes have occurred to the receiving environment water quality.

If required, data will be used to prepare a construction phase water quality monitoring report covering monitoring results and analysis for both years of construction.

3.5 OPERATIONS

During the operations phase, water quality monitoring for the Project will be expanded to address the performance of environmental mitigation systems as well as receiving water compliance. The baseline surface water quality monitoring program remains the basis for operational monitoring with some modifications that reflect changes associated with construction of Project infrastructure. During operations, excess water generated from the site that does not meet discharge criteria will be treated through a mine water treatment plant (MWTP), located in the near vicinity of the processing facilities (Figure 1.1-1). Effluent from the MWTP will be discharged to a Finishing Tank (FT) within the treatment facility prior to release to Haggart Creek; the finishing tank will facilitate sample collection and laboratory analyses, and provide data to ensure that the tank water meets discharge criteria prior to discharge to Haggart Creek. The effluent discharge from the MWTP to the finishing tank will be routinely monitored during periods of MWTP operation.

The excavation of the open pit will result in groundwater inflows as well as the accumulation of precipitation runoff from the pit walls entering the pit floor. This water will be removed via a pit sump and used in the process system. Monitoring of the pit sump water (station PS; Table 3.5-1 and Figure 3.5-1) will occur, for the purposes of establishing physical factors and controls on the quality of LDSP water to be used for process make-up, understanding continuing treatment requirements, and for developing a database to improve the accuracy of future pit lake water quality estimates for the closure period of the mine life.

The parameter list and detection limits monitored during the operations phase of the Project are outlined in Table 3.3-2.

3.5.1 Locations and Frequency

Table 3.5-1 provides a summary of each monitoring station, location, coordinates, rationale and monitoring frequency for the operations phase of the Project. When no discharge is occurring from the Project site, the frequency of monitoring will generally occur monthly; whereas stations W39 and W49, in the far-field, will be monitored on a quarterly basis. As stated previously, the operations phase of the Eagle Gold Project will result in the periodic operation of a MWTP to treat excess contact water prior to release to the environment. When treated effluent is released to Haggart Creek via the finishing tank, the frequency of monitoring will be increased to daily at the following strategic locations (Table 3.5-1):

- MWTP for raw effluent;
- Finishing tank (prior to discharge to Haggart Creek);
- W4 in Haggart Creek (immediately downstream of effluent discharge point); and
- W29 in Haggart Creek (downstream of all potential Project water discharges).

The full suite of parameters listed in Table 3.3-2 will be analyzed on a monthly basis. During periods of discharge to Haggart Creek, the analytical parameter list will be reduced for the above four stations, but will include, at a minimum, those parameters that have specific water license criteria.

Table 3.5-1: Operations Phase Surface Water Quality Monitoring Locations and Frequency

Site	Location Description	Coordinates ¹		Rationale	Frequency of Sampling
		Northing	Easting		
Haggart Creek Drainage Basin					
W22	Haggart above Dublin Gulch	7101377	458319	Above Project influence	Monthly
W4	Haggart below Dublin Gulch	7101223	458144	Immediately below discharge	Monthly; daily when discharging ²
MWTP	Treatment Plant effluent	7101085	458711	Treated water effluent	Daily when discharging
LDSP	Lower Dublin South Pond	TBD	TBD	Process make-up water or pre-treated water: compliance location	Weekly when operating; daily when discharging
FT	MWTP Finishing Tank	TBD	TBD	Batched discharges of treated effluent; compliance location	Daily when discharging
LDNP	Lower Dublin North Pond	TBD	TBD	Below Project influence	Daily when discharging ¹
W29	Haggart below Eagle Creek	7099583	458225	Directly below all Project influence	Monthly; daily when discharging
W5	Haggart above Lynx Creek	7095887	457815	Below Project influence	Monthly

Site	Location Description	Coordinates ¹		Rationale	Frequency of Sampling
		Northing	Easting		
W23	Haggart below Lynx Creek	7095682	457790	Below Project influence	Monthly
W39	Haggart above S. McQuesten River	7086504	449780	Far field below Project	Quarterly
Dublin Gulch Drainage Basin					
W20	Bawn Boy Gulch	7101961	461945	Above Project influence	Monthly
W1A	Dublin Gulch below Stewart Gulch and above DGDC	7101545	460249	Above Project influence	Monthly
Eagle Creek Drainage Basin					
EPS	Eagle Pup WRSA seepage	7101052	459630	WRSA seepage water quality	Monthly
EP	Eagle Pup Pond	TBD	TBD	Combined WRSA runoff and seepage water quality	Monthly
PGS	Platinum Gulch WRSA seepage	7099684	458243	WRSA seepage quality	Monthly
PP	Platinum Gulch Pond	TBD	TBD	Combined open pit sump, WRSA runoff and seepage water quality	Monthly
PS	Open pit sump	7099574	459536	Pit wall runoff and pit inflow water quality	Monthly
Lynx Creek Drainage Basin					
W6	Lynx Creek above Haggart Creek	7095964	458099	No Project influence	Monthly
South McQuesten Drainage Basin					
W49	S. McQuesten below Haggart Creek	7085495	449221	Far field below Project	Quarterly

¹ TBD indicates new stations to be active during construction; final UTM coordinates to be determined after site selection

² daily sampling for TSS and turbidity only

3.5.2 Data Analysis and Reporting

As described previously, receiving environment surface water quality data collected during the operations phase of the Project will be compared to two key benchmarks:

- baseline water quality; and
- Project surface water quality criteria as detailed below.

Effluent water quality from the FT will be required to meet all regulatory discharge limits as stipulated by the Type A Water Use License issued by the Yukon Water Board. Data will be managed in a database and updated on a monthly basis following receipt of the final analytical reports from the laboratory (for any off-site analyses conducted). Monthly data will be tabulated and compared to existing baseline water quality for each Project receiving stream and the Water Use License criteria.

Surface water quality monitoring QA/QC results for field blanks, filter blanks, field replicates, laboratory replicates, and certified reference materials will be reported for each month of the sampling program.

Monthly water quality monitoring updates will be prepared summarizing key monitoring results and analysis for the previous month. This information will be used by MWTP operators and provide compliance-related data for Yukon Government inspectors as required. An annual water quality monitoring report will be prepared that provides a summary of the annual monitoring results and analyses with comparisons to the developing database for operations as well as baseline. Statistical analyses will be performed as needed on the monitoring data and compared directly to the baseline results to determine if any statistically significant changes have occurred to the receiving environment water quality.

3.6 EARLY CLOSURE

The early closure phase of the Project is defined as the period immediately following the cessation of economic gold recovery and the initiation of rinsing and neutralization of the HLF. Surface water quality monitoring during the early closure phase of the Project is largely unchanged from the operations phase monitoring (Figure 3.6-1).

Reclamation activities, including placement of cover on the Eagle Pup WRSA will be initiated and likely completed during the early closure phase. A cover will be placed onto the Platinum Gulch WRSA once the WRSA is decommissioned currently planned for after operations phase year 3 as part of progressive reclamation. Monitoring of the Eagle Pup Seepage (EPS), Eagle Pup Pond (EP), Platinum Gulch Seepage (PGS) and Platinum Gulch Pond (PP) will continue to provide useful geochemical information on the long term seepage and runoff water quality from these facilities to inform final mine closure planning. This data and data collected during operations will assist in the final design and operation of the proposed passive treatment systems at these locations.

Similarly, upon completion of active mining from the open pit, any groundwater inflow and precipitation runoff will be allowed to accumulate in the pit. The site Surface Water Balance Model (SWBM) estimates that the pit will fill in approximately eight years. The water quality of the accumulating open pit pond (OPP); shown on Figure 3.6-1 will continue to be sampled on a quarterly basis as it fills to evaluate against predicted water quality and to make changes to passive treatment system design and other adaptive management measures if required. As the pit water deepens, samples will be collected at specified intervals (to be determined) to identify whether the pit lake will develop long-term stratification (meromictic). Characterization of this water quality through time will assist in design of the Platinum Gulch passive treatment system. When the open pit fills, any open pit overflow (OPPO, Figure 3.6-1) will be monitored on a monthly basis.

3.6.1 Locations and Frequency

Table 3.6-1 provides a summary of each monitoring station, location, coordinates, rationale and monitoring frequency for the early closure phase of the Eagle Gold Project. Sampling locations are depicted on Figure 3.6-1. Most monitoring locations will be monitored on a monthly basis in the receiving environment, whereas stations W39 and W49, in the far-field, are monitored on a quarterly basis. As per the operations phase, the frequency of monitoring during operation of the MWTP will be daily at the following locations (Table 3.6-1):

- MWTP effluent;
- FT (prior to discharge)
- W4 in Haggart Creek (immediately downstream of the effluent discharge point); and
- W29 in Haggart Creek (downstream of all potential Project waterway discharges)

The full suite of parameters identified in Table 3.3-2 will be analyzed on a monthly basis. During periods of discharge to Haggart Creek, the analytical parameter list will be reduced for the above four stations, but will include, at a minimum, those parameters that have specific water license criteria.

3.6.2 Data Analysis and Reporting

Data analysis and reporting will follow the same protocols as outlined previously for the operations phase.

Table 3.6-1: Early Closure Phase Surface Water Quality Monitoring Locations and Frequency

Site	Location Description	Coordinates		Rationale	Frequency of Sampling
		Northing	Easting		
Haggart Creek Drainage Basin					
W22	Haggart above Dublin Gulch	7101377	458319	Above Project influence	Monthly
W4	Haggart below Dublin Gulch	7101223	458144	Below Project influence	Monthly; daily when discharging ¹
MWTP	Treatment Plant effluent	7101085	458711	Project discharge location	Daily when discharging
LDSP	Lower Dublin South Pond	TBD	TBD	Process make-up water or pre-treated water; compliance location	Daily when discharging
FT	MWTP Finishing Tank	TBD	TBD	Batched discharges of treated effluent; compliance location	Daily when discharging
LDNP	Lower Dublin North Pond	TBD	TBD	Below Project influence	Daily when discharging until pond is reclaimed ¹
W29	Haggart below Eagle Creek	7099583	458225	Directly below all Project influence;	Monthly; daily when discharging
W5	Haggart above Lynx Creek	7095887	457815	Below Project influence	Monthly
W23	Haggart below Lynx Creek	7095682	457790	Below Project influence	Monthly
W39	Haggart above S. McQuesten River	7086504	449780	Far field below Project	Quarterly
Dublin Gulch Drainage Basin					
W20	Bawn Boy Gulch	7101961	461945	Above Project influence	Monthly
W1A	Dublin Gulch below Stewart Gulch and above DGDC	7101545	460249	Above Project influence	Monthly
DG	Dublin Gulch Diversion Channel below LDSP/EP PTS	TBD	TBD	Below Project influence	Monthly

Eagle Gold Project

Environmental Monitoring, Surveillance and Adaptive Management Plan

Section 3 Surface Water Quality

Site	Location Description	Coordinates		Rationale	Frequency of Sampling
		Northing	Easting		
Existing Eagle Creek Drainage Basin					
EPS	Eagle Pup WRSA seepage	7101052	459630	WRSA seepage quality	Monthly
EP	Eagle Pup Pond	TBD	TBD	Combined WRSA runoff and seepage water quality	Monthly
PGS	Platinum Gulch WRSA seepage	7099684	458243	WRSA seepage quality	Monthly
PP	Platinum Gulch Pond	TBD	TBD	Combined WRSA runoff and seepage water quality	Monthly
OPP	Open Pit Pond	TBD	TBD	Combined groundwater inflow, pit wall runoff and precipitation	Quarterly until full
OPPO	Open Pit Pond Overflow	7099574	459536	Pit pond discharge water quality	Monthly
W45	Eagle Creek above Haggart Creek	7099684	458243	Below Project influence	Monthly
Lynx Creek Drainage Basin					
W6	Lynx Creek above Haggart Creek	7095964	458099	No Project influence	Quarterly
South McQuesten Drainage Basin					
W49	S. McQuesten below Haggart Creek	7085495	449221	Far field below Project	Quarterly

¹ daily sampling for TSS and turbidity only

3.7 LATE AND POST-CLOSURE PHASE

The late closure phase of the Project is defined by the period when all reclamation and decommissioning activities are assumed to be complete; the HLF and WRSA covers are in place, the MWTP is no longer in operation and the HLF, EP and PG passive treatment systems are in operation. Monitoring of the receiving environment in Haggart Creek and Dublin Gulch will continue as per the previous Project phases. Monitoring during the late closure phase will focus on the passive treatment systems and their performance through routine sampling of inflow and outflow water to each system. Monitoring during the post-closure phase will focus on routine sampling of key compliance and environmental effects locations.

3.7.1 Locations and Frequency

Table 3.7-1 provides a summary of each monitoring station, location, coordinates, rationale and monitoring frequency for the late closure phase of the Project; sampling locations are also depicted on Figure 3.7-1. Key closure phase surface water quality monitoring stations include:

- HLF PTS (inflow and outflow from the HLF passive treatment system);
- EP PTS (inflow and outflow from the Eagle Pup passive treatment system); and
- PG PTS (inflow and outflow from the Platinum Gulch passive treatment system).

Monitoring frequency at the above three locations for key indicator parameters and those with specific criteria provided by the WUL will initially occur on a weekly basis for approximately the first year of complete operation of each passive treatment system, and prior to decommissioning of the MWTP. The objective of the higher frequency monitoring is to generate a defensible water quality compliance database that supports the successful operation of each of the passive treatment systems and justifies decommissioning of the MWTP. After one year, the monitoring frequency will decrease to monthly and be supported by monthly monitoring in the receiving environment at the following key locations:

- DG in Dublin Gulch/Eagle Creek (downstream of the EP PTS discharge);
- W4 in Haggart Creek (downstream of the HLF PTS); and
- W29 in Haggart Creek (downstream of all passive treatment system discharges)

After the cessation of active treatment, monitoring of passive treatment systems and the three key compliance locations will continue on a monthly basis for approximately five years as part of the post-closure phase water quality monitoring program or until water quality criteria are met and seepage from project facilities have equilibrated. Water quality monitoring in upper Dublin Gulch (W1A); Lynx Creek (W6)), Haggart Creek (W23) and far field stations (Haggart Creek W39) and South McQuesten W49) will occur on a quarterly basis during the post-closure phase.

3.7.2 Data Analysis and Reporting

Data analysis and reporting will follow the same protocols as outlined previously for the operations and early closure phase.

Table 3.7-1: Late Closure Phase and Post-closure Phase Surface Water Quality Monitoring Locations and Frequency

Site	Location Description	Coordinates		Rationale	Frequency of Sampling
		Northing	Easting		
Haggart Creek Drainage Basin					
W22	Haggart above Dublin Gulch	7101377	458319	Above Project influence	Monthly; quarterly ¹
W4	Haggart below Dublin Gulch	7101223	458144	Below Project influence	Monthly; quarterly ¹
HLF PTS	Inflow of HLF passive treatment system	7101085	458711	Inflow water quality	Weekly; monthly ²
HLF PTS	Outflow of HLF passive treatment system	7101085	458711	Outflow from passive treatment; Compliance location	Weekly; monthly ²
LDSP	Outflow of LDSP passive treatment system	TBD	TBD	Outflow from passive treatment; compliance location	Weekly; monthly ²
W29	Haggart below Eagle Creek	7099583	458225	Below Project influence	Monthly; quarterly ¹
W23	Haggart below Lynx Creek	7095682	457790	Below Project influence	Quarterly

Eagle Gold Project

Environmental Monitoring, Surveillance and Adaptive Management Plan

Section 3 Surface Water Quality

Site	Location Description	Coordinates		Rationale	Frequency of Sampling
		Northing	Easting		
W39	Haggart above S. McQuesten River	7086504	449780	Far field below Project	Quarterly
Dublin Gulch Drainage Basin					
W1A	Dublin Gulch below Stewart Gulch and above DGDC	7101545	460249	Above Project influence	Quarterly
DG	Dublin Gulch Diversion Channel below EP PTS	TBD	TBD	Below Project influence	Monthly; quarterly ¹
Existing Eagle Creek Drainage Basin					
EP PTS	Inflow of EP passive treatment system	7101052	459630	Inflow water quality	Weekly; monthly ²
EP PTS	Outflow of EP passive treatment system	7101052	459630	Outflow from passive treatment	Weekly; monthly ²
PG PTS	Inflow of PG passive treatment system	7099684	458243	Inflow water quality	Weekly; monthly ²
PG PTS	Outflow of PG passive treatment system	7099684	458243	Outflow from passive treatment	Weekly; monthly ²
OPPO	Open Pit Pond Overflow	7099574	459536	Pit pond discharge water quality	Quarterly
Lynx Creek Drainage Basin					
W6	Lynx Creek above Haggart Creek	7095964	458099	No Project influence	Quarterly
South McQuesten Drainage Basin					
W49	S. McQuesten below Haggart Creek	7085495	449221	Far field below Project	Quarterly

¹ monthly during first year; quarterly thereafter

² weekly during first year; monthly thereafter

3.8 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

3.8.1 Performance Objectives - Water Quality Criteria

Water quality data will be stored in a database that allows water quality to be tracked at each station for any sampling event and to examine trends over time. Using this method, parameters can be evaluated to monitor fluctuations from baseline to thresholds. The database will allow for thresholds to serve as triggers for notification and action.

Table 3.8-1 and Table 3.8-2 provides receiving environmental water quality objectives including site-specific objectives and rationale for each as stated in the WUL application. The Water Management Plan provides the design criteria established for the mine water treatment plant to achieve receiving water quality objectives at compliance points in Haggart Creek. Design criteria for passive treatment systems to be commissioned post

closure are provided in the Reclamation and Closure Plan. Monitoring thresholds for effluent are provided below for comparison to sampled data to indicate if adaptive management measures are necessary to achieve the following objectives.

Table 3.8-1: Proposed Water Quality Objectives for Haggart Creek at W29

Parameter List		Proposed WQ Objectives at W29	Regulatory Source	Comments
Dissolved Parameters	SO ₄	309	BC WQO	BC hardness based WQO for hardness of 150 to 160 mg/L at W29
	Nitrate-N	3	BC WQO	Revised (2009) approved BC water quality guideline for 30-day average
	Nitrite-N	0.02	BC WQO	Revised (2009) approved BC water quality guideline for 30-day average
	NH ₃ -N	1.13	BC WQO	Revised (2009) approved BC water quality guideline for 30-day average; value based on Temp. of 10 degrees C and pH 8.0
	CN _{WAD}	0.005	BC WQO	Approved BC guideline; 30-day average
	Al (diss)	0.2	BC WQO	Water quality objective based on mean+2SD and 95th percentile at W29
Total Metals	Sb	0.02	BC WQO	Draft Working BC guideline
	As	0.015	SSWQO	Water quality objective based on mean+2SD at W4 and W29
	Cd	0.00023	CCME	CCME criteria; chronic value assuming hardness of 150 to 160 mg/L
	Cu	0.006	BC WQO	Approved BC guideline; 30-day average assuming hardness of 150 to 160 mg/L
	Co	0.004	BC WQO	Approved BC guideline; 30-day average
	Fe	1.0	BC WQO	Approved BC guideline; 30-day average
	Pb	0.0087	BC WQO	Approved BC guideline; 30-day average assuming hardness of 150 to 160 mg/L
	Hg	0.00002	BC WQO	Approved BC guideline; 30-day average
	Mn	1.3	BC WQO	Approved BC guideline; 30-day average assuming hardness of 150 to 160 mg/L
	Mo	0.073	CCME	CCME criteria
	Ni	0.132	CCME	CCME criteria; chronic value based on hardness of 150 to 160 mg/L
	Se	0.005	BC WQO	Target value based on Trend/Roman MAPA - BC coal project and USEPA
	Ag	0.0015	BC WQO	Approved BC guideline; 30-day average for hardness greater than 100 mg/L
	U	0.015	CCME	Approved CCME chronic value
	Zn	0.055	BC WQO	Approved BC guideline; 30-day average assuming hardness of 150 to 160 mg/L

Table 3.8-2: Proposed Water Quality Objectives for Dublin Gulch

Parameter List		Proposed WQ Objectives for ECC	Regulatory Source	Comments
Dissolved Parameters	SO ₄	218	BC WQO	BC hardness based WQO for hardness of 50 mg/L (mean at W1)
	Nitrate-N	3	BC WQO	Revised (2009) approved BC water quality guideline for 30-day average

Eagle Gold Project

Environmental Monitoring, Surveillance and Adaptive Management Plan

Section 3 Surface Water Quality

Parameter List		Proposed WQ Objectives for ECC	Regulatory Source	Comments
	Nitrite-N	0.02	BC WQO	Revised (2009) approved BC water quality guideline for 30-day average
	NH ₃ -N	1.13	BC WQO	Revised (2009) approved BC water quality guideline for 30-day average; assumes Temp. of 10 degrees C and pH 8.0
	CN _{WAD}	0.005	BC WQO	Approved BC guideline; 30-day average
	Al (diss)	0.15	BC WQO	Water quality objective based on mean+2SD and 95th percentile at W1
Total Metals	Sb	0.02	BC WQO	Draft Working BC guideline
	As	0.046	SSWQO	Site-specific water quality objective based on mean+2SD at W1
	Cd	0.00009	CCME	CCME criteria; chronic value assuming hardness of 50 mg/L (mean W1)
	Cu	0.002	BC WQO	Approved BC guideline; 30-day average assuming hardness of 50 mg/L
	Co	0.004	BC WQO	Approved BC guideline; 30-day average
	Fe	1.0	BC WQO	Approved BC guideline; 30-day average
	Pb	0.0046	BC WQO	Approved BC guideline; 30-day average assuming hardness of 50 mg/L
	Hg	0.00002	BC WQO	Approved BC guideline; 30-day average
	Mn	0.8	BC WQO	Approved BC guideline; 30-day average assuming hardness of 50 mg/L
	Mo	0.073	CCME	CCME criteria
	Ni	0.025	CCME	CCME criteria; chronic value based on hardness of 50 mg/L
	Se	0.005	BC WQO	Target value based on Trend/Roman MAPA - BC coal project and USEPA
	Ag	0.00005	BC WQO	Approved BC guideline; 30-day average for hardness 50 mg/L
	U	0.015	CCME	Approved CCME chronic value
	Zn	0.008	BC WQO	Approved BC guideline; 30-day average assuming hardness of 50 mg/L

3.8.2 Construction

There is potential for construction activities, including stream bank construction for diversions, to release sediment to streams and result in disturbance of aquatic habitat; however, standard erosion prevention and sediment control practices as described in the Water Management Plan will be sufficient to minimize effects. Practices will include constructing channels with check dams, sediment control ponds, sediment basins, exfiltration ponds, and sediment traps, as well as through the stabilization of disturbed land surfaces, and re-establishment of vegetative cover as soon as practical post disturbance. All runoff from camp construction, site clearing and other soil and vegetation disturbance and stockpiling activities will be diverted to the sediment control ponds for settling.

The proposed total suspended solids (TSS) discharge standard is 25 mg/L above background levels when background levels are <250 mg/L, and will not exceed 110% of background levels when background TSS is >250 mg/L. The proposed discharge standard is achievable with the implementation of the sediment and erosion control mitigation strategies (including adapting various additional erosion prevention or sediment

accumulation practices) as described in the Water Management Plan, and therefore the effects of discharged TSS is expected to be negligible.

In the event the above discharge standard is exceeded at compliance locations (discharge to Haggart Creek), the following adaptive management measures will be considered:

- Inspection of exposed surfaces and application of additional erosion control methods.
- Inspection of upstream sediment control facilities to determine if functioning as designed.
- Repair of sediment control facilities if required.
- Increased water quality monitoring.
- Consideration of capital improvements and implementation including the following:
 - o Additional source control measures such as mulching, filter logs, silt fence, surface roughening (rough and loose preparation), and vegetation establishment
 - o Installation of additional sediment traps and sediment basins upstream of sediment control ponds
 - o Installation of filter bags for localized sediment point sources and/or geotubes for treatment of runoff from larger areas
 - o Addition of flocculants to sediment control ponds (pending prior approval from Yukon Government and the Yukon Water Board)
 - o Additional sediment control facilities and methods
 - o Expansion of existing sediment control facilities and methods
 - o Diversion of stormwater runoff to the Mine Water Treatment Plant to remove suspended solids

3.8.3 Operations, Closure and Post Closure

There is potential for impacts to water quality in the receiving environment via discharged effluent that does not meet licensed effluent quality standards. Water quality data will be collected and evaluated to determine if water quality monitoring thresholds have been exceeded. Thresholds have been developed for Haggart Creek and Dublin Gulch (diversion channel) based on the anticipated licensed effluent quality standards (Table 3.8-3 and 3.8-4) to achieve receiving environment water quality objectives as presented in the Site-specific Water Quality Objectives Report. These values will be updated in compliance with the Type A Water Use License once issued. These thresholds will be used to compare against sampled effluent during post construction phases of the Project. During operations and active water treatment, effluent will be discharged to Haggart Creek from the MWTP finishing tank at water quality sampling location W4. Once active water treatment ceases during early closure, effluent from passive treatment systems will be discharged to both Haggart Creek and Dublin Gulch (diversion channel) as described in the Closure and Reclamation Plan.

Table 3.8-3: Effluent quality standards (mg/L) for the MWTP

Parameter	<i>MWTP Proposed Effluent Quality Standards (Phase 2 to Phase 6)</i>
pH	6.5 to 8
TSS	15
SO ₄	2000
Nitrate-N	30
Nitrite-N	0.2
NH ₃ -N	15
CN _{WAD}	0.05
Al (diss)	1.6
Sb	0.24
As	0.09
Cd	0.0028
Cu	0.04
Co	0.04
Fe	11
Pb	0.1
Hg	0.00012
Mn	18
Mo	1
Ni	0.5
Se	0.07
Ag	0.02
U	0.2
Zn	0.5

Table 3.8-4: Effluent Quality Standards (mg/L) for the Eagle Pup and Platinum Gulch Passive Treatment Systems

Parameter	<i>WRSA PTS Effluent Quality Standards</i>
pH	6.5 to 8
TSS	15
SO ₄	2000
Nitrate-N	30
Nitrite-N	0.5
NH ₃ -N	13
CN _{WAD}	not applicable
Al (diss)	0.61
Sb	0.2
As	0.15
Cd	0.001
Cu	0.012
Co	0.046
Fe	8.6
Pb	0.05
Hg	0.00014
Mn	9.4
Mo	0.84
Ni	0.29
Se	0.06
Ag	0.02
U	0.15
Zn	0.05

Adaptive management thresholds for effluent are as follows:

- Effluent sample result exceeds 75% of the above-anticipated licensed effluent standards in Table 3.8-3 and Table 3.8-4. Samples will be collected from the MWTP finishing tank during MWTP operations, and the HLF PTS, EP PTS and PG PTS during closure.

Adaptive management thresholds for receiving environment water quality at stations W29 and DG (Figure 3.7-1) are as shown in Tables 3.8-5 and 3.8-6:

Table 3.8-5: Adaptive Management Thresholds (mg/L) for the Protection of the Receiving Environment at W29

Parameter	Adaptive Management Threshold	Site Specific Water Quality Objective
SO ₄	230	309
NO ₃	2.25	3

Eagle Gold Project

Environmental Monitoring, Surveillance and Adaptive Management Plan

Section 3 Surface Water Quality

Parameter	Adaptive Management Threshold	Site Specific Water Quality Objective
NO ₂	0.015	0.02
NH ₄	0.85	1.13
CN _{WAD}	0.004	0.005
Al	0.15	0.2
Sb	0.015	0.02
As	0.011	0.015
Cd	0.00017	0.00023
Cu	0.0045	0.006
Co	0.003	0.004
Fe	0.75	1.0
Pb	0.0065	0.0087
Hg	0.000015	0.00002
Mn	0.98	1.3
Mo	0.055	0.073
Ni	0.1	0.132
Se	0.0038	0.005
Ag	0.0011	0.0015
U	0.011	0.015
Zn	0.041	0.055

Table 3.8-6: Adaptive Management Thresholds (mg/L) for the Protection of the Receiving Environment at Dublin Gulch

Parameter	Adaptive Management Threshold	Site Specific Water Quality Objective
SO ₄	164	218
NO ₃	2.25	3
NO ₂	0.015	0.02
NH ₄	0.85	1.13
CN _{WAD}	0.004	0.005

Parameter	Adaptive Management Threshold	Site Specific Water Quality Objective
Al	0.11	0.15
Sb	0.015	0.02
As	0.035	0.046
Cd	0.000068	0.00009
Cu	0.0015	0.002
Co	0.003	0.004
Fe	0.75	1.0
Pb	0.0035	0.0046
Hg	0.000015	0.00002
Mn	0.6	0.8
Mo	0.055	0.073
Ni	0.019	0.025
Se	0.0038	0.005
Ag	0.000038	0.00005
U	0.011	0.015
Zn	0.006	0.008

Adaptive management measures that will be employed in the event these thresholds are reached include:


- MWTP inspection during operations to determine if system is functioning as intended
- PTS inspection early and post closure to determine if system is functioning as intended
- Repair MWTP components and adjust reagent dosages as necessary
- Perform maintenance on passive treatment systems
- Verify on site analysis results with accredited laboratory results
- Re-sample and analyze after verification water treatment system functioning properly
- Consider need for temporary re-routing of contact water to suspend effluent discharge until licensed effluent concentrations are achieved prior to discharge. Examples of operational/ routing changes include:
 - o Recirculation of excess process water within the HLF until repairs and adjustments are made to MWTP to achieve licensed effluent concentrations


Eagle Gold Project


Environmental Monitoring, Surveillance and Adaptive Management Plan



Section 3 Surface Water Quality

- o Rerouting contact water from Open Pit and Waste Rock Storage Areas from MWTP to the events pond and/or HLF for storage and recirculation temporarily
 - o Suspend Open Pit dewatering operations
- Consider capital improvements to augment or replace existing treatment systems










- Water Quality Monitoring Station - Proposed Water Quality Monitoring Station - Site General Arrangement	- Eagle Project Access Road - Watercourse (perennial) - Watercourse (intermittent)	- Watercourse (ephemeral) - Contour (100ft) - Dublin Gulch Basin Boundary	- Eagle Creek Basin - Upper Haggart Creek Basin Boundary - Closure	- Heap Embankment - Waterbody
---	--	---	--	--



Projection:
NAD83 UTM
Zone 8N


Date:
2014/07/02

Drawn By:
SS

Figure:
3.6-1

**EAGLE GOLD PROJECT
YUKON TERRITORY**

**Surface Water Quality Monitoring
Stations During Early Closure**



4 GROUNDWATER QUANTITY

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The objectives of the groundwater quantity monitoring program are to provide a continuous baseline dataset and to monitor Project effects on the occurrence and quantity of groundwater as the Project transitions from baseline characterization through construction.

The majority of the Project will be situated within the Dublin Gulch basin, which is part of the Haggart Creek basin (Figure 4.1-1). To characterize the baseline groundwater for the Project, the site was divided into hydrogeologic zones (Stantec 2010, 2011, and 2012b). The zones have been named according to the primary watercourse draining each sub-catchment. The hydrogeologic zones used to characterize groundwater in the Project area include Eagle Pup and the Ann, Suttles, Olive, Bawn Boy, Platinum and Dublin Gulches. The groundwater monitoring program that will be adopted during construction will emphasize the spatial zones where facilities will be constructed to monitor Project effects on the groundwater flow system. The construction zones requiring groundwater monitoring are depicted in Figure 4.1-1 and include:

- the proposed Heap Leach Facility (HLF) area
- the proposed Eagle Pup Waste Rock Storage Area (EP WRSA) and Eagle Pup Pond (EP)
- the proposed Platinum Gulch Waste Rock Storage Area (PG WRSA) and Platinum Gulch Pond (PP)
- the proposed Events Pond
- the proposed Truck Shop area, and
- the Lower Dublin South Pond.

4.2 PREVIOUS WORK

Historically, baseline hydrogeology data and information has been collected in the Project area for two periods: from 1995 to 1996 and 2009 to present. The more recent baseline hydrogeology data collection began in May 2009 with the installation of new monitoring wells in addition to identifying and then using historical wells that were established during the 1995-1996 period. The objective of the baseline programs was to characterize subsurface conditions, groundwater occurrence (including seasonal variability) and hydraulic properties. Hydrogeologic baseline data from previous site investigation programs are documented in Stantec (2010b, 2011c, 2012a, 2012b and 2012c) and BGC (2012a, 2012b, 2013a and 2013b).

4.2.1 Existing Monitoring Program

Currently, there are approximately 99 monitoring wells, standpipe piezometers, vibrating wire piezometers and aquifer test wells installed throughout the Project area (Figure 4.1-1). This total includes 10 nested well pairs (i.e. 20 of the 99 wells), 13 vibrating wire piezometer installations (with between one and three pressure

transducers installed at each location), four pumping test wells and 62 standpipe piezometers/monitoring wells. Of these, 20 (including four nested pairs – or eight wells) were completed in Stewart, Bawn Boy and Olive Gulches up gradient from the immediate proposed Project area (Figure 4.1-1). Potable water supply wells (current and historic) used to supply the exploration program and the existing camp are not included in this total.

Monitoring wells that were used to collect the 2011 and 2012 baseline water level data are summarized in Table 4.2-1, indexed by catchment area, proposed major mine facility and sampling record. These wells are highlighted in green (manual monitoring) and yellow (datalogger and pressure transducer) in Figure 4.1-1.

Groundwater quantity data and information have been described in Stantec (2010b, 2011c and 2012c) and BGC (2013). Continuous water level measurements were collected across the site at nine monitoring wells equipped with dataloggers and pressure transducers as indicated in Table 4.2-1 and Figure 4.1-1. Four of the dataloggers were installed in 2010, and five additional dataloggers were installed in 2011. Instantaneous water levels were also collected periodically from many other wells in 1995, 1996, and from 2009 until 2012.

Eagle Gold Project

Environmental Monitoring, Surveillance and Adaptive Management Plan

Section 4 Groundwater Quantity

Table 4.2-1: Existing Groundwater Monitoring Well Network Used for Baseline Data Collection

Instrument ID	Catchment	Facility	Data Logger Installation Date	Apr-11	May-11	Jun-11	Aug-11	Oct-11	Jan-12	Mar-12	May-12	Aug-12	Oct-12	Nov-12
MW10-AG3a	Ann Gulch	Heap Leach	31-May-10	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
MW10-AG5	Ann Gulch	Heap Leach	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-
MW10-AG6	Ann Gulch	Heap Leach	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-
DH95-152	Dublin Gulch	100 Day Storage	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-
MW09-DG1	Dublin Gulch	Heap Leach	16-May-10	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-
MW09-DG2	Dublin Gulch	Event Ponds	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-
MW09-DG4	Dublin Gulch	Mine Site	1-Apr-11	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
MW09-DG5	Dublin Gulch	Mine Site	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-
MW10-DG6	Dublin Gulch	Heap Leach	1-Apr-11	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-
MW10-OBS1	Dublin Gulch	Mine Site	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-
MW10-OBS2	Dublin Gulch	Mine Site	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-
MW96-23	Platinum Gulch	PG WRSA	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-
MW10-PG1	Platinum Gulch	PG Pond	19-May-11	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-
MW96-19	Suttles Gulch	Open Pit	27-May-10	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	-
MW09-Stu2	Suttles Gulch	100 Day Storage	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-
MW96-12a	Eagle Pup	EP WRSA	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-
MW96-12b	Eagle Pup	EP WRSA	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-
MW96-13a	Eagle Pup	EP WRSA	19-May-11	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
MW96-13b	Eagle Pup	EP WRSA	19-May-11	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
MW96-8	Bawn Boy	Background	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-

Instrument ID	Catchment	Facility	Data Logger Installation Date	Apr-11	May-11	Jun-11	Aug-11	Oct-11	Jan-12	Mar-12	May-12	Aug-12	Oct-12	Nov-12
	Gulch													
MW96-9a	Bawn Boy Gulch	Background	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-
MW96-9b	Bawn Boy Gulch	Background	<i>27-May-10</i>	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-
DH95-150	Stewart Gulch	Background	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-
MW09-OG3	Olive Gulch	Background	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-

NOTES:

X represent water level measurement taken, italics indicates that there is a break in the continuous dataset

Existing monitoring network is shown on Figure 2.3-1

Nested ground water wells are indicated by a and b distinction

Sources: Stantec (2012) Eagle Gold Project, Environmental Baseline Data Report: Hydrogeology 2011-2012 Update; BGC (2013) Eagle Gold Project, 2012 Groundwater Data Report.

4.3 METHODS

4.3.1 Overview

The proposed operations and closure/post closure monitoring programs will use primarily nested or couplet monitoring well pairs to measure groundwater levels in the saturated materials at the site. Vibrating wire piezometers (VWPs) will be used where only groundwater level information is required. The monitoring wells will also be used to collect groundwater quality samples (as per Section 5) for comparison against baseline conditions as well as the applicable water quality criteria to be identified in the Type A Water Use License.

Groundwater level measurements will be used to indirectly monitor changes in groundwater occurrence and quantity from baseline conditions. Groundwater levels (from wells) and pressure measurements (from VWPs) can be used, as necessary, to help estimate horizontal and vertical hydraulic gradients and potential changes in groundwater flow direction due to the construction or development of Project facilities.

The proposed monitoring program for the Project is presented in three main phases as follows:

- Construction Phase
- Operations Phase
- Closure and Post Closure Phases

4.3.2 Construction

Due to construction activities, many of the existing monitoring wells will be excavated or abandoned (following standard practices, as required) therefore additional wells may need to be drilled and installed in key locations prior to operations. During construction, groundwater level monitoring will occur at specified locations for the given rationale at the frequency as summarized in Table 4.3-1 and depicted on Figure 4.3-1.

Based on the existing baseline database, although there is some variability, groundwater quantity does not vary substantially from quarter to quarter. Thus, quarterly sampling during the construction phase will be to determine changes. However, groundwater quantity typically shows systematic changes associated with break-up (recharging causes levels to increase relatively rapidly), followed by a slower and longer period of decreasing water levels throughout the year. Depending on site location and rock type, this observed pattern will vary somewhat. Thus, continuous monitoring (using transducers that are downloaded on a quarterly basis) will provide sufficient temporal coverage to characterize baseline trends, as well as the potential effects of construction on groundwater levels.

Table 4.3-1: Groundwater Monitoring Well Network – Construction

Instrument ID	Facility	Datalogger ¹	Groundwater Level Sample Frequency ²	Groundwater Quality Sample Frequency	Rationale	Construction Impacts to Well
MW09-DG1	Heap Leach	Equipped	Downloaded monthly until decommissioned during construction	Quarterly	Evaluate seasonal flow in HLF embankment area until disturbed	Will be excavated during construction
MW10-AG3A	Heap Leach	Equipped	Downloaded monthly until decommissioned during construction	Quarterly	Evaluate seasonal water level variability and infiltration rates in the Ann Gulch basin (HLF area) above the Phase 1 footprint	Will not be excavated during Stage 1 construction and will remain in place as operations monitoring well until Phase 2 of HLF construction.
MW10-AG3B	Heap Leach	None	Monthly	Quarterly	Evaluate depth to the water table in the Ann Gulch basin (HLF area) above the Phase 1 footprint	Will not be excavated during Stage 1 construction and will remain in place as operations monitoring well until Phase 2 of HLF construction.
MW10-DG6	Heap Leach	Equipped	Downloaded monthly until decommissioned during construction	No	Evaluate seasonal water level variability in the Ann Gulch basin (HLF area) during construction	Will be excavated during construction
MW96-15A	EP Pond	None	Quarterly until decommissioned during construction	Quarterly	Evaluate vertical and seasonal flow in EP Pond area during construction	Will be excavated during construction
MW96-15B	EP Pond	None	Quarterly until decommissioned during construction	Quarterly	Evaluate vertical and seasonal flow in EP Pond area during	Will be excavated during construction

Eagle Gold Project

Environmental Monitoring, Surveillance and Adaptive Management Plan

Section 4 Groundwater Quantity

Instrument ID	Facility	Datalogger ¹	Groundwater Level Sample Frequency ²	Groundwater Quality Sample Frequency	Rationale	Construction Impacts to Well
					construction	
MW96-13A	EP WRSA	Equipped	Downloaded monthly until decommissioned during construction	Quarterly	Evaluate vertical and seasonal flow in the EP WRSA area during construction	Will be excavated during construction or covered during operations
MW96-13B	EP WRSA	Equipped	Downloaded monthly until decommissioned during construction	Quarterly	Evaluate vertical and seasonal flow in EP WRSA area during construction	Will be excavated during construction
MW96-14A	EP WRSA	None	Quarterly until decommissioned during construction	No	Evaluate vertical and seasonal flow in EP WRSA area	Will be excavated during construction
MW96-14B	EP WRSA	None	Quarterly until decommissioned during construction	No	Evaluate seasonal flow and vertical gradients in EP WRSA area	Will be excavated during construction
MW09-DG2	DGDC	None	Quarterly until decommissioned during construction	No	Will likely be excavated during construction; evaluate seasonal water level variability along DGDC during construction	Will be excavated during construction
MW96-17A	Open Pit	None	Monthly until decommissioned during construction	No	Evaluate seasonal water level patterns in the Open Pit during initial depressurization	Will be excavated during open pit pre-stripping activities
MW96-17B	Open Pit	None	Monthly until decommissioned during construction	No	evaluate seasonal water level patterns in the Open Pit during initial depressurization	Will be excavated during open pit pre-stripping activities

Section 4 Groundwater Quantity

Instrument ID	Facility	Datalogger ¹	Groundwater Level Sample Frequency ²	Groundwater Quality Sample Frequency	Rationale	Construction Impacts to Well
09-BGC-GTH2a	Open Pit	Equipped	Downloaded monthly until decommissioned during construction	No	Measure deep water pressures in pit walls during depressurization	Will be excavated during open pit pre-stripping activities
10-BGC-GTH-05	Open Pit	Equipped	Downloaded monthly or as pre-stripping conditions dictate	No	Measure deep water pressures in pit walls during depressurization	Will be excavated during open pit pre-stripping activities
10-BGC-GTH-06	Open Pit	Equipped	Downloaded monthly or as pre-stripping conditions dictate	No	Measure deep water pressures in pit walls during depressurization	Will be excavated during open pit pre-stripping activities
10-BGC-GTH-07	Open Pit	Equipped	Downloaded monthly or as pre-stripping conditions dictate	No	Measure deep water pressures in pit walls during depressurization	Will be excavated during open pit pre-stripping activities
10-BGC-GTH-08	Open Pit	Equipped	Downloaded monthly or as pre-stripping conditions dictate	No	Measure deep water pressures in pit walls during depressurization	Will be excavated during open pit pre-stripping activities
10-BGC-GTH-10	Open Pit	Equipped	Downloaded monthly or as pre-stripping conditions dictate	No	Measure deep water pressures and vertical gradients in pit during depressurization	Will be excavated during open pit pre-stripping activities
10-BGC-GTH-11	Open Pit	Equipped	Downloaded monthly or as pre-stripping conditions dictate	No	Measure deep water pressures in pit walls during depressurization	Will be excavated during open pit pre-stripping activities
BH-BGC11-74	Lower Dublin Gulch	Equipped	Downloaded monthly	No	Evaluate flow near Haggart Creek and long term change in water table	Will not be excavated during construction – will remain throughout operations and post-closure

Eagle Gold Project

Environmental Monitoring, Surveillance and Adaptive Management Plan

Section 4 Groundwater Quantity

Instrument ID	Facility	Datalogger ¹	Groundwater Level Sample Frequency ²	Groundwater Quality Sample Frequency	Rationale	Construction Impacts to Well
MW10-PG1	PG Pond	Equipped	Downloaded monthly	No	Consistency with ongoing baseline and evaluate flow downgradient from PG WRSA/Pond and Open Pit	Will not be excavated during construction – will remain throughout operations and post-closure
MW96-23	PG WRSA	None	Quarterly	Quarterly	Consistency with ongoing baseline and to evaluate seasonal flow down gradient of the PG WRSA and the Open Pit during construction	Will be excavated during construction or covered by waste rock during operations
BH-BGC11-72	Lower Dublin Gulch	Install	Downloaded monthly or as construction conditions dictate	No	Evaluate flow near Haggart Creek and evaluate long term change in water table	Will not be excavated during construction – will remain throughout operations and post-closure

¹ Dataloggers: column indicates wells that currently have dataloggers installed wells that do not have loggers installed but will be in 2013 and wells that will not have loggers installed.

² Frequency: for wells that will be excavated as a result of construction this column provides the monitoring frequency as stated until well excavation

4.3.3 Operations

After construction is complete for each facility, new monitoring wells will be required in certain areas where either a well was excavated or a well is required to monitor the potential effects from operation of a facility (e.g., down gradient of the HLF). Thus, the remaining monitoring network will be expanded by 10 well nests (two wells are proposed for each nest), each of which will comprise a shallow well screened in the surficial deposits (where thick enough) or shallow weathered bedrock, and a deeper well screened in bedrock. Monitoring well locations (Figure 4.3-2) will be located immediately down gradient from each facility of interest to minimize the elapsed time prior to identifying trends and/or meeting conditions of the Water Use License criteria.

Table 4.3-2 summarizes the proposed new monitoring wells and provides the monitoring well nest number, approximate screen depths for both wells in each nest (see table notes), and the Project facility targeted for monitoring.

Table 4.3-2: New Nested Monitoring Wells Needed Prior to Operations

Well ID	Zone	Mine Component	*Proposed Depth A	*Proposed Depth B
MW-4	Platinum Gulch	PG WRSA	15 m	40 m
MW-6	Platinum Gulch	PG WRSA	10 m	30 m
MW-9	Platinum Gulch	PG SCP	10 m	30 m
MW-10	Eagle Pup	EP SCP	10 m	30 m
MW-14	Dublin Gulch	HLF	10 m	30 m
MW-15	Dublin Gulch	HLF	10 m	30 m
MW-16	Dublin Gulch	Events Ponds	10 m	30 m
MW-18	Eagle Pup	EP WRSA	10 m	30 m

NOTE:

Depths are estimated and will need to be modified in the field based on the geology and depth to water table encountered during drilling activities.

Installation Program

The additional monitoring wells will be installed sometime during or shortly after the construction phase, once construction activities are completed at each proposed well site. Upon well installation, completion, and development, the static water level in each well will be measured. Single well response (slug) tests will be conducted to estimate hydraulic conductivities of the overburden and underlying bedrock materials. Installation of pressure transducers and dataloggers (e.g. Schlumberger Divers or Solinst Leveloggers with temperature and conductivity probes) in selected wells will permit collection of fluid level, water temperature and, potentially conductance measurements.

Drill hole logs will be prepared for each newly completed monitoring well. The logs will document the hole coordinates, intersected stratigraphy, hydraulic testing results (e.g., packer or airlift/drill stem injection testing results, slug testing and pumping testing results as appropriate) and pertinent geotechnical and/or geochemical data (e.g., density, soil moisture, soil and water chemistry data).

Eagle Gold Project

Environmental Monitoring, Surveillance and Adaptive Management Plan

Section 4 Groundwater Quantity

The proposed mine facilities together with the current monitoring groundwater network are shown in Figure 4.1-1. The facility being monitored, the frequency of sampling and the rationale for sampling each well are provided in Table 4.3-3.

Table 4.3-3: Proposed Groundwater Monitoring Network for Measurement of Groundwater Levels during Operations

Instrument ID	Facility	Frequency	Groundwater Sample Collected?	Rationale
MW-11	EP WRSA	Monthly	Yes	Evaluate conditions down-gradient of EP WRSA
MW-10	EP Pond	Datalogger	Yes	Evaluate groundwater conditions down-gradient of EP Pond
MW-18	EP WRSA	Monthly	Yes	Evaluate groundwater conditions down-gradient of EP WRSA and up-gradient of EP Pond
MW-14	HLF	Datalogger	Yes	Evaluate groundwater conditions to the east of Heap Leach
MW-15	HLF	Datalogger	Yes	Evaluate groundwater conditions downgradient of HLF and upgradient of events ponds
MW-16	Events Ponds	Datalogger	Yes	Evaluate groundwater conditions near events ponds
MW-4	PG WRSA	Monthly	Yes	Evaluate groundwater conditions down-gradient of PG WRSA and up-gradient of PG Pond
MW-5	Open Pit	Datalogger	No	Evaluate groundwater conditions in the Open Pit area
MW-6	Open Pit	Datalogger	No	Evaluate groundwater conditions in the Open Pit area
MW10-PG1	PG Pond	Monthly	Yes	Consistency with baseline program and to evaluate groundwater conditions downgradient from PG WRSA/Pond and Open Pit; will likely remain throughout operations
MW-9	PG Pond	Datalogger	Yes	Evaluate groundwater conditions near PG Pond
BH-BGC11-72	Lower Dublin Gulch	Datalogger	No	Evaluate short and long-term changes in groundwater conditions near Haggart Creek and downgradient of operations in Dublin Gulch
BH-BGC11-74	Lower Dublin Gulch	Datalogger	No	Evaluate short and long-term changes in groundwater conditions near Haggart Creek and downgradient of operations in Dublin Gulch

Note: wells installed with dataloggers will be downloaded monthly to quarterly depending on observed trends and data requirements

4.3.4 Closure and Post Closure Monitoring

Groundwater monitoring locations during the closure and post closure phases of the Project (Figure 4.3-2) will be the same as those proposed for the operations phase, subject to modifications and changes introduced through adaptive management. For example if groundwater monitoring indicates the need for additional wells down gradient of facilities to better monitor effects, they will be installed during operations as needed. The closure and post closure monitoring program will be adapted to groundwater flow patterns and conditions observed during active mining and to meet specific monitoring needs / objectives that will be refined as the mine decommissioning and reclamation plan is refined over the same period.

Monitoring frequency and data analysis methods will generally be as proposed for the operations phase of the program and will continue as such until each mine facility is closed (i.e. the reclamation plan has been successfully implemented).

The post closure monitoring program for groundwater levels will continue for a period of five years after each major mine facility has been closed. For the initial two years of this period, groundwater monitoring instruments will be downloaded quarterly and compared to anticipated post closure conditions in each facility area to confirm that the reclamation in each area is performing as expected. Thereafter, groundwater monitoring instruments will be downloaded on a semi-annual basis. Once it is determined that the reclamation objectives for groundwater levels have been established, the monitoring well network will be decommissioned and the monitoring sites reclaimed in accordance with the Reclamation and Closure Plan.

4.4 DATA ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

Groundwater level measurements will indirectly monitor changes in groundwater occurrence and quantity from baseline conditions. Groundwater levels (from wells) and pressure measurements (from VWP's) will be used to estimate horizontal and vertical hydraulic gradients which will permit an independent assessment of potential changes in groundwater flow direction and migration rates.

Groundwater levels for each monitored instrument will be compiled, corrected for elevation and or barometric pressure fluctuations (as needed depending on instrument type) and plotted versus time and climate data (precipitation and temperature). These hydrographs will be added to and compared with the existing baseline data set to assess potential changes associated with the Project. A data summary report will be prepared post construction, annual during operations and for specific reporting periods as identified in the Reclamation and Closure Plan.

4.5 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

Most of the groundwater monitoring wells will be used to examine effects that are predicted to occur during operations and are or will be located to collect groundwater level data in the areas associated with facilities that will be built during late construction and commissioned at the start of operations. Thus, in practice the monitoring program during construction is designed to maintain a continuous data record from baseline and into operations. The one major exception to this is the groundwater level monitoring associated with the proposed Stage 1 construction activities in the Dublin Gulch valley. Depending on the construction methods chosen (i.e.,


Section 4 Groundwater Quantity

conventional cut and fill and/or deep dynamic compaction), and the timing and magnitude of stream diversions, some of the construction zone may require dewatering, so that a decline in groundwater levels could be expected. Although the groundwater monitoring will assist construction engineering management there is no particular environmental effects threshold for groundwater levels that will cause a change in the construction process. Nevertheless, the existing water supply well is completed in the lower Dublin Gulch valley aquifer, and groundwater level monitoring results will be examined periodically to see if any of the dewatering activities will effect production in the water supply well. If so, then alternate water supplies will be considered (e.g., drill a second potable well outside the Dublin Gulch valley and/or bring in potable water for drinking and use one of the other two wells completed in the lower bedrock aquifer for all other purposes).


A comprehensive Water Management Plan has been developed for operations and a separate plan has been developed as part of the Reclamation and Closure Plan. These discuss the management of process water supply, potable water supply, sediment and erosion control, treatment of mine water, and required diversions as a result of mine site infrastructure. The WUL application includes hydrogeology baseline technical data and numerical modeling reports that predict impacts of the Project on groundwater. As a result of the open pit advance, groundwater supply demands, and reduced recharge to the HLF and WRSA footprints the mine development is simulated to cause a reduction in hydraulic heads (i.e., drawdown) in the project footprint. As a result, it is estimated that the mean monthly stream flow in Haggart Creek, as measured at station W5 may be reduced by approximately 1% from May to October to up to 3% to 6% from December through April during mine operations. During active, passive and post closure, the reduction in baseflow and increase in stream leakage are estimated to reduce stream flow at W5 by less than 1% to 2% from May through November, and by 2% to 5% from December to April.

However, there are not local end users that would be affected by potential effects on hydrogeology resources. It is expected that changes to groundwater levels will not impact any other end users or surface water flow downstream of the Project. Rather it is indirect effects on other VCs such as hydrology, fisheries resources, wildlife, and aquatic biota that require monitoring. Consequently, monitoring of the Project's impact on groundwater quantity and potential indirect effects on other resources is described elsewhere in this monitoring plan.

Therefore adaptive management thresholds for groundwater quantity have not been developed. However, groundwater levels will be monitored to compare to predicted (modeled) effects due to the loss of recharge in the HLF and waste rock storage areas.



Legend: - Groundwater Monitoring Well - Water level Only Sampling - Groundwater Monitoring Well - Water Level and Water Quality Sampling - BGC Vibrating Wire	- BGC Standpipe Piezometer - Site General Arrangement - Watercourse	- Watercourse (Diverted) - Contour (100ft) - Dublin Gulch Basin Boundary	- Eagle Creek Basin - Upper Haggart Creek Basin Boundary - Waterbody	StrataGold Corporation 0 250 500 Metres Scale = As Shown	Projection: NAD83 UTM Zone 8N Date: 2014/07/02	Drawn By: SS Figure: 4.3-1	EAGLE GOLD PROJECT YUKON TERRITORY Groundwater Monitoring Network - Construction
---	---	--	--	---	--	--	--



5 GROUNDWATER QUALITY

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The objectives of the groundwater quality monitoring program are to provide a continuous baseline dataset and monitor Project effects on the quality of groundwater as the Project transitions from baseline conditions through construction and operations. As with the baseline characterization program, the groundwater quality monitoring program is integrated with the groundwater quantity monitoring program, and will utilize the wells described in Section 4.

The primary objective of the groundwater quality monitoring is the detection of process solution leakage from the HLF and Events Pond as well as seepage migration of contact water from WRSAs, water management ponds and other infrastructure facilities that may indirectly result in effects on surface water.

5.2 PREVIOUS WORK

Previous work used as a basis to develop the groundwater monitoring plan for groundwater levels and quality are summarized in Section 4. Groundwater quality monitoring stations sampled are summarized in Table 5.2-1.

Table 5.2-1: Groundwater Quality Monitoring Program (2012)

Drainage Sub-basin	MWID	Continuous Data logger deployed	Water Level Measurement & Water Quality Sampling Events										
			Apr-11	May-11	Jun-11	Aug-11	Oct-11	Jan-12	Feb-12	Mar-12	May-12	Aug-12	Oct-12
Ann Gulch	MW10-AG3a	Yes	--	●	●	●	●	--	--	●	●	●	●
	MW10-AG5	No	--	●	●	●	●	--	--	●	●	●	●
	MW10-AG6	No	--	●	●	●	●	--	--	●	●	●	●
Dublin Gulch	DH95-152	No	--	○	○	○	○	--	--	--	--	--	--
	MW09-DG1	Yes	○	○	○	○	○	--	○	○	--	--	--
	MW09-DG2	No	--	●	●	●	●	●	--	●	●	●	●
	MW09-DG4	Yes	○	●	●	●	●	●	--	●	●	●	●
	MW09-DG5	No	○	○	○	○	○	--	--	--	--	--	--
	MW09-DG6	Yes	○	●	●	●	●	●	--	●	-F-	●	●
	MW10-OBS1	No	○	○	○	○	○	--	--	--	--	--	--
	MW10-OBS2	No	○	○	○	○	○	--	--	--	--	--	--
Platinum Gulch	MW96-23	No	--	●	○	○	○	--	--	●	--	--	--
	MW10-PG1	Yes	--	○	●	●	●	--	●	●	●	●	●
Suttles Gulch	MW96-19	Yes	--	○	○	○	○	○	--	○	○	--	○
	MW09-STU2	No	--	●	●	●	●	-F-	--	-F-	-F-	●	-F-
Eagle Pup	MW96-12a	No	--	●	○	○	○	--	--	--	--	--	--
	MW96-12b	No	--	○	○	○	○	--	--	--	--	--	--
	MW96-13a	Yes	--	●	●	●	●	●	--	●	●	●	●
	MW96-13b	Yes	--	○	○	○	○	--	--	●	●	●	●
Bawn Boy Gulch	MW96-8	No	--	○	○	○	○	--	--	--	--	--	--

Eagle Gold Project

Environmental Monitoring, Surveillance and Adaptive Management Plan

Section 5 Groundwater Quality

Drainage Sub-basin	MWID	Continuous Data logger deployed	Water Level Measurement & Water Quality Sampling Events										
			Apr-11	May-11	Jun-11	Aug-11	Oct-11	Jan-12	Feb-12	Mar-12	May-12	Aug-12	Oct-12
	MW96-9a	Yes	--	○	○	○	○	--	--	○	○	○	○
	MW96-9b	Yes	--	○	○	○	○	○	--	○	○	○	○
Stewart Gulch	DH95-150	No	--	○	○	○	○	--	--	--	--	--	--
Olive Gulch	MW09-OG3	No	--	○	○	○	○	--	--	--	--	--	--

○ only manual groundwater level measurement collected

● manual measurement and groundwater quality sample collected

-- no measurements or groundwater quality samples collected

-F- frozen

Groundwater quality parameters that were monitored during baseline characterization and that will continue to be monitored during this program are summarized in Table 5.2-2.

Table 5.2-2: Groundwater Quality - Monitored Parameters

Parameter Set	Comment
Field parameters	temperature, pH, conductivity, turbidity
Laboratory physical parameters	temperature, conductivity, turbidity, TDS, TSS, pH
Anions	Cl, SO ₄ , NO ₃ , NO, CN ¹ , Total Alkalinity
Nutrients	TKN, NH ₃ , T-Nitrogen, Total-PO ₄ , Dissolved-PO ₄ , Ortho-PO ₄
Carbon	Dissolved Organic Carbon, Total Organic Carbon
Total Metals	ICPOES/MS + mercury, trace metals (Al, Sb, As, Ba, Be, B, Cd, Ca, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mg, Mn, Hg, Mo, Ni, P, K, Se, Si, Ag, Na, Sr, Ti, V, U, Zn)
Dissolved Metals	ICPOES/MS + mercury, trace metals (Al, Sb, As, Ba, Be, B, Cd, Ca, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mg, Mn, Hg, Mo, Ni, P, K, Se, Si, Ag, Na, Sr, Ti, V, U, Zn)

Previous work on groundwater quality monitoring is documented in the reports listed in Section 4.

5.3 METHODS

5.3.1 Field

Groundwater quality sampling will be conducted according to the methods currently in use at the site², which are consistent with industry standard practice and ASTM D4448-01 Standard Guide for Sampling Ground-Water Monitoring Wells (Environment Yukon, 2011). The use of field preservatives, as needed, (including the strength and the type of preservative to be used) will be dictated by the analytical laboratory responsible for completing the analyses.

5.3.2 Quality Control / Quality Assurance

Groundwater sampling will be conducted on an approximate quarterly basis, subject to access constraints and inclement weather limitations typical in northern mining sites. Groundwater samples will be collected by appropriately trained environmental staff or subcontractors and be submitted to an independent, Canadian Association of Environmental Analytical Laboratories (CAEAL) accredited environmental laboratory in chilled coolers (ice-packs) using laboratory specified bottles and chain-of-custody forms.

¹ Total Cyanide was analyzed from early baseline studies and discontinued after years of no detection. Total and WAD Cyanide will be analyzed in groundwater samples upon the commencement of use of cyanide for the Project.

² well development and purging three well volumes using disposable inertial lift pumps (e.g. Waterra tubing and foot valve) followed by sample collection using disposable bailers, with field filtering as required by parameter/analysis type.

Trip blanks (one per cooler per major analysis type), field blanks (one per analysis type per technician per sampling event) and blind field duplicates (random at a ratio of one for every ten samples collected, minimum one blind per analysis type per sampling event) will be submitted for every sampling event to evaluate the potential for sampling, transport or analytical biases in the results. These sample results will be used together with the laboratories internal quality assurance / quality control program to evaluate the confidence in the groundwater quality results and to identify outliers and false positives in the results.

5.3.3 Data Analysis

Results, when available from the laboratory (typically 10 to 14 days after sample receipt by the laboratory), will be reviewed against baseline groundwater quality data for each hydrogeologic zone, or facilities area and QA/QC criteria to identify and eliminate false positives/negatives. Subsequently, results will be compared to the Contaminated Sites Regulation Schedule 3 Generic Numerical Water Standards for the Protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life (AW) under the Yukon *Environment Act* (O.I.C. 2002/171) and any applicable permit discharge or monitoring criteria that may be required for specific facilities areas.

Chemical constituent concentrations for each sampled location will be maintained in an on-site database, and concentrations of regulated constituents and key indicator parameters will be plotted versus time to help identify temporal concentration trends. In general, these plots will show applicable standards and baseline concentrations for each regulated chemical constituent. Groundwater quality data will be submitted for regulator review together with groundwater quantity data on an annual basis or in accordance with permit requirements.

5.3.4 Construction

5.3.4.1 Locations and Frequency

During construction groundwater sampling will continue to occur on a quarterly basis at the locations provided in Table 5.2-1. The addition of the wells in Table 4.3-3 in the preceding section sometime prior to operation will replace some of the excavated or abandoned wells due to construction. The parameter set that will be analyzed is summarized in Table 5.2-2. Well locations are shown in Figure 4.3-1.

5.3.5 Operations

5.3.5.1 Locations and Frequency

The majority of the existing monitoring well network at the Project will be decommissioned as part of construction activities and prior to commencement of mining (discussed in Section 4). As such, during operations, groundwater sampling will be conducted at the locations and frequency as provided in Table 4.3-3. Parameters that will be analyzed are listed in Table 5.2-2. Well locations are shown in Figure 4.3-2.

5.3.6 Closure and Post Closure

Groundwater quality sampling locations during the closure and post closure phases of the Project will be the same as those proposed for the operations phase, subject to modifications and changes introduced through adaptive management. The closure and post-closure monitoring program will be adapted to groundwater flow

patterns and conditions observed during active mining and to meet specific monitoring needs / objectives that will be updated during Decommissioning and Reclamation planning.

Monitoring frequency will generally be as proposed for the operations phase of the program and will continue as such until each facility is closed and successfully reclaimed (i.e. the Decommissioning and Reclamation plan has been successfully implemented).

It is assumed that the post closure monitoring program for groundwater quality will continue for a period of 5 years after each major mine facility has been closed. For the initial 2 years of this period, groundwater samples will be collected quarterly and compared to anticipated post closure conditions in each facility area to confirm that the reclamation in each area is performing as expected. Thereafter, groundwater sampling will occur on a semi-annual basis for the final 3 years, and, assuming conditions continue to meet reclamation objectives. Once it is determined that the reclamation objectives for groundwater levels have been established, the monitoring well network will be decommissioned and the monitoring sites reclaimed in accordance with the RCP.

5.4 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

5.4.1 Construction

Described groundwater monitoring wells are or will be located in specific areas designed to collect groundwater chemistry data in the areas associated with facilities that will be built during Stage 2 Construction and then commissioned for operations. Thus, in practice the monitoring program during construction is designed to maintain a continuous groundwater chemistry data record from baseline and into operation, and will serve to identify or help characterize any trends prior to operations. As a result adaptive management thresholds for the construction stages are not required.

5.4.2 Operations

Adaptive management thresholds for groundwater quality is as follows:

- Detection of concentration of total and/or WAD cyanide, if any
- Detection of hydrocarbons
- Increased concentrations of baseline water quality parameters that are within 25% of the maximum baseline concentration for two consecutive sampling events

Adaptive management measures that will be employed in the event thresholds are reached include:

- Cyanide detection (refer to Section 18 for more detail):
 - o HLF inspection for liner leaks
 - o process solution systems for leaks
 - o event ponds for leaks
 - o ADR plant and cyanide storage area for discharge

- Hydrocarbon detection: Inspection of fuel storage tanks and areas and other areas/facilities where hydrocarbons are used or stored to determine if spills or leaks are contaminating groundwater
- Increased nitrogen and/or metal concentrations:
 - o Inspection of contact water conveyance system for leaks
 - o Inspection of waste rock storage area toe berms for seepage rates to estimate flow and potential metals loadings from facilities to groundwater
 - o Capital improvements such as inter lift liner installation in Waste Rock Storage Areas to limit infiltration of precipitation through waste rock that would then discharge to ground
 - o Change to waste rock disposal sequencing to allow for early progressive reclamation on larger portions of waste rock storage areas that would include placement of store and release covers to limit infiltration precipitation and seepage to groundwater

6 GEOCHEMICAL MONITORING

6.1 INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES

The geochemical monitoring program is intended to provide on-going characterization of rock excavated during the construction process and to confirm the results of the assessment of the potential for acid rock drainage and metal leaching and resulting effects on contact water quality as mining progresses from that work developed in support of the Project as reported in SRK 2012, SRK 2014 and Lorax 2014.

The geochemical monitoring program for construction rock has been designed to:

- Assess the potential for metal leaching and acidic drainage from excavated rock;
- Verify geochemical predictions made during the mine planning phase;
- Assess the level of weathering-driven reaction products and their potential to migrate; and
- Evaluate the effectiveness of measures to prevent and control metal leaching and acidic drainage (if applicable).

6.2 PREVIOUS WORK

Geochemical characterization completed prior to mining indicates that the majority of the waste rock and ore from this site has a low sulphur content (typically less than 0.5%), and is predominantly non-acid generating. Additionally, the geochemical characteristics of the rock were relatively uniform, implying that a relatively moderate frequency of monitoring would be appropriate. Results of these evaluations have been provided in SRK (2014). Characterization of potential construction materials has also been completed (SRK 2012) and the report and methods to characterize construction materials are provided in an Appendix of the WUL application.

6.3 METHODS

6.3.1 Construction Rock

A number of potential borrow sources have been identified to support construction efforts for the Project as reported in BGC (2011). These include primarily placer tailings in the Dublin Gulch and Haggart Creek valleys and silt borrow sites near the existing camp and near the confluence of Platinum Gulch and Haggart Creek. Potential durable rock sources include the open pit pre-strip area, and a large bedrock knob (i.e., from the Ann Gulch central knob) to be cut and excavated during the first phase of the heap leach pad subgrade development. In addition, there will be some degree of cut and fill to support road construction on the site.

Previous geochemical characterization work to date indicates that it is reasonable to assume that rock sourced from pre-stripping of the open pit will not result in any metal leaching or acid rock drainage (ML/ARD) if used for construction (SRK 2014). Additionally, the placer tailings and other surficial materials proposed for use as

Section 6 Geochemical Monitoring

borrow material or in cut and fill areas present a low risk for ML/ARD and are suitable for construction (SRK 2012). The only exception to this are potential excavations within metasedimentary rock that are outside of the open pit limits, in which two out of five samples were identified as potentially acid generating. To address uncertainties in the evaluations, further investigations may need to be undertaken within these 'other' metasedimentary areas to evaluate their suitability for construction purposes if these areas are designated as potential construction rock sources. Geochemical monitoring will be undertaken to verify these conclusions and to ensure that the characteristics of the construction materials are adequately documented.

The geochemical monitoring of surficial materials will consist of the following:

- Visual inspection of the blasted rock to ensure that anomalously high concentrations of sulphide are not present.
- Grab samples representing each major excavation, with a separate bulk sample collected in each distinct geological formation encountered and/or from every 200,000 m³ material moved.

The geochemical monitoring of bedrock materials will consist of the following:

- Grab samples representing each major excavation, with a separate sample collected in each distinct geological formation encountered and/or from every 100,000 m³ material moved. An exception is proposed for bedrock excavated from the open pit, which has been subject to extensive characterization demonstrating a low potential for ARD. Material excavated for use in construction will be sampled at a rate of one per every 250,000 m³ of material moved.
- Samples will be sieved to obtain subsamples representing specific grain size distributions as follows:
 - o Bulk sample
 - o <2 mm fraction

Other aspects of the sampling and analysis will be the same for surficial materials and bedrock samples:

- The samples will be reduced to 1-2 kg in size using a riffle splitter prior to shipping to an accredited analytical laboratory for testing.
- Test methods will include the following as recommended in MEND (2009) and summarized in Table 6.3-1:
 - o Rinse pH and EC on the <2 mm fraction
 - o Modified Acid Base Accounting on the bulk sample and the <2 mm fraction
 - o Metal analysis by ICP-MS following aqua regia digestion on the bulk sample and the <2 mm fraction
 - o Leach extraction tests will be completed on every 5th sample using a 3:1 water to solid ratio on the <1 cm sample fraction

Table 6.3-1: Construction Rock Monitoring Test Methods and Detection Limits

Test	Parameter	Unit	Method Code ^a	Detection Limit
Modified Acid Base Accounting	Paste pH	Standard Units	Sobek	0.20
	Total Inorganic Carbon	%	SCB02V	0.01
	Equivalent CaCO ₃	kg CaCO ₃ /t	Calculated	
	Total Sulphur	%S	CSA06V	0.01
	Sulphate Sulphur	%S	CSA07V	0.01
	Sulphide Sulphur	%S	Calculated	
	Acid Potential (AP)	kg CaCO ₃ /t	Calculated	
	Modified Neutralization Potential (NP)	kg CaCO ₃ /t	Modified NP	0.5
	Net NP	kg CaCO ₃ /t	Calculated	
	NP/AP	Ratio	Calculated	
	Fizz Test	Visual	Sobek	
Low-Level Metals by Aqua Regia Digestion with ICP-MS Finish	Ag, Al, As, Au, B, Ba, Bi, Ca, Cd, Co, Cr, Cu, Fe, Ga, Hg, K, La, Mg, Mn, Mo, Na, Ni, P, Pb, S, Sb, Sc, Se, Sr, Te, Th, Ti, Tl, U, V, W, Zn	ppm	IF-01	
Rinse pH and EC	pH	Standard Units		
	EC	µS/cm		
Shake Flask Extraction (3:1 water to solid ratio)	Ag, Al, As, Au, B, Ba, Bi, Ca, Cd, Co, Cr, Cu, Fe, Ga, Hg, K, La, Mg, Mn, Mo, Na, Ni, P, Pb, S, Sb, Sc, Se, Sr, Te, Th, Ti, Tl, U, V, W, Zn	ppm	IF-01	

^a Method codes provided are those from SGS where baseline testing was completed.

6.3.2 Additional Waste Rock Characterization

Where possible, the geochemical monitoring program will be tied to operational activities for ore versus waste identification. Therefore, it is useful to understand the analytical programs that are proposed for daily mining operations, summarized as follows:

- Assaying capability will be required once operations commence. Assaying may include a mobile or containerized lab whose equipment would be re-installed in the permanent facilities once constructed, or a program to build a lab utilizing modular or pre-engineered construction that would be extended to provide the additional facilities contemplated.
- The assay lab will use both fire assay and perform atomic absorption assay to support both mining and processing functions. It is estimated that up to 200 blast-hole samples will require gold assays each day using fire assay.

Section 6 Geochemical Monitoring

- Crushing equipment to prepare samples for metallurgical testing to be included with all appropriate dust controls.
- Plant ore head samples, process solution samples and carbon samples will require assaying as well as samples from the metallurgical laboratory. The laboratory will include crushers, pulverizers and all associated equipment, including dust collection and environmental safety controls for sample preparation through to fire assaying.
- Analysis will be primarily for gold and silver, however pH, cyanide, total and sulfide sulfur, as well as arsenic will be included.

Given the facilities that will be in place during operations to support ore and metallurgical analytical needs, it is anticipated that there will be capability for sulphur and arsenic on-site for waste rock analyses. The geochemical monitoring program will therefore take advantage of any on-site analyses and be augmented by off-site testing. The program will be staged, with more frequent monitoring and analysis in the early years of mining and likely scaled down as a better understanding and verification of the existing geochemical characterization database is developed.

On-site analysis will consist of the following:

- Blast-hole chip composites from each blast round in the open pit.
- Geological logging of blast hole composites.
- Analysis for sulphur and arsenic.
- Results will be geospatially linked to the sample location from the pit, and if possible, to the area within the waste storage facilities that it is placed.

Off-site analysis (accredited analytical lab) will consist of the following:

- Grab samples collected quarterly representing blasted waste, reduced to 1-2 kg in size using a riffle splitter prior to shipping to an accredited analytical laboratory for testing of the following methods as recommended in MEND, 2009.
 - o Rinse pH and EC
 - o Modified Acid Base Accounting (ABA) including a total sulphur, sulphate sulphur, fizz rating, modified Sobek neutralization potential and total inorganic carbon
 - o Metal analysis by ICP-MS following aqua regia digestion
- Annual waste sampling from placed waste rock in the storage facilities (Eagle Pup and Platinum Gulch) consisting of collection of grab samples from waste produced in the previous calendar year. The number of samples will vary depending on production. One sample per million tonnes of waste produced be collected. Based on anticipated waste production as summarized in Table 6.3-2 this would result in an average of 13 samples per year (ranging from 4 to 20 depending on annual production).
- Samples will be sieved to collect samples representing specific grain size distributions as follows:

- o Bulk sample
- o <2 mm fraction
- o <1 cm fraction (including the < 2mm fraction)
- o The samples will be reduced to 1-2 kg in size using a riffle splitter prior to shipping to an accredited analytical laboratory for testing.
- Test methods will include the following as recommended in MEND (2009) and summarized in Table 6.3-1:
 - o Rinse pH and EC on the <2 mm size fraction
 - o Modified Acid Base Accounting including a total sulphur, sulphate sulphur, fizz rating, modified Sobek neutralization potential and total inorganic carbon on all three size fractions
 - o Metal analysis by ICP-MS following aqua regia digestion on all four size fractions
 - o Leach extraction analyses using a 3:1 water to solid ratio on the <1 cm sample fraction

Table 6.3-2: Anticipated Waste Rock Production and Proposed Annual Sample Size

	Y0	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	Y7	Y8	Y9
Annual Waste Production (MT)	4.8	14.4	16.4	15.6	17.4	19.9	12.7	11.1	15.9	4.3
Proposed Number of Annual Samples	5	14	16	16	17	20	13	11	16	4

6.3.3 Waste Rock Contact Water

In addition to monitoring of the solids geochemistry of waste produced, the seepage water quality monitoring program includes monitoring of seeps at the toe of both waste facilities. It is noted that these are not points of proposed compliance or discharge, but are monitored for internal trend monitoring. Proposed seep monitoring includes the following:

- Sample collection every two weeks when flow is occurring at the toe of the Eagle Pup and Platinum Gulch Waste Storage facilities and analysis for full chemistry: total suspended solids, total dissolved solids, oxygen reduction potential, pH, alkalinity, acidity, nitrogen species, sulphate, chloride, fluoride, total and dissolved metals (Table 6.3-3).
- Flow measurements every two weeks when flow is occurring at each seep collection point.
- Monthly survey of waste facilities for development of new seeps. If any are identified, samples will be collected and submitted for routine analysis and locations detailed geospatially. If seep locations persist, they will be added to the routine surface water quality monitoring program.

Additional characterization of waste rock contact water is currently being evaluated in the form of a field barrel monitoring program as described in the WUL Application.

Section 6 Geochemical Monitoring

- Field barrel monitoring is currently being conducted on a monthly basis (during ice-free periods), and will continue through initial operations to expand the time trends until actual seepage database is adequate and can be related to the barrel data.
- Analysis currently includes hardness, pH, anions and nutrients (acidity, alkalinity, chloride, fluoride, nitrate, nitrite and sulfate) and dissolved metals.
- Replicate analyses are completed on one sample for each sampling campaign with relative percent differences calculated and reported with lab results.

Table 6.3-3: Geochemical Water Monitoring Parameters and Corresponding Detection Limits

Physical Parameters	Detection Limit(mg/L)	Total and Dissolved Metals		Detection Limit (mg/L)
Temperature	1	Aluminum	(Al)	0.0002
Conductivity	1	Antimony	(Sb)	0.00002
Hardness	0.5	Arsenic	(As)	0.00002
Total Suspended Solids	4	Cadmium	(Cd)	0.000005
Total Dissolved Solids	10	Calcium	(Ca)	0.05
pH	0	Chromium	(Cr)	0.0001
Turbidity	0.1	Cobalt	(Co)	0.000005
DOC	0.5	Cobalt	(Co)	0.000005
Major Anions		Copper	(Cu)	0.00005
Alkalinity-Total	0.5	Copper	(Cu)	0.00005
Acidity-Total	0.5	Iron	(Fe)	0.001
Bromide	0.1	Iron	(Fe)	0.001
Chloride	0.5	Lead	(Pb)	0.000005
Fluoride	0.01	Magnesium	(Mg)	0.05
Sulphate	0.5	Manganese	(Mn)	0.00005
Nutrients		Mercury	(Hg)	0.00001
Ammonia Nitrogen	0.005	Molybdenum	(Mo)	0.00005
Nitrate Nitrogen	0.002	Nickel	(Ni)	0.00002
Nitrite Nitrogen	0.002	Phosphorus	(P)	0.002
Dissolved Ortho-Phosphate	0.001	Potassium	(K)	0.05
Total Phosphate	0.005	Selenium	(Se)	0.00004
		Silicon	(Si)	0.1
		Silver	(Ag)	0.000005
		Sodium	(Na)	0.05
		Strontium	(Sr)	0.00005

Physical Parameters	Detection Limit(mg/L)	Total and Dissolved Metals		Detection Limit (mg/L)
		Thallium	(Tl)	0.000002
		Vanadium	(V)	0.0002
		Zinc	(Zn)	0.0001

6.4 REPORTING

Results from the geochemical monitoring will be input to an environmental database. Annual review and reporting will be prepared at which time the monitoring program will be reviewed and amendments proposed as required.

6.5 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

6.5.1 Construction Rock

The objective for geochemical monitoring during construction is to identify rock or soils that possess relatively higher proportions of sulfide, and therefore could require placement and handling practices to prevent ARD and the associated release of metals into surface waters. Because the overall proportion of high sulphide-bearing rocks/soils is low throughout the Project site, the adaptive management strategy will employ mixing/blending of high sulphide materials with low sulphide/neutralizing materials on site that are used for construction fill. Mixing of materials will be employed in the immediate vicinity of the working area with other non-sulphide bearing rock during road and/or pad preparations (including temporary stockpile development). Adaptive management strategies would include avoiding the use of certain rocks for specific areas, if feasible, when visual monitoring (and/or follow-up sampling) suggests a zone of relatively high sulphide-bearing rock, and if not feasible to avoid, then blending with other rock in more distal construction areas where there is a sufficient volume of non-sulphide bearing rock to reduce acid generation and metal leaching from construction rock.

ABA test work will be conducted on grab samples of excavated materials that will be sourced for construction. Testing will confirm that rock used as construction material will have an NP/AP ratio >3, a paste pH >5 and a sulphide sulfur content <0.3%.

Water quality monitoring data from receiving stream stations will indicate non-point sources of metal leaching from construction rock. In the event metal leaching is detected via increased metals concentrations in surface waters the following adaptive management measures may be employed:

- Source control options:
 - o excavation of previously placed construction material if feasible
 - o installation of limestone benches within fill areas or blending of non-PAG materials if acid generating rock is detected and if mitigation is feasible when compared to other methods
 - o reducing precipitation infiltration via covers or other means of encapsulation as feasible

- Seepage collection and treatment via additional water management infrastructure (e.g. new contact water capture and conveyance infrastructure)

6.5.2 Operations and Post Closure

Characterization indicated that carbonates, predominantly calcite, were generally well in excess of sulphides. Calcite content was generally 1 to 4% (from X-ray diffraction) whereas sulphur was most often less than 0.5% (from Leco S and ICP-S). Static testing showed a predominance of non-acid generating material with the large majority of samples tested having a neutralization potential to acid potential ratio above 4. Acid rock drainage, or ARD, is therefore not anticipated for the Eagle Gold Project.

Kinetic testing based on humidity cell testing and a field barrel program indicate that, although pH conditions are expected to be neutral, some metal leaching may still occur. This may include leaching of sulphate, arsenic, cadmium, manganese, antimony, selenium and uranium, and potentially also fluoride, iron, lead, molybdenum, and zinc.

Seepage from Waste Rock Storage Areas is expected to report to planned surface drainages and to ground. Seepage that reports to the rock drains at the toe of Eagle Pup and Platinum Gulch WRSAs will be collected and treated as contact water via active treatment at the mine water treatment plant. Post closure this seepage will be collected and treated semi-passively via the passive treatment systems as described by the Reclamation and Closure Plan. In the event seepage is not captured by the rock drains and reports to unplanned surface drainages that report to area watercourses it will be detected via surface water quality monitoring. In this case, the adaptive measures described for surface water quality will be employed as described previously. Additional adaptive management measures for seepage that is not collected will include inspection of the rock drains and water management infrastructure to determine if changes are required to capture all seepage from the facility.

AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT

This section describes the monitoring of stream sediments, benthic macroinvertebrates and fisheries. The following sections describe the objectives and methods for the monitoring of the aquatic environment.

7 STREAM SEDIMENT

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The stream sediment monitoring program has been designed to provide data on pH and metal levels in the fine fraction of the stream sediments in watercourses of the study area. These parameters are relevant to toxicity and physical habitat requirements for benthos, fish eggs and juvenile fish. The objectives of the sediment monitoring program are to:

- Obtain data on sediment quality that can be used to evaluate changes related to all phases of the Project
- Provide ongoing data to support the refinement of future monitoring programs.

Sediment quality monitoring will focus on the following key Project watersheds, namely:

- Haggart Creek from below the confluence of Fisher Gulch to immediately downstream of the confluence of Lynx Creek;
- Dublin Gulch;
- Lower Eagle Creek; and
- Lynx Creek

7.2 PREVIOUS WORK

Sites sampled for sediment were selected based on geological and hydrological characteristics relative to proposed Project activities. A total of 26 sites were sampled between 1976 and 2010: ten in Haggart Creek, eight in Dublin Gulch, three in Eagle Creek, and five in Lynx Creek drainage basins. The September 2009 campaign sampled six previously monitored stations and one new station established at W29. Sampling in August 2010 was conducted at a total of eight stations, four of which were newly established at W72, W73, W74 and W75 in Haggart and Eagle Creek drainages.

Stream sediment sample locations for the previous work completed to date are shown in Figure 7.2-1 and details of the stations are summarized in Table 7.2-1. Generally, sediment samples were co-located at water quality monitoring sites, while six stations did not coincide with water quality monitoring (e.g. stations 51, 62, 63, 64, 72 through 75). The number of sites sampled in a given year varied, as did the number of replicates. The GSC collected samples from 11 of the 26 sites in the watershed in 1976 and 1977 and re-analyzed them for a broad range of metals in 1989 and 1990 under the Canada Yukon Economic Development Program.

First Dynasty Mining Ltd. collected six replicate samples from four sites on Haggart Creek and one site on Dublin Gulch in 1993 and 1995 (Knight Piésold 1996). Eleven sites in the four drainages were sampled for the Project in September 2007 (JWA 2008). Seven additional sites were sampled in 2009 and 2010 to provide

either confirmatory data for sites considered most relevant to proposed mine activities or new data for ponds on Haggart and Eagle Creeks that provide depositional habitat on those drainages (higher potential for sediment accumulation).

Table 7.2-1: Baseline Site Locations, Rationale, and Number of Stream Sediment Sampling Dates, 1976 – 2010

Site	Location Description	Coordinates		Rationale	No. of Samples 1976 to 2010
		Northing	Easting		
Haggart Creek Drainage Basin					
W2	Above Iron Rust Creek	7102902	458442	Above Project influence	2
W3	Lower Iron Rust Creek	7102895	458173	Above Project influence	1
W7	Above Fisher Gulch	7102608	458302	Below Project influence	1
W22	Haggart above Dublin Gulch	7101377	458319	Above Project influence	4
W4	Haggart below Dublin Gulch	7101223	458144	Below Project influence	4
W29	Haggart below Eagle Creek	7099583	458225	Below Project influence	2
W5	Haggart above Lynx Creek	7095887	457815	Below Project influence	4
W23	Haggart below Lynx Creek	7095682	457790	Below Project influence	1
Dublin Gulch Drainage Basin					
W20	Bawn Boy Gulch	7101961	461945	Above Project influence	2
W30	Lower Cascallen Gulch	7102209	461877	Above Project influence	1
W51	Below Bawn Boy Gulch	7102039	461638	Above Project influence	1
W8	Below Olive Gulch	7101619	461122	Above Project influence	2
W1	Dublin Gulch above Stewart Gulch	7101545	460249	Above Project influence	3
W36	Upper Stewart Gulch	7101346	460485	Above Project influence	1
W26	Stewart Gulch	7101443	460331	Above Project influence	2
W21	Dublin Gulch above Haggart Creek	7101261	458359	Below Project influence	3
W74	Inlet Pond Haggart Creek	7098330	458287	Below Project influence	1
W75	Outlet Pond Haggart Creek	7098200	458312	Below Project influence	1
Eagle Creek Drainage Basin					
W27	Eagle Creek midway	7100997	458235	Below Project influence	3
W72	Inlet Pond Eagle Creek	7099890	458361	Below Project influence	1
W73	Outlet Pond Eagle Creek	7099730	458312	Below Project influence	1
Lynx Creek Drainage Basin					
W62	Lynx Creek above Skate Creek	7101138	468945	No Project influence	1
W63	Lynx Creek below Skate Creek	7099580	467310	No Project influence	1
W13	Lynx Creek above Ray Creek	7098295	464770	No Project influence	1
W64	Lynx Creek below Ski Creek	7097774	462796	No Project influence	1

Eagle Gold Project

Environmental Monitoring, Surveillance and Adaptive Management Plan

Section 7 Stream Sediment

Site	Location Description	Coordinates		Rationale	No. of Samples 1976 to 2010
		Northing	Easting		
W6	Lynx Creek above Haggart Creek	7095964	458099	No Project influence	1

Mean metal concentrations are summarized by site in Table 7.2-2 for the 2007 – 2010 data. High levels of arsenic were reported at all sites sampled (higher than the CCME Probable Effects Level). Concentrations of arsenic in sediment were highest in Dublin Gulch (particularly near the confluence with Haggart Creek). Lynx Creek basin also had elevated arsenic concentrations despite being in an undisturbed basin, indicating that arsenic levels in the Project area are naturally elevated. Arsenic concentrations in sediments were lowest in Haggart Creek upstream of the confluence with Dublin Gulch and higher downstream of the Dublin-Haggart confluence than at other sites in that stream. Nickel concentrations were higher than the BC Interim Sediment Quality Guidelines at all sites sampled (there is no CCME guideline). Cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, mercury, and zinc were higher than their sediment quality guidelines at some sites.

There were no significant differences in cadmium, lead, nickel, and zinc concentrations among drainages. Concentrations of antimony, beryllium, molybdenum, thallium, and tin were at or close to the detection limit in all samples analyzed. Barium, cobalt, molybdenum, and vanadium were present at detectable levels; there is no Canadian SQG available for these metals. Cadmium, lead, and selenium were at or close to the detection limit in all samples analyzed and were below the ISQG.

Table 7.2-2: Stream Sediment Metal Concentrations (mean values, N=3 to 11), 2007 – 2010

Parameter	Guideline ¹		Haggart Basin					Dublin Basin				Eagle Cr	Lynx Basin	
	ISQG	PEL	W22	W4	W29	W5	W23	W20	W1	W26	W21	W27	W13	W6
No. samples			6	8	8	6	3	3	11	6	6	11	3	3
Antimony			< 10	< 10	10	< 10	< 10	< 10	< 10	< 10	< 10	< 10	< 10	< 10
Arsenic	5.9	17	84.6	127	113	106	96.4	566	315	215	200	130	139	65.9
Barium			158	154	62.8	139	219	219	165	115	129	163	228	194
Beryllium			< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	1.23	0.68	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
Cadmium	0.6	3.5	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	<0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
Chromium	37.3	90	14.5	17.1	14.3	19.7	23.0	21.7	30.8	16.8	18.4	14.3	23.2	20.2
Cobalt			13.6	14.9	12.5	11.6	12.7	8.4	12.2	6.9	8.6	9.5	10.9	10.1
Copper	35.7	197	21.7	23.7	23.8	26.1	29.0	12.3	20.0	12.9	21.3	27.4	23.8	22.8
Lead	35	91	< 30	< 30	33	< 30	< 30	< 30	< 30	< 30	32	< 30	< 30	< 30
Mercury	0.17	0.486	0.0721	0.0486	0.0284	0.0507	0.0574	0.0681	0.0366	0.0341	0.0311	0.0337	0.0547	0.0388
Molybdenum			< 4.0	< 4.0	< 4.0	< 4.0	< 4.0	6.4	< 4.0	< 4.0	< 4.0	< 4.0	< 4.0	< 4.0
Nickel ²	16	75	26.2	29.2	25.6	26.2	28.8	21.9	39.3	16.4	21.0	22.1	25.4	23.6
Selenium	5	–	< 2.0	< 2.0	< 2.0	< 2	< 2.0	< 2.0	< 2.0	< 2.0	< 2.0	< 2.0	< 2.0	< 2.0
Silver	0.5	–	< 2.0	< 2.0	< 2.0	< 2.0	< 2.0	< 2.0	< 2.0	< 2.0	< 2.0	< 2.0	< 2.0	< 2.0
Thallium			< 1.0	< 1.0	< 1.0	< 1.0	< 1.0	< 1.0	< 1.0	< 1.0	< 1.0	< 1.0	< 1.0	< 1.0
Tin			< 5.0	< 5.0	< 5.0	< 5.0	< 5.0	< 5.0	< 5.0	< 5.0	< 5.0	< 5.0	< 5.0.	< 5.0
Vanadium			22.8	24.8	13.6	23.9	36.0	36.3	33.8	26.0	26.2	22.8	37.9	33.4
Zinc	123	315	88.0	94.5	102	90.9	112	84.6	87.9	55.4	66.7	66.1	116	103

NOTE:

Bold numbers exceed ISQG, **Shaded** and **bold** numbers exceed PEL

¹ Derived from CCME (2002), except for nickel, selenium and silver (based on BC SQG as per Nagpal et al. 2006) because there are no CCME SQG for these parameters

² for nickel, BC SQG are for Lowest Effect Level and Severe Effect Level – BCSQG

7.3 METHODS

7.3.1 Field Collection

The stream sediment quality monitoring program described herein will continue to use the sampling methods and analyses established during baseline characterization programs. Specifically, sampling methods will be compatible with those described in the British Columbia Field Sampling Manual (2003) and includes input provided by Environment Canada – Yukon Branch on methods used in the Yukon. Stream sediment samples will be collected downstream of riffle habitat in depositional environments (e.g. pools) to obtain fine-grained sediment samples.

At each station, a minimum of five (5) samples will be collected and composited into a single sample. Replicate samples (i.e., additional sets of five or more) will also be collected from each site, with the first composite sample located at a downstream position and the others located consecutively upstream to avoid sampling downstream from disturbed substrate. Fine sediment will be collected using methods that consider site conditions and water depth (e.g. 2" Lexan core tube, stainless steel trowel, glass jars, and gloved hands). Samples will be placed into acid-washed glass sediment sample bottles and kept cool prior to delivery to the analytical laboratory.

7.3.2 Laboratory

Sediment samples will be sieved in the laboratory for analysis of total metals of the fine fraction (< 63 µm). For elemental abundance, sediments samples will be fire dried and then digested in a nitric aqua regia cocktail (HCl and HNO₃) at 90°C for 3-hours according to the BC Strong Acid-Leachable Metals (SALM) protocol to provide a measure of sediment components. Metals in the digest will then be measured using inductively coupled plasma mass spectrophotometry (ICP-MS) or optical emission spectrophotometry (ICP-OES), as appropriate. Mercury will be analyzed by cold vapour atomic fluorescence spectrophotometry (CVAFS).

7.3.2.1 Parameter List and Detection Limits

The suite of sediment parameters to be monitored for the Project has been established as part of the existing baseline monitoring program. The program includes the analysis of pH and total metals including Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Cr, Co, Cu, Pb, Mo, Hg, Ni, Se, Ag, Tl, Sn, U, V, Zn. The analytical detection limits for each parameter are summarized in Table 7.3-1. The sampling, handling, preservation, parameter list and analytical detection limits are applicable to all monitoring phases.

Table 7.3-1: Stream Sediment Quality Parameters and Detection Limits

Parameter	Detection Limits
pH	0.1
Antimony, total	10
Arsenic, total	5
Barium, total	1

Parameter	Detection Limits
Beryllium, total	0.5
Cadmium, total	0.5
Chromium, total	2
Cobalt, total	2
Copper, total	1
Lead, total	30
Mercury, total	0.005
Molybdenum, total	4
Nickel, total	5
Selenium, total	2
Silver, total	2
Thallium, total	1
Tin, total	5
Uranium, total	0.05
Vanadium, total	2
Zinc, total	1

7.3.2.2 Quality Assurance/Quality Control

QA/QC protocols comprise standard procedures in the field to avoid sample contamination, review of laboratory QA/QC (certified reference materials [CRM] and laboratory duplicates), and evaluation of the precision of field replicates. Quality assurance in the field will include cleaning the equipment (plastic collection pan, spatulas) with de-ionized water between sites, rinsing thoroughly with ambient water between replicates, and wearing nitrile gloves (clean gloves at each site) while sampling and preparing samples. Acid-washed glass sampling jars will be used for sediment sample collection. Upon collection, filled sample jars will be immediately placed in a clean cooler containing ice packs.

Laboratory QA/QC will include the use of certified reference materials including CRM standard MESS-2, marine sediment CRM for trace elements from National Research Council of Canada, and laboratory replicates. Field replicate samples will also be collected at each station as described above to provide information about the heterogeneity of the sediment within a site.

7.4 CONSTRUCTION

7.4.1 Locations and Frequency

The stream sediment quality monitoring program for the construction phase will continue to monitor sediment quality in key drainage basins; however, a more focused monitoring program is planned relative to the baseline program. Figure 7.4-1 illustrates the construction phase sediment quality monitoring locations. Table 7.4-1

provides a summary of each monitoring station, location, coordinates, rationale and monitoring frequency for the construction period.

The sediment quality monitoring stations will be sampled in the late summer on an annual basis during construction.

Table 7.4-1: Construction Phase Stream Sediment Quality Monitoring Locations and Frequency

Site	Location Description	Coordinates		Rationale	Frequency Of Sampling
		Northing	Easting		
Haggart Creek Drainage Basin					
W22	Haggart above Dublin Gulch	7101377	458319	Above Project influence	Annual
W4	Haggart below Dublin Gulch	7101223	458144	Below Project influence	Annual
W29	Haggart below Eagle Creek	7099583	458225	Below Project influence	Annual
W5	Haggart above Lynx Creek	7095887	457815	Below Project influence	Annual
W23	Haggart below Lynx Creek	7095682	457790	Below Project influence	Annual
Dublin Gulch Drainage Basin					
W1	Dublin Gulch above Stewart Gulch	7101545	460249	Above Project influence	Stage 1 Construction
W1A	Dublin Gulch below Stewart and above DG Diversion Channel	7101545	460249	Above Project Influence	Stage 2 Construction
W26	Stewart Gulch	7101443	460331	Above Project influence	Stage 1 Construction
Eagle Creek Drainage Basin					
W27	Eagle Creek	7100997	458235	Below Project influence	Stage 1 Construction
Lynx Creek Drainage Basin					
W6	Lynx Creek above Haggart Creek	7095964	458099	Reference, No Project influence	Annual

7.4.2 Data Analysis and Reporting

Sediment quality data collected during the construction phase of the Project will be compared to two key benchmarks:

- pre-construction baseline sediment quality; and
- BC Interim Sediment Quality Guidelines (ISQG) (Nagpal et al. 2006).

Data will be managed in a sediment quality database and updated on an annual basis following receipt of the final analytical reports from the laboratory. Data will be tabulated and compared to existing baseline sediment quality for each station and ISQGs.

Sediment quality monitoring QA/QC results for field replicates, laboratory replicates, and certified reference materials will be reported annually with the results of the program.

An annual sediment quality monitoring report will be prepared covering monitoring results and analysis for each year of the construction phase; this report will likely be included in the annual water quality monitoring report. Statistical analysis will be performed on the monitoring data and compared directly to the baseline results to determine if any statistically significant changes have occurred to the receiving environment sediment quality.

7.5 OPERATIONS PHASE

During the operations phase, the sediment quality monitoring program remains unchanged from that performed during construction.

7.5.1 Locations and Frequency

The sediment quality-monitoring program for the operations phase will continue to monitor sediment quality as per the construction period on a bi-annual basis. Figure 7.5-1 illustrates the operations phase sediment quality monitoring locations. Table 7.5-1 provides a summary of each monitoring station, location, coordinates, rationale and monitoring frequency for the operations period.

Table 7.5-1: Operations Phase Stream Sediment Quality Monitoring Locations and Frequency

Site	Location Description	Coordinates		Rationale	Frequency of Sampling
		Northing	Easting		
Haggart Creek Drainage Basin					
W22	Haggart above Dublin Gulch	7101377	458319	Above Project influence	Bi-Annual
W4	Haggart below Dublin Gulch	7101223	458144	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
W29	Haggart below Eagle Creek	7099583	458225	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
W5	Haggart above Lynx Creek	7095887	457815	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
W23	Haggart below Lynx Creek	7095682	457790	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
Dublin Gulch Drainage Basin					
W1A	Dublin Gulch below Stewart Gulch and above DGDC	7101545	460249	Above Project influence	Bi-Annual
Lynx Creek Drainage Basin					
W6	Lynx Creek above Haggart Creek	7095964	458099	Reference, No Project influence	Bi-Annual

7.5.2 Data Analysis and Reporting

Data analysis and reporting of sediment quality will be as described for the construction phase of the Project.

7.5.3 Early Closure Phase

During the early closure phase, the sediment quality monitoring program remains unchanged from that performed previously throughout construction and operations.

7.5.4 Locations and Frequency

The sediment quality-monitoring program for the early closure phase will continue to monitor sediment quality as per the construction and operations periods on a bi-annual basis. Early closure phase sediment quality monitoring locations remain the same as described for operations (Figure 7.5-1). Table 7.5-2 provides a summary of each monitoring station, location, coordinates, rationale and monitoring frequency for the operations period.

7.5.5 Data Analysis and Reporting

Data analysis and reporting will follow the same protocols as outlined previously for the construction and operations phase.

Table 7.5-2: Early Closure Phase Stream Sediment Quality Monitoring Locations and Frequency

Site	Location Description	Coordinates		Rationale	Frequency of Sampling
		Northing	Easting		
Haggart Creek Drainage Basin					
W22	Haggart above Dublin Gulch	7101377	458319	Above Project influence	Bi-Annual
W4	Haggart below Dublin Gulch	7101223	458144	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
W29	Haggart below Eagle Creek	7099583	458225	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
W5	Haggart above Lynx Creek	7095887	457815	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
W23	Haggart below Lynx Creek	7095682	457790	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
Dublin Gulch Drainage Basin					
W1A	Dublin Gulch below Stewart Gulch and above the DGDC	7101545	460249	Above Project influence	Bi-Annual
Lynx Creek Drainage Basin					
W6	Lynx Creek above Haggart Creek	7095964	458099	Reference, No Project influence	Bi-Annual

7.6 LATE CLOSURE PHASE

For the late closure phase of the Project, all reclamation and decommissioning activities are assumed to be complete; the MWTP is no longer in operation and the passive treatment systems for treatment of HLF seepage, Eagle Pup WRSA seepage and Platinum Gulch WRSA seepage/Open pit overflow are in operation. Sediment quality monitoring of the receiving environment in Haggart Creek and Dublin Gulch will continue as per the previous mine phases. Monitoring during the late closure phase will focus on the passive treatment systems and their performance through annual sampling of sediments within the passive treatment cells.

7.6.1 Locations and Frequency

Table 7.6-1 provides a summary of each monitoring station, location, coordinates, rationale and monitoring frequency for the late closure phase of the Project; sampling locations are also depicted on Figure 7.6-1. Key late closure phase sediment quality monitoring stations include:

- HLF PTS (sediment quality within the HLF passive treatment system);
- EP PTS (sediment quality within the Eagle Pup WRSF passive treatment system); and
- PG PTS (sediment quality within the Platinum Gulch WRSF passive treatment system)

Monitoring frequency for the closure phase sediment quality program will be bi-annual for a period of 5 years (i.e., years 1, 3 and 5) after inception of the passive treatment systems.

7.6.2 Data Analysis and Reporting

Data analysis and reporting will follow the same protocols as outlined previously for the operations and early closure phase.

Table 7.6-1: Late Closure Phase Stream Sediment Quality Monitoring Locations and Frequency

Site	Location Description	Coordinates		Rationale	Frequency of Sampling
		Northing	Easting		
Haggart Creek Drainage Basin					
W22	Haggart above Dublin Gulch	7101377	458319	Above Project influence	Bi-Annual
HLF PTS	HLF passive treatment system	7101085	458711	PTS performance	Bi-Annual
W4	Haggart below Dublin Gulch	7101223	458144	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
W29	Haggart below Eagle Creek	7099583	458225	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
W5	Haggart above Lynx Creek	7095887	457815	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
W23	Haggart below Lynx Creek	7095682	457790	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
Dublin Gulch Drainage Basin					
W1A	Dublin Gulch below Stewart Gulch and above DGDC	7101545	460249	Above Project influence	Bi-Annual
Eagle Creek Drainage Basin					
EP PTS	EP passive treatment system	7101052	459630	PTS performance	Bi-Annual
PG PTS	PG passive treatment system	7099684	458243	PTS performance	Bi-Annual
Lynx Creek Drainage Basin					
W6	Lynx Creek above Haggart Creek	7095964	458099	Reference, Below Project influence	Bi-Annual

7.7 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

Sediment quality guidelines provide scientific benchmarks, or reference points, for evaluating the potential for observing adverse biological effects in aquatic systems. The guidelines are derived from the available toxicological information according to the formal protocol established by the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME). Concurrently collected chemical and biological data (“co-occurrence data”) are evaluated from numerous individual studies to establish an association between the concentration of each chemical measured in the sediment and any adverse biological effect observed.

The CCME has established a Biological Effects Database for Sediments to calculate two assessment values. The lower value, referred to as the threshold effect level (TEL), represents the concentration below which adverse biological effects are expected to occur rarely. The upper value, referred to as the probable effect level (PEL), defines the level above which adverse effects are expected to occur frequently. By calculating TELs and PELs according to a standard formula, three ranges of chemical concentrations are consistently defined: (1) the minimal effect range within which adverse effects rarely occur (i.e., fewer than 25% adverse effects occur below the TEL), (2) the possible effect range within which adverse effects occasionally occur (i.e., the range between the TEL and PEL), and (3) the probable effect range within which adverse biological effects frequently occur (i.e., more than 50% adverse effects occur above the PEL).


Baseline data for the Project includes metals concentrations that exceed Probable Effects Levels as provided by CCME. Adaptive management thresholds for sediment monitoring are initially set at 25% higher than median baseline values for those parameters that currently exceed the PEL as a baseline condition. For those parameters that do not exceed PEL at baseline, the PEL will constitute the threshold for adaptive management. Final thresholds for metal concentrations in sediment will be developed with guidance from Environment Canada and the Yukon Water Board as required.

In the event parameter concentrations exceed the PEL or for those select parameters exceed the PEL at baseline by 25%, the following adaptive management measures will be considered.

Adaptive management measures that will be employed in the event these thresholds are reached include:


- Investigate for possible previously unidentified upstream sources, and if found develop appropriate mitigation to minimize source
- MWTP inspection during operations to determine if system is functioning as intended
- PTS inspection during early and post closure to determine if system is functioning as intended
- Repair MWTP components and/or adjust reagent dosages as necessary
- Perform maintenance on passive treatment systems
- Verify on site analysis results with accredited laboratory results
- Re-sample and analyze after verification water treatment system functioning properly

- Consider need for temporary re-routing of contact water to suspend effluent discharge until licensed effluent concentrations are achieved prior to discharge. Examples of operational/ routing changes include:
 - o Recirculation of excess process water within the HLF until repairs and adjustments are made to MWTP to achieve licensed effluent concentrations
 - o Rerouting contact water from Open Pit and Waste Rock Storage Areas from MWTP to events ponds and/or HLF for storage and recirculation temporarily
 - o Suspend Open Pit dewatering operations
- Consider capital improvements to augment or replace existing treatment systems




Legend: ● Sediment Monitoring Station --- Watercourse (ephemeral) --- Watercourse (perennial) --- Watercourse (intermittent) --- Eagle Project Access Road --- Contour (100ft) ■ Construction ■ Waterbody --- Dublin Gulch Basin Boundary --- Eagle Creek Basin --- Upper Haggart Creek Basin Boundary						Projection: NAD83 UTM Zone 8N	Drawn By: SS	EAGLE GOLD PROJECT YUKON TERRITORY
				Scale = As Shown		Date: 2014/07/02	Figure: 7.4-1	

**Stream Sediment Monitoring
Stations - Construction**



Legend:					Projection: NAD83 UTM Zone 8N	Drawn By: SS	EAGLE GOLD PROJECT YUKON TERRITORY
 Sediment Monitoring Station	 Watercourse (ephemeral)	 Dublin Gulch Basin Boundary	 Operations		Date: 2014/07/02	Figure: 7.5-1	
 Watercourse (perennial)	 Eagle Project Access Road	 Eagle Creek Basin	 Heap Embankment				Stream Sediment Monitoring Stations - Operations
 Watercourse (intermittent)	 Contour (100ft)	 Upper Haggart Creek Basin Boundary	 Waterbody				



Legend: Sediment Monitoring Station Watercourse (perennial) Watercourse (intermittent)		Watercourse (ephemeral) Eagle Project Access Road Contour (100ft)	Dublin Gulch Basin Boundary Eagle Creek Basin Upper Haggart Creek Basin Boundary	Closure Heap Embankment Waterbody	 Scale = As Shown	Projection: NAD83 UTM Zone 8N Date: 2014/07/02	Drawn By: SS Figure: 7.6-1	EAGLE GOLD PROJECT YUKON TERRITORY Stream Sediment Monitoring Stations - Closure
--	--	---	--	---	--------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	---

8 BENTHIC MACROINVERTEBRATES

8.1 INTRODUCTION

The objectives of the benthic invertebrate monitoring program are to:

- Characterize community diversity and abundance during the transition from baseline and through construction of the Project
- Determine variation relative to baseline data
- Provide supporting information for fisheries assessments and to comply with future MMER requirements.

Environment Canada recommends that benthic invertebrates be used as the primary indicator organisms for use in monitoring effects on fish habitat (Environment Canada 2002).

8.2 PREVIOUS WORK

Previous benthic invertebrate monitoring occurred during the late summer low flow period in 1995 (11 sites), 2007 (11 sites), 2009 (7 sites), and 2010 (7 sites), at sites shown in Figure 8.2-1 (Stantec (2011)). Samples were collected from riffle habitat to target the preferred habitat of the more sensitive benthic invertebrate species (Table 8.2-1). In 1995, a Hess sampler (250 µm mesh; 0.096 m² sampling area) was used to collect three replicate samples from riffle habitat at each site (Hallam Knight Piésold 1996). In 2007, 2009, and 2010, a Surber sampler (250 µm mesh size; 0.093 m² area) was used to collect five replicate samples from riffle habitat at each site. Five replicate samples at least 15 m apart were collected at each site. Invertebrates were identified to the lowest practical level (genus for most insects including chironomids, family or order for other organisms, species or phylum in some cases). The size fraction analyzed was 500 µm in 2007, 2009, and 2010, rather than 250 µm in 1995.

Table 8.2-1: Benthic Invertebrate Sample Locations, 1995, 2007, 2009, and 2010

Site	Location	Dates Sampled			
		11 – 16 Aug 1995	11 – 20 Sept 2007	14 – 15 Sept 2009	18 – 19 Aug 2010
Haggart Creek Drainage Basin					
W2	Haggart above Ironrust Creek	✓			
W3	Lower Ironrust Creek	✓			
W7	Haggart below Ironrust Creek	✓			
W11	Lower Fisher Gulch	✓			
W22	Haggart above Dublin Gulch		✓	✓	✓

Section 8 Benthic Macroinvertebrates

Site	Location	Dates Sampled			
		11 – 16 Aug 1995	11 – 20 Sept 2007	14 – 15 Sept 2009	18 – 19 Aug 2010
W4	Haggart below Dublin Gulch	✓	✓		
W29	Haggart below Eagle Creek			✓	✓
W5	Haggart above Lynx Creek	✓	✓	✓	✓
W23	Haggart below Lynx Creek		✓		✓
Dublin Gulch Drainage Basin					
W20	Bawn Boy Gulch		✓		
W8	Dublin below Olive Gulch	✓			
W1	Dublin above Stewart Gulch	✓	✓	✓	✓
W26	Stewart Gulch	✓		✓	
W21	Dublin above Haggart Creek		✓	✓	✓
Eagle Creek Drainage Basin					
W9	Eagle Pup	✓	✓		
W10	Suttles Gulch		✓		
W27	Eagle Creek			✓	✓
Lynx Creek Drainage Basin					
W13	Lynx above Ray Creek		✓		
W6	Lynx above Haggart Creek	✓	✓		

Baseline data indicate the presence of viable and diverse benthic invertebrate communities in all the watercourses monitored, including those with elevated arsenic levels. Differences in taxonomic richness and abundance, diversity, and evenness among sites and years were noted, and were related to the range of habitat characteristics, water quality and fish presence (predators) in the watercourses studied.

Variability within sites and among years in terms of abundance was observed, less so for other community characteristics. The number of organisms/m² tended to be higher at creek sites in Dublin Gulch and Eagle Creek drainage basins than in Haggart or Lynx Creek drainage basins. Taxon richness and diversity tended to be higher in Haggart and Lynx Creeks than the smaller tributaries, commonly noted when comparing larger and smaller streams. Pollution sensitive aquatic insects (Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera and Trichoptera [EPT], or mayflies, stoneflies and caddisflies) were abundant and diverse at all sites except Eagle Creek (W27) in 2010; abundance and diversity of these organisms are considered an indicator of good water quality and of food supply for fish. Numbers of EPT taxa were highest at sites in Haggart Creek and Dublin Gulch.

The predominant taxa were Ephemeroptera in all drainages except Eagle Creek and Plecoptera in all drainages, as well as pollution tolerant organisms (Chironomidae or midges and Oligochaeta or aquatic worms in all drainages). The changes noted for Eagle Creek (W27) between 2009 and 2010 (shift to lower richness, diversity, number of EPT taxa, Plecoptera abundance and increased chironomid abundance) reflect the changes in water chemistry (higher TSS and metals levels) and habitat quality over that period.

8.3 METHODS

8.3.1 Field

Survey methods will be consistent with those recommended in the Metal Mining Guidance Document for Aquatics Effects Monitoring, Environment Canada, June 2002 (EEM Guidance Document). Riffle zones will be sampled using a Hess sampler (0.1 m² area, 500 µm mesh size). Sampling will occur along a longitudinal stretch of the stream that includes one pool/riffle sequence. Five replicates will be collected in each area with a minimum separation of three times the bank-full width (measured at the top of the bank) between stations. Three subsamples (i.e. Hess sampler sets) will be composited to make up a replicate.

Samples will be collected in later summer/early fall to allow comparison of results to historical data to aid in the interpretation of results. Field notes will contain the following information and follow protocols as stipulated in the most current Metal Mining Environmental Effects Monitoring (EEM) Technical Guidance Document, including at a minimum:

- Coordinates of each of the five replicates
- Date and time of sample collection
- Field crew members, their affiliations and credentials
- Habitat descriptions including supporting environmental variables
- Type of sampler used including area and mesh size
- Sample IDs, # of jars per sample, preservation
- Any observations that will help in the interpretation of results

The water quality and sediment sampling programs will be coordinated with the benthic invertebrate sampling program as much as possible, so that the samples will be collected within the same time period and stream reach location and as dictated by the proposed sampling frequency for each program. Field measurements of water temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH, and conductivity will be conducted. Morphometric measurements of each sampling area will include bankfull width, wetted width, depth, and gradient. Canopy cover will also be estimated at each sampling area.

MMER *Schedule 5, section 16(a) (iii)* requires that total organic carbon (TOC) and particle size distribution of sediment be reported along with benthic invertebrate metrics if invertebrate sampling is carried out in an area where sediment can be sampled. The benthic invertebrate sampling will take place in riffle zones with mainly cobble and gravel substrate, whereas sediment samples will be collected in pools or other depositional areas; therefore, sediment samples will not be collected at the same sites during benthic macroinvertebrate sampling as supporting variables. Embeddedness of cobbles will be measured as a supporting variable.

8.3.2 Data Analysis and Reporting

Benthic invertebrates will be enumerated and identified to a minimum taxonomic level of family, and statistical summaries and descriptive metrics will be done on family level data. Taxonomy on baseline samples will be done to the lowest practical level, usually genus. Taxonomic analysis will be carried out by a qualified taxonomic laboratory experienced with identification of invertebrates from northern streams.

Data from the taxonomic laboratory will be in the form of bench sheets and an electronic form (e.g. Excel workbook). Taxonomic references used for identification will be listed in the taxonomy laboratory report. Data for each replicate sample will include the number of organisms identified from each taxonomic category (minimum of Family). The method and level of sub-sampling that will be carried out during sorting and identification will be clearly identified.

Reporting will include the number of individuals counted as well as the conversion to number per sample. The number per sample will be standardized to number per square meter by dividing by the area sampled (e.g. 0.1 m² per Hess set x 3 Hess sets per replicate = 0.3 m² per replicate). These data will be used to calculate indices of community characteristics, which will be used to determine if there is an effect on benthic communities in receiving environments sampled.

The abundance data will be used to calculate the following endpoints for each area:

- Total invertebrate density for each replicate as well as arithmetic mean, standard deviation, median, minimum and maximum;
- Family density for each replicate as well as arithmetic mean, standard deviation, median, minimum and maximum;
- Family richness;
- Simpson's diversity index;
- Simpson's evenness index;
- Bray Curtis index;
- Taxon (i.e., Family) proportion; and,
- Taxon (i.e., Family) presence/absence.

Calculation of total invertebrate density will include unidentified individuals. Individuals that cannot be identified to Family level will not be included in calculations of Family density or community descriptors. A large number of benthic invertebrate community descriptors exist. In general these include measures of the number of organisms present (i.e. density or abundance), the number of different taxa present (i.e. richness), and whether or not the community composition is dominated by a few taxa (i.e. diversity).

In addition, indicator taxa (taxa that are known to be sensitive or tolerant of stressors in general, or to a specific stressor such as metals) may be used to identify changes to the benthic invertebrate community. The federal Metal Mining Effluent Regulation (MMER) requires reporting of total invertebrate density, taxon richness,

Simpson's diversity index, and the Bray Curtis index (a measure of the similarity of the benthic community at a sample site to a reference site).

Total invertebrate density, Family richness, Simpson's evenness index, and Bray-Curtis index will be statistically analyzed using ANOVA (power of 0.1). If the ANOVA determines that a metric has a significant difference among stations, a multiple comparison test (e.g. Tukey test) will be used to determine if the exposure sites are significantly different from reference sites, which will be defined as an effect. The results of these analyses will be interpreted relative to the other endpoints listed above (e.g. diversity and Family density, proportion, and presence/absence) as well as supporting environmental variables measured at the time of sampling, results of fish surveys, and relative to historical sampling. In addition, the effect of outliers or extreme values, if any, on results will be evaluated.

8.4 CONSTRUCTION

8.4.1 Locations and Frequency

The benthic invertebrate monitoring program for the construction phase will monitor key drainage basins; however, a more focused monitoring program is planned relative to the baseline program. Figure 8.4-1 illustrates the construction phase benthic invertebrate monitoring locations. Table 8.4-1 provides a summary of each monitoring station, location, coordinates, rationale and monitoring frequency for the approximate 2-year construction period.

The benthic invertebrate monitoring stations will be monitored on an annual basis during the late summer/early fall during construction.

Table 8.4-1: Construction Phase Benthic Invertebrate Monitoring Locations and Frequency

Site	Location Description	Coordinates		Rationale	Frequency of Sampling
		Northing	Easting		
Haggart Creek Drainage Basin					
W22	Haggart above Dublin Gulch	7101377	458319	Above Project influence	Annual
W4	Haggart below Dublin Gulch	7101223	458144	Below Project influence	Annual
W29	Haggart below Eagle Creek	7099583	458225	Below Project influence	Annual
W5	Haggart above Lynx Creek	7095887	457815	Below Project influence	Annual
W23	Haggart below Lynx Creek	7095682	457790	Below Project influence	Annual
Dublin Gulch Drainage Basin					
W1	Dublin Gulch above Stewart Gulch	7101545	460249	Above Project influence	Stage 1 Construction
W1A	Dublin Gulch below Stewart and above DG Diversion Channel	TBD	TBD	Above Project Influence	Stage 2 Construction
W26	Stewart Gulch	7101443	460331	Above Project influence	Stage 1 Construction
Eagle Creek Drainage Basin					
W27	Eagle Creek	7100997	458235	Below Project influence	Stage 1 Construction

Site	Location Description	Coordinates		Rationale	Frequency of Sampling
		Northing	Easting		
Lynx Creek Drainage Basin					
W6	Lynx Creek above Haggart Creek	7095964	458099	No Project influence	Annual

8.5 OPERATIONS

During the operations phase, the benthic invertebrate monitoring program remains unchanged from that performed during construction. During operations, the MWTP will be discharging treated effluent immediately upstream of station W4 in Haggart Creek at various times of the year dependent upon Project water demands. Therefore station W4 will be an important monitoring location for the aquatic monitoring program.

8.5.1 Locations and Frequency

The benthic invertebrate monitoring program for the operations phase will continue to monitor benthos as per the construction period during the late summer/early fall on an annual basis. Figure 8.5-1 illustrates the operations phase benthic invertebrate monitoring locations. Table 8.5-1 provides a summary of each monitoring station, location, coordinates, rationale and monitoring frequency for the operations period.

Table 8.5-1: Operations Phase Benthic Invertebrate Monitoring Locations and Frequency

Site	Location Description	Coordinates		Rationale	Frequency of Sampling
		Northing	Easting		
Haggart Creek Drainage Basin					
W22	Haggart above Dublin Gulch	7101377	458319	Above Project influence	Annual
W4	Haggart below Dublin Gulch	7101223	458144	Below Project influence	Annual
W29	Haggart below Eagle Creek	7099583	458225	Below Project influence	Annual
W5	Haggart above Lynx Creek	7095887	457815	Below Project influence	Annual
W23	Haggart below Lynx Creek	7095682	457790	Below Project influence	Annual
Dublin Gulch Drainage Basin					
W1A	Dublin Gulch below Stewart Gulch and above the DGDC	7101545	460249	Above Project influence	Annual
Lynx Creek Drainage Basin					
W6	Lynx Creek above Haggart Creek	7095964	458099	Reference, No Project influence	Annual

8.6 EARLY CLOSURE PHASE

The benthic invertebrate monitoring program will remain unchanged from that performed previously throughout operations.

8.6.1 Locations and Frequency

The benthic invertebrate monitoring program for the early closure phase will continue to monitor benthos as per the operations periods on a bi-annual basis. Table 8.6-1 provides a summary of each monitoring station,

location, coordinates, rationale and monitoring frequency. Locations remain the same as those proposed during operations.

Table 8.6-1: Early Closure Phase Benthic Invertebrate Monitoring Locations and Frequency

Site	Location Description	Coordinates		Rationale	Frequency of Sampling
		Northing	Easting		
Haggart Creek Drainage Basin					
W22	Haggart above Dublin Gulch	7101377	458319	Above Project influence	Bi-Annual
W4	Haggart below Dublin Gulch	7101223	458144	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
W29	Haggart below Eagle Creek	7099583	458225	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
W5	Haggart above Lynx Creek	7095887	457815	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
W23	Haggart below Lynx Creek	7095682	457790	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
Dublin Gulch Drainage Basin					
W1A	Dublin Gulch below Stewart Gulch and above the DGDC	7101545	460249	Above Project influence	Bi-Annual
Lynx Creek Drainage Basin					
W6	Lynx Creek above Haggart Creek	7095964	458099	Reference, No Project influence	Bi-Annual

8.7 LATE CLOSURE PHASE

At the start of the late closure phase, all decommissioning and reclamation activities are assumed complete; the MWTP will no longer be in operation and the passive treatment systems for treatment of HLF seepage, Eagle Pup WRSA seepage and Platinum Gulch WRSA seepage/Open pit overflow will be in operation. Benthic invertebrate monitoring of the receiving environment in Haggart Creek and Dublin Gulch will continue as per the previous Project phases. Monitoring during the closure phase will also focus on the passive treatment systems and their performance through annual sampling of benthos immediately down gradient of the passive treatment systems.

8.7.1 Locations and Frequency

Table 8.7-1 provides a summary of each monitoring station, location, coordinates, rationale and monitoring frequency for the late closure phase; sampling locations are also depicted on Figure 8.7-1.

The benthic invertebrate monitoring stations will be monitored on a bi-annual basis during the late summer/early fall during the closure phase for a period of 5 years (i.e., post closure years 1, 3 and 5).

Table 8.7-1: Late Closure Phase Benthic Invertebrate Monitoring Locations and Frequency

Site	Location Description	Coordinates		Rationale	Frequency of Sampling
		Northing	Easting		
Haggart Creek Drainage Basin					
W22	Haggart above Dublin Gulch	7101377	458319	Above Project influence	Bi-Annual
HLF PTS	Just downgradient of HLF	7101085	458711	PTS performance	Bi-Annual

Site	Location Description	Coordinates		Rationale	Frequency of Sampling
		Northing	Easting		
	passive treatment cell				
W4	Haggart below Dublin Gulch	7101223	458144	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
W29	Haggart below Eagle Creek	7099583	458225	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
W5	Haggart above Lynx Creek	7095887	457815	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
W23	Haggart below Lynx Creek	7095682	457790	Below Project influence	Bi-Annual
Dublin Gulch Drainage Basin					
W1A	Dublin Gulch below Stewart Gulch and above the DGDC	7101545	460249	Above Project influence	Bi-Annual
Eagle Creek Drainage Basin					
EP PTS	Just downgradient of the EP passive treatment system	7101052	459630	PTS performance	Bi-Annual
PG PTS	Just downgradient of the PG passive treatment system	7099684	458243	PTS performance	Bi-Annual
Lynx Creek Drainage Basin					
W6	Lynx Creek above Haggart Creek	7095964	458099	Reference, No Project influence	Bi-Annual


8.8 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT


Trends in benthic macroinvertebrate community composition will be used to determine Project effects. As discussed above, total invertebrate density, Family richness, Simpson's evenness index, and Bray-Curtis index will be statistically analyzed using ANOVA (power of 0.1). If the ANOVA determines that a metric has a significant difference among stations, a multiple comparison test (e.g. Tukey test) will be used to determine if the exposure sites are significantly different from reference sites, which will be defined as an effect.

In the event effects to benthic macroinvertebrates are observed, adaptive management measures that will be considered include:


- Comparison of data with changes to water quality and sediment data to determine if water chemistry is a factor in benthic macroinvertebrate changes
- Analysis of watershed changes to determine if any localized changes independent of the Project by placer mining upstream have resulted in impacts to benthic macroinvertebrate community structure
- If effluent discharge meets regulated standards and receiving environment water quality objectives, re-evaluate water quality objectives to determine if effective to protect specific benthic macroinvertebrates and assemblages as required based on effects
- If effluent discharge does not meet regulated standards and receiving environment water quality objectives:
 - o Investigate for possible previously unidentified upstream sources, and if found develop appropriate mitigation to minimize source
 - o Conduct MWTP inspection during operations to determine if system is functioning as intended

- o Repair MWTP components and/or adjust reagent dosages as necessary
- o PTS inspection during early and post closure to determine if system is functioning as intended
- o Perform maintenance on passive treatment systems
- o Consider temporary re-routing of contact water to suspend effluent discharge until licensed effluent concentrations are achieved prior to discharge. Examples of operational/ routing changes include:
 - Recirculation of excess process water within the HLF until repairs and adjustments are made to MWTP to achieve licensed effluent concentrations
 - Rerouting contact water from Open Pit and Waste Rock Storage Areas from MWTP to events ponds and/or HLF for storage and recirculation temporarily
 - Suspend Open Pit dewatering operations
- o Consider capital improvements to augment or replace existing treatment systems






Legend: Benthic Invertebrate Monitoring Station Watercourse (ephemeral) Watercourse (perennial) Watercourse (intermittent) Eagle Project Access Road Contour (100ft) Dublin Gulch Basin Boundary Eagle Creek Basin Upper Haggart Creek Basin Boundary Construction Waterbody				 0 0.5 1 Kilometres Scale = As Shown		Projection: NAD83 UTM Zone 8N Date: 2014/07/02	Drawn By: SS Figure: 8.4-1	EAGLE GOLD PROJECT YUKON TERRITORY Benthic Invertebrate Monitoring Stations - Construction
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	-------------------------------------	---



Legend:					Projection: NAD83 UTM Zone 8N	Drawn By: SS	EAGLE GOLD PROJECT YUKON TERRITORY
 Benthic Invertebrate Monitoring Station	 Watercourse (ephemeral)	 Dublin Gulch Basin Boundary	 Operations		Date: 2014/07/02	Figure: 8.5-1	
 Watercourse (perennial)	 Eagle Project Access Road	 Eagle Creek Basin	 Waterbody	 Kilometres Scale = As Shown			Benthic Invertebrate Monitoring Stations - Operations
 Watercourse (intermittent)	 Contour (100ft)	 Upper Haggart Creek Basin Boundary					



Legend: Benthic Invertebrate Monitoring Station Watercourse (perennial) Watercourse (intermittent)	Watercourse (ephemeral) Eagle Project Access Road Contour (100ft)	Dublin Gulch Basin Boundary Eagle Creek Basin Upper Haggart Creek Basin Boundary	Closure Waterbody	 Scale = As Shown	Projection: NAD83 UTM Zone 8N Date: 2014/07/02	Drawn By: SS Figure: 8.7-1	EAGLE GOLD PROJECT YUKON TERRITORY Benthic Invertebrate Monitoring Stations - Closure
--	---	--	----------------------	--------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	--

9 FISH AND FISH HABITAT

9.1 INTRODUCTION

The Project may result in potential impacts to fish and fish habitat during construction through increased sediment loads and operations through post closure due to water quality degradation from water treatment effluent. Effluent concentration 250 m downstream of the final effluent discharge point is predicted to be greater than 1% during average flow conditions therefore a fish population survey will be required under the Metal Mines Effluent Regulations (MMER Schedule 5, Section 9(b)). Total mercury concentrations in effluent are predicted to be less than 0.10 parts per billion therefore fish tissue sampling is not included.

9.2 PREVIOUS WORK

Baseline fish and fish habitat information was gathered from existing consultant reports, government databases, and the results of field studies conducted for the Project prior to SGC's claim ownership. Field studies were completed for watercourses located within the local Project area to obtain biophysical habitat data, determine fish presence and abundance, and characterize fish populations (i.e., size, age, and tissue metal concentrations). The fish and fish habitat study area (study area) included:

- All perennial watercourses in the Dublin Gulch watershed and lower Haggart Creek (below Dublin Gulch).
- Reference watercourses that would be uninfluenced by flows from the Dublin Gulch watershed (i.e., Ironrust Creek, Lynx Creek, and upper Haggart Creek [above Dublin Gulch]).
- All perennial watercourses that cross or approach within 30 m of the site access road which parallels Haggart Creek.

9.2.1 Fish-bearing Watercourses

Field studies within the study area were completed over four sampling periods (August 2007, October 2007, April 2008, and July 2009) and included 59 sample sites, located on 28 mapped or field identified watercourses. Of the 28 watercourses sampled, 13 are crossed by the access road, 13 are within or immediately downstream of the Project, and two are within reference watercourses. Detailed results from the 2007-2009 Fish and Fish Habitat Baseline Program are provided in *Eagle Gold Project Environmental Baseline Report: Fish and Fish Habitat* (Stantec 2010b).

Figure 9.2-1 depicts the fish sampling sites and fish bearing water courses in the immediate Project area. Additional sites sampled throughout the Haggart Creek watershed are described in the 2011 Fish and Fish Habitat baseline report (Stantec 2010e).

Sampled watercourses were characterized as non-fish-bearing unless:

- Fish were not captured, despite the application of appropriate capture methods, during at least two different sampling periods, and;
- The watercourse had physical characteristics that could explain fish absence (i.e., gradient >20% or a permanent barrier to upstream fish passage where no perennial fish habitat exists upstream of the barrier).

Fish density per unit area was estimated for fish-bearing sites sampled in Dublin Gulch, Ironrust Creek, Lynx Creek, and a subset of sites in Haggart Creek, using electrofishing via multiple-pass removal methods.

Of the 26 watercourses sampled in the study area, 14 were identified as fish-bearing or potentially fish-bearing and 12 were identified as non-fish-bearing. The 14 fish-bearing watercourses were:

- Three watercourses located within or immediately downstream of the proposed mine site footprint—Haggart Creek, lower reaches of Dublin Gulch, and the lower reaches of Eagle Creek (including a pond created for historic placer mining operations and its tributary stream).
- Two watercourses sampled as reference watercourses—Lynx Creek and Ironrust Creek.
- Nine additional watercourses crossed by the site access road including: North Star, Bighorn, Cadillac, and Swede Creeks; the South McQuesten River, one unnamed tributary of Haggart Creek, and two unnamed tributaries of the South McQuesten River.

A summary of the data collected for all identified fish-bearing watercourses is presented in Stantec 2010b.

The 12 watercourses identified as non-fish-bearing were as follows:

- Two watercourses with barriers to upstream fish passage located within the footprint of the proposed mine site – Upper Dublin Gulch (a gradient barrier located 1.5 km upstream of the confluence with Haggart Creek) and Upper Eagle Creek (a perched culvert located 1.9 km upstream of the confluence with Haggart Creek).
- Seven tributaries to the non-fish-bearing upper reaches of Dublin Gulch and Eagle Creek—Suttles Gulch, Ann Gulch, Bawn Boy Gulch, Stewart Gulch, Olive Gulch, Cascallen Gulch, and Eagle Creek.

Three watercourses with fish passage barriers that were located outside the Dublin Gulch and Eagle Creek watersheds: Platinum Gulch and three un-named watercourses tributary to Haggart Creek and crossed by the access road.

9.2.2 Fish Species Distribution

At least 11 fish species are known to occur in the South McQuesten River watershed, including Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*), northern pike (*Esox lucius*), longnose sucker (*Catostomus catostomus*), Arctic lamprey (*Lampetra camtschatica*), burbot (*Lota lota*), slimy sculpin (*Cottus cognatus*), round whitefish (*Prosopium cylindraceum*), inconnu (*Stenodus leucichthys*), lake whitefish (*Coregonus clupeaformis*), and rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*).

No freshwater fish species on Schedules 1 or 2 of the Federal *Species at Risk Act* (SARA) were present in the South McQuesten River watershed or the entire Yukon Territory (GoC 2008). Haggart and Lynx creeks are both known to contain five fish species: Chinook salmon, Arctic grayling, round whitefish, burbot, and slimy sculpin (DFO 2010). Ironrust Creek, Dublin Gulch and Eagle Creek are known to be inhabited by Arctic grayling and slimy sculpin (Hallam Knight Piésold 1996, DFO 2010).

The baseline field program for the Project captured five fish species from ten different watercourses. Arctic grayling were captured in nine watercourses and slimy sculpin were captured in seven. Burbot were captured in the South McQuesten River and lower Haggart Creek. Chinook salmon and longnose sucker were observed in the South McQuesten during a July 2009 snorkel survey.

Previous studies reported the presence of Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) in Haggart and Lynx creeks (Madrone 2006; Hallam Knight Piésold 1995, 1996; DFO 2010). In the 2007 to 2009, Dublin Gulch sampling programs, Chinook salmon were not captured at any of the Haggart and Lynx creek sites. Previous studies also reported the presence of Chinook salmon in the South McQuesten River, which was confirmed by the sighting of juvenile Chinook (est. age 1+) during a snorkel survey of the South McQuesten River at the access road crossing on July 23, 2009.

No adult Chinook spawners or evidence of spawning were observed in the South McQuesten River during the July 2009 survey. However, Chinook spawners were observed in August 2009 adjacent to the South McQuesten River Bridge immediately downstream of the mouth of Haggart Creek by Stantec personnel.

9.2.3 Fish Relative Abundance

Arctic grayling and slimy sculpin were the only species caught during multiple-pass depletion surveys completed in Ironrust Creek, Haggart Creek, Lynx Creek, and in Dublin Gulch. Both species were present in low densities in these watercourses. Mean Arctic grayling catch rate for all sites during all three electrofishing sampling programs was 1.6 fish/100 m², and mean catch rate for slimy sculpin for all sites was 2.9 fish/100 m². Slimy sculpin were caught at higher densities in Haggart Creek (4.3 to 6.0 fish/100 m²) than in the other three watercourses (0.7 to 1.9 fish/100 m²). There were no consistent differences in estimated Arctic grayling densities among the waterbodies sampled.

9.2.4 Habitat Usage

The majority of Arctic Grayling in the Project area are thought to overwinter in the South McQuesten River and migrate into Haggart Creek and its tributaries to rear during summer (Pendray 1983). The summer migration into Lynx Creek has been observed to occur during June and early July (Pendray 1983). The timing of outmigration to overwintering areas has not been observed for the Project Area; however, baseline assessment for this Project (Stantec 2010e) demonstrated that densities of Arctic grayling in Dublin Gulch were similar during July, August, and October, even though anchor ice was beginning to form on the stream margins during the October sampling program. This suggests that significant outmigration may not occur from Dublin Gulch until after October.

The documented capture of juvenile Arctic grayling in Haggart Creek during May, at a location 19 km upstream from the South McQuesten River (Pendray 1983), suggests that some Arctic grayling may overwinter in the Haggart Creek watershed. The baseline assessment for this Project did indeed document potential overwintering habitat (i.e., with residual pool depth ≥ 0.8 m) at sample sites in Lynx and Haggart creeks.

Furthermore, a large number of Arctic grayling were captured from a large pool on Haggart Creek in April 2008 (i.e., after freeze up but before breakup) (Stantec 2010b). It is assumed that this unnaturally large pool (1 ha in area and over 10 m deep) was created by placer mining operations and was not present during fish studies conducted in 1996 (Hallam Knight Piésold 1996). This pool created by placer mining and the South McQuesten River likely represent the most important overwintering habitat for Arctic grayling in the study area. The quality of potential overwintering habitat in fish-bearing streams within the mine site footprint (i.e., Dublin Gulch and Eagle Creek) was poor due to residual pool depths ≤ 0.3 m that most likely freeze to the bottom in winter.

Pendray (1983) observed that spawning by Arctic Grayling in this region occurred predominantly in the South McQuesten River during the last two weeks of May. He also identified a small area at the mouth of Haggart Creek as a probable spawning site. Since spawning occurs in late May, immediately after ice breakup, Arctic grayling that winter in the Haggart Creek watershed might also spawn in the Haggart watershed. The baseline fisheries assessment for this Project identified areas of good to excellent quality potential spawning habitat for Arctic grayling—with modest currents (0.5 – 1.0 m/s), depths of 0.1 – 0.4 m, and 2 – 4 cm diameter gravel (McPhail, 2007)—in Lynx, Haldane, Swede, and Haggart creeks. The quality of potential spawning habitat provided by fish-bearing streams within the mine site footprint (i.e., Dublin Gulch and Eagle Creek) was poor, primarily due to lack of suitable gravel.

As the majority of Arctic grayling in the study area are thought to overwinter and spawn in the South McQuesten River (Pendray 1983), Arctic grayling primarily use study area streams as summer rearing habitat. Good to excellent rearing habitat was present at sample sites in the South McQuesten River, Bighorn Creek, Haggart Creek, Haldane Creek, Lynx Creek, Ironrust Creek, and North Star Creek. These sites had abundant complex cover and availability of pool, riffle, and run habitats. The quality of potential rearing habitat provided by fish-bearing streams within the proposed Project footprint (i.e., Dublin Gulch and Eagle Creek) was moderate, primarily due to lack of cover, high stream gradients, or insufficient channel depths.

9.3 METHODS

9.3.1 Survey Areas

Fish sampling and fish habitat assessments will be conducted in July or August. Sampling locations will include previously sampled locations on Ironrust Creek station IR2, Haggart Creek stations HC1, HC2, and HC3, and Lynx Creek station L1. These sampling locations are consistent with reaches and locations sampled as part of the baseline surveys and include representative reaches that include all mesohabitat types present in the watercourse.

Figure 9.3-1 depicts the sampling locations for fish abundance and fish habitat.

9.3.2 Fish Abundance

Assessment of Arctic grayling utilization of habitat downstream of the Project will be accomplished through sampling of fish populations using standard collection methods (e.g., electrofishing, baited minnow traps, angling, seining), with the selection of methods depending on the characteristics of the sampled habitat type. Abundance estimates will be based on catch-per-unit of effort (CPUE) calculations and multiple-pass depletion sampling in sections of the watercourses isolated with seine nets. Relevant population data will be recorded for all captured fish including: species, weight, and length will be collected from a representative sample of Arctic grayling.

Habitat maps will be prepared for each of the representative reaches, and locations of sampling locations will be delineated in the field and geo-referenced to facilitate sampling in multiple years. The results of depletion sampling will be used to extrapolate population estimates for fish present in the watercourse.

Multiple-pass depletion sampling will be conducted to estimate densities across age and size classes of Arctic grayling. To remain consistent with baseline studies, total fish abundance at each sampling site will be estimated using standard methods (e.g. Zippen (1958) and Microfish for Windows (v 3.0)). This method requires three or more passes on the selected stream section and relies heavily on consistent catchability of fish.

The Metal Mining Guidance Document for Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring (EEM Guidance Document) (Environment Canada, 2002) states that a minimum of 100 individuals of the target species should be collected if non-lethal sampling is used. However, results from the baseline survey efforts indicate it is unlikely that this many individuals will be captured in any given reach. Instead of targeting one species, all fish (primarily Arctic grayling and slimy sculpin) that are encountered during the survey will be captured and length, weight and general condition data recorded. The area sampled will be maximized in order to capture as many fish as possible.

9.4 REPORTING

Results of monitoring programs will be compiled annually. All field data will be recorded in the field on modified RISC site cards, entered into a spreadsheet, and summarized in site summary tables.

9.5 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

The objectives of the fish and fish habitat monitoring program are to assess the effect of effluent in the exposure area (Haggart Creek) and to document any changes to fish habitat downstream of the Project. Fish abundance and individual data and habitat characteristics will be collected and compared to baseline data to determine if there is any effect on fish populations as a result of the Project. This data will be used in combination with benthic macroinvertebrate, sediment, hydrology and water quality data to determine if there are Project effects on fish and fish habitat.

Construction of watercourse diversions, in-stream and stream bank construction, site grading, soil and overburden removal, and stockpiling of soils, could result in the release of sediment to streams which may have nominal effects to fish and fish habitat. All runoff from camp construction, site clearing and other soil and vegetation disturbance and stockpiling activities will be diverted to the sediment basins or sediment control

ponds for treatment prior to discharge to receiving streams (e.g., Eagle Creek, Dublin Gulch and Haggart Creek). The monitoring plans for benthic macroinvertebrates, stream sediment, water quality, and fish habitat will provide data to assess whether the standard erosion prevention and sediment control practices, as described in the Construction Water Management Plan, are sufficient to minimize effects.


In addition to TSS monitoring, significant changes (primarily decreases) from the range of values established by the baseline program, in sediment chemistry, benthic community values and fish abundance may indicate effects from construction activities. These effects would be attributed to higher TSS or turbidity, or a change in flow, both of which have proposed threshold values in the water quality and hydrology sections, and so no additional thresholds are provided here (other than an observed trend away from baseline).

During operations, closure, and post closure potential effects to fish and fish habitat include:

- acute and chronic toxicity from exposure to mine effluent. Although not predicted, these effects could result via increased concentrations of metals, nutrients and total suspended solids
- sedimentation and degradation of habitat via changes to benthic macroinvertebrate community structure or spawning habitat that requires low concentration of fine material that can prevent spawning by infilling of gravels or suffocate eggs

The thresholds for these effects include any direct or indirect mortality of fish species downstream of the Project, and/or changes to fish abundance or community assemblage as well as changes to fish habitat as described in the hydrology, sediment and benthic macroinvertebrate sections. These effects will likely be detected via multiple monitoring described previously in this plan. If detected, effects will be addressed via adaptive management measures as described in previous sections in addition to the following:

- if mortalities are observed, tissue sampling and toxicology assessments will be conducted to determine the cause
- if chronic effects for individuals or changes to fish assemblages are observed a quantitative ecological risk assessment will be undertaken to identify exposure pathways, receptors and recommendations for mitigation measures
- if acute or chronic effects are observed while the effluent discharge standards and receiving water quality objectives are consistently met, these standards and objectives will be reviewed for efficacy. In the event standards and objectives are updated for the Project, additional water management infrastructure changes will be required to meet the new objectives
- if low flows are observed to result in decreased habitat available, water management changes will be considered to restore flows to baseline conditions
- habitat restoration will be considered for areas observed to have increased sedimentation; restoration may involve sediment transport analysis to identify and mitigate upstream sediment sources or the addition of instream structures to increase scour to decrease sedimentation in various reaches valuable to fish



METEOROLOGICAL AND ATMOSPHERIC

10 CLIMATE

10.1 INTRODUCTION

Two automated climate stations are currently operating in the Project area. The Potato Hills station (elevation 1420 m) was installed in 2007 and the Camp station (elevation 778 m) in 2009. The climate stations collect data for the following parameters:

- Air temperature
- Rainfall (tipping bucket)
- Wind speed and direction
- Barometric pressure,
- Snow depth, and
- Relative Humidity

Snow depth information has also been collected with snow course surveys near both stations during winter.

The objectives of the baseline climate monitoring program are to characterize the local atmospheric environment of the Project area, and to support hydrologic analyses and air quality assessments. The climate monitoring program, through the construction phase of the Project, will include the two existing climate stations, as well as the baseline snow course survey locations.

The objective of the ongoing climate monitoring program will be to calibrate precipitation, snowmelt predictions and runoff patterns used in the water balance and water management design. It will also provide air quality information once Project facilities (e.g. site haul roads, crushing and screening plant, open pit, heap leach facility, refinery and waste rock storage areas, etc.) are in place.

10.2 PREVIOUS WORK

Historical climate data were initially collected intermittently in the area in 1979 to 1980, 1984 and 1993 to 1996. The more recent baseline climate monitoring program was initiated by SGC in August 2007 with the installation of the Potato Hills climate station (elevation 1420 m). This station is an ONSET Hobo operating system and currently records data at a 15-minute interval.

The second climate station, the Camp station was installed in August 2009 (initially at an elevation of 820 m, and then later moved in September 2010 to an elevation of 778 m during camp development activities), as a result of large differences in snow survey information collected in April 2009 near the Potato Hills station compared to the lower elevation area near the camp. The Camp station is a Campbell Scientific CR800 datalogger, which records data at a 15-minute interval.

Snow course surveys have been conducted during the late winter (generally in April) beginning in 2009 to the present. The snow courses are located near the climate stations and collect snow depth, snow density and snow water equivalent (SWE) data.

Previous work on climate data and information are described in JWA (2008 and 2009), Stantec (2010, 2011 and 2012) and Knight Piesold (2013).

10.3 METHODS

The current climate stations will continue to collect data at 15-minute intervals for the parameters outlined above.

Snow course surveys will continue to be undertaken following the accepted sampling procedures and techniques used by Yukon Environment and outlined in the Ministry of Environment of British Columbia's document "Snow survey sampling guide" (MOE 1981).

10.3.1 Locations

The locations of the current and ongoing climate stations are shown in Figure 10.3-1 and summarized in Table 10.3-1.

Table 10.3-1: Project Climate Station Locations

Site	Zone	Coordinates		Site Type
		North	East	
Potato Hills	8V	7100800	463550	Automated
Camp	8V	7101000	458200	Automated

10.3.2 Frequency

The climate stations will be visited and data downloaded on a regular basis to ensure that all instrumentation is maintained and functioning properly. During the open water season the stations will be visited 3-4 times, concurrent with hydrology data collection. In the winter, the stations will be visited in conjunction with collection of snow course survey data, which will occur on a monthly basis from the beginning of March until the snow is gone by May or June.

10.3.3 Data Analysis and Reporting

The following climate data will be included for each station in the summary annual report following each data collection year:


- Monthly and annual recorded mean, minimum and maximum temperature
- Total monthly and annual precipitation, as well as estimated rainfall and snowfall amounts
- Maximum 24-hour precipitation totals for each month

Eagle Gold Project

Environmental Monitoring, Surveillance and Adaptive Management Plan

Section 10 Climate

- Monthly snowpack depth as well as estimated monthly snowmelt distribution
- Monthly average barometric pressure and relative humidity
- Monthly and annual recorded mean, minimum and maximum wind speed and direction



11 AIR QUALITY

11.1 INTRODUCTION

Fugitive dust emissions will likely occur as a result of soil disruption through Project-related activities, most notably clearing, grading, drilling, blasting, loading/unloading. SGC is committed to applying industry standard best management practices to reduce Project emissions. SGC will construct the Project in a way that minimizes dust emissions to the atmosphere and thus minimizes the potential for the ambient air quality standards to be exceeded and adopt a range of design and operational safeguards and procedures for the Project to ensure that emission controls are working effectively.

Yukon Ambient Air Quality Objectives define maximum allowable limits, for particulate matter, carbon monoxide (CO), sulphur dioxide (SO₂) and nitrogen dioxide (NO₂). These standards are summarized in Table 11.1-1.

Dispersion modeling results predict that Project emissions of the Criteria Air Contaminants (CACs) will not exceed applicable regulatory objectives and standards with the exception of particulate matter. Increased dustfall may occur during periods of high ambient TSP concentrations as a result of construction activities. TSP will be the primary means of monitoring ambient particulate conditions because Yukon does not have dustfall standards and the specific correlation between dustfall and ambient TSP is not known.

Table 11.1-1: Yukon Ambient Air Quality Standards^{ab}

Parameter	Standard (µg/m ³) ^c	Standard (ppm) ^d	Standard (ppbv) ^e
Total Suspended Particulate (TSP)			
24-hour average	120		
Annual geometric mean	60		
Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5})			
24-hour average	30		
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)			
1-hour average			213
24-hour average			106
Annual arithmetic mean			32
Carbon Monoxide (CO)			
1-hour average		13	
8-hour average		5	
Sulphur Dioxide (SO₂)			

Parameter	Standard ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) ^c	Standard (ppm) ^d	Standard (ppbv) ^e
1-hour average			172
24-hour average			57
Annual arithmetic mean			11

NOTES:

^a The following standards are the maximum concentrations of pollutants acceptable in ambient air throughout the Yukon Territory. These standards will be used to determine the acceptability of emissions from proposed and existing developments.

^b All ambient air quality measurements will be referenced to standard conditions of 25 degrees Celsius and 101.3 kiloPascals.

^c $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ = micrograms per cubic meter

^d ppm = parts per million

^e ppbv = parts per billion by volume

11.2 METHODS

The methods for air quality monitoring described below pertain to the monitoring of TSP via ambient air monitoring. For dust deposition, in addition to these methods, SGC will be monitoring metals content in soil and vegetation that will provide data that will be used to determine potential effects from dust deposition. The methods to monitor metal levels in vegetation and soils are described in Sections 12 and 13 respectively.

The air quality baseline data collection program is planned to record baseline data prior to construction and operations. A Thermo Scientific Partisol 2025i Sequential Ambient Air Sampler has been installed near the Camp climate station, in an area away from active exploration activities. The unit is capable of sampling TSP over a continuous 24-hour period according to protocols established for the National Air Pollution Surveillance (NAPS) program.

Air quality monitoring will begin prior to construction activities and continue throughout operations.

11.2.1 Locations

The 2025i Partisol air quality sampler is located at the lower camp climate station directly adjacent and west of the existing and future camp. Given the prevailing NNW winds this location is suitable to detect TSP concentrations from the majority of Project activities.

11.2.2 Frequency

The 2025i Partisol air quality sampler will sample on a 6-day cycle.

11.2.3 Data Collection and Analysis

The 2025i Partisol holds a filter supply magazine containing 16 filter cassettes. Filters used include a Pallflex TX40 HI20-WW 47 mm filter specified for TSP and a 37 mm MCE (mixed cellulose ester) filter specified for metals. Each filter will be pre-weighed in triplicate according to procedures in U.S. EPA 2.12 Quality Assurance

Handbook, Section 7. The filter weight will be recorded along with the filter cassette number and placed into the cassette. Sixteen cassettes are placed into a magazine and shipped to site to be installed in the Partisol.

During a programmed sampling date, the 2025i maintains a temperature- and pressure-compensated flow of 16.67 L/min (1 m³/hr) through the filter. Following completion of the programmed sampling event (24 hours) the sample filter is automatically transferred into the storage magazine. After 16 sampling events have been completed the storage magazine will be shipped to an accredited laboratory for re-weighing.

The sampled concentration will be determined as the net weight of the filter divided by the total flow volume over the sampling event. During operations, chemical analysis of particulate samples will be performed on two samples every second magazine.

Annual reports will be produced which contain the recorded TSP concentrations with comparison to Yukon Ambient Air Quality Objectives. The reports will also contain the sampling QA/QC data recorded in the Partisol Sampler interval file and the results of any chemical lab analyses (after mining begins during operations).

11.3 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

Construction and operation activities, including general earthworks, road use, blasting, ore processing and overburden disposal will generate dust. Standard best practices for dust control include regular and periodic watering of haul and access roads, and pad work areas, and when very windy conditions are occurring, to minimize the road traffic. The thresholds for adaptive management of air quality are observed concentrations that are within approximately 80% of the Yukon Air Quality Standards provided above in Table 11.1-1. SGC has established ambient air TSP thresholds for adaptive management. If the TSP concentrations exceed 100 µg/m³ 24 hour average or 50 µg/m³ as an annual geometric mean, additional dust control mitigation measures will be implemented.

As part of adaptive management practices, inspections for fugitive dust generation will be conducted for site roads and all facilities that produce dust to determine the need for additional mitigation measures.

In addition to air quality sampling, dust control inspections will be conducted for site roads and facilities to determine the need for additional mitigation measures. If threshold levels for TSP are exceeded, SGC will take the following actions:

- Notify Environment Yukon and EMR of the exceedance and any changes to mitigation measures.
- Review all applicable air quality, meteorological data and metadata (e.g., records of Project activities during the exceedance period, inspection reports, field notes etc. and any other information that may be relevant) to determine reason for high TSP concentrations.
- Apply dust control contingency measures and modify or add mitigation measures to reduce dust emissions including:
 - Increase the watering rate of roads and exposed soils
 - Traffic and work reduction in areas where dust is generated

- Review and potential revision of road speed limits and their enforcement
- Use of dust suppressants on roads such as calcium chloride
- Rescheduling of revegetation activities for disturbed areas so that they may be seeded as early as possible
- Wind barrier (windrow) construction such as crushed rock, soil berms or fences upwind of roads and exposed areas. The following methods will be considered when placing barriers to prevent dust emissions:
 - i. Wind barriers are most effective when placed perpendicular to the direction of the prevailing wind, but will have little or no effect when the wind direction is parallel to the barrier.
 - ii. When choosing wind barriers it has been observed that solid barriers provide Significant reductions in wind velocity for relatively short leeward distances, whereas porous barriers provide smaller reductions in velocity for more extended distances.
 - iii. Wind barriers should be at least 2 metres high.
 - iv. Screening material with a porosity of 50% is optimum for controlling dust.
- Reconfiguration or covering of stockpiles. Limit work to the downwind side of stockpiles. Uncovered stockpiles may need re-orientation to offer minimal cross sectional area to prevailing winds.
- Construction of rock berm on portions of or around the open pit
- Reduce drop heights from conveyors
- Limit material transfer points
- Installation of additional sprinklers along conveyor or increase enclosure of conveyors
- Pre-watering of areas prior to earthworks
- Review of dust control equipment, control measures and overall dust management plan for crushing facilities and baghouse

Ongoing dust control concerns and corrective actions will be periodically reviewed by the Environmental Manager to determine if additional contingency measures and/or Project design, or operational changes are required.

TERRESTRIAL

12 VEGETATION

12.1 INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES

The vegetation monitoring program has been designed to evaluate changes to vegetation during the construction phase of the Project. The objectives of the vegetation monitoring program include:

- To measure plant metal uptake during construction,
- Establish monitoring sites that will be monitored during future activities, and
- Help identify whether any trends in metal uptake could be attributed to site activities.

12.2 PREVIOUS WORK

A baseline vegetation assessment was completed in 2009 and 2010 (Stantec, 2011e). The baseline assessment includes terrestrial ecosystem mapping, a rare plant survey and foliar sampling for the area of the proposed Project, including the mine site and access road. Vegetation field surveys were undertaken in August 2009 to gather data necessary for the preparation of terrestrial ecosystem mapping and rare plant surveys. Foliar samples of commonly occurring shrubs, grasses or sedges were collected at nine sites for metals analysis. A second rare plant survey was conducted in July 2010 to capture earlier flowering plants.

Terrestrial ecosystem mapping was completed for an area of approximately 7,538 ha in the Project area. Ecosystem mapping was also prepared for a 1 km wide corridor along the 44.8 km long access road (4,580 ha). A Project specific ecosystem classification system, based on field data and literature review, was developed for the study areas. A total of 21 vegetated ecosystem units and nine non-vegetated units have been mapped in the study areas.

All foliar samples analyzed in 2009 contained metal concentrations below levels considered toxic for cattle.

12.2.1 Trace Metal Concentrations in Vegetation

Establishment of baseline trace metals was undertaken by conducting foliar analysis of selected plant species at nine locations in and around the local study area. Species sampled included: willow (*Salix* spp.), sedge (*Carex* spp.), bluejoint (*Calamagrostis canadensis*) and northern rough fescue (*Festuca altaica*). All metal levels were analyzed using inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS).

The dietary tolerances of wild ungulates for the elements considered are not known due to the difficulties associated with sampling large populations of wild mammals. Consequently, the dietary guidelines established for domestic cattle have been used to predict effects on wild ungulates. All elements were below toxic levels for dietary intake by cattle for all sites and species based on dietary guidelines outlined in Puls (1994).

Barium concentration was high, but not toxic/excessive, in grasses at one site (ELG-10) and willows at another (EGL-50). Phosphorus and potassium concentrations were deficient for all sites and species. Moose are present and forage in the Project study areas, year round, and Caribou are known to be occasionally present (Stantec, 2011b).

12.3 METHODS

Vegetation monitoring will include the establishment of permanent sample sites and sampling on vegetation monitoring plots. Vegetation monitoring plots will utilize a consistent sample layout (Figure 12.3-1). Each plot will have a center point established and four corner points 10 m from the center point in cardinal directions (half-inch diameter rebar metal rods (50 cm long) will be used to mark center and corner points. At the time of establishment, an ecosystem plot will be implemented which will allow documentation of site conditions, terrain and soil, vegetation and wildlife sign. Data will be recorded on BC MOF (1998) detailed ecosystem field data forms (FS882); information will follow standards in the Field Manual for Describing Terrestrial Ecosystems (BC Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks and BC Ministry of Forests 1998).

Foliar samples of willow, sedge, bluejoint and northern rough fescue will be collected as available at the center and corner points within a 2 m diameter circle around each point. If those particular species are not available within the 2 m circle, then samples will be taken from the nearest available specimens. Samples will be collected in paper bags and dried on site before being transported to the selected laboratory for analysis.

12.3.1 Locations

Four permanent monitoring plots will be established, one in each of four quadrants (D1-D4) located in the Project area (Figure 12.3-2). Plot locations will be selected in the field based on identification of pre-established ecosystem criteria (the dominant ecosystems, previously identified). Vegetation monitoring plots will be established on the predominant slope, aspect and drainage position within each dominant vegetation ecosystem unit.

- Vegetation monitoring station D1 will be co-located with the Potato Hills meteorological station.
- Vegetation monitoring station D2 will be located at or near the Camp meteorological station and location of the Partisol Air Quality Sampler. This station will be representative of the Project area boundary.
- Vegetation monitoring station D3 will be located below the hilltop just southeast of the Project area. This corresponds to the area of highest TSP concentrations and dustfall that were predicted by dispersion modeling.
- Vegetation monitoring station D4 will be approximately 1.5 km south of the camp, to the east of the access road. This location is downwind of prevailing winds at the Camp meteorological station.

12.3.2 Frequency


All permanent vegetation monitoring plots will be sampled once each construction year during the growing season (July to September). The first sampling event will occur in in late summer of the first year of construction.

12.3.3 Data Analysis

Vegetation species composition will be assessed to determine vegetative assembly and local ecosystem changes over the Project phases. Vegetation samples will be analyzed by an accredited laboratory for metals including mercury using inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS). Duplicates of selected vegetation samples and reference standards will also be completed for the purpose of QA/QC of laboratory analytical technique.

12.4 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

In the event vegetation monitoring indicates that metals concentration in vegetation is significantly increasing, SGC will consider additional dust control contingency measures described by the Dust Control Plan to limit particulate matter settling on vegetation.



Legend:



1 m radius

Vegetation sample plot locations; painted ½ inch rebar to locate centre and corner plots; foliar samples collected every other year.



Soil sampling locations, surface horizon between 0 and 0.5 m depths; one sample every other year.



**EAGLE GOLD PROJECT
YUKON TERRITORY**

**Vegetation and Soil Monitoring
Plot Layout**

Projection:

N/A

Drawn By:


SS

Date:

2014/07/02

Figure:

12.3-2



13 SOILS

13.1 INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES

The soils monitoring program has been designed to provide data to determine changes to metal and nutrient levels in soils adjacent to the mine as a result of dust deposition. Soils monitoring will be undertaken in conjunction with the vegetation monitoring program to evaluate if Project activities are resulting in increased trace metal and nutrient levels in soils.

13.2 PREVIOUS WORK

Soil baseline studies were conducted during 2009. The background information, methods, and results for the study are presented in the Surficial Geology, Terrain and Soils Baseline Report (Stantec 2011g). For the purposes of the environmental assessment, the Project area was divided into three study areas defined by the proposed development footprint and by terrain features. The local study area (LSA) encompasses the proposed development area, and is 1,606 hectares in size. The LSA is the Dublin Gulch watershed, with extensions to capture proposed development footprint outside the watershed at the northwestern corner (near Ann Gulch), and north of the confluence of Dublin Gulch and Haggart Creek. The regional study area (RSA) encompasses the 1,606 ha LSA plus an additional 5,932 ha surrounding the LSA, for a total of 7,538 ha. The RSA provides broader context for the LSA, and provides baseline information for the vegetation and wildlife disciplines. The RSA is defined by the heights of land to the west and east of the Dublin Gulch watershed, and by Haggart Creek to the north and Lynx Creek to the south. The road corridor study area (RCSA) encompasses the proposed road upgrade corridor for the South McQuesten Road (SMR) and the Haggart Creek Access Road (HCAR). This corridor is approximately 44.8 km long and 1 km wide (500 m either side of the road centreline), or 4,579 ha.

The soil baseline assessment included:

- Description of soil profiles within the LSA, RSA and RCSA, with a total of 142 plots;
- Sampling of soils at 16 locations in the LSA, with subsequent physical and chemical analysis;
- Description and mapping of soil map units for the RSA;
- Soil metals analysis; and
- Interpretation of soils for soil reclamation suitability.

All soils were described according to the Canadian System of Soil Classification (Soil Classification Working Group 1998). Soil samples were taken at various depths (linked to horizon designation) to a maximum depth of 50 cm. Lab analysis of soils included: particle size (fine [<2 mm] and coarse [>2 mm]) and pH. soil map units were mapped and described to characterize topsoil depths and reclamation suitability.

Areas with known ore bodies often have mineralized soils present; as a result they can have naturally elevated concentrations of some metals. Total recoverable concentrations of 30 elements were determined for 19 surface soil samples. Analytical results were checked for exceedance of the Soil Quality Guidelines of the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME 1999) and the Yukon Contaminated Sites Regulation (YSR 2002).

The results of the baseline soil elemental analyses show arsenic was naturally above all guideline values for this parameter in almost all soil and overburden samples. For the remainder of the analyzed elements, three soil samples, and four overburden samples, had Cd, Cu, Pb, Mo, Ni, or Se concentrations which were equal to or exceeded the lowest of the soil quality guidelines, which was often the CCME agriculture guideline limit. Table 13.2-1 and Table 13.2-2 are reproduced from Appendix 6 of the Eagle Gold Project Proposal to provide the soil and overburden baseline data set for samples that exceeded guidelines. Further detail is provided in the Environmental Baseline Report: Surficial Geology, Terrain, and Soils (Stantec 2011c).

Table 13.2-1: Surface Soil Sample Metal Exceedances

Sample	Depth (m)	Element	Concentration (mg/kg)	Guideline Limit (mg/kg)	Guideline
EGL8 NT-1	0 – 0.04	Cd	1.4	1.4	CCME Agriculture
EGL17 NT-1	0 – 0.06	Ni	54	50	CCME Agriculture, Parkland
HL6-8 S1	0.3	Se	1.3	1	CCME Agriculture, Parkland

Table 13.2-2: Overburden Sample Metal Exceedances

Sample	Depth (m)	Element	Concentration (mg/kg)	Guideline Limit (mg/kg)	Guideline
P4 S2	1.8 – 2	Cu	81	63	CCME Agriculture, Parkland
		Se	1	1	CCME Agriculture, Parkland
WR3 S1	2	Mo	5.7	5	CCME and Yukon CSR Agriculture
HL5-7 S3	2.2 – 2.5	Pb	85.8	70	CCME Agriculture
		Mo	7.8	5	CCME and Yukon CSR Agriculture
HL6 -1 S3	5 – 5.5	Ni	57	50	CCME Agriculture, Parkland
WR1 S3	6	Cu	84	63	CCME Agriculture, Parkland
		Se	1.2	1	CCME Agriculture, Parkland

A set of 18 historic soil samples from 1995 were also collected and analyzed for total Cu, Fe, Pb, Zn, Mo, and Hg; and evaluated against the above guidelines (full soil analysis results, see Appendix B). All samples were found to be below guideline limits for the assessed elements.

Arsenic

The soil and overburden of the LSA are naturally enriched with arsenic (As), and most baseline samples collected have arsenic concentrations well above the CCME and Yukon CSR guidelines for Agriculture and Parkland soils. Only two of the soil samples, and none of the overburden samples, had a total arsenic concentration below CCME and Yukon CSR summary guidelines (12 and 15 mg/kg, respectively). The mean concentration of As in soils (0 – 50 cm depth) was 193 mg/kg, with a range of 2.4 to 880 mg/kg. In overburden, the mean As concentration was 320 mg/kg, ranging from 23.7 to 1350 mg/kg.

When compared to the receptor-specific guidelines provided in the Yukon CSR, the natural arsenic content of the soils and overburdens in the footprint are above the values considered to pose a risk to livestock, soil invertebrates, plants, and even humans. More than half of the soil samples collected are above the 50-mg/kg guideline recommended to prevent toxicity to soil invertebrates and plants, and all but one are above the limit recommended to prevent illness in livestock ingesting soil while grazing.

The total As concentration in the soils exceeds the thresholds recommended for the protection of soil biota and vegetation by orders of magnitude. It is important to document these elevated pre-disturbance soil arsenic levels, so that post-closure soils analyses do not erroneously attribute elevated arsenic levels to the effects of Project development. These elevated As levels will also require consideration in planning soil handling for reclamation, and for post-closure assessment of reclamation success.

13.3 METHODS**13.3.1 Soil Sampling**

Soil samples will be collected from the surface soil horizon at depths between 0 and 0.5 m, and carefully transferred from the metal shovel and/or split spoon sampler into clean, pre-labeled jars equipped with Teflon-lined lids. Soils collected will be handled only with disposable gloves or clean stainless steel spoons. Soil remaining in the metal shovel and/or split spoon sampler is used to describe and develop a log of the soil characteristics and site stratigraphy for each sample location. To prevent cross-contamination at each sampling location, new nitrile sampling gloves are worn prior to collecting each soil sample.

13.3.2 Locations

Four permanent soil monitoring sampling locations will be established in conjunction with the permanent vegetation monitoring plots, one in each monitoring quadrant (D1-D4). Plot locations will be selected in the field based on identification of pre-established ecosystem criteria (the dominant ecosystems, previously identified). Vegetation monitoring plots will be established on the predominant slope, aspect and drainage position within each dominant vegetation ecosystem unit.

- Soil and vegetation monitoring station D1 will be located adjacent to the Potato Hills meteorological station.

- Soil and vegetation monitoring station D2 will be located at or near the Camp meteorological station and location of the Partisol Air Quality Sampler. This station will be representative of the Project area boundary.
- Soil and vegetation monitoring station D3 will be located below the hilltop just southeast of the Project area. This corresponds to the area of highest TSP concentrations and dustfall that were predicted by dispersion modeling.
- Soil and vegetation monitoring station D4 will be approximately 1.5 km south of the camp, to the east of the access road. This location is downwind of prevailing winds at the Camp meteorological station.

13.3.3 Frequency

Soil samples will be collected in coordination with vegetation monitoring and will be collected once during the growing season (July to September) of the construction phase. The first sampling event will occur in Year 1 of construction.

13.3.4 Data Analysis

Soil samples will be analyzed for metals and nutrients using the methods outlined below. Ten percent of analyzed samples will be blind duplicates, as an assurance on analytical quality and consistency.

13.3.5 Test Method

pH in Soil or Solid – analysis will be performed based on procedures described in the “Manual on Soil sampling and Methods of Analysis” (1993) published by the Canadian Society of Soil Science. The test is performed using a deionized water leach with measurement by pH meter.

Particle Size Analysis – the particle size distribution will be determined in accordance with Methods of Soil Analysis Part 1-Physical and Mineralogical Methods (2nd Ed). UBC Methods Manual for Soil Analysis (1981) and Soil Sampling and Methods of Analysis (1993). The percentage gravel, sand, silt and clay will be determined by a combination of a standard dry sieve, wet sieve and pipetting techniques. Particle size limits used to define size fractions are based according to Canadian Soil Survey Committee (CSSC) and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) classification scheme.

CSSC Textural Category – C Clay, S = Sand, SI Silt, L - Loam, CL Clay Loam, SC = Sandy Clay, SIL = Silt Loam, SIC - Silty Clay. LS = Loamy Sand, SL = Sandy Loam. HC = Heavy Clay, SCL - Sandy Clay Loam, SICL = Silty Clay Loam.

Silver—Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry (ICP/MS).

Arsenic—Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry (ICP/MS).

Cadmium—Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry (ICP/MS).

Mercury—Cold Vapour Atomic Fluorescence.

Molybdenum—Acid digestion followed by determination using Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry (ICP/MS).

Strong Acid Leachable Metals in Soil —B.C. MOELP Method “Strong Acid Leachable Metals In Soil Version 1.0”. The method involves drying the sample at 60 C, sieving using a 2 mm (10 mesh) sieve and digestion using a mixture of hydrochloric and nitric acids. Analysis is performed using inductively Coupled Argon Plasma Spectroscopy (ICAP) or by specific techniques as described.

Selenium Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry (ICP/MS).

Thallium—Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry (ICP/MS).

Particle Size Analysis - Standard – according to the CSSC and USDA Classification schemes. Soil texture is determined according to CSSC definition of texture. The size fractions that are analyzed are 2.0, 0.250, 0.125, 0.053 and 0.002 mm. The % Sand, % Silt and % Clay are based on the <2 mm fraction of the sample by weight.

Total Nitrogen and Sulfur—combustion analyzer where nitrogen in the reduced nitrous oxide gas is determined using a thermal conductivity detector.

Available NO₃ and Available NO₂—Available Nitrate and Nitrite will be extracted from the soil sample using a dilute calcium chloride solution. Nitrate will be quantitatively reduced to nitrite by passage of the sample through a copperized Cadmium column. The nitrite (reduced nitrate plus original nitrite) is then determined by diazotizing with sulfanilamide followed by coupling with N-(1-naphthyl) ethylenediamine dihydrochloride. The resulting water soluble dye has a magenta color which, is measured at colorimetrically at 520 nm.

Available P and Available K - Plant available phosphorus and potassium will be extracted from the soil using Modified Kelowna solution. Phosphorous in the soil extract is determined colorimetrically at 880 nm, while potassium is determined by flame emission at 770 nm.

13.4 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

In the event monitoring data indicates that metals concentration in soil is increasing, SGC will engage additional dust control contingency measures described above in the Air Quality Section 11 to limit particulate matter settling on soils.

14 NOISE

14.1 INTRODUCTION

The objective of the noise monitoring program is to ensure that public users of the Haggart Creek Access Road (HCR) adjacent to the Project site are not at risk of exposure to high sound levels associated with blasting. For on-site personnel project design criteria and procurement policy requires that noise levels from any equipment shall not exceed 85 dBA at 1 metre, and noise level for control rooms and offices shall not exceed 60 dBA at 1 m in accordance with the Yukon Occupational Health Regulations.

The loudest source of noise during construction and operations will be from the use of explosives. The maximum peak sound pressure level of 120 dB is the cautionary limit for blasting. Blasting will occur during construction in the development of the open pit, development of infrastructure pads, and quarry development. Blasting will occur in the open pit throughout the operations phase of the Project and will be scheduled to occur once per day at shift change or lunch break. Blasting will occur only during daylight hours.

The predicted peak sound level (PSL) at 500 m from the open pit is 196 dB. At 1.5 km from the open pit, noise from blasting is expected to be 92 dB north; 85 dB east; 82 dB south; and 103 dB west. These numbers are below the cautionary limit of 120 dB.

Within the site boundaries closest to the open pit, noise levels from blasting will likely be higher than 120 dB during blasting. On-site personnel may be potentially affected by noise from blasting without the proper safety measures in place. The health and safety of on-site personnel with respect to exposure to steady state or impact noise will be managed in accordance with the *Yukon Occupational Health and Safety and Regulations*.

By restricting access to the mine site at the gate house on the HCR immediately prior to the site entrance, recreational land users will not be present in the vicinity of the mine during blasting operations. However, the HCR is located directly adjacent to the mine site, and at the closest point, it is approximately 1000 m west of the open pit. Sound levels from blasting in the open pit will be between 196 dB and 103 dB. It is possible that noise levels could exceed 120 dB on the HCR closest to the open pit during blasting. Members of the public and uninformed mine personnel may be potentially affected by noise from blasting when traveling on the HCR.

A number of standard mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project design to minimize noise including:

- Minimize effect of blasting noise on people and applying Yukon Occupational Health Regulations for employees and restrict public access to the mine site
- Limit blasting to the least noise-sensitive times of day (between 7:00 am and 10:00 pm)
- Locate major crushing equipment and other noise-generating equipment (e.g., blowers and air compressors, etc.) inside buildings wherever possible

- Perform regular inspection and maintenance of vehicles and equipment to ensure that they have high quality mufflers installed and worn parts replaced
- Follow posted vehicle speed limits
- Maintain site haul and secondary roads to minimize vehicle noise associated with vibration
- Turn off equipment when not in use and practical to do so
- Restricting access to the mine site so that recreational land users are not present in the vicinity of the mine during blasting operations

14.2 PREVIOUS WORK

A noise assessment was conducted as part of the Project Proposal developed under the *Yukon Environment and Socio Economic Assessment Act* (YESAA) requirements.

Yukon has no specific regulatory guidance that relates to environmental noise effects on the general public. Hence, guidelines widely used in other jurisdictions where no provincial noise assessment regulations exist were considered. Following these guidelines, a study area, encompassing the Project footprint, the physical area occupied by the Project infrastructure, and an extension beyond the footprint boundary (the Project boundary) of approximately 2 km in all directions, was selected for the noise assessment. Baseline ambient sound levels of 35 dBA Leq(9) nighttime and 45 dBA Leq(15) daytime were applied for the assessment. Sound level modeling was conducted using the software CADNA/A Version 4.0 (DataKustik GmbH (DataKustik) 2009) for Project construction, operations, blasting, and decommissioning. Predictions at 1.5 km from the Project boundary were compared to the regulatory noise criteria to evaluate Project compliance.

The construction-related noise limits for residential areas are 65 dBA Leq(12) for daytime, 60 dBA Leq(4) for evening, and 55 dBA Leq(8) for nighttime and all day for Sundays and holidays set by Environment Canada (1989) *Code of Practice*. Because the Project construction equipment will be operating continuously, the focus was to assess the effects of construction noise in relation to the most stringent regulatory criteria (nighttime limit of 55 dBA Leq(8)).

During construction and decommissioning, the maximum predicted nighttime sound level will be 42 dBA Leq(8) and the maximum cumulative predicted nighttime sound level, including ambient baseline sound levels, will be 43 dBA Leq(8). This is less than the Environment Canada (1989) *Code of Practice* nighttime limit of 55 dBA Leq(8) for construction-related noise. Therefore predicted noise levels during the construction phase are well below generally accepted regulatory criteria.

Permissible sound levels (PSLs) are 50 dBA Leq(15) for operations during daytime and 40 dBA Leq(9) for operations during nighttime, respectively. During Project operations, the maximum predicted daytime sound level is 41 dBA Leq(15). The maximum cumulative predicted daytime sound level, including ambient baseline sound levels, is 46 dBA Leq(15), which is less than the daytime PSL of 50 dBA Leq(15). During Project operations, the maximum predicted nighttime sound level associated with the Project alone is 36 dBA Leq(9). The maximum cumulative predicted nighttime sound level, including ambient baseline sound levels, is 39 dBA

Leq(9), which is lower than the PSL of 40 dBA Leq(9). Therefore, predicted noise levels during the operation phase are within the generally accepted applicable regulatory criteria in Canada.

The maximum predicted daytime peak (instantaneous) sound level at 1.5 km from the Project boundary during blasting is approximately 104 dBA. All predicted peak sound levels at receptors located 1.5 km from the Project boundary are well below the cautionary limit of 120 dB, as specified by the Ontario MoE (1978) *NPC-119 Blasting*.

Based on the results of the noise assessment, predicted sound levels at 1.5 km from the Project boundary during construction, operation, and decommissioning phases are expected to remain within acceptable limits of the generally accepted criteria for ambient sound quality in Canada.

14.3 METHODS

In accordance with term and condition #121 of the Decision Document, SGC will monitor sound-levels related to blasting activities along the portion of the HCR that is within the 1.5 km boundary identified in the Noise Assessment Report. Should noise levels on the HCR exceed 110 dB, SGC will use personnel to control and inform traffic on this portion of the HCR during blasting events until such time as the noise monitoring demonstrates blasting noise at the HCR is consistently below 110 dB.

Prior to scheduled blasting events, a technician will travel to the monitoring locations and record sound levels during blasting. Sound levels will be measured using a Class 1 Sound Level Meter that has a dynamic range of at least 30 - 140 dB.

14.3.1 Location

Monitoring will be completed at several fixed locations on the HCR closest to the open pit. Additionally, SGC will conduct instantaneous monitoring at specific locations to be determined based on blasting locations during construction if outside of the open pit area or, if warranted by a noise complaint.

14.3.2 Frequency

Sound monitoring will be initially undertaken monthly for a minimum of 3 months to determine if the peak sound levels on the Haggart Creek Road exceed 110 dB during blasting. In the event sound levels exceed 110 dB during blasting, monitoring will continue during blasting activities to ensure access road restrictions are necessary. If sound levels do not exceed 110 dB during this period and blasting operations do not vary, monitoring and road restrictions during blasting will be discontinued until warranted by a change in blasting procedures that may increase sound levels in the area or if warranted by a noise complaint.

14.4 DATA ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

Recorded sound levels will be collected and stored in an electronic database. Data reports will be made available upon request. Any noise complaints received will be recorded and included.

Based on the results of the monitoring additional mitigation measures, or adaptive management strategies will be identified and implemented as required.

14.5 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

The adaptive management thresholds for noise generated by the Project at the 1.5 km radius are 50 dBA Leq(15) for operations during daytime and 40 dBA Leq(9) for operations during nighttime, respectively. The threshold during blasting is 110 dB. If these thresholds are exceeded the following measures will be considered:

- Reduce static noise from mobile mining and other heavy construction equipment and generators as much as possible through enclosures, mufflers and berms to block or deflect sound. Reduce idling as much as possible
- Addition of enclosures, berms, acoustic screening and shrouding for stationary sources
- Blasting will be limited to certain times of the day based on wildlife sensitivities if any are identified
- Strategic scheduling of noise events that limit certain activities to specific times of day
- House stationary sources in buildings
- To protect worker health:
 - o Delineate and mark areas where noise is constant and more than 85 dBA
 - o Provide and enforce the use of suitable hearing protection for all employees exposed to noise over 85 dBA, to be used in accordance with recommendations outlined in the Canadian Standards Association Standard Z.94.2-94, Hearing Protectors, where other mitigation and management options are not available or reasonable.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND FACILITIES

This section of the Plan describes the surveillance activities to monitor the physical performance of key mine infrastructure and of mine workings. Monitoring methods are described for the open pit, material management and storage facilities and heap leach and process facilities. In addition permafrost adjacent to facilities and infrastructure will be monitored to ensure changes in permafrost condition do not create instability for project infrastructure. These methods are described in a separate section as well as within individual facilities monitoring sections below.

15 PERMAFROST

15.1 INTRODUCTION

The Project site is located in a region of widespread discontinuous permafrost. Construction, operation and closure of the mine have the potential to disturb permafrost. Permafrost monitoring is required to provide information to update engineering design, adaptively manage construction activities that may require the over-excavation of ice rich material, and minimize thawing and permafrost degradation wherever possible.

The permafrost monitoring plan includes the following:

- Visual Inspection,
- Subsurface Temperature Monitoring,
- Surface Water Quality Monitoring, and
- Climate Monitoring (addressed in Section 10).

Baseline monitoring has included regular observation of subsurface temperatures at existing thermistor strings, as well as routine visual inspections of disturbed areas. Depending on the condition and location of the thermistor after construction, additional thermistor strings may need to be installed at selected facilities. In some cases, decisions on specific monitoring will be made as part of detailed engineering design.

15.2 PREVIOUS WORK

A total of thirteen thermistor strings were installed in test holes around the site between 2009 and 2012, as illustrated in Figure 15.2-1. These have been monitored since their installation (BGC 2012a), and will be monitored on a quarterly basis, twice in summer and twice in winter until mine construction begins.

In addition to thermistor readings, subsurface data from 463 test holes with observations of the presence or absence of late summer frozen ground, which may be taken as a proxy for the probable presence of permafrost, has been compiled (see Frozen Materials Management Plan). These data provide a basis for inferring the spatial distribution of permafrost. The thermistor strings and other subsurface data show the sporadic presence of relatively warm permafrost (generally warmer than -1°C) in selected areas of the site, and absence of permafrost elsewhere.

15.3 METHODS

Permafrost monitoring will involve the following primary components:

- Visual inspection during construction of selected engineered facilities, including cut or fill slopes greater than 3 m in height, will be inspected visually at regular intervals for signs of sloughing, slumping, settlement, tension cracks, rill or gully erosion, seepage or other evidence of permafrost degradation.

Locations where water is ponding will also be noted since they represent heat sources that could potentially trigger subsurface thawing and instability. A record will be prepared for every inspection and compared to previous observations to assess ongoing degradation. This information will inform mitigation strategies or design changes as described in the adaptive management program.

- Subsurface temperature monitoring: shallow and deep ground temperatures will be monitored using existing thermistors. The locations of thermistor monitoring correspond to those where visual monitoring is required. Additional thermistors may need to be installed during construction and will be determined based on site observations and on as needed basis as part of finalizing designs.
- Surface water quality monitoring: runoff from engineered facilities will be monitored for Total Suspended Solids (TSS) and turbidity. Changes in runoff water quality can be used as early indication of evolving issues (e.g. unknown ground disturbance associated with permafrost degradation) before they become more acute issues. Areas demonstrating elevated levels will be investigated by field reconnaissance, and may be further monitored through more frequent visual monitoring, if required, following any remedial efforts considered warranted.

15.3.1 Locations

Existing thermistors depicted on Figure 15.2-1 will be used to monitor permafrost conditions. Existing thermistors will be maintained where possible to identify thermal trends that may be occurring in response to construction-related ground disturbance. It is expected, however, that many of the existing thermistors will be destroyed during construction. In some cases thermistors may be destroyed by excavation activities that remove permafrost and ice-rich material; monitoring of the ground temperature in these areas will not be necessary. If thermistors are destroyed in areas adjacent to where permafrost will remain, they will be replaced. Although no such locations are currently envisaged, destroyed thermistors would be replaced with new thermistors, as deemed necessary and installed to an approximate 10 m depth, outside but close to the disturbance areas.

For monitoring during construction and operations, new thermistors may be installed at specific locations where visual monitoring may be necessary to inform detailed design specifications and/or to monitor evolving conditions during operations, including for example:

- Dublin Gulch Diversion Channel (channel and cut slopes),
- Heap Leach Facility:
 - o Heap Leach Embankment
 - o Heap Leach Pad
- Reclamation Stockpiles,
- Temporary Ore Stockpile,
- Building Pad Fills, and

- Waste Rock Storage Areas.

15.3.2 Frequency

Baseline monitoring, prior to mine construction, will involve reading thermistors four times a year to capture the seasonal fluctuations of ground temperatures and to determine the presence of frozen ground and thickness of the active layer.

Quarterly monitoring of thermistors installed in key facilities to assess trends in changes on permafrost. Visual inspections and surface water quality monitoring will also be carried out during freshet, following prolonged rainy periods and during freeze-up.

Review of compiled weather data will be conducted on an annual basis and will include review of total monthly and annual precipitation, mean monthly and annual temperatures, air freezing indices and air thawing indices. The data will be compared with climate normals for the area.

15.3.3 Data Analysis

Data from thermistor readings will be plotted as profiles of temperature with depth and as profiles of temperature with time at selected depths noting the following:

- Range of ground temperature;
- Temperature of permafrost at depth;
- Thickness of the active layer;
- Identification of differences in ground temperature with respect to distribution of facilities within the site; and
- Identification of any trends within the ground temperatures with depth that could indicate potential warming.

Data from visual inspections will be collected as photo log albums, indicating date, time and personnel responsible for data collection, accompanied by a written description of observations. Compiled records of visual observations will be reviewed for evidence of permafrost degradation warranting either more vigilant monitoring or remedial action (e.g. stabilization or excavation of permafrost).

Data and findings will be presented in an annual data report, with a detailed assessment of subsurface trends and conditions carried out to determine the need for either more frequent monitoring or remedial effort.

15.4 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

The following adaptive management measures may be undertaken in the event monitoring data indicate a measureable reduction in depth and thickness or increase in temperature of permafrost on site and if it may result in threat to infrastructure stability or water quality impacts via high turbidity:

- Increase the frequency of visual monitoring and/or add monitoring locations.

- Employ additional monitoring methods to help verify trends and associated risks to project infrastructure (e.g. additional monitoring specific to infrastructure such as stability monitoring for tension cracks in foundations, embankments, or mass ground movement).
- Place (additional) insulation over thawing permafrost areas.
- Adjust or modify water management infrastructure if heat transfer from the infrastructure could be the cause for permafrost warming, thaw and/or discharge of increased TSS. Options include:
 - o Collection of seepage from thawing permafrost
 - o Re-routing of conveyance system to treat seepage as required (e.g. settling of TSS)
 - o Construction of additional sediment basin(s).
- Stabilize of areas and infrastructure as necessary prior to failure due to permafrost changes (e.g. buttressing, earthworks etc.).
- Excavate permafrost and unstable areas.

16 OPEN PIT

16.1 INTRODUCTION

Gold-bearing ore and barren waste rock will be removed from the Eagle deposit by conventional drill, blast, shovel and truck mining. Over the life of the Project, the open pit will be advanced in four major stages with an ultimate pit size of 1,420 m long and 780 m wide and approximately 85 ha. Based on the surface topography, the open pit will be scalloped-shaped with a lower west highwall. The minimum elevation of the pit is 847.5 masl and there will be a maximum crest elevation of approximately 1,409 masl, giving the pit a depth of 562 m along the east highwall. The west highwall crest elevation will be approximately 925 masl, giving the west highwall a height of approximately 77 m. To maintain access to the primary crusher, a single ramp will spiral down to the bottom of the final pit. This ramp will also connect to the external access road that leads to the truck shop. No ramps will be maintained inside the final pit above the crusher elevation to minimize stripping requirements.

During a pre-production period, a total of 4.8 Mt of waste material will be mined and this material will be used to develop haul roads, the HLF embankment and for other construction purposes. Following the pre-production period, ore production will increase to the nominal production rate of 29,500 t/d.

Geotechnical investigations to support the final open pit design were supported by field work undertaken in 2009, 2010 and 2011 and included geotechnical mapping, geotechnical drilling, oriented core measurements, one borehole televiewer survey, hydrogeologic (packer) testing, installation of borehole instrumentation to measure groundwater pressures and laboratory testing of rock core samples. These investigations are described in the Mine Development and Operations Plan which provides a discussion of pit wall stability and slope design criteria.

During mining, ongoing monitoring of the pit wall will be required to:

- Maintain safe operational practices for personnel, equipment, and near-pit facilities.
- Provide advance warning of slope instability.
- Provide geotechnical information for slope designs to assist in making subsequent modifications, should they be required, to achieve the desired slope performance.

A well-developed risk management system, which includes active deformation monitoring, may allow additional optimization of the slope design during operation of the mine.

16.2 METHODS

The current state of practice for slope monitoring in open pit mines in North America is based on a multi-layered system, which in approximate order of sophistication and cost, may include:

- Visual inspections

- Theodolites (robotic or manual) and a network of survey prisms
- Time domain reflectometry (TDR) cables
- Slope inclinometers
- Extensometers
- Fixed slope radar installations (e.g. IDS IBIS system)
- Mobile slope radar equipment (e.g. Reutech or GroundProbe)

Slope stability radar systems are not anticipated to be necessary unless significant instability develops and the threat of the instability on production warrants the high costs. Other monitoring systems may be required during operations depending on slope performance.

16.2.1 Locations

Approximately 40 prisms will be installed around the pit perimeter, including three backsights (control points), during the mine start-up to establish the initial survey monitoring system. These initial prisms could be monitored with a single theodolite surveying from two or three locations around the pit, either from within the pit or along the pit perimeter. Selected monitoring locations will be stable with good visibility of the prisms from these locations. During the development and expansion of the pit, another 50 to 100 prisms may be required, with higher prism density in the east wall.

Once areas of instability have been identified either through visual inspections or surveying, specific locations within the failure areas may require more detailed monitoring that will include installation of TDR cables, slope inclinometers, or extensometers to measure displacements across specific features such as shear zones or cracks.

16.2.2 Frequency

Visual inspections of the open pit slopes will be undertaken daily. Monthly surveys will be carried out on the survey prisms until movements are detected. These inspections will be completed by the shift foreman, or someone at a similar level of responsibility with experience in the open pit development. Records of the results of these visual inspections will be maintained in shift log reports, along with daily and weekly records.

16.3 REPORTING

Annual reports will be prepared internally to document changes to pit wall stability, movement as observed and mitigation measures applied.

16.4 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

If movements are detected during the daily visual inspections or monthly surveys adaptive management measures will be considered and implemented, as necessary. This includes an increase in survey frequency from monthly to weekly. Once movement trends are established, movement rate thresholds can be developed

which will trigger reductions/increases in the time intervals between readings. Depending on the proximity of the movements to personnel, equipment and infrastructure, survey monitoring frequency may have to be increased to as much as daily. This could include, although not anticipated to be needed, automation of the survey equipment due to the time requirements involved, or the purchase of more sophisticated equipment such as slope stability radar. Further, adjustment of controlled blasting techniques can be used to minimize damage to rock at limits of the pit and reduce the potential for pit wall movement.

17 MATERIAL STORAGE AND STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT AREAS

17.1 INTRODUCTION

A Waste Rock and Overburden Facility Management Plan has been developed and describes the types of waste rock and overburden including reclamation soil stockpiles, temporary ore stockpile, and the ice-rich overburden storage area (IROSAs) that will be constructed and/or encountered on site, and how these materials will be characterized, segregated, and stored to ensure long-term chemical and physical stability. The plan provides details about the design, construction and operation of each waste rock and overburden storage facility, and summarizes closure strategies considered during the design, construction and operation of each facility.

Upon the commencement of open pit development, waste rock is scheduled for disposal in one of two areas:

- Platinum Gulch Waste Rock Storage Area (PG WRSA), or
- Eagle Pup Waste Rock Storage Area (EP WRSA)

The WRSAs are located within a short haul distance from the open pit; they will provide adequate capacity for waste rock over the life of the mine (LOM). Waste rock will be hauled from the pit via strategically positioned egress points. As part of the mine plan, the upper internal pit ramp will ultimately be mined out and external ramps will be constructed to access the upper lifts of the WRSAs. Further, as part of project development, a temporary ore stockpile will be constructed adjacent to and downhill from the crushing facilities, reclamation soil stockpiles will be developed along the main east west haul road, and the IROSAs will be built along the Haggart Creek valley.

The objective of the monitoring and surveillance of the material storage and stockpile areas include:

- Detection of the movement and stability of the facilities based on visual inspections and using various instrumentation and surveying, as applicable, to inform the mine engineer regarding the continued development of the facility, and
- Characterization of seepage water quality, runoff water quality and flow conditions to provide input to water management strategies including water treatment requirements, conveyance and storage needs, and sediment and erosion control practices.

17.2 METHODS

Visual inspections of the storage facilities and stockpiles should be routinely completed by technical personnel at the mine. These inspections should include but not be limited to, the following:

- Inspection of the crest areas for any signs of deformation, instability, or erosion

- Inspection of the facility faces for any signs of deformation, instability, or erosion.
- Inspection of the toe areas for any signs of deformation, instability, or erosion, at a frequency determined by the results of crest and face monitoring.
- Inspection of the toe for any signs of seepage from the base, other than the rock drains at a frequency determined by the results of crest and face monitoring.
- Monitoring of water levels in existing piezometers adjacent to or within the facility footprints (details described above in Section 4).
- Inspection of the rock drain discharge areas at the toe of the WRSAs and notes made of water flow rates, and visual water quality.

These inspections will be completed by the shift foreman, or someone at a similar level of responsibility with experience in storage facility construction.

The results of the visual monitoring will provide insight on the physical performance of the storage areas and stockpiles over the course of operations. If instabilities are detected then various adaptive management practices, as described below, may be followed.

17.2.1 Locations

Visual inspections will take place along the crest and toe areas of the waste rock storage area lifts. Deformation monitoring using survey prisms will require set up of a survey station at a location that can clearly observe the crest and toe areas of the waste dumps. More specific deformation monitoring of unstable areas can be undertaken using wireline extensometers across specific cracks, or slope inclinometers installed through the waste rock into the foundation to monitor shearing in the foundation.

17.2.2 Frequency

Visual inspections of the crest areas of waste dumps are usually undertaken twice per shift or at least daily by the shift boss or foreman, if the waste dump is active. The toe areas of the waste rock storage areas and the rock drain discharge outlet should be inspected weekly. Visual inspection of the temporary ore stockpile, reclamation soil stockpiles and the IROSA require less frequent monitoring, typically weekly during annual development (i.e., for the ore stockpile) and then monthly once the facility is established.

More detailed inspections of the WRSAs may be completed on a monthly basis by the mine's geotechnical engineer familiar with the technical aspects of the WRSA design, construction, and monitoring. More detailed inspections of the reclamation soil stockpile may be completed annually by the mine's geotechnical engineer.

17.3 REPORTING

Records of the visual inspections will be maintained in shift log reports, along with daily and weekly records detailing the location and type of materials placed in the WRSAs. Records of the daily, weekly, monthly and

annual visual inspections should be maintained and complied annually, and incorporated into the annual independent review

17.4 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

Adaptive management strategies are designed to address unexpected performance of rock and overburden management programs. In the event of instability, or poor performance (i.e. slumping of the crest, bulging of toe areas, erosion, etc.), which is affecting the ability of mining operations to place waste in the WRSAs or stockpile, or jeopardizes downhill working areas or roads, deformation monitoring of specific areas may be required. Numerous techniques are available to monitor the deformation. These include:

- Surveying of optical prisms installed at the surface of the facilities;
- Measurement of surface movements using wireline extensometers;
- Measurement of sub-surface movements using inclinometer casing.
- Radar or photogrammetric surveying

These techniques form the basis for most monitoring systems in place in North America. The frequency of the readings will depend on the magnitude of the movements and the potential consequences of a failure, with higher reading frequencies required for high consequence failures and accelerating movement rates. Site-specific monitoring frequencies and alarm trigger thresholds will be developed by the mine engineer as part of operating procedures for these areas.

18 HEAP LEACH AND PROCESS FACILITIES

18.1 INTRODUCTION

Regular surveillance is essential to ensure ongoing safety of the heap leach and process facilities and to identify areas requiring maintenance before problems and safety concerns develop. Behavior and performance of the facilities are assessed visually and through monitoring of instrumentation. More details on the surveillance process are described in the Operations, Maintenance and Surveillance Manual for the Heap Leach Facility.

The purpose of an inspection program is to identify problems and/or unsafe conditions that are visually evident. Visual inspections are an integral part of proper maintenance and performance of monitoring programs for the heap leach and process facilities. Failure to correct identified maintenance and repair items, or potential adverse behavior, could result in unsafe conditions or lead to a failure of operating systems or cause an adverse environmental effect.

18.2 HEAP LEACH FACILITY

18.2.1 Inspection Methods

There are four types of HLF inspections summarized in Table 18.2-1:

- Routine inspections
- Annual inspections,
- Event-driven inspections, and
- A comprehensive Dam Safety Review

18.2.1.1 Routine Inspections

Routine and/or regular visual inspections will be completed weekly. The visual inspections will be done for all components of the HLF, including the visible portions of the leach pad liner; leach pad embankment; stacked ore pile; accessible portions of the solution delivery and collection system including pipelines, drip emitters, pumps, tanks and other support facilities; conveyors, radial stacker and agglomeration facilities; the two event ponds, and instrumentation as appropriate.

The leach pad leak detection and solution collection system monitoring ports will be monitored daily, including sampling and analyses, flow rates and volumes as required. The presence of process solution in any of the ports is expected but excess volume is a potential indication of a leak in the heap leach pad liner. All observations will be documented.

18.2.1.2 Annual Inspections

Annual inspections are intended to be part of a more thorough review of the condition of the facility, and are carried out by a qualified engineer, experienced with the design and maintenance of the HLF. The annual inspections will be conducted by July 1st and will include the following items:

- Visual inspection of the HLF and dam by the engineer, including taking appropriate photographs of the observed conditions;
- Review whether or not recommendations from previous year's inspection(s) have been addressed, and any incidents or actions arising from those previous recommendations;
- Review of instrumentation and monitoring data; and
- An evaluation and interpretation of the structural performance of the embankment and related components, and identify any potential safety deficiencies or recommended items that need to be addressed in the coming year,

The results of the inspection and review will be documented and kept as a permanent record until operations are complete.

18.2.1.3 Event-Driven Inspections

As part of standard adaptive management practices, special inspections will be carried out if any of the following events occur:

- Unusual events such as an earthquake or large precipitation event;
- Unusual operating events such as rupture of a pipeline or a power loss that lasts longer than 8 hours;
- Slide of the stacked leach ore;
- Unusual observations such as cracks, excessive settlements, sinkholes, large slope or foundation deformations in the embankment; or
- Instrument readings that deviate from historical trends, or are within site specific designated "alert" action levels.

Special inspections after unusual events are necessary to evaluate whether there has been any damage requiring correction, any safety measures or special operating procedures that need to be implemented.

18.2.1.4 Comprehensive Dam Safety Review

The Canadian Dam Association, Dam Safety Guidelines (CDA, 2007) recommend a comprehensive dam safety review be carried out every seven years during operations, prior to decommissioning and following closure. The comprehensive review provides independent verification of:

- Safety and environmental performance of the HLF facility, including the embankment;
- Adequacy of the surveillance program;

- Adequacy of delivery of OMS requirements;
- Design basis with respect to current standards and possible failure modes; and
- Compliance with new engineering standards (including analysis to confirm if necessary).

18.2.2 Locations and Frequency

Table 18.2-1 summarizes the routine surveillance requirements for the HLF. If any unusual occurrences are observed during the completion of the routine surveillance activities, they will be immediately reported to the Process Plant Manager and the Process Plant General Foreman for assessment and development of an appropriate course of action. If deemed necessary, appropriate Adaptive Management Procedures (AMP) will be implemented as outlined below in the Adaptive Management section.

Table 18.2-1: Surveillance Requirements for the HLF

Surveillance Locations	Frequency
<i>Routine Inspection</i>	
Embankment	Weekly by staff (Annually by Engineer)
Pad Liner	Weekly
Stacked leach ore for stability	Weekly
Solution collection and recovery system	Weekly
Leak Detection and Collection System Monitoring Ports	Daily
Heap leach pad standpipe piezometers	Weekly
Monitoring Vault	Weekly
Embankment geotechnical instrumentation	Weekly
Events Pond liners	Weekly
Conveyors, radial stacker, agglomeration facilities	Weekly
Geochemical sampling of leach ore	Quarterly
Geochemical sampling of pregnant and barren process solution	Quarterly
HLF and Dam Inspection by Engineer	Annually
Event Driven Inspection	Following Unusual Event
Comprehensive Review	Every 7 years and prior to decommissioning
Instrumentation	Monthly and per Manufacturer Guidelines
General Visual Inspection of HLF Components and the Events Pond	Daily during the completion of standard work procedures

18.3 PROCESSING FACILITIES (ADR PLANT)

18.3.1 Methods

On regular occasions the main components of the Adsorption Desorption Recovery (ADR) plant will be physically inspected.

The purpose of the physical inspection is to observe and record sufficient information to allow for the identification of areas, components, or issues that are not functioning as designed or could potentially require modification, repair, or rehabilitation.

Physical inspections consist of visual inspections conducted by a qualified and experienced engineer or technician. Inspection results and any repairs needed will be documented and retained. Should any component inspected be found to be sub-standard or repairs needed those repairs will be documented and recorded.

The main inspection area and information to guide the inspector are summarized in Table 18.3-1.

Table 18.3-1: ADR Facility Inspection Priorities

Inspection Area	Environmental Concern	Focus Point(s)
Containment Area 1 Reagent Storage Area	Fluid Containment	Concrete curbs, gutters capable of containing fluids
Containment Area 2 Carbon Column Area	Fluid Containment	Concrete curbs, gutters capable of containing fluids
Containment Area 3 Barren Solution Tank	Fluid Containment	Inspect leak detection groove on pedestal. Insure tank materials of construction in good repair capable of containing fluids. Inspect tank overflow piping including destination.
Containment Area 4 Fuel Oil Tank	Fluid Containment	Inspect for leakage from tank or pedestal. Insure tank materials of construction in good repair capable of containing fluids. Inspect tank basin for flammable debris. Inspect for proper material labelling.
ADR Carbon Tank 5, Train A, B, & C (3 tanks)	Fluid Containment	Concrete curbs, gutters capable of containing fluids. Insure tank materials of construction in good repair capable of containing fluids.
Carbon Area Sump	Fluid Containment	Concrete side wall capable of containing fluids. Pump and controls functional.
Electro-winning Area Sump	Fluid Containment	Concrete side wall gutters capable of containing fluids. Pump and controls functional.
Sodium Cyanide Mixing Tank	Fluid Containment	Concrete pedestal, tank materials of construction in good repair capable of containing fluids. Inspect safety shower and eyewash.
Sodium Cyanide Holding Tank	Fluid Containment	Concrete pedestal, tank materials of construction in good repair capable of containing fluids.

Section 18 Heap Leach and Process Facilities

Inspection Area	Environmental Concern	Focus Point(s)
Acid (HCl) Mix Tank	Fluid Containment	Concrete pedestal, tank materials of construction in good repair capable of containing fluids. Inspect safety shower and eyewash. Inspect physical barrier between acid and cyanide mix area.
Sodium Hydroxide Mix Tank	Fluid Containment	Concrete pedestal, tank materials of construction in good repair capable of containing fluids. Inspect safety shower and eyewash.
Sodium Cyanide Delivery Pipelines	Fluid Containment	Piping in good repair, no leaks, identification labels in place. Capable of containing fluids at the design pressure & flow.
Acid Delivery Pipelines	Fluid Containment	Piping in good repair, no leaks, labels in place. Capable of containing fluids at the design pressure & flow.
Sodium Cyanide Isotainers, Full Containers	Product Security, Containment	Proper storage of solid briquettes including security. Security of lid. Restricted access.
Sodium Cyanide Isotainers, Empty Containers	Fluid Containment	Proper storage of container, minimal residue from solids. Security of lid. Restricted access.
Hydrochloric Acid Full Containers	Product Security, Containment	Proper storage of acid solution including security. Security of lid. Restricted access.
Hydrochloric Acid Empty Containers	Product Security, Containment	Proper storage of containers and any residue including security. Security of lid. Restricted access.
Sodium Hydroxide Full Containers	Product Security, Containment	Proper storage of solid briquettes including security. Security of lid. Restricted access.
Sodium Hydroxide Empty Containers	Product Security, Containment	Proper storage of solid briquettes including security. Security of lid. Restricted access.

18.3.2 Frequency

Table 18.3-2 below provides a summary of the inspection points and frequency of inspection to guide the inspector.

Table 18.3-2: ADR Facility Inspection Frequency

Inspection Area	Frequency
Containment Area 1 Reagent Storage Area	Annually
Containment Area 2 Carbon Column Area	Annually
Containment Area 3 Barren Solution Tank	Annually
Containment Area 4 Fuel Oil Tank	Annually
ADR Carbon Tank 5, Train A, B, & C	Annually
Carbon Area Sump	Annually
Electro-winning Area Sump	Annually
Sodium Cyanide Mixing Tank	One time per six months

Inspection Area	Frequency
Sodium Cyanide Holding Tank	One time per six months
Acid (HCl) Mix Tank	One time per six month
Sodium Hydroxide Mix Tank	One time per six months
Sodium Cyanide Delivery Pipelines(2)	One time per month
Acid Delivery Pipelines	One time per month
Sodium Cyanide Isotainers, Full Containers	One time per month
Sodium Cyanide Isotainers, Empty Containers	One time per month
Hydrochloric Acid Full Containers	One time per six months
Hydrochloric Acid Empty Containers	One time per six months
Sodium Hydroxide Full Containers	One time per six months
Sodium Hydroxide Empty Containers	One time per six months

18.4 REPORTING

18.4.1 Documentation

Documentation of surveillance and inspection activities will be maintained by the Process Plant Manager and Environmental Superintendent and will include recording of:

- Routine visual observations (departures from normal conditions);
- Instrumentation monitoring and testing;
- Analyses and evaluations; and
- Reviews.

Documentation will include, as a minimum, the following:

- Routine inspection log;
- Surveillance network monitoring report
- Quarterly instrumentation reports;
- Annual engineering inspection reports;
- Biannual review of data and annual environmental monitoring and surveillance report
- Comprehensive dam safety report every seven years.

Documentation will include inspection reports, photographic and video records, incident reports, instrumentation readings, instrumentation plots, annual inspections and third-party reviews, so that they can be quickly retrieved for review and in case of an emergency.

18.4.2 Reporting

The Process Plant Manager will review collected data records from facility monitoring and assess the need for maintenance activities or response. The reporting procedures for various levels of surveillance are dependent on whether:

- Performance meets design expectations,
- Conditions may require adjustment to design, operation, maintenance or surveillance,
- Potential Emergency Response Alert, or
- the standard Environmental Monitoring and Reporting

Details of these reporting requirements are described in the OSM Manual.

18.5 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

Adaptive Management for the HLF is wholly considered by the HLF Emergency Response Plan (ERP), which is designed to ensure that an adequate level of emergency preparedness and response is available in the event of an emerging, imminent or actual emergency scenario involving the HLF or associated structures. The HLF ERP Plan is supplemental to the Eagle Gold Project Emergency Response Plan, and was developed based on the following guidelines:

- Dam Safety Guidelines (2007);
- International Cyanide Management (2012);
- Type A and B Quartz Mining Undertakings - Information Package for Applicants (2012);
- Plan Requirement Guidance for Quartz Mining Projects (2013).

As described above, a range of monitoring and inspections will be conducted to ensure that Project features operate as intended. Unusual conditions or emergency events are situations that are different from the normal or expected conditions of the HLF facilities. These unusual conditions may indicate problems needing further monitoring, inspection, or corrective measures or may indicate an emergency condition requiring emergency response. Table 18.5-1 provides a description of the emergency levels which may be detected on the Project.

Table 18.5-1: Emergency Levels

Emergency Level		Description
1	Non-failure	Abnormal situation which has not threatened the operation, or structural integrity, of a system.
2	Potential failure developing	Abnormal situation which may eventually lead to a system failure but there is no immediate threat
3	Imminent or actual failure	Extremely urgent situation where a system failure is occurring or its failure is imminent

The following emergency scenarios were considered in the HLF ERP:

1. HLF foundation or slope failure
2. Overtopping of HLF
3. Ore heap slope failure
4. Events Pond foundation or slope failure
5. Overtopping of Events Pond
6. Failure of liner system
7. Failure of leak detection and recovery system
8. Failure of overliner drain fill
9. Failure of solution collection and delivery system
10. Dublin Gulch Diversion Channel failure
11. Catastrophic release of hydrogen cyanide from ADR plant or during transportation

For each scenario, the potential causes, preventative measures, detection methods, site response, emergency level classification, potential effects and follow up activities are described in the HLF ERP, along with SGS's internal and external communication protocols.

Monitoring of settlement pins will be conducted semi-annually. Areas showing instability or poor performance will be monitored in a more frequent basis.

19 REFERENCES

- Alberta Environment. Available at: <http://environment.gov.ab.ca/info/library/5726.pdf>
- B.C. Ministry of Environment, Lands, and Parks (MELP) and B.C. Ministry of Forests (MoF). 1998. Field manual for describing terrestrial ecosystems. Land Management Handbook No. 25. Victoria, B.C.
- BC Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection (2003). BC Freshwater Biological Sampling Manual.
- BGC Engineering Inc. (2011). Eagle Gold Project, Dublin Gulch, Yukon, 2011 Geotechnical Investigation for Mine Site Infrastructure Foundation Report. Report prepared for Victoria Gold Corporation, December 13, 2011.
- BGC (2012a) Eagle Gold Project – Open Pit Pumping Tests. Memorandum prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., September 6, 2012.
- BGC (2012b) Eagle Gold Project – Lower Dublin Gulch Valley Aquifer Tests. Memorandum prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., September 6, 2012.
- BGC 2012c. Instructions for reading Thermistors Installed by BGC at Eagle Gold – DRAFT. October 31, 2012.
- BGC (2013b) Eagle Gold Project – 2012 Groundwater Data Report DRAFT Report prepared for Citoria Gold Corp., February 15, 2013.
- BGC (2013b) Eagle Gold Project. Numerical Hydrogeologic Model. DRAFT Report prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., January 4, 2013.
- Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME). 2002. Canadian Sediment Quality Guidelines for the Protection of Aquatic Life. Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME), 1999. Canadian Environmental Quality Guidelines (updated to 2007). Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, Winnipeg, MB.
- DFO (Fisheries and Oceans Canada). 2010. *Yukon Fisheries Information Summary System (FISS)*. Available at: <http://habitat.rhq.pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/fiss/dcf01.cfm> Accessed: March 2010.
- Environment Canada. 2002. Metal Mining Guidance Document for Aquatics Effects Monitoring.
- GoC (Government of Canada), 2008. Species at Risk Act. Public Registry. Available at: http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca/background/default_e.cfm. Accessed November 2008.
- Hallam Knight Piésold Ltd. 1996. Dublin Gulch Project, Initial Environmental Evaluation Volume II, Environmental Setting. First Dynasty Mines Ltd. March 1996.
- Hallam Knight Piésold Ltd. 1995. Dublin Gulch Project, Preliminary Baseline Fisheries Study Proposal. Prepared for Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada. 8 pp.

Section 19 References

- Howes, D.E. and E. Kenk. 1997. Terrain Classification System for British Columbia. British Columbia Ministry of Environment, Victoria, BC.
- Jacques Whitford AXYS (2008). Dublin Gulch Project, Climate and Hydrology Environmental Baseline Report. Report prepared for StrataGold Corp., Vancouver, BC by Jacques Whitford AXYS, Burnaby, BC.
- Jacques Whitford AXYS (2008). Water and Sediment Quality Environmental Baseline Report, prepared for StrataGold Corp., Vancouver, BC by Jacques Whitford AXYS, Burnaby, BC Jacques Whitford Stantec AXYS. 2009. Snow Survey Environmental Baseline Report. Report prepared for StrataGold Corp., Vancouver, BC by Jacques Whitford Stantec AXYS, Burnaby, B.C.
- Knight Piesold. 2013. Eagle Gold Project – Hydrometeorology Report. Ref. No. VA101-290/6-8 Rev A. August, 2013.
- Lorax. 2013. Eagle Gold Project Environmental Baseline Report. Water Quality. April 2013.
- Lorax. 2014. Eagle Gold Geochemical Source Term Predictions - Model Description and Results. June 2014
- MOE. 2009. Manual of British Columbia Hydrometric Standards. Ministry of Environment. Science and Information Branch for Resources Information Standards Committee (RISC). March 12, 2009.
- Madrone Environmental Services Ltd. 2006. Dublin Gulch Project Gap Analysis: Environmental Baseline Information. Prepared for Strata Gold Corporation. 32 pp.
- McPhail, J. D. 2007. The Freshwater Fishes of British Columbia. University of Alberta Press, Edmonton. 620 pp.
- MEND (2009). Prediction Manual for Drainage Chemistry from Sulphidic Geologic Materials. MEND Report 1.20.1, December 2009.
- Ministry of Environment. 1981. Snow survey sampling guide. Water Management Branch, Province of B.C. 27p
- Ministry of Water, Lands and Air Protection (MWLAP), 2004. *Standards and Best Practices for Instream Works*. Ecosystems Standards and Planning Division, Biodiversity Branch, Victoria, BC.
- Nagpal, N.K., L.W. Pommen and L.G. Swain. 2006. A Compendium of working water quality guidelines for British Columbia. Environmental Protection Division, Ministry of Environment.
- Pearson, M.P., Quigley, J.T., Harper, D.J., and Galbraith, R.V. 2005. *Monitoring and assessment of fish habitat compensation and stewardship Projects: Study design, methodology and example case studies*. Can. Manuscr. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2729: xv + 124 p.
- Pendray, T. 1983. Life History and Habitat Utilization of Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) in Two Central Yukon Drainages. Land Planning Branch, Department of Renewable Resources, Government of Yukon. Yukon River Basin Study, Project Report: Fisheries No. 8. 63 pp.
- Puls, R. 1994. Mineral Levels in Animal Health: Diagnostic Data, 2nd Edition. Sherpa International, Clearbrook, BC.

- Resources Inventory Committee Standard. 1998. Standard for Terrestrial Ecosystem Mapping in British Columbia. Prepared by Ecosystems Working Group, Terrestrial Ecosystems Task Force, Resources Inventory Committee.
- Soil Classification Working Group. 1998. The Canadian System of Soil Classification. Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada Publication 1646. 3rd Edition (revised).
- SRK (2012). Geochemical Characterization of Proposed Excavation Areas and Borrow Sources from the Eagle Gold Project, Yukon. Report prepared by SRK Consulting (Canada) Inc. for Victoria Gold Corp., December 2012.
- SRK (2014). Geochemical Characterization - Eagle Gold Project. Report prepared by SRK Consulting (Canada) Inc. for Victoria Gold Corp., March 2014.
- Stantec (2010a) Eagle Gold Project Environmental Baseline Report: Climate; report prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., February 2010
- Stantec (2010b) Eagle Gold Project Environmental Baseline Report: Hydrology, report prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., Feb 2010
- Stantec (2010c) Eagle Gold Project Environmental Baseline Report: Hydrogeology, report prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., Feb 2010
- Stantec, 2010d. Eagle Gold Project Water Quality and Aquatic Biota Baseline Report. Prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., Vancouver, BC.
- Stantec, 2010e. Eagle Gold Project Environmental Baseline Report: Fish and Fish Habitat. Prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., Vancouver, BC.
- Stantec (2011a) Eagle Gold Project Environmental Data Summary Report: Climate 2011 Update; report prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., June 2011
- Stantec (2011b) Eagle Gold Project Environmental Baseline Data Report: Hydrology; report prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., June 2011
- Stantec (2011c) Eagle Gold Project Environmental Baseline Data Report: Hydrogeology, report prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., June 2011
- Stantec (2011d) Eagle Gold Project Environmental Baseline Data Report: Water Quality and Aquatic Biota; report prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., June 2011
- Stantec, 2011e. Eagle Gold Project: Environmental Baseline Report: Vegetation, prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., June 2011.
- Stantec, 2011f. Eagle Gold Project, Environmental Baseline Report: Terrestrial Wildlife, prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., June 2011.
- Stantec, 2011g. Eagle Gold Project, Environmental Baseline Report: Surficial Geology, Terrain, and Soils; prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., June 2011.

Eagle Gold Project

Environmental Monitoring, Surveillance and Adaptive Management Plan

Section 19 References

Stantec (2012a) Eagle Gold Project: Supplementary Information Report (SIR). Report prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., May 2012.

Stantec (2012b) Eagle Gold Project Environmental Baseline Report: Climate; report prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., March 2012.

Stantec (2012c) Eagle Gold Project Environmental Baseline Data Report: Hydrology 2011-2012 Update, report prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., June 2012

Stantec (2012d) Eagle Gold Project Environmental Baseline Data Report: Water Quality 2011-2012 Update, report prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., June 2012

Stantec (2012e) Eagle Gold Project Environmental Baseline Data Report: Hydrogeology 2011-2012 Update, report prepared for Victoria Gold Corp., June 2012

Yukon Environment 2012. Yukon Department of Environment Dust Management Plan Guidelines. Available at: http://www.env.gov.yk.ca/air-water-waste/documents/dust_management_guidelines_2012.pdf

Yukon O.I.C. 2002/171. Contaminated Sites Regulation, Environment Act. Available at: http://www.gov.yk.ca/legislation/regs/oic2002_171.pdf