

# Canadian Environmental Network

## CONSULTATION REPORT FORM

*(a cautionary note – the information you provide in this report may be posted on the CEN website and will NOT BE treated as CONFIDENTIAL)*

**Title of Consultation:** Consultation regarding additions of Carol and Scully Mines /Schedule 2 amendments to the MMER

**Date(s) held:** May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2008

**Location:** Place Vincent Massey, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor Churchill Boardroom

**Delegate Name and Affiliation:** Judy Parkman ( R.O.A.R. )

**Number of ENGO Delegates at Consultation:** Four. Two attended by phone, two in person.

---

### **What was the purpose of the consultation?**

To provide comments, questions, perspectives, and advise to Environment Canada to be considered prior to gazetting the proposed amendments relating to the above mentioned mines.

### **What were the outcomes of the consultation?**

Additions of the above additions to Schedule 2 will go ahead.

The overall feelings by ENGO's attending this consultation was that this was more of an information session than a consultation.

### **Considerations:**

Both mines in this case have already been using lakes as TIA's, as both mines came into operation in the 60's ( MMLERs came into effect 1977). They are looking for expansion of there TIA's into the same lake area and use of additional lake areas. Both had been given TA's for non compliance mainly for TSS. Tailings for these mines are not as toxic relative to other mining operations ( mainly silica, iron fines ).

### **What action, in your opinion, should be taken by the ENGO community in the aftermath of this consultation?**

The main concern is continued use of water bodies for TIA's, and expansion to include a new waterbody(ies)

This should be the focus, as both mines have been dealing with the compliance issues (TSS through flocculation). Also, both mines have already compromised the lakes they are depositing into as this activity was grandfathered prior to the original MMLER's.

The commodity iron is a more sustainable mineral in terms of its end use. The size and impact as well as the fact it supports a considerable number of jobs in the community with significant community support would make it difficult for our voice heard.

I feel we should place a more concerted focus on raising the profile of the mines that will initiate use of new waterbodies, are less sustaining ( the mine may only operate for a couple of years ), mines that are new and mines that are have come into operation after the MMER's ( not grandfathered ). I think we stand a better chance of support for our concerns.