



Taseko Mines Limited
15th Floor, 1040 West Georgia St.
Vancouver, BC V6E 4H1
tasekomines.com

November 27, 2012

EMAIL AND REGULAR MAIL

Dr. Bill Ross
Chair, Federal Review Panel
Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
160 Elgin Street, 22nd Floor
Ottawa, ON K1A 0H3

Dear Dr. Ross,

This letter is in response to your letter of November 26, 2012 to Katherine Gizikoff and the attached Information Request (IR1) of the same date.

While we appreciate the opportunity to respond to information requests at an early date it is discouraging that the Panel has used an apparent technicality to stop the timeline remaining for the Panel to complete its review. Taseko does not agree that there is a deficiency in the EIS related to the approach that was used to assess the cumulative environmental effects which would cause the panel to determine that the EIS is not sufficient to proceed to panel hearings.

The method applied to determine whether further cumulative environmental effects of a VEC were required is identical to the method used in the in the 2009 EIS. That Panel concluded that there were no significant adverse cumulative effects on;

- Vegetation;
- Deer, moose, and other wildlife (with the exception of grizzly bear); or
- Surface and groundwater.

The Panel for the 2009 EIS did conclude that the project would result in significant adverse cumulative effects on South Chilcotin grizzly bear as a result of interaction with forestry activities. The Panel also concluded that the Project, in combination with an extended mine life proposal, would increase the likelihood of failure of the fish and fish habitat compensation plans and thus result in a significant adverse cumulative effect on fish and fish habitat. Both of these conclusions have been addressed in the current EIS.

The March 2012 EIS guidelines state, as you have pointed out, that Taseko should consult the Cumulative Effects Assessment Practitioners Guide for further direction and we have done that. This same guidance document was in place and consulted for the 2009 EIS. Section 2.7.1.4 of



the guidelines provides additional direction on the assessment of cumulative effects and we have also been consistent with that.

The March EIS guidelines also state that “the Government of Canada indicated that it accepted the conclusions of the panel as presented in its report” and that “In his referral to a review panel, the Minister of the Environment ... directed the Agency to ensure that information obtained during the previous environmental assessment is used to the extent possible to ensure a timely decision and that the review take no more than 12 months”.

Based on the above, Taseko’s response to IR1 is that there is no need to complete additional cumulative effects assessments for VECs and key indicators for which there was no significant adverse effect in the 2009 review.

Please feel free to contact me with further comments.

Regards,

TASEKO MINES LIMITED

<original signed by>

~~John~~ W. McManus, P. Eng.
Senior Vice President, Operations

Cc: Livain Michaud, Panel Manager, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency