

# New Prosperity Gold-Copper Mine Project Federal Review Panel

Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, 160 Elgin Street, 22nd Floor, Ottawa, ON K1A 0H3, Tel: 1-866-582-1884  
NewProsperityReview@ceaa.gc.ca

---

November 29, 2012

Mr. John McManus  
Senior Vice President, Operations  
Taseko Mines Limited  
15<sup>th</sup> Floor, 1040 West Georgia St.  
Vancouver, BC  
V6E 4H1

**Sent by e-mail:** <email address removed>

**Subject:** Request for Information – Cumulative Effects Assessments – New Prosperity Gold-Copper Mine Project Environmental Impact Statement

---

Dear Mr. McManus:

This letter responds to your letter of November 27, 2012, in which you indicated that:

- Taseko does not agree that there is a deficiency in the EIS related to the approach used to assess the cumulative environmental effects which would cause the Panel to determine that the EIS is not sufficient to proceed to public hearing.
- There is no need to complete the additional cumulative effects assessments for VECs and key indicators for which there was no significant adverse effect in the 2009 review. Taseko noted as part of its rationale that the panel for the 2009 EIS 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 disagrees, and finds Taseko's cumulative effects assessment methodology and, accordingly, the EIS deficient.

Article 2.1 of the Panel's Terms of Reference requires the Panel assess the environmental effects of the Project in a manner consistent with the requirements of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* (the Act). To do so, the Panel requires the requested additional cumulative effects assessments.

According to the Terms of Reference and the Act, the Panel may require the information that it deems necessary to assess the Project. For the components of the Project that have not changed since the 2009/10 review, Article 3.3 directs the Panel to rely on the 2009/10 materials

as much as possible, as its “primary” source of information. However, Article 3.3 also directs that the Panel may require additional information.

While this Panel will review and consider the findings of the previous panel, this Panel is not bound by the previous findings. This Panel must consider and assess the consolidated record (previous information and current information) to reach its own findings and recommendations. Accordingly, the fact that the previous panel concluded that there were no significant adverse cumulative effects on certain VECs and key indicators does not preclude this Panel from assessing that issue for itself.

As explained in the Panel IR 1, Taseko narrowed the scope of its cumulative effects assessment in a manner that is inconsistent with the EIS Guidelines and the Act.

The Panel requires more information about cumulative effects to assess the Project. Therefore, the Panel reiterates its request for Taseko to provide the information described in its information request (IR 1).

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact Livain Michaud, Panel Manager at 613-948-1359 or at [NewProsperityReview@ceaa-acee.gc.ca](mailto:NewProsperityReview@ceaa-acee.gc.ca).

Sincerely,

<original signed by>

Bill Ross  
Chair

cc: Ms. Katherine Gizikoff, Taseko Mines Limited  
Mr. Brian Battison, Taseko Mines Limited