October 11, 2011

Our file: EA0809-004

Via email

Dr. Rick Schryer
Director of Regulatory and Environmental Affairs
Fortune Minerals Limited
140 Fullarton Street, Suite 1902
London, ON N6A 5P2

Dear Dr. Schryer:

Re: EA0809-004: NICO Project - Fortune Minerals Ltd
Information Requests

The Review Board requests that Fortune Minerals Limited respond to the attached information requests. These information requests are provided to you after viewing the information requests submitted by other parties in order to avoid duplication.

As with information requests submitted by parties, if Fortune cannot respond to a specific request, please provide rationale.

If you have any questions, please contact me by email or phone.

Sincerely,

Chuck Hubert
Environmental Assessment Officer
Mackenzie Valley Review Board
867 766-7052
chubert@reviewboard.ca

Attachment

IR number MVRB #1
To: Fortune Minerals Limited
Source: Mackenzie Valley Review board
Subject: Co-disposal Facility – mine rock void space and tailings infill
Reference: Appendix 3.II, section 3.II.5.1 and Section 3.4.2.1 & 3.4.2.3

Preamble: It is estimated that 38.3% of the tailings generated will infiltrate into the voids between the mine rocks in the Co-disposal Facility. This arbitrarily assumes that 50% of the void space in the Mine Rock will be filled.

Request: a) The arbitrary figure of 50 % was chosen as the amount of void space that would be infilled in the mine rock by tailings. Please provide rationale for the use of 50%.

b) Please describe the likelihood of alternative percentage infill scenarios that could occur (ie 40%, 60%) in waste rock void space and describe how these alternatives may impact Co-disposal Facility design, including dyke construction and scheduling.

IR number MVRB #2
To: Fortune Minerals Limited
Source Mackenzie Valley Review Board
Subject Co-disposal Facility – Equipment usage, tailings dispersal
Reference DAR 3.8.2.2, Appendix 3.II.6.2.1

Preamble: A bulldozer is proposed to rip the waste rock prior to tailings deposition in order to accelerate tailings filtration into void spaces. Mobile equipment used on the Co-disposal Facility will come into contact with tailings and could spread tailings and contaminants around the mine site.

Request a) Will the equipment used to prepare mine rock surfaces for tailings placement in the Co-disposal Facility be contained within the Co-disposal Facility perimeter throughout mine operations?

b) If mobile equipment will not remain within the Co-disposal Facility perimeter, provide mitigation to ensure that carry-back of tailings and contaminants by mobile equipment does not occur outside of the Co-disposal Facility.

IR number MVRB #3
To: Fortune Minerals
Source Mackenzie Valley Review Board
Subject Co-disposal Facility adaptive management
Reference Appendix 3 Section 3.II.6.2

Preamble: Thickened tailings delivered to the Co-disposal Facility will have solids content in the range of 73-77 %. This is predicted to form a 2% beach slope once deposited in a Co-disposal Facility cell.

Request: Please describe impacts to the Co-disposal Facility over the long-term, including impacts to ground water from seepage if thickened tailings has less solids content than the predicted 73-77% range during a prolonged time period in the operations phase.

IR number MVRB #4
To: Fortune Minerals
Source Mackenzie Valley Review Board
Subject Diffuser in Peanut Lake, thermal regime, ice cover
Reference Appendix 7 Section 7.IV.4.1

Preamble: The conceptual design for the diffuser in Peanut Lake concludes that the thermal output during the winter months may result in areas of weak ice cover that might be a concern for local stakeholders or wildlife. Potential mitigation proposed in this section includes a multiport diffuser or increasing diffuser depth as well as heat recovery from treated effluent. These mitigation measures, however, do not appear in the pathways analysis for water quality (Section 7.5), human environment (Section 16.3), wildlife (Section 15.3) or in the Commitments Table (Appendix 1.III).

Request: Please describe the impacts to people and wildlife from weakened ice cover on Peanut Lake due to heated effluent discharge into the lake and discuss as part of the pathways analysis.

IR number MVRB #5
To: Fortune Minerals
Source Mackenzie Valley Review Board
Subject Closure and reclamation – adaptive management responses
Reference DAR Volume 1, Section 9.4.1.2

Preamble: The approach to closure and reclamation planning relies on the demonstration of the technical performance of a wetland treatment system. The performance of the wetland system will be determined during the operations phase. In the event that the wetlands system is not demonstrated prior to closure the contingency will be to pump water from the seepage control ponds and surge pond into the open pit. During post-closure a new effluent treatment facility would be constructed to treat open pit water prior to spillover and discharge through a diffuser into Peanut Lake.

Request:

a) Estimates of the pit infilling with water after operations in the base case are in the order of 120 years. Does Fortune have estimates for pit infill if the effluent treatment facility post-closure option is selected?

b) Does construction and operation of a new effluent treatment facility to treat flooded open pit water during post-closure represent treatment in perpetuity?