



NIRB File No.: 03MN107
KIA File No.: KVPL08D280
DFO File No.: 14HCAA-01046
EC File No.: 6100 000 008 /002

December 23, 2015

Meadowbank Distribution List

Sent via email

Re: Final Written Submissions Format for the NIRB's Reconsideration of AEM's Meadowbank Gold Mine Project Certificate for the Vault Pit Expansion Project Proposal

Dear Parties:

On December 8, 2015 the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB or Board) requested that Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.'s (AEM) review parties' technical comment submissions provided to the Board regarding AEM's Addendum to the Meadowbank Gold Mine Project Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Vault Pit Expansion proposal (NIRB File No. 03MN107). The NIRB received AEM's response to the technical comments on December 22, 2015 which can be accessed online at the NIRB's public registry using the following link:

<http://ftp.nirb.ca/03-MONITORING/03MN107-MEADOWBANK%20GOLD%20MINE/01-PROJECT%20CERTIFICATE/05-AMENDMENTS/02-VAULT%20EXPANSION-CONDITION%2048/06-IR%20%26%20TECHNICAL%20REVIEW/05-RESPONSE%20TO%20TECH%20COMMENTS/>.

The NIRB would like to remind all parties that the next step in the reconsideration process for the Vault Pit Expansion proposal is the filing of final written submissions with the Board which are due on or before **5:00 p.m. MST, Friday, February 12, 2016**. The NIRB is providing guidance regarding the format for written submissions to be filed by intervenors in this matter and the Board expects that parties' final written submissions will comply with the requirements as set out in Appendix A.

Should you have questions regarding the filing of your written submissions or your participation in the Public Hearing for the Vault Pit Expansion proposal, please contact Sophia Granchinho, Senior Technical Advisor at (867) 857-2052 or via email at sgranchinho@nirb.ca.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "Tara Arko", is centered within a light gray rectangular box.

Tara Arko
Director, Technical Services
Nunavut Impact Review Board

cc: Stéphane Robert, Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.
Ryan Vanengen, Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd

Attachment: Appendix A: Format for Parties' Final Written Submissions

Format and File Size

Parties must provide submissions in a fully functional, electronically searchable Word, Excel or PDF file. Noting the current constraints with respect to internet bandwidth and speed, the NIRB requests that all documents be submitted as files no larger than 5 MB.

Translation/Interpretation Requirements

The NIRB requires executive summaries be provided in English and be translated into both **Inuktitut** and **French**. Please note that parties are responsible for sourcing this translation.

The Public Hearing will be conducted in English, using Inuktitut simultaneous interpretation. The NIRB will also ensure that simultaneous interpretation in French is made available upon request; please notify the NIRB at least 14 days prior to the Public Hearing should you require French interpretation to be made available.

Additionally, those who require special audio-visual equipment at the Public Hearing are requested to inform the NIRB in order that adequate arrangements can be made.

Deadline for filing final written submissions

The deadline for final written submissions is **5:00 p.m. MST, Friday, February 12, 2016**.

Final written submissions must contain the following:

1. Executive Summary

Submissions must contain a non-technical executive summary of the major issues identified during the review of the Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS). The summary should not exceed two pages.

2. Table of Contents

Submissions must contain a table of contents with sections that relate to the main headings of the Addendum to the Final EIS and also which identify the major issues under those headings the party intends to bring forward for discussion and intends to address at the Public Hearing. Submissions may also address any other matter that the party considers relevant to the NIRB’s review of the Addendum and Vault Pit Expansion proposal.

3. Introduction

All submissions should contain a statement of the party’s mandate and relationship to the project. Parties that have regulatory jurisdiction over the Meadowbank Gold Mine project and/or the Vault Pit Expansion must also provide a description of the party’s jurisdiction as well as a list of legislation, regulations, policies and guidelines administered by the party that are applicable to the Vault Pit Expansion project.

4. Specific Comments

For each issue included in the submissions, parties should provide the following:

- a. A detailed description of the issue and, where appropriate, a reference to where within the Addendum (volume/document, section and page number) that issue is discussed;

- b. If provided by the Proponent within the Addendum, identify the Proponent's conclusion(s) related to the issue;
- c. A statement regarding the conclusion(s) of the commenting party related to the issue, including reference to the justification/data/rationale supporting that conclusion;
- d. A brief discussion on the issue's importance to the impact assessment process; and
- e. Any recommendation(s) to the Board with respect to the disposition of the issue.

5. Summary of Recommendations

Submissions must contain a *summary* of the party's recommendations to the Board, specifically:

- Whether Parties agree/disagree with the conclusions presented in the Addendum regarding the alternatives assessment, environmental impacts, proposed mitigation, significance of impacts, and monitoring measures – and all evidence supporting the parties' position;
- Whether or not conclusions presented in the Addendum are supported by the analysis – and all evidence supporting the parties' position;
- Whether appropriate methodology was utilized in the Addendum to develop conclusions – and all evidence supporting the parties' position along with any proposed alternative methodologies which may be more appropriate if applicable;
- An assessment of the quality and the presentation of the information presented in the Addendum;
- An assessment of the appropriateness of proposed monitoring measures – and evidence to support the determination, along with any proposed alternative monitoring measures which may be more appropriate (if applicable); and
- Any comments regarding additional information which would be useful in assessing impacts – and reasons to support any comments made.

6. Suggested submission format in Table Form

Review Comment Number	
Subject/Topic	
References to NIRB EIS Guidelines (if applicable) and Addendum (i.e. volume/document, Section/sub-section, page number, etc.)	
Summary (include AEM's conclusion if relevant, then conclusion of party)	
Importance of issue to impact assessment	
Detailed Review Comment	1. Gap/Issue 2. Disagreement with Addendum conclusion 3. Reasons for disagreement with Addendum conclusion
Recommendation/Request	