



P.O. Box 119  
GJOA HAVEN, NU X0B 1J0  
TEL: (867) 360-6338  
FAX: (867) 360-6369

ᓄᓇᓂᓪ ᐃᓚᓕᓴᓂᓪ ᑲᑎᓚᓂᓪ  
NUNAVUT WATER BOARD  
NUNAVUT IMALIRIYIN KATIMAYINGI  
OFFICE DES EAUX DU NUNAVUT

File: 2AM-MEA0815/Part B/1  
8BC-TEH0708/Part C/17

January 8, 2009

Rachel Lee Gould, M.Sc.,  
Project Manager, Environmental Permitting and Compliance Monitoring  
Agnico-Eagle Meadowbank  
555 Burrard Street, Suite 375  
Box 209, Two Bentall Centre  
Vancouver, B.C. V7X 1M8  
Email: [rgould@agnico-eagle.com](mailto:rgould@agnico-eagle.com)

**Subject: Agnico-Eagle Meadowbank; Submission of a Road Alignment Quarry Site  
Geochemistry Report for the Meadowbank Gold Mine; Licence 2AM-MEA0815**

Dear Ms. Gould;

The Nunavut Water Board ("NWB") acknowledges the receipt of the above document under Part C, Item 17 of Licence No. 8BC-TEH0708 which is now a requirement of Part B, Item 1 of Licence No. 2AM-MEA0815. The Road Alignment Quarry Site Geochemistry Report was distributed upon receipt for review and comment to interested persons with a submission deadline of April 20, 2007.

The technical review of the Road Alignment Quarry Site Geochemistry Report has been completed. Comments on the Plan were received from Indian and Northern Affairs (INAC) dated April 19, 2007 and the Government of Nunavut Department of Environment (GN-DoE) dated April 12, 2007. In addition to this letter, the Licensee is advised to review these submissions. The Board has taken into consideration the information submitted and hereby accepts the Road Alignment Quarry Site Geochemistry Report.

In order to finalize this Report, the Licensee is requested to submit within thirty (30) days of the date of this letter, an addendum for the report to address the following issues:

1. An explanation on how the NP/AP ratios were calculated. For example: sample P2-2 has an AP of 1.6 and an NP of 10.9 but an NP/AP of 7.0, should it not be 6.8? This same issue is present for samples P2-3, P3-3, P4-1 etc.;
2. An explanation on how NET NP values were calculated. For example: sample P2-1 had an AP of 1.3 and an NP of 7.7 but a NET NP of 6.5, should it not be 6.4? This same issue is present for samples P4-1, P7-2 etc.;
3. An explanation as to why samples with an NP/AP ratio of less than 1, such as sample P8-2, P8-3, P10-2, P10-3 and P27-3, were considered non-PAG. According to Table 2.2 these samples fall under the Likely Acid Generating (PAG) category;

4. An explanation as to why static tests were done but not kinetic tests. Although static tests are an acceptable momentary indication of ARD and ML potential, they do not cover future potential ARD and ML; and,
5. An update to the INAC guidelines for ARD potential as indicated in the GN-DoE's comments.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (867) 360-6338, at your earliest convenience.

Yours truly,

Deon Bridge  
Technical Advisor