

Attachment 1. EC comments on Agnico-Eagle Mines Limited - Meadowbank Division's 2008 Annual Report - Water License 2AM-MEA0815

| Annual Report Section: | Water license (2AM-MEA0815) condition or reference: | Comment: |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Section 3.3 – Bathymetric Surveys | Schedule B, Item 4: <i>The bathymetric survey(s) conducted prior to each year of shipping at the Baker Lake Marshalling Facility.</i> | It is not indicated whether or not any shipping took place in 2008. If no shipping took place there is no conflict with the general condition, however if shipping occurred then bathymetric survey results are required or, at a minimum, the annual report should be updated to include an explanation of why this data was not collected. |
| Section 4.1 – Geochemical Monitoring | Schedule B, Item 5 (a-g): <i>Geochemical Monitoring results including:</i> <i>b. As-built volumes of waste rock used in construction and sent to the Waste Rock Storage Facilities with estimated balance of acid generation to acid neutralization capacity in a given sample as well as metal toxicity;</i> <i>e. Any geochemical outcomes of observations that could imply or lead to environmental impact;</i> | <p>The response for Item 5b) is incomplete, in that while the volumes of waste rock used in construction and sent to the waste rock pile were provided, no estimates were included as to the balance of acid generation to acid neutralization capacity of any used material, or metal toxicity.</p> <p>An update to the annual report is needed to either provide this information, or provide a reference indicating the location of this information.</p> <p>Note: In the Geochemical Characterization Study provided in Appendix B1, there is an inconsistency between Table 2.6 and remainder of the document; Table 2.6 shows quarries 7 and 18 as having high AP values, but throughout the rest of the document (in both text and related tables) it is quarries 6 and 17 that are referred to as having high AP values.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Section 5.2.1 – Incinerator | Schedule B, Item 10: <i>Report of Incinerator test results including the materials burned and the efficiency of the incinerator as they relate to water and the deposit of waste into water.</i> | While it is understood that the permanent incinerator was still under construction, further information as to the use of any temporary incinerators on site is required to address this condition. If temporary incinerator(s) were in use on site in 2008 it is still necessary to indicate what materials are being burned, as well as the efficiency of said incinerator(s). |
| Section 6.1 – 2008 Incident Summary – Minesite and AWP | Schedule B, Item 11: <i>A list and description of all unauthorized discharges including volumes, spill report line identification number and summaries of follow-up action taken</i> | <p>The spill report line identification numbers are not indicated in Table 6.1. Additionally, the summary of follow-up actions taken in terms of clean-up of the spill is either inadequate or missing for the following spills:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AEM internal # 06-2008-05 • AEM internal # 06-2008-09 • AEM internal # 08-2008-08 • AEM internal # 09-2008-07 • AEM internal # 10-2008-09 <p>For AEM internal # 07-2008-05, it is understood that some of the spill occurred along the AWP, which may hinder immediate follow-up activities, however it is also indicated that some of the material was spilled at the refueling station, but no details on the follow-up action taken at the station are included. Was there any follow-up activity and at the refueling station? Why was this not treated as a separate spill?</p> |
| Section 6.2 – 2008 Incident Summary – Ship Cargo: | (This section of the Annual Report is a response to NIRB Project Certificate No. 0004 condition 82, but still pertinent to the WL) | Why were the two spills at the Baker Lake Marshalling Facility not reported as those that occurred at the mine site or along the AWP? Further details on the nature and follow-up actions of these spills are requested. |
| Section 7.1 – Aquatic Monitoring program | Schedule I: <i>Conditions Applying to General and Aquatic Effects Monitoring</i> | It is not clear which Monitoring Program Stations listed in Schedule I, Table 2 are actually being addressed. In particular, the station labelled ST-27 in Table 2 is described as “water intake for camp and concrete batch plant purposes”, while this same ID number is used by the company to identify a monitoring location in the Stormwater Management Pond, which is also shown as ATT-2. It would be useful to have a master list of |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | sampling stations indicating station number/name, location and whether active or inactive. |
| Section 7.1.5 Mine Site | | Table 7.7 Monitoring data for the Sewage Treatment Plant should have included ammonia, as stated in the approved STP O&M Manual. |
| Section 7.1.11 Receiving Environment | Appendix C5 | (See Attachment 2 for AEMP review comments table.) |
| Section 7.3 Wildlife Monitoring | NIRB Project Certificate No. 0004, Condition 55 | This review is still underway, and will be forwarded by July 20 th . |
| Section 10.3 Non-compliance Issues | NIRB PC Condition 4 | EC suggests that the dike construction sedimentation issues should be included in this section, given that receiving environment TSS levels greatly exceeded those contemplated in the predictions and plans. |