



August 07, 2014

Ms. Amanda Hanson Main  
Director, Technical Services  
Nunavut Impact Review Board  
PO Box 1360  
Cambridge Bay, NU  
X0B 0C0

Dear Ms. Hanson Main,

**NIRB File No: 11MN034**

**Re: Meliadine Project FEIS Technical Review – Response to Written Submissions**

We want to thank all of the parties for their written final submissions on their respective technical reviews of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for our proposed Meliadine gold mine project. We acknowledge the level of effort put into these reviews by all of the parties. We have only had a small amount of time to go through in detail each of the ten written submissions sent to the NIRB. By our count there were a total of 201 technical issues/questions/recommendations raised by the parties in their submissions. We have created A Recommendation Response Table (see enclosed) outlining the technical review issues/questions/recommendations raised by the parties as identified by AEM. We have gone through each of these technical issues/question/recommendations and have addressed them as follows:

- There are a number of technical review comments that do not require a response or a commitment.
- There are a number of reviewer recommendations which AEM agree with in principle (marked in green in the enclosed table). We have also flagged recommendations that in our view remain under consideration (marked in orange in the enclosed table), recognizing that many of these may quickly become resolved following further discussion of the intent/scope/breath/timing of the proposed recommendation.

It is our intent to bring these issues/recommendations to the public hearing in a tabular format to be shared with all parties. In our opinion this will aid the NIRB, AEM and all parties in tracking the proponent's commitments and in reaching consensus on the wording of such commitments, many of which will likely become certificate conditions if the NIRB recommends that a Project Certificate be issued for this Project. AEM is committed to working with each of the parties to reach consensus on the appropriate wording of these commitments.



## AGNICO EAGLE

- There are also a number of technical review comments that either raise a question or make a recommendation that calls for a response from AEM (marked in yellow in the enclosed table). For this category we have attempted to provide clarification of what was said and/or meant within the FEIS to help the parties in their respective preparations for the upcoming technical and public hearings. Also enclosed with this letter are our responses to these issues. In some cases the parties refer to or suggest an amendment of the FEIS. Obviously at this point in the process such amendment of the FEIS is not possible. In such cases AEM through the attached responses has attempted to indicate how in its opinion such recommendations can be achieved. In some cases AEM has recommended that the added requested detail is premature and is better addressed at the permitting phase if the project is given the go ahead to proceed to permitting.

Should you require any further information or questions please contact me via email or by telephone.

Regards,

Stéphane Robert  
stephane.robert@agnicoeagle.com  
Manager Regulatory Affairs

cc: Kelli Gillard - NIRB

Enclosed: Recommendation Response Table  
Detailed Responses to Select Recommendations