

REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
KIA-IR-01	Volume 9, Section 9.3 Volume 9, Appendix 9.3-A Volume 6.	1. Provide the Caribou Decision Tree prior to the Final Hearings, providing details on monitoring linked to numbers, composition (cows and calves) or seasons that caribou approach the mine area. Linkages between monitoring and mitigation should be clear. 2. Clarify within the TEMMP issues related to critical caribou calving timing and distances from the road alignment. 3. 3 km2 buffer: KIA considers this issue resolved. 4. Provide specific caribou road crossing sites. 5. Clarify how road surveillance monitoring determine if a threshold of no more than 10% deflection of caribou approaching roads and infrastructure occurs.	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR-02	SD 6-4 Terrestrial Environment Management and Monitoring Plan	1. Clarify directly how monitoring links back to mitigation. 2. Ensure consistency between the Caribou Migration Procedure and the TEMMP. 3. Clarify how zone of influence (ZOI) monitoring for caribou will be conducted for the Project to verify impact predictions and provide data to direct mitigation to minimize impacts of the Project on caribou. 4. Sighting thresholds for actions to specifically address muskoxen should be specifically included in TEMMP. 5. Modify the threshold for project-related mortality for predatory mammals to include more than Arctic fox.	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR-03	Volume 6, 2009 Terrestrial Vegetation and Wildlife Baseline Synthesis Report	AEM commit to providing details on how upland breeding birds and raptors will be prevented from nesting on mine infrastructure and man-made structures	Agreed to in principle
KIA-IR-06	Volume 1, Section 7.4.3 Volume 7, Section 7.4	Using these receptors and following the Assessment Approach, it is likely AEM will be able to detect changes to water quality as a result of mining activities. HESL cautions that AEM should consistently and proactively engage the Inuit to ensure their assessment of whether the “Opportunity for traditional and non traditional use” has been impaired. The KIA considers this issue resolved.	Agreed
KIA-IR-11	Volume 7, Section 7.4.4.4.4.	Ongoing water quality monitoring in the receiving environment will enable the identification of trends and additional adaptive management strategies if required, including potential sediment and erosion control.	Agreed
KIA-IR-15	Volume 4 Cumulative Effects Assessment Table 4.5.3	Prior to the Final Hearing, AEM justify (a) using locations not individual collared cows as the sample unit and (b) use of the 85% volume contour to delineate the Caribou Effects Study Area. If NIRB finds this justification is inadequate, then AEM should re-establish the CESA and redo the cumulative effects assessment.	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR-17	Volume 5, Section 5.2.5.2.4	Given the uncertainty in modelling estimates for Calpuff, inadequate response to the KIA IR by AEM, KIA concerns with the amounts of dust at Meadowbank and the proximity of the Meliadine project to Rankin Inlet, the KIA recommend that the Project Certificate require AEM to design, have approved and implement a dust monitoring and adaptive management program to include: - Snowpack surveys and dust fall collectors - Lichen surveys - Near field, far field and reference sites that are located with consideration of ambient wind conditions - Baseline data collected prior to significant construction activity and - An annual reporting mechanism and response framework.	Agreed to in principle
KIA-IR-21	Volume 7, Section 7.3	We reiterate the IR – Please provide a comprehensive table showing lake area, average depth, maximum depth, lake volume, monthly and annual discharge for Meliadine Lake. If bathymetric information has yet to be collected for Meliadine Lake, AEM should add an investigation of the lake bathymetry to the coming field season. If it exists it should be presented in the FEIS.	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR-22	Volume 7, Section 7.4.6, Table 7.4.18 and Appendix 7.4-B	We reiterate our information request. Dissolved oxygen concentrations are particularly vulnerable during the summer low flow period and under ice. Modelling of the under ice dissolved oxygen response within the mixing zone should be provided for the under ice period. We look forward to reviewing the water license to assess if this IR was addressed.	Agreed to in principle
KIA-IR-23	Volume 1, Section 2.3.2.1	We suggest that overburden be separately segregated from the waste rock piles for use during site reclamation as surficial organic matter. If AEM disagrees with this as a potential option than we reiterate the initial information request.	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR-26	Volume 5, Sections 5.4.3.2 and 5.4.5.4, p. 5.75	We recommend development of a GHG reduction plan akin to the other management plans presented in the supporting documents of Volume 2.	Agreed to in principle
KIA-IR-29	Volume 7, Sections 7.5.4.2, 7.5.5, 7.5.5.2	We reassert our request made in the original IR. This has been elaborated in the technical review of the FEIS. This has been elaborated in the technical review of the FEIS as a recommendation to repeat a survey of fish contaminants to provide a recent baseline.	Agreed to in principle
KIA-IR-30	Volume 1, Appendix 1.0-A; Volume 9, Socio-economic environment and impact assessment	Please disaggregate data for Aboriginal / Non-Aboriginal. Please add data from 1996 / 2001 Census to show trends	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR-31	Volume 9, Socio-economic environment and impact assessment	Please disaggregate data for Aboriginal / Non-Aboriginal Table 9.3.8; Table 9.3.9; Table 9.3.10	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR-32	Volume 9, Socio-economic environment and impact assessment	1. Can sections 9.3.1.6.2 and 9.3.1 be linked to allow for more efficient review of the data. 2. Can all these information be referenced for easier flow of the report and less duplication of information.	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR- 34	Volume 1, Appendix 1.0-A; Volume 9, Socio-economic environment and impact assessment	Please disaggregated data for Aboriginal / Non-Aboriginal Table 9.5.1; Table 9.5.2 Please add High school completion rate for each community Please add data on Northern Food Basket	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR- 35	Volume 1, Appendix 1.0-A; Volume 9, Socio-economic environment and impact assessment	Please provide data on the number of secondary school graduates by community, region.	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR- 36	Volume 1, Appendix 1.0-A; Volume 9, Socio-economic environment and impact assessment	Provide information on the available training programs for adults and youth through the existing education system within the Kivalliq Region.	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR- 37	Volume 1, Appendix 1.0-A; Volume 9, Socio-economic environment and impact assessment	To be consistent with the level of analysis provided in relation to Community infrastructure, please provide detailed analysis for each component of the community infrastructure (and not aggregate them in one table).	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR-NEW-01	Volume 4, Section 4.5.5 Residual Impact Classification and Significance	Clarify both the wording and assessment methodology associated with these terms.	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR-NEW-04	Volume 6, Section 6.6.4.3	Provide a quantitative analysis of the potential effects of a doubling of the Rankin Inlet caribou harvest will have on a declining Qamanirjuaq herd.	Under consideration
KIA-IR-NEW-06	Volume 7, Section 7.2.2.5 Volume 7, Section 7.2.4	Yearly monitoring, by definition, is not sufficient to detect seasonal variations. HESL recommends a more frequent sampling protocol of at least 2x/year if the intent is detection of seasonal variations in ground water quality, as stated. We also recognize, however, that deep groundwater is not likely to show seasonal changes.	Under consideration

REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
KIA-IR-NEW-07	Volume 7, Section 7.3.1.2.3 Volume 5, Figure 5.4-2	Significant predictions are based on the efficacy of modeled data created on the assumption that the inputs will continue to be applicable throughout project life. Modeling presented in Figure 5.4-2 indicates that precipitation will increase up to approximately 20% and temperature will increase up to approximately 3%. HESL expresses concern that AEM's conservative approach in project design is sufficient to accommodate greater water volume during freshet over a shorter period of time as indicated by IQ and exacerbated through increased precipitation and temperature than was historically present.	No Recommendation or Request.
KIA-IR-NEW-08	Volume 7, Figure 7.4-4 Volume 7, Section 7.4.4	AEM's most recent modeling results indicates that water quality will not be impacted downstream of Peter Lake. If this assumption is violated there are no further downstream sample locations with established baseline water quality to assess potential changes against. AEM should include one further downstream sample location within the Diana River Watershed in future sample years.	Under consideration
KIA-IR-NEW-09	SD 7-1 Volume 7, Section 7.4.4.3.3 Volume 7, Section 7.4.4.3.4 Volume 7, Section 7.4.6.1.1 Volume 7, Section 7.4.6.2 Volume 7, Section 7.4.7	AEM should clearly define how means have been calculated when producing summary statistics of baseline data. Medians are preferred as a measure of central tendency as they are less impacted by varying detection limits and outliers. Data points are greater than the median $\pm 1.5 \times$ the interquartile range should be examined closely before inclusion in calculations of central tendency. AEM should also clearly define what is meant by "differing from the baseline".	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR-NEW-10	SD 7-1 SD 7-2	AEM should include free cyanide in future sampling years along with total cyanide to facilitate a "calibration exercise". The proportion of free cyanide as compared to the total can be calculated on a site specific basis and used to back calculate a historical baseline. [Present Day Free CN]/[Present Day Total CN] * [Historical Total CN] = HistoricalFree CN  Note that to correctly carry out a calibration exercise the method used to collect and analyze present day total cyanide should be the same as that used historically. If multiple historical methods exist then multiple analysis should be run for total cyanide using each historical methodology.	Agreed to in principle
KIA-IR-NEW-11	SD 7-1 SD 7-2 Volume 7, Section 7.5.4.2.2 Volume 7, Section 7.5.4.2.2.2	AEM will assess the impact of project activities in part through the changes observed in the benthic macroinvertebrate community composition and density. As it will be difficult to distinguish changes to the community from the baseline HESL cautions use of benthic macroinvertebrate data compared with baseline as evidence of little or no mine impact. HESL suggests that a better assessment of project impacts to the benthic macroinvertebrate community can be made through comparison of the composition and density between impact sites and reference sites in follow up EEM and AEMP programs. Nonparallel changes in the communities between the two sites should be considered as evidence of impacts resulting from mine activities.	Agreed to in principle
KIA-IR-NEW-12	Volume 7, Section 7.5.4.6. SD 7-2	AEM should add fish tissue sampling to the coming year's sampling program prior to Meliadine becoming an operational mine. This will provide a second year of data to assess the stability of tissue concentrations detected in the fish. It will also provide greater confidence in the efficacy of fish tissue baseline data when comparisons are made to it in AEMP and EEM reporting.	Agreed to in principle
KIA-IR-NEW-13	Volume 7, Section 7.5.6.4.2.	Given AEM's assertions regarding copper in the Tiriganiaq Pit Lake post closure, a site specific water quality objective should be calculated for copper using a CCME approved procedure.	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR-NEW-14	SD 9-2 Socio-economic Management Plan	SD 9-2 Socio-economic Management Plan: Executive Summary (page i) - Please indicate how often the plan will be reviewed	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR-NEW-15	SD 9-2 Socio-economic Management Plan	SD 9-2 Socio-economic Management Plan: Section 4.3 Education and Training (page 13): "Based on the success of this initiative, AEM intends to extend..." - When all the other measures are set as final, why this one is "intended"? Please explain.	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR-NEW-16	SD 9-2 Socio-economic Management Plan	SD 9-2 Socio-economic Management Plan: Section 4.5 Effects on Wellbeing (page 15): "AEM intends to provide similar programs ..." - When all the other measures are set as final, why this one is "intended"? Please explain.	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR-NEW-17	SD 9-2 Socio-economic Management Plan	SD 9-2 Socio-economic Management Plan: Section 4.7 Community contributions (page 18) - "AEM would expect to continue to respond..." - Why "expect" - Please explain / clarify.	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR-NEW-18	SD 9-3 Business Development Plan	SD 9-3 Business Development Plan Section 1.3.2 Local hiring / Business area. The LSA in here is defined as three communities. Why is this different from the initial LSA (with five communities)? Please explain / clarify.	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR-NEW-19	SD 9-4 Human Resources Plan	SD 9-4 Human Resources Plan: Section 2.4 Career Path Program - The program is explained for the Meadowbank project, but it is not clear if it will be an option for the Meliadine project. Please clarify.	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR-NEW-20	SD 9-5 Community Involvement Plan	SD 9-5 Community Involvement Plan Section 3.5 Community Liaison Representatives (page 11) - "AEM plans to continue this arrangement..." Can this be as affirmative as other measures?	See detailed response provided in attachment
KIA-IR-NEW-21	Volume 6, Section 6.6	1. Identify the lack of representation of the collar data and the limitations from sample design (related to this point, the Proponent should ensure that maps of collar distribution or seasonal ranges include the years that the ranges represent); 2. Comment on accepting a definition of non-migratory for the Lorillard herd while discussing seasonal ranges in the context of predicting effects; 3. Explain how changes in the CESA influences effects predictions and uncertainty; 4. Conduct an energetics/population modelling cumulative assessment for the Project to estimate energetic costs and effects on calf survival as estimated for other mine projects (e.g., Baffinland, Fortune, Niro and De Beers, Gahcho Kué).	See detailed response to recommendations 1 to 3 provided in attachment. Recommendation 4 under consideration
KIA_MAR_01	NIRB Guidelines: s.2.3, p. 607 Traditional Knowledge, 7.3, p. 34-35 Baseline Information Collection, s.7.4, p. 35-36 Use of Existing Information, s.8.1.13.1, p. 64 Baseline Information (Marine Environment), s.8.1.14, p. 65 Baseline Information (Marine Wildlife).  FEIS Volume 8: s.8.2.1.1 Purpose and Scope (Marine Environment), s.8.2.2.2 Existing Environment within Hudson Bay / Hudson Strait Shipping Corridor, s.8.3.1.1 Purpose and Scope (Marine Wildlife), s.8.3.2.2.1.2 Marine Birds, s.8.3.2.2.1.3 Marine Mammals, s.8.3.6.2.2 Change in Behaviour due to Underwater Noise from Project Vessels; Volume 9 (Socio-economic Environment, IQ appendices)	Provide a solid foundation for monitoring, mitigation and adaptive management. Possible terms and conditions: 1) Prior to any Project-related shipping, the Proponent will prepare an updated marine baseline that includes the most recent information on marine wildlife abundance and distribution, carefully considers seasonal distribution patterns of marine wildlife, and incorporates western scientific and IQ knowledge sources. The updated marine baseline should be incorporated into the Shipping Management Plan (SMP), and updated on a regular basis as new information becomes available. Prior to being included in the SMP, the updated baseline should be sent to KIA and regulatory agencies for review and comment. The revised and updated baseline should also be used to update the fuel spill modelling and inform preparedness planning (see KIA_MAR_05). 2) The Melvin Bay baseline should be assessed to ensure that it is adequate for the detection of Project-related impacts, particularly related to contaminants, when compared with a robust monitoring program, and augmented if it is not. 3) A baseline should also be developed for the area surrounding the fuel transshipment anchorage. This information is needed both to detect impacts and to ensure they are attributed to their proper source. Note: also see relevant recommended Terms and Conditions in TC KIA_MAR_06, KIA_MAR_07, and KIA_MAR_08.	This is a new issue raised by KIA that was not addressed in their technical review of the DEIS - thus we had no opportunity to discuss with the KIA to fully understand. AEM can agree in principle but needs to determine that the baseline information to be collected is limited to the areas near Melvin Bay and to understand the extent of the proposed work before agreeing to any such commitment.



REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
KIA_MAR_02	NIRB Guidelines: s.2.3, p. 6-7 Traditional Knowledge, s.6.6.6, p. 29 Marine Shipping, s.7.3, p. 34-35 Baseline Information Collection, s.7.4, p. 35-36 Use of Existing Information, s8.1.13, p. 64 Marine Environment, s.8.1.14, p. 65 Marine Wildlife. FEIS Volume 8 (Marine Environment): Executive Summary, s.8.3.2.2.1.5 Sensitive/Protected Areas, s.8.3.7.2.2 Residual Impacts on Marine Mammals; Volume 9 (IQ).	Provide additional information on marine mammal critical habitats, distribution, and seasonal migration patterns, and potential for interactions with project vessels, through an updated baseline. No specific Terms and Conditions are recommended, but see those recommended in TC KIA_MAR_01 (also KIA_MAR_03 and KIA_MAR_08).	Agreed to in principle subject to confirmation of wording - see KIA_MAR-01 for concern
KIA_MAR_03	NIRB Guidelines: s.2.3, p.6-7 Traditional Knowledge, s.6.6.6,B42 p. 29 Marine Shipping, s.7.2, p. 34 Traditional Knowledge, s.7.3, p. 34-35 Baseline Information Collection, s.7.4, p. 35-36 Use of Existing Information, s.8.1.13.1, p. 64 Baseline Information (Marine Environment), s.8.1.14.1, p. 65 Baseline Information (Marine Wildlife), s.9.4.11, p. 86-88 Shipping Management Plan, s.9.4.17, p. 90 Wildlife Mitigation and Monitoring Plan.  FEIS Volume 8 (Marine Environment): s.8.3.2.2.1.3 Marine Mammals, s.8.3.6.1 Relevant Project Components, SD 8-1 (Shipping Management Plan).	KIA recommends that the baseline information for beluga whales be updated, similar to the updates required for all marine mammals as described in TC KIA_MAR_01 (also see KIA_MAR_08). An effective baseline is needed to confirm impact predictions, inform monitoring and mitigation, and contribute to adaptive management.	Agreed to in principle
KIA_MAR_04	NIRB Guidelines: s.7.0, p. 33 Impact Assessment Methodology, s.7.3, p. 34-35 Baseline Information Collection, s.7.4, p. 35-36 Use of Existing Information, s.8.1, p. 47 Biophysical Environment and Impact Assessment.  FEIS Volume 4 (Impact Assessment Methodology); Volume 8 (Marine Environment): s.8.3.4.1 Methods, s.8.3.4.4 Summary of Primary Pathways, s.8.3.7.1 Methods (Residual Impact Classification).	No specific terms and conditions are recommended, but monitoring and mitigation need careful consideration, as highlighted in the recommendations for other marine TCS (KIA_MAR_01, KIA_MAR_05, KIA_MAR_06, KIA_MAR_07, and KIA_MAR_08).	Agreed to in principle
KIA_MAR_05	NIRB Guidelines: s.4.5, p. 12ff Data Presentation, s.9.4.2, p.81 Fuel Management Plan, s.9.4.3, p. 81 Spill Contingency Plans (incl. SOPEPs), s.9.4.11, p. 87 Shipping Management Plan. IRs 124 EC and 150 TC and AEM responses. KIA Marine IR 3 on June 12, 2014 and AEM responses on June 19, 2014 and July 2, 2014 (dated 26 June) GN TRC 14  FEIS Volume 1: s.2.3.7, Marine Shipping, s.8.3, p. 1-105 Environmental Effects; Volume 2, s.2.6.5, p. 250ff Marine Shipping; Volume 8, s.8.3.6.1, p. 8-104ff Relevant Project Components, App.8.2 Oil Spill Modelling; SD2-16 Spill Contingency Plan; SD8-1 Shipping Management Plan; SD8-2 Oil Pollution Emergency Plan.	It is recommended that the Proponent reassess its spill predictions to inform spill response planning. The Proponent should revise and rerun its fuel spill dispersal modeling to consider: 1) high risk spill locations; 2) model inputs that capture the range of environmental conditions that occur during the shipping season at each spill location, 3) potential interactions between spills and concentrations of migratory or resident marine mammals, birds, and/or fishes; 4) a range of spill volumes up to and including loss of a full tanker cargo, and 5) differences in the quantity and properties of each type of bulk fuel transported by ships when they are at, or in transit to, Melvin Bay. The results should be used to reassess seasonal spill impact predictions along the shipping route and in port, and to reassess the adequacy of spill response planning and preparedness.	Under consideration
KIA_MAR_06	NIRB Guidelines: s.9.4.17p. 90 Wildlife Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, s.9.4.11p.87 Shipping management Plan. KIA Marine IR 1 June 12, 2014 and AEM response June 19, 2014. FEIS Document Map; Terrestrial Environment Management Plan (SD-6.4); Shipping Management Plan (SD-8.1).	KIA recommends that the Proponent develop the necessary marine components for wildlife mitigation and monitoring and add this information to the appropriate management plan. The plan will need to include specific plans for monitoring of marine wildlife, mitigation steps to be employed (and monitoring to ensure that mitigation is successful), plans for inclusion of local hunters in monitoring, and plans to coordinate with other organizations such as Government departments. The following terms and conditions are recommended to ensure adequate monitoring for potential impacts to marine wildlife: 1) Prior to any Project-associated shipping, the Proponent shall revise and update the Terrestrial Environment Management Plan (TEMMP) and/or the Shipping Management Plan (SMP) to include the necessary information on marine wildlife monitoring required by NIRB's Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (s.9.4.17) for a Wildlife Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (WMMP). This will include, but is not limited to: a) a plan for involvement of local hunters in wildlife baseline studies and monitoring program, b) a plan for coordinating wildlife studies/monitoring activities with other organizations, institutions, government departments and/or individual researchers conducting wildlife studies in the RSA, and, c) measures to be applied to avoid or reduce the disturbance, harassment, injury or mortality of marine mammals due to shipping activities.	Agreed to in principle

REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
KIA_MAR_07	<p>NIRB Guidelines: s.6.6.6, p. 29 Marine Shipping, s.9.4.11, p. 86-88 Shipping Management Plan, s.9.4.17, p. 90 Wildlife Mitigation and Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>KIA Marine IR 1 June 12, 2014 and AEM response June 19, 2014; IR 125 EC.</p> <p>FEIS Volume 8 (Marine Environment): s.8.3.1.1 Purpose and Scope (Marine Wildlife), s.8.3.2.2.1.4 Species at Risk, Shipping Management Plan (SD 8-1).</p>	<p>KIA recommends that a detailed plan for marine wildlife monitoring be developed, particularly for “species at risk” under SARA or COSEWIC (see also TC KIA_MAR_02). Shipping companies should be required to conduct monitoring of marine wildlife and ensure that trained observers are used, that established data collection and recording protocols are used, and that monitoring results are provided to regulators and KIA on a timely basis. Ideally, such monitoring would be conducted continuously during daylight conditions, but this may be logistically challenging.</p> <p>The Proponent should work with the shipping companies, NIRB, regulators (e.g., DFO, EC) and KIA to develop a suitable monitoring program. Monitoring data should include both geo-referenced and time-stamped wildlife observations and vessel location information (allowing KIA and regulators to monitor vessel compliance with identified mitigation steps, including speed limits). This is similar to an Environment Canada request (EC-2 (shown as IR 125 EC on submission)) that an annual log and map of ship tracks be included in annual monitoring reports in order to assess adherence to the Proponent's commitment to have vessels avoid the 30 km radius offshore area off Coats Island that has been identified as a key marine habitat site for seabirds.</p> <p>In their response (file: 131129-11MN034-AEM Response Technical Comments-IT3E.xlsx), the Proponent noted that they are but one of the companies and communities contracting ships and that it was not reasonable that AEM alone be required to meet the requirement of providing an annual shipping log and a map of ship tracks in its annual report. KIA contends that NIRB has the ability and mandate to include Project conditions that go above regulatory requirements or standard operating procedures, where appropriate, and is therefore able to place conditions on the Proponent to be met by contractors. The Project will have impacts on the marine environment, and mitigation steps have been identified (i.e., speed restrictions) that can only be assessed for compliance and efficacy through time-stamped vessel location data. This monitoring information will also be important for establishing the Proponent’s contribution to the cumulative impacts of shipping, which will otherwise not be studied, go undetected, and remain difficult to predict.</p> <p>The following Terms and Conditions are recommended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) AEM will require all contracted shipping companies to provide full-time marine wildlife monitoring using trained observers and established data collection and recording protocols. Monitoring plans will need to include provisions for all SARA and COSEWIC listed species (birds and mammals).</li> <li>2) AEM will develop a standard operating procedure (SOP) for marine wildlife monitoring and provide this to KIA and other interested parties before any shipping contracts are established.</li> <li>3) AEM will require all contracted shipping companies to provide time-stamped vessel location information, which AEM will provide to regulatory agencies (including KIA) in a timely manner.</li> </ol> <p>Note: also see relevant conditions in TC KIA_MAR_06.</p>	Under consideration
KIA_MAR_08	<p>NIRB Guidelines: s.2.3, p.6-7 Traditional Knowledge, s.6.6.6, p. 29 Marine Shipping, s.7.3, p. 34-35 Baseline Information Collection, s.7.4, p. 35-36 Use of Existing Information, s.8.1.14.1, p. 65 Baseline Information, s.9.4.11, p. 86 Shipping Management Plan, s.9.4.17, p. 90 Wildlife Mitigation and Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>FEIS Volume 8 (Marine Environment): s.8.3.2.2.1.3 Marine Mammals, s.8.3.7.2.2 Residual Impacts on Marine Mammals, SD 8-1 (Shipping Management Plan), SD 8-2 (Oil Pollution Emergency Plan ); Volume 9 (IQ appendices).</p>	<p>KIA recommends that walrus haulouts be given special attention for marine monitoring, mitigation, and adaptive management.</p> <p>The following Terms and Conditions are recommended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Prior to any Project-related shipping, the Proponent will prepare a map of terrestrial walrus haulouts (uglit) in the Project area, and use this information for route planning, fuel spill modeling, and sensitive area identification. The map should include all available sources of information on uglit locations, including scientific knowledge and Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and be updated whenever new information becomes available.</li> <li>2) The Proponent shall consider ways to monitor disturbance to walruses at terrestrial haulout sites, including but not limited to remote monitoring (e.g., time-lapse cameras) and community-based monitoring or IQ surveys.</li> <li>3) Prior to any Project-related shipping, the Proponent shall provide merchant shipping companies with information on the locations of walrus haulouts (and other sensitive marine habitats if necessary) and require all contracted vessels to stay at least 5.5 km (ca. 3 nautical miles) from all identified locations.</li> </ol> <p>Note: also see relevant recommendations in TC KIA_MAR_05, KIA_MAR_06 and KIA_MAR_07.</p>	Agreed to in principle
KIA_MAR_09	<p>NIRB Guidelines: p. v Glossary, s.2.1, p.5 The NIRB’s Impact Review Principles, s.6.3, p.17, Future Development, s.6.4, p.18 Alternatives, s.7.5.1, p.36ff Spatial Boundaries, s.7.11, p.44ff Cumulative Effects Assessment, s.7.12, p.45 Transboundary Impacts s.7.13, p. 45 Indicators and Criteria, s.7.15, p.46 Significance Determination, s.8.1.12.2, p.64 Impact Assessment (Birds and Bird Habitat), s.8.1.14.2, p.66 Impact Assessment (Marine Wildlife).</p> <p>IRs 56 AANDC, 124 and 125 EC</p> <p>FEIS Volume 2: Exec. Summ., p.xx and xxv; Volume 8: s.8.3.6.1, p.8-105ff Relevant Project Components, s.8.3.7.2.2, p.134 Residual Impacts on Marine Mammals, s.8.3.7.2.3, p.8-137 Residual Impacts on Marine Birds; Volume 9: s. 9.3.5.1, p. 9-111 Traditional Harvesting.</p>	<p>To reduce uncertainty surrounding its cumulative impact assessment AEM should revise the assessment to reflect: a) updated impact predictions (see KIA_MAR_TC04) that are based on an improved baseline (see KIA_MAR_TC01) and better understanding of shipping interactions with marine wildlife (see KIA_MAR_TC02, KIA_MAR_TC03), b) revised spill modelling (see KIA_MAR_TC05), c) consideration of harbour alternatives (see KIA_MAR_TC10), d) potential increases in the quantity of ore mined and in the lifetime of the project, and e) foreseeable future shipping by the Mary River and Canadian Royalties Inc. mining projects. Activities, VECS, and VSECs should not be considered in isolation to one another or removed from cumulative consideration if they are considered non-significant when considered in isolation.</p> <p>AEM and KIA should consider seeking participation in the Marine Environmental Working Group that was established for the Mary River Project. This group is tasked with advising Baffinland Iron Mines Ltd. on monitoring studies related to its shipping in Hudson Strait, and could do the same for AEM. Both projects will have cumulative effects related to their shipping in Hudson Strait. This is an opportunity to pool resources related to shared shipping routes and to extend monitoring and any ancillary research to Rankin Inlet. This cooperation should improve understanding of shipping impacts and thereby their cumulative effects, and inform mitigation and adaptive management. This impact monitoring (see KIA_MAR_TC06, KIA_MAR_TC07, KIA_MAR_TC08) will help to establish the Meliadine Gold Project’s contribution to cumulative shipping effects so they can be properly considered when other developments are assessed-otherwise the baseline is allowed to shift unchecked, increasing the risk of lasting environmental damage.</p>	Under consideration
KIA_MAR_10	<p>NIRB Guidelines: s.6.4, p. 17 Alternatives, 6.6.9, p. 32 Fuel and Explosives Facilities, s.8.1.7.2, p. 55 Impact Assessment, s.9.4.11, p.87 Shipping management Plan.</p> <p>KIA Marine IR 2 June 12, 2014 and AEM response June 19, 2014.</p> <p>FEIS Volume 2: s.2.6.2, p. 175ff Rankin Inlet Infrastructure, s.2.6.5.4, p. 254ff Shipping Routes and General Lightering Procedures at Itivia Harbour; Volume 8: s.8.3.6.1, p. 8-105 Relevant Project Components.</p>	<p>The Proponent should provide a detailed assessment of the environmental and economic trade-offs of using a deep-water port as opposed to the harbour facility presented in the FEIS. Options for avoiding the cumulative impacts of two substantial harbour/port developments in a small community should be presented.</p> <p>NIRB should consider whether it is reasonable to assess a deep water port proposal separate from the mine project given that development of a deep water port may hinge on whether the port will be used by mine traffic.</p>	Under consideration
KIA_MAR_11	<p>NIRB Guidelines: s.8.1.14.2 Impact Assessment, s.9.4.11 Shipping Management Plan.</p> <p>FEIS Volume 2: s.2.6.5.7, p. 261ff On-Board Waste Management; Volume 8: s.8.3.4.2, p. 8-99ff Pathways with Minor Linkage; SD8-1 Shipping Management Plan (s.9, p. 21ff; s.3, Tab.3-1); SD8-2 Oil Pollution Emergency Plan (s.2.1, p. 4+5; App. A, p. A-3)</p>	<p>Measures to mitigate risk of introducing NIS carried in ballast water by vessels operating within the Canadian EEZ should be considered and implemented. These could, for example, include logistical planning to minimize ballast water carried into the region by ensuring that vessels arrive loaded, or by requiring all project vessels to flush their ballast water tanks if they are arriving loaded or exchange their ballast water enroute if they are arriving empty (in ballast).</p> <p>The following terms and conditions are recommended to reduce risk from NIS introductions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Mitigation measures should be implemented to reduce the risk of non-indigenous species being introduced into the Rankin Inlet area during ballast water discharge by ships that remain within the Canadian Economic Exclusion Zone.</li> </ol>	Agreed to in principle

REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
GNWT-a	SD 6-4 TEMPP	AEM ensure that monitoring the effectiveness of project mitigations is included in the TEMMP.	Agreed to in principle
GNWT-b	SD 6-4 TEMPP	NIRB should give very careful consideration to the design and details of the Hunter Harvest Survey in its recommendations.	Recommendation for NIRB Action
GNWT-c	SD 6-4 TEMPP	The NIRB include terms and conditions to ensure AEM’s Hunter Harvest Survey include a provision for hiring a dedicated local survey coordinator through the Rankin Inlet HTO and provide adequate resources for the HTO to run the program.	Agreed to in principle
GNWT-d	SD 2-9 : Roads (Also references Volume 6, Section 6.6.4.3 –Survival and Reproduction) and SD 6-4 TEMPP	GNWT recommends that the harvest study areas identified in the TEMMP Appendix 1 (Harvest calendar) be extended further west to capture potential changes in access to the post-calving and calving ranges of the herd.	See detailed response provided in attachment
GNWT-e	SD 2-9, SD 6-4 TEMPP	The NIRB incorporate terms and conditions to support collaboration between AEM, Rankin Inlet, Chesterfield Inlet and Whale Cove HTOs, the GN and other authorities as appropriate to develop an access management plan that identifies harvest thresholds along the road and to coordinate appropriate management responses in the event that monitoring indicates those thresholds are exceeded.	Under consideration
GNWT-f	Volume 11, Section 11.3	The NIRB make recommendations to the appropriate authorities for development of a framework for assessing, monitoring and managing cumulative effects for the entire multi-jurisdictional Qamanirjuaq range which recognizes the shared nature of the herd among numerous communities in four jurisdictions.	Recommendation for NIRB Action

REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
KWB-1	Volume 2, Section 2.6.4, p. 224; Volume 6, Section 6.6.8, p. 6-244; Volume 9, Section 9.3, p. 9-63	Concerns: There is a need to clarify and emphasize both AWAR traffic and access protocols and improve public awareness, communication and cooperation. Summary: Recommendation Ensure the compatibility of AEM access to the mine site and Inuit access to the land.	Agreed to in principle
KWB-2	Volume 1, Section 12.2, p 1-147; Volume 8, Section 8.3.7, p. 8-133; Volume 9, Section 9.3, p. 9-70.	Summary recommendation: Consider project-related marine shipping as incremental, cumulative traffic in a context of great uncertainty and poor understanding with respect to the impacts of shipping on marine mammals and the underwater environment.	Agreed to in principle
KWB-3	Volume 1, Section 12.2, p. 1-146; Volume 6, Section 6.6.4, p. 6-220; Volume 6, Section 6.6.11, p. 6-255; Volume 6, Section 6.6.12, p. 6-257	Summary recommendation: Give due regard to the fact that the significance of cumulative impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat may be different, if determined through the viewpoint of Inuit harvesters, rather than from an industrial perspective.	Agreed to in principle
KWB-4	Volume 1, Section 6.6, p. 1-79; Volume 1, Table 1.0-C24, p 1-C55; Volume 9, Section 9.3, p. 9-64; SD 6.4, Section 3.1.8, p. 19.	Concern: Impact on caribou post-calving grounds and migration. Summary recommendation: Further bring the importance of caribou to Kivalliq Inuit to the forefront of impact assessment, especially since the majority of project-related interaction occur at a particularly sensitive space (post-calving grounds) and time (post-calving migration) in the lifecycle of the caribou.	Recommendation for NIRB to act on
KWB-5	Volume 1, Section 6.6, p. 1-80; Volume 1, Section 8.0, p. 1-105; Volume 9, Section 9.3.4, p. 9-106; Volume 9, Section 9.3.4, p. 9-107	Concern: Impact on Inuit harvesting, particularly re: compensation for imposition of harvesting restrictions on Kivalliq Inuit. Summary Recommendation: Uphold a precautionary approach in the assessment of matters that can potentially affect present and future Inuit harvesting, so that Inuit do not needlessly bear the brunt of eventual population-level impacts and repercussions.	Agreed to in principle



REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
GN-1	Volume 7, Section 7.4.4	The Proponent shall develop and implement water quality monitoring through the Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan for Meliadine Lake during the spring snowmelt period. Water quality monitoring shall include snowpack and snowmelt runoff.	Agreed to in principle
GN-2	Air Quality Monitoring Plan (SD 5-1), Terrestrial Environment Management and Monitoring Plan (SD 6-4), Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan (SD 7-3), Socioeconomic Management Plan (SD 9-2)	The Proponent shall consult with the Nunavut Research Institute (NRI) on the research permitting process as it relates to the Nunavut Scientists Act. The Proponent shall share monitoring and research study design with NRI 6 months prior to the anticipated commencement of research activities to facilitate licensing review.	Agreed to in principle
GN-3	SD 6-4, Section 4.6:	Within six (6) months of the issuance of the Project Certificate, the Proponent shall update the Terrestrial Environment Monitoring and Management Plan (TEMMP) to include a detailed harvest study prepared in consultation with the GN and other affected parties.	Agreed to in principle
GN-4	Proponent commitment regarding GN-3 technical comment: “AEM commits to conduct water quality monitoring in Meliadine River and to include this information along with baseline water quality data within the FEIS. Further, AEM will also include in the FEIS a commitment to consult with regulatory agencies in determining reference waterbodies (lake(s) and river(s)) to be used for the aquatics effects monitoring plans for the Type A Water Licence.”	The Proponent shall conduct continuous water quality monitoring on Little Meliadine Lake and Meliadine River during the construction, operation, and closure stages of the Project.	Under consideration
GN-5	SD 6-4, Section 3.1.2	The Proponent shall not conduct helicopter flights over or land in Iqalugaarjuup Nunanga Territorial Park.	Agreed to in principle
GN-6	Volume 9, Section 9.9.1.3:	The Proponent shall update information pertaining to Iqalugaarjuup Nunanga Territorial Park in consultation with the GN.	See detailed response provided in attachment
GN-7	GN-6 Technical Comment, SD 2-9, Section 6.2, Proponent’s Response to Technical Comments Nov 29, 2013	The Proponent shall consult the GN on matters relating to access to the all-weather access road (AWAR).	Agreed to in principle
GN-8	GN-7 technical comment, Vol. 2 Section 2.6.4.3, Vol. 6 Section 6.6.4.2.2, Proponent’s response to Technical Comments	The Proponent shall share information with the GN relating to the migration of caribou and include the GN as a party respecting caribou monitoring and movement through and in the Project area.	Agreed to in principle
GN-9	FEIS Vol. 6, Section 6.6.8.3 and table 6.6-30; FEIS Vol. 6, Section 6.6.11	The Proponent shall support the development of adequate monitoring and mitigation measures relating to improved access for harvesting caribou in conjunction with the GN and other relevant parties.	Agreed to in principle
GN-10	Vol. 6 Executive Summary, SD 6-4, Section 4.5.2, SD 6-4, Section 4.3.2, Vol. 6, Table 6.6-30, Vol. 6, Section 6.6.4.2.2., page 234, SD 6-4, Section 3.1.2, page 14, SD 6-4, Section 4.2.4, page 25, SD 6-4, Section 4.2.4, page 25, 38, FEIS Vol. 6, Section 6.1.1.2, SD 6-4, Section 4.2.3, page 23, SD 6-4, Section 4.1, SD 6-4, Section 2.2 Monitoring Scales, page 8, SD 6-4, Sections 2.2 & 4.5.3.	The Proponent shall support adequate caribou population monitoring programs in conjunction with the GN and other relevant parties.	Agreed to in principle - Not a commitment for AEM only but we commit to continue to be a party to the support of ongoing monitoring programs
GN-11	Volume 6 Terrestrial Environment, Section 6.6.1.2	The Proponent shall monitor the distribution and abundance of muskox within the Regional Study Area to assess the potential effects of the Project on future range expansion, abundance and availability for harvest.	Agreed to in principle
GN-12	SD 6-4, Terrestrial Environment Management and Monitoring Plan, Section 2.3, page 10; Vol. 6 Section 6.6.1.2.	Prior to construction of Project infrastructure and Phase 2 of the AWAR, the Proponent shall conduct a survey of reasonable design that is sufficient to locate any dens of foxes, bears or wolverines that could be damaged or destroyed during construction or operation of the Project. The Proponent shall ensure compliance with Section 73(1)b of the Nunavut Wildlife Act and all other applicable laws and regulations of Nunavut.	Agreed to in principle
GN-13	SD 6-4, Terrestrial Environment Management and Monitoring Plan, Section 4.3.2, page 26.	In consultation with the GN and other affected parties, the Proponent shall set thresholds for direct mortality of wolf, grizzly bear, polar bear, wolverine, and fox to ensure monitoring and mitigation for the Project is responsive to undesirable rates of mortality. The Proponent shall reach an agreement with the appropriate Designated Inuit Organization regarding compensation for any direct mortality of wildlife resulting from the Project.	Agreed to in principle
GN-14	SD 2-17 Preliminary Mine Closure and Reclamation Plan (CRP), Sections 4.2.1 and 8.3, Volume 6, Terrestrial Environment and Impact Assessment, Section 6.5.11.2, SD 6-4, Section 4.4.2 and table 2, page 39.	The duration of monitoring and mitigation for re-vegetation of disturbed sites shall be subject to performance standards established in consultation with landowners and the appropriate government, as the case may be.	Agreed to in principle
GN-15	Section 6.7.4.1, table 6.7-21, SD 6-4, Sections 4.7.2, 4.7.4	The Proponent shall not destroy or disturb raptor nests without a permit issued by the GN-DOE.	Agreed to in principle
GN-16	SD 2-16 Spill Contingency Plan Proponent’s Conclusion, Section 2.1	Within 6 months of the issuance of the Project Certificate, the Proponent shall update the Spill Contingency Plan to include a detailed account of spill prevention and inspection measures as well as spill clean-up verification measures.	Agreed to in principle
GN-17	SD 2-9 Roads Management Plan (Table 6-1 Estimated Average Daily Traffic on the AWAR), SD 2-9, 1.2.4 Hamlet Bypass Road, SD 2-9, Section 6.6, Table 6.1, SD 2-9, Section 8; SD 2-15 Risk Management and Emergency Response Plan, SD 2-15, Section 4.6.7, SD 2-15, Section 4.6.8; SD 2-16 Spill Contingency Plan, SD 2-16, Section 5.4.	Within 6 months of the issuance of the Project Certificate, the Proponent shall provide a spill contingency plan specific to a major spill event occurring on the bypass road close to Nipissar Lake prior to construction. This can be included as an appendix to the current spill contingency plan.	Agreed to in principle
GN-18	Volume 5, Table 5.2-26: All-weather Access Road Project Fleet Traffic SD 2-9 Table 6-1 Estimated Average Daily Traffic on the AWAR	Within 6 months of the issuance of the Project Certificate, the Proponent shall update the Air Quality Monitoring Plan to include dustfall monitoring on the bypass road.	Agreed to in principle

REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
GN-19	Volume 10, Table 10.2-E-1 and Volume 7 Table 7.4-20	<p>The GN requests that:</p> <p>a) AEM update table 10.2-E-1 to clarify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• what the predicted concentrations represent (maximum, upper estimate, average)</li> <li>• where they occur (edge of mixing zone, within Meliadine Lake)</li> <li>• whether they reflect the total or dissolved concentration</li> <li>• whether the predicted concentration includes baseline or is incremental</li> </ul> <p>b) AEM update the Baseline Concentration column in table 10.2-1 to reflect a more appropriate measure of baseline concentrations for the purpose of screening.</p> <p>c) Given that the country food pathways are screened out of the risk assessment, and that members of the public, including workers, may use Meliadine Lake for both drinking water and fishing, the GN requests that AEM adjust its COPC screening threshold to account for this possibility. One appropriate way of doing this would be comparing to a specified fraction of the drinking water guidelines.</p> <p>d) The Proponent's far-field modeling shows concentrations of TDS, chloride and sodium increasing above their respective predicted edge-of-mixing-zone concentrations. However, many other chemicals of interest were excluded from this far-field modeling. In the absence of additional information about how chemicals will accumulate in Meliadine Lake, or rationale for excluding them from far-field modeling, AEM has not demonstrated that chemicals screened out of the risk assessment will not exceed relevant guidelines over the course of the Project life. The GN requests that AEM provide additional far-field modeling in response to this concern.</p> <p>e) As the requests outlined above (a–d) likely cannot all be responded to before the NIRB Final Hearing, the GN expects these issues that cannot be dealt with before the Final Hearing be resolved through AEM's Water License Application.</p>	See detailed response provided in attachment
GN-20	Volume 10, Section 10.2.6.3.1.3	<p>The Proponent shall update air quality monitoring in their environmental and health risk monitoring program to include</p> <p>Analysis of the metals content of the dust collected in passive monitoring</p> <p>Discrete samples collected on a periodic basis from the camp and analyzed for acrolein and aldehyde.</p>	See detailed response provided in attachment
GN-21	Volume 10, 10.2.5, Table 10.2-3; Section 10.2-6	The Proponent shall provide rationale in the context of the Environmental and Human Health Risk Assessment to support the assumption that the operations scenario is an appropriate bounding scenario even for the construction phase when Project activities will differ.	See detailed response provided in attachment
GN-22	Volume 9, Sections 9.2.8, 9.4.6, 9.5.6; and SD 9-2 Socio-Economic Management Plan	<p>The GN is proposes the following three (3) Terms and Conditions:</p> <p>1. The Proponent shall participate in the work of the Kivalliq Socio-Economic Monitoring Committee along with other agencies and affected communities, and it should endeavor to identify areas of mutual interest and priorities for inclusion into a collaborative monitoring framework that includes socio-economic priorities related to the Project, communities, and the Kivalliq region as a whole. Regional Kivalliq SEMC reports and frameworks will be submitted to NIRB's monitoring officer.</p> <p>2. The Proponent, in collaboration with other monitoring groups, shall establish a socio-economic monitoring working group to meet Project-specific monitoring requirements throughout the life of the Project. The working group shall agree on a Terms of Reference that outlines each member's roles and responsibilities within six (6) months of the issuance of a Project Certificate, and submit a copy to NIRB's Monitoring Officer.</p> <p>3. The Proponent, in collaboration with other monitoring groups, shall develop a Meliadine socioeconomic monitoring program that is designed to monitor the predicted impacts outlined in the FEIS as well as regional concerns identified by the Kivalliq SEMC. The program should include a process for adaptive management and mitigation in the event of unanticipated impacts. This process shall include other members of the socio-economic working group as appropriate. The Government of Nunavut - Final Written Submission NIRB File No. 11MN034 - Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.'s Meliadine Gold Project Page 40 first report should be submitted within one (1) year of the issuance of a Project Certificate and every March 31st thereafter.</p>	Agreed to in principle but need to discuss when monitoring stops in the post closure period - it cannot go on for ever
GN-23	Volume 9, Sections 9.4.3.3.1, 9.4.3.3.2, and 9.4.5.1	<p>The GN proposes the following Term and Condition:</p> <p>The Proponent shall submit a detailed staff schedule to the GN in the first 6 months following the issuance of a Project Certificate. The schedule should, at a minimum, provide an understanding of:</p> <p>Title of positions required by department and division.</p> <p>Quantity of positions available by Project phase and year.</p> <p>The National Occupational Classification (NOC) code for each individual position.</p> <p>The Department of Family Services should be consulted on the development of the exact format of the schedule. A new schedule should be submitted following any significant deviation from original predictions.</p>	Under consideration - the condition should be tied to the start of construction as detailed staffing positions will not likely be finalized until after a construction decision is reached
GN-24	SD 9-2 Socio-Economic Management Plan, Sections 4.1, 4.3, and 5.	<p>DFS is making the following two requests:</p> <p>Government of Nunavut - Final Written Submission</p> <p>NIRB File No. 11MN034 - Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.'s Meliadine Gold Project Page 43</p> <p>1. That the Proponent identify and register all trades occupations, journeypersons and apprentices working within the Project operations, with a commitment to register any trades occupations listed in their forecast.</p> <p>2. That the Proponent identifies how many registered apprentices and journeypersons are from other jurisdictions and report this information to DFS.</p> <p>No Term and Condition is proposed at this point in time.</p>	Agreed to in principle
GN-25	Volume 9, Sections 9.4.3.2.1 and 9.4.3.2.2, Volume 9, Section 9.1.7.1, Pages 9-25, Volume 9, Section 9.4.3.2.1, Page 9-164	<p>The GN proposes the following Term and Condition:</p> <p>Government of Nunavut - Final Written Submission NIRB File No. 11MN034 - Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.'s Meliadine Gold Project Page 44</p> <p>The Proponent shall communicate to the GN major decisions which may impact territorial tax revenues and respond to requests for information and input from GN finance officials regarding taxes</p>	Agreed to in principle but need more clarity on what is defined as a "major" decision



REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
GN-26	Volume 9, Sections: 9.6.2.5, 9.6.4.4, 9.7.1.1, 9.7.3.1, 9.7.4.1. Tables: 9.7-1, 9.7-2, 9.7-4.	The GN proposes the following Term and Condition: The Proponent shall undertake an annual survey of its employees to identify any changes of address, detailed occupancy status, housing preferences, migration intentions, and reasons for migration. The survey should be designed in collaboration with the Kivalliq Socio-Economic Monitoring Committee (SEMC), the Nunavut Housing Corporation (NHC), and other relevant stakeholders. The results of the survey are to be reported to the Government of Nunavut and the Nunavut Impact Review Board.	AEM is not agreeable with taking on responsibility for provision of social housing in Nunavut
GN-27	Volume 9, Sections: 9.6.2.5; 9.6.4.4; 9.7.1.1, 9.7.3.1, 9.7.4.1, Table: 9.7-4.	The GN proposes the following two (2) Terms and Conditions: 1. AEM shall collaborate with the GN and NHC on potential housing solutions that improve employee access to homeownership or alternative affordable housing options. Housing mitigation for AEM employees could include an optional housing/ homeownership plan administered by the company in conjunction with NHC, or staff housing in communities. 2. As part of the regular Life Skills Training and/or Career Path Program, AEM shall collaborate with the GN and NHC to provide financial literacy, financial planning, and personal budgeting training with a view to enhancing employee access to a range of housing options, including homeownership.	AEM is not agreeable with taking on responsibility for provision of social housing in Nunavut
GN-28	SD 2-9 Roads Management Plan, Section 7.2.1, Pages 27 - 28	The Proponent shall provide twice weekly inspection reports for the Meliadine River Bridge, the Char River Bridge, and the Bridge at Crossing M5 directly to the Territorial Archaeologist during the spring/early summer freshet period (mid-May – June) and weekly during the remainder of the ice-free period prior to fall freeze-up (July – October). If inspections reveal that ice buildup is reaching a point that is putting upstream archaeological sites at risk, the Proponent shall, in consultation with the Department of Culture and Heritage, develop and implement an action plan before any harm occurs.	Agreed to in principle
GN-29	Volume 9, Section 9.11.5, Table 9.11-1; Volume 9, Section 9.11.5.1.2.1, Tables 9.11-2 and 9.11-3; Supporting Document 9-1, Section 4, Page 6	The Proponent shall provide an annual inspection report to the Department of Culture and Heritage that summarizes the current status of all known archaeological sites within 80 metres of Project infrastructure. The design of a standard site status form should be developed in consultation with the Department of Culture and Heritage which will form the basis of the inspection report. The report will be due February 28th of each year in advance of the deadline for reports pertaining to work carried out under any Class 2 archaeological permits.	Agreed to in principle but only should be required in years when changes in the project footprint are occurring
GN-30	SD 9-1 Cultural and Heritage Resources Protection Plan, Section 4, Page 6	The Proponent shall provide a set of maps to the Department of Culture and Heritage on February 28th of each year an archaeological permit is obtained and archaeological assessment and/or mitigation work is completed. The maps are to be designed according to the following specifications: a) All sites inventoried in the Local Study Areas of the Mine Infrastructure, All-Weather Access Road Phase 2, and the Rankin Inlet Bypass Road Infrastructure b) Archaeological sites planned for mitigation – colour coded by year c) Archaeological sites designated for avoidance/protection – shape and colour coded d) The information in points a, b, and c overlaid onto an updated map of the final location of Project infrastructure as it is known. e) The scale of the maps has to be such that the limits of individual infrastructure components are well defined and the location of the archaeological sites within those limits is precise. A textual description of the map contents should also be submitted in table form. This will be a standalone document that will evolve over time as an ongoing status report.	Agreed to in principle but only should be required in years when changes in the project footprint are occurring
GN-31	SD 9-1 Cultural and Heritage Resources Protection Plan, Section 4, Page 5	The Proponent shall conduct additional Archaeological Impact Assessments for all future exploration targets and new developments with moderate to high archaeological potential as determined by the Department of Culture and Heritage.	Agreed to in principle - AEM needs to understand how this will be done
GN-32	Volume 9 Section 9.7.3.2.2 pg288; Volume 2 SD 2-15 pg23-25	It is the GN's recommendation that the Proponent commit to provide and establish a level of health services on-site that will reduce the project's direct impact on Rankin's health services as much as possible. This includes committing to the measures outlined in the numbered list above: 1. Staffing an experienced Nurse or Nurse-Practitioner on-site at all times who has prescriptive authority from AEM's on-call Physician, and the ability to follow through on physician direction. 2. Contracting a 24-hr on-call Physician Coverage by phone for on-site medical staff to avoid calls to GN Health facilities for medical treatment advice. 3. Following the GN's Medevac Protocol for Medevacs requiring use of the GN's contracted medevac aircraft. 4. Providing Financial Coverage for Employees and Contractor employees requiring medevac or medical scheduled flights while in Nunavut for the purpose of working for AEM. 5. Working with the department of Health, post-Environmental Assessment to establish clear structures and guidelines for referral to GN Health Services and Medevac 6) Participate with the Department of Health to monitor the impact of the Meliadine Project on Health Services. The GN is not proposing a term and condition at this time.	AEM does this at Meadowbank and has committed to follow a similar set up at Meliadine. We do not believe this needs to be a Project Certificate Condition.
GN-33	FEIS Volume 9 section 9.6.4.3 Sexually Transmitted Infections AEM's response to GN IRs 26, 28, 29 and 31	Annual reporting suggestions; The GN is not proposing a term and condition at this time.	Agreed - No commitment required

REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
DFO-1	Valued Ecosystem Components (VEC)	Agnico to update the FEIS and Offsetting Plan to include all the Recreational fish of Nunavut affected by the project.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-2	VEC. Volume 7, Page 284 - 468.	The Proponent should identify their level of confidence that fish will not be affected, effects are negligible and the hydrology will return to baseline levels post closure. The Proponent should also identify an expected timeline for “reversibility” of impacts and how this relates to the duration of mine related impacts on fish populations	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-3	VEC	DFO also requested in the DEIS review that ‘revision is necessary to more accurately describe temporal impacts of the project currently described as ‘temporary’, or ‘short duration’ when referencing impacts of the project which is proposed to have an approximate 25 year lifespan. If impacts to particular waterbodies are intended to be shorter in duration, please make this clear for each waterbody.’ DFO identified an inconsistent use of the terminology of ‘short duration’ referencing timespans of operations to post closure periods rather than evaluating the impacts during the lifespan of the species affected.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-4	VEC. Volume 1, P. 23 - Impact Assessment Methods, first paragraph and Volume 7 P. 7-325, table 7.5.1	As DFO recommended in the DEIS Review, Agnico should recognize the value of the species that support Canada’s commercial, recreational and Aboriginal fisheries (e.g. Slimy Sculpin. “Fishery Value” should be defined and clarified throughout the document not be evaluated based on fishing preference by a particular community and Agnico to ensure its interpretation is consistent with the Fisheries Act and Northwest Territory Fishery Regulations.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-5	Effects of Increased Access and Fishing Pressure. Volume 1, P. 27 and 28, Fish and Fish Habitat, last paragraph. Volume 7, Section 7.5.6.2.5; SD 7-4 Offsetting Plan and Nunatsiq News.	It is incumbent upon Agnico to mitigate overharvesting as a result of their project. DFO recommends that Agnico clarify their position with respect to mitigating fishing overharvesting throughout the lifespan of the mine so that DFO can make a determination as to whether or not Agnico’s conclusions that effects from increased fishing pressure will be negligible compared to baseline conditions.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-6	Regulatory Requirements. Volume 2 Table 1-2 Primary Project Approval Requirements p.25	1) The Proponent should also refer to section 36 of the Fisheries Act. 2) Should add the Applications for Authorization under Paragraph 35(2)(b) of the Fisheries Act Regulations: <a href="http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/pnw-ppe/reviews-revues/application-eng.html">http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/pnw-ppe/reviews-revues/application-eng.html</a> 3) The Policy for the Management of Fish Habitat has been replaced by the Fisheries Protection Policy Statement (October 2013) 4) The proponent should refer to the Measures to Avoid Causing Harm to Fish and Fish Habitat website ( <a href="http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/pnw-ppe/measures-mesures/index-eng.html">http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/pnw-ppe/measures-mesures/index-eng.html</a> ) since it replaces all “Operational Statements” previously produced by Fisheries and Oceans Canada. 5) The proponent should refer to the General fish-out protocol for lakes and impoundments in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut. 6) The proponent should refer to the DFO protocol for winter water withdrawal from ice-covered waterbodies in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut.	Agreed to in principle
DFO-7	Regulatory Requirements. SD 2-5 Environmental Management and Protection Plan (EMPP) P. 4, SD 7-4 No Net Loss Plan	Replace ‘No Net Loss Plan’ with ‘Offsetting Plan’ and replace “to discuss measures to be implemented for compensation of the loss of fish habitat” with “to discuss measures to support and enhance the sustainability and ongoing productivity of commercial, recreational and Aboriginal fisheries.	Agreed to in principle
DFO-8	Regulatory Requirements. SD 2-2, Tailings Storage Facility Alternative Assessment P. 22, third paragraph and P. 23, 1st paragraph	the proponent should adapt terminology to reflect the amended Fisheries Act and its requirements.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-9	Regulatory Requirements. Volume 7 P. 7-325, last paragraph	This should state Section 35(1) and not Section 35(2). Also, the proponent should state the full definition of Section 35(1) and not only part of it. Therefore, the statement should read as follows: “No person shall carry on any work, undertaking or activity that results in serious harm to fish that are part of a commercial, recreational or Aboriginal fishery, or to fish that support such a fishery”.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-10	Prohct decription and mitigation measures. Volume 2 - Project Description. P.165, Table 2-29 List of Waterbodies Impacted by the Meliadine Project; P. 166, Table 2-29 List of Waterbodies Impacted by the Meliadine Project; and, P. 178, second paragraph. SD 2-1 Alternatives Assessment Report	Agnico to clarify why streams were not incorporated into Table 2-29 as they are also considered waterbodies. Clarify the need for a pumping location if no dewatering is to occur for waterbodies E5, H20, and J7 from B6, Meliadine and J1. Also, clarify for consistency whether Agnico meant mid or late July referencing the shipping season.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-11	Prohct decription and mitigation measures. Volume 2 – Mitigation Measures	references to Timing Window restrictions for inwater works – the FEIS references the timing window restriction for spring spawners of May 1-July 15 in this region of Nunavut, though other portions of the project have potential to affect fall spawners (e.g. p.230 and p.233 of the document). It is advisable to simply reference that Agnico will adhere to DFO’s Timing Windows for Nunavut: <a href="http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/pnw-ppe/timing-periodes/nu-eng.html">http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/pnw-ppe/timing-periodes/nu-eng.html</a>	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-12	Prohct decription and mitigation measures. P. 230, water crossing phase 1 and 2, first paragraph and P. 233, AWAR road design phase 2, discovery and bypass, third paragraph	the following sentence should be amended to inform readers that more measures might apply: “In accordance with DFO and Environment Canada guidance, the following will be applied during construction of the AWAR whenever near a waterbody or stream”. The new sentence might read: In accordance with DFO and Environment Canada guidance, the following are examples of measures that will be applied during the construction of the AWAR whenever in or near a waterbody or watercourse.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-13	Surface water management plan. Volume 2, Tables 2-29, Table 7 and Table 8 Mine Development Sequence. Page 9 -10.	There is much discrepancy between Tables 2-29 and Table 8. DFO would like for the proponent to provide clarification as to whether dewatering will be required for waterbody H13 and H19. DFO would like to confirm that the construction of the sump in H1 basin is for the water management facility. Clarify which waterbodies are to receive waste rock. Clarify why H8, A7 and other similarly ‘reduced’ waterbodies/watercourses are not included in calculations of impacts.	See detailed response provided in attachment

REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
DFO-14	SD 2-6 Surface Water Management Plan, page 10-30	The proponent to provide clarification as to exactly which waterbodies will require dewatering/lowering/removal to facilitate the WRSF, how Agnico calculated these reductions in volume, and to address discrepancies in anticipated water level reductions (ex for Lake A6). DFO is also recommending that inconsistencies between Tables be corrected.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-15	SD 2-14 Explosives Management Plan	P. 10 – The first bullet should be reworded to reflect guidance provided by DFO on the use of explosives and reference the Measures to Avoid Causing Harm to Fish and Fish Habitat available on DFO’s website. Also, reference should be made to the NWT/Nunavut directive on overpressures from explosives not to exceed 50 kPa P. 10 – The second bullet should read: No explosive is to be detonated that produces, or is likely to produce, a peak particle velocity greater than 13 mm/s in a spawning bed during the period of egg incubation. P. 10, second bullet – Arctic Grayling is a spring spawning species and it has been listed as species found in Meliadine Lake and surrounding area. The proponent should amend its spawning period to cover both spring and fall spawning species.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-16	SD 3-1 Public Engagement and Consultation	P. 21, Backfilling of selected open pits with waste rock – the proponent needs to refer to the appropriate document, i.e. Conceptual Fisheries Protection and Offsetting Plan. P. 27, first bullet – Fisheries and Oceans Canada’s engagement wording should be amended to reflect the amended Fisheries Act requirements. P. 35, Effects of surface and underground blasting on lakes and fish – according to the “Guidelines for the use of explosives in or near Canadian fisheries waters, 1998”, No explosive is to be detonated that produces, or is likely to produce, a peak particle velocity greater than 13 mm/s in a spawning bed during the period of egg incubation, not 12mm/s as Agnico states. Please correct this number.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-17	P.7-326, second and fourth paragraph P.7-355, third paragraph P.7-409, first paragraph	Remove repetitive sentences. Clarify which overwintering habitat will be accessible to fish during all stages of the mine (e.g. construction, preproduction, mining, closure and post-closure). Adjust the FEIS to accurately account for permanent alterations to fish habitat as per DFO’s definition, and duration of impacts (e.g. lifespan of mining activities – not temporary).	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-18	P.7-408 to 413, Connectivity of fish habitat, P.7-418, the three bullets and P. 7-446, last paragraph	Consider the connectivity of all fish species listed in Schedule I (i.e. species of game fish) of the Northwest Territories Fishery Regulations and fish that support those fish.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-19	P.7-426 – The third bullet and P. 7-426 – The forth bullet	Reference should be to guidance for the use of explosives in or near Canadian fisheries waters in the Measures to Avoid Causing Harm to Fish and Fish Habitat available on DFO’s website, and to ensure that instantaneous pressure change does not exceed 50kPa or a peak particle velocity greater than 13 mm/s in a spawning bed during the period of egg incubation.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-20	SD 7-3 Conceptual Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan, page 6-20 Volume 7-Freshwater Environment Page 7-428 last paragraph	Clarify effects to quality of fish habitat in the AEMP; add fish habitat as affected by dust from blasting; consider all fish listed in the NWT Regulations; and consider sedimentation as a component of AEMP; and, DFO would like Agnico to include more than two reference lakes in the Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-21	Conceptual Fisheries Protection and Offsetting Plan. Table 3-3 p.40 Fishery Values for Fish Species per Ecotype.	Clarify why Meliadine Lake was included in the Offsetting calculations while not proposed to be impacted by the Project directly, and clarify why no value was assigned to species that support the fisheries.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-22	Conceptual Fisheries Protection and Offsetting Plan. Table 2-9: Lakes and Ponds Affected by B7 Waste Rock Storage Facility	In order to make conclusions on the acceptability of the Final Offsetting Plan during the regulatory phase, Agnico to confirm that waterbodies not fished will be sampled prior to the regulatory phase, and Agnico will review it’s tables for consistency.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-23	SD 7-4 – Conceptual No Net Loss Plan 5.3.1 Gains from Stream Habitat Alteration Section 5.3.3 SD 7-4 Offsetting Plan P.65 of SD 7-4 FEIS Offsetting Plan	Agnico’s calculations of losses and gains with respect to stream habitat alterations and diversions is not clear to DFO. Can Agnico elaborate on how calculations of losses and gains were reached, and was any consideration given to the time lag and water quality issues associated with flows received from an end pit lake and the sheer number of years of productivity lost until such time as connections can be re-established? This seems a large assumption of gains when the water quality and subsequent fish repopulation, minus loss in productivity during mining operations, is largely to be determined through detailed post-operations monitoring.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-24	FEIS Offsetting Plan	Elaborate on the calculations of loss versus gain associated with these activities.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-25	Conceptual Fisheries Protection and Offsetting Plan, Table 2-13	DFO would like clarification from Agnico on why H2 was considered low risk, and thus not included in Offsetting calculations.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-26	Conceptual Offsetting Plan	Clarify why impacts to the marine fisheries environment were not considered in the Offsetting Plan and what mitigation and avoidance measures are proposed for construction in the marine environment.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-27	The Conceptual Offsetting Plan Section 3.1 Overview; Section 4.1.2	Agnico to clarify references to disruption and permanent alterations to align with the amended Fisheries Act, and include these waterbodies in consideration for fish out protocol plan development.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-28	Conceptual Offsetting Plan	Agnico review the Fisheries Protection Policy Statement and Proponent’s Guide to Offsetting to ensure all conditions are met when developing a finalized Offsetting Plan ready for the Regulatory phase. Specifically in relation to the Guide to Offsetting, Agnico has not yet included information to outline a description of monitoring measures, a timeline for implementation or an estimate of the cost to implement the plan. This more detailed updated plan will need to be submitted along with Agnico’s Application for Fisheries Act Authorization in the Regulatory phase.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-29	Offsetting Plan	DFO refers Agnico to DFO’s original DEIS request, and recommends that conclusions in the FEIS be based on definitions of fisheries as provided in the amended Fisheries Act.’	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-30	Offsetting Plan, the Project Table 4-1	Clarify Table 4-1 to indicate whether LKTR are present or not and elaborate on how a local extirpation is within baseline values – what is currently affecting the lake so as to result in local extirpation?	See detailed response provided in attachment





REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
DFO-31	Offsetting Plan	With consideration to the above quoted literature on fisheries productivity and end pit lake scenarios, can Agnico elaborate on the proposed staging of end pit lake construction to provide for fisheries productivity during mining operations and post closure? What steps will Agnico take to ensure the feasibility of their proposed end pit lake offsetting to ensure fisheries productivity and future use by recreational and Aboriginal fishers?	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-32	Offsetting Plan, page 2, last paragraph	DFO recommends adding death of fish as an element to be addressed in the offsetting plan. Suggestion that reference state that "...offsetting measures will be required to offset death of fish, fish habitat altered and/or destroyed by Project development.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-33	Offsetting Plan, P. 2, last paragraph; P. 9, first paragraph; P. 9, third paragraph; P. 10, first paragraph; P. 10, second paragraph; P. 15, Table 2-5 lakes and ponds affected by open pits in the Pump deposit	Provide clarification on the difference between the two tables. Also, explain why pond B60 is not listed as an impacted waterbody in table 2-29	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-34	P. 21, Section 2.2.3 A45 Waste Rock Storage Facility	Provide clarification on this statement: "Dewatering will be an effect on fish and fish habitat as a permanent alteration."	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-35	P. 27, Section 2.4 Tailings Storage Facility, Table 2-19	Considering that ninespine stickleback was captured it should be listed as habitat lost in Volume SD 7-4 Conceptual Fisheries Protection and Offsetting Plan and listed in Schedule 2 of the Mineral Mining Effluent Regulations. Section 36 of the Fisheries Act applies to all fish and not only fish that are part of or support a commercial, recreational or Aboriginal fishery.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-36	P. 29, fourth bullet; P. 29, seventh bullet	The Proponent should consider all fish that are listed in Schedule I (i.e. species of game fish) of the Northwest Territories Fishery Regulations and for fish that support them.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-37	P. 31, 32, 34 and 39	Given that overwintering is only one of several types of fish habitat required to support fish, Meliadine Lake is not the only lake capable of supporting a fishery in the project area. Also, all fish that are listed in Schedule I (i.e. species of game fish) of the Northwest Territories Fishery Regulations and the fish that supports need to be considered in the assessment of impacts on fisheries resources.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-38	P. 35, section 3.2 HEP Model	That migration and nursery habitat be considered as important and as per the definition of Fish Habitat under the Fisheries Act. Clarify how fish biomass was evaluated for waterbodies that were not sampled, and where fish presence is suspected (e.g. A2a, A3 and A4).	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-39	P. 59 – section 5.2.2 Habitat Restoration	Confirm that only lakes A8 and B5 are being referred to here and not ponds A2, A2a, A3, A4 and A5 given there is no increase for these ponds when comparing the information from habitat loss and habitat restored. P. 77, section 7.1 Objective and Components – Clarify that basic fish and fish habitat data was collected and not only biological data.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-40	Risk Management Technical Memorandum in the SD 7-4 Offsetting Plan	Update the Risk Management Technical Memorandum portion of the Offsetting Plan to be consistent with the New Fisheries Protection Policy.	Agreed to in principle
DFO-41	FEIS	Agnico evaluate conclusions of the FEIS to be consistent with DFO Policy as previously recommended in the DEIS review. This would require revision to Offsetting Calculations and Tables throughout the FEIS.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-42	Volume 9 pages 9-53 to -9-65; and Section 9.3.1.5.1.3	Agnico to revise the FEIS conclusions of Fishery Value and the Offsetting Plan to consider the Aboriginal fishery to be consistent with the definitions in the Fisheries Protection Policy and Nunavut Land Claims Agreement. The Aboriginal Fishery is not limited to the preference of one community, but rather 'means that fish is harvested by an Aboriginal organization or any of its members for the purpose of using the fish as food, for social or ceremonial purposes or for purposes set out in a land claim agreement. . . ' The FEIS itself contains information gathered through consultations that indicate the Aboriginal fishery is not limited to just Arctic Grayling, Lake Trout and Arctic Char as stated above.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-43	FEIS and Offsetting Plan	Agnico to revise the FEIS and Offsetting Plan considerations of recreational Fishery to be consistent with DFO's Fisheries Protection Policy definitions rather than state there is no recreational fishery, which is not accurate. Legally, there is a recreational fishery in Nunavut as it outlined in the NWT Regulations.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-44	Volume 8, P. 8-75, section 8.3.2.2.1.4 Species at Risk – In table 8.3-6	Provide clarification as to why the Killer Whale was not included.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-45	Volume 11, P. 11-27, section 11.4 Adaptive Management	Amend the name of the SD 7-4 document since it is no longer the No Net Loss Plan on p.11-27 of Volume 11.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-46	FEIS	Ensure consistency in the FEIS when using the word 'ponds' and 'lakes' as the utilization alternates for the same waterbody throughout the FEIS; the same comment applies to use of km vs ha.	See detailed response provided in attachment
DFO-47	fish baseline study done in 2012	Provide clarification as to the exact location of documents such as the baseline study referenced in the FEIS.	See detailed response provided in attachment

REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
6.1.1	Volume 5, Subsection 5.2.5.5.1, Table 5.2-33	The Proponent states that it used “published emission factors” to calculate emissions. What emission factors were used? Please provide references?EC recommends that the Proponent provide details on the shipping emission estimates. The details should include information on the emission factors and assumptions used in the calculations and information on emissions from support vessels.	See detailed response provided in attachment
6.1.2	Volume 2, SD 2-12: Incineration Management Plan	EC recommends that: a) If the Proponent plans to incinerate sewage sludge, it provide the Board a letter from the manufacturer stating that the incinerator is designed to incinerate sewage sludge. The letter should include previous stack testing results demonstrating that the incinerator can achieve the Canada-wide Standards for Dioxins and Furans while incinerating sewage sludge. b) The Proponent complete stack emission testing for all incinerators to ensure achievement of the Canada-wide Standards for Dioxins and Furans and the Canada-wide Standards for Mercury. The stack tests should be completed using the waste streams, including sewage sludge, proposed by the Proponent.	Agreed to in principle
6.2.1	Volume 2, Subsection 2.6.3.3. Waste Water Treatment Facilities Page 204; SD 2-6 Subsection 7.3 Treatment Options Volume 2, Subsection 2.6.3 Waste Management Facilities, Subsection 2.6.3.1, Waste Rock Storage Facilities Page 187	EC acknowledges that AEM identified the potential for ammonia concentrations to be a concern and would be prepared to implement mitigation measures. EC recommends that monitoring of source concentrations (e.g., blasting/minewater sumps, seepage, TSF supernatant) be done during early construction and operations and the water quality model updated with monitoring data to predict nitrogen species concentrations over time and to identify concerns early enough for mitigation to be implemented.	Agreed to in principle
6.2.2	Volume 2, Subsection 2.6.1.4; Subsection 2.6.1.5 Mining – Open Pits; Environmental Management Page 130; Volume 7: Appendix 7.4-A Water and Sediment Quality Model, Table 7.4-A24 Preliminary Maximum Allowable Effluent Concentrations • SD 2-6 Surface Water Management Plan Section 7.6.1Water Quality Operation Phase; Appendix C Mine Site Water Quality Predictions	EC recommends the following with regards to effluent quality: • That the Proponent monitor water quality from Year 3 onwards for all source waters that report to waterbody AP-01 and use data for total metals to periodically re-run the water quality model, or otherwise update predictions in order to inform both operational and closure planning; • That Table 7.4-A24 be updated with an additional column showing predicted effluent quality for each parameter (minimum, maximum and median) over life of mine. This will be useful for developing effluent quality criteria and further refinement of edge of mixing zone concentration targets; and • Thresholds should be identified that would trigger implementation of further treatment for AP-01 discharges and included in an adaptive management plan.	See detailed response provided in attachment
6.2.3	Volume 2, Subsection 2.6.1.9 Tiriganiaq Underground Mine Dewatering Page 169-170; SD 2-1 Project Alternatives Subsection 5.10 Salt Water Management	EC recommends that disposal of treatment brine residuals be done such that there are no impacts to fish-bearing waters. If the Proponent is going to give further consideration to the marine option, full characterization of effluent and receiving waters should be done and an assessment of impacts carried out.	Agreed to in principle
6.2.4	Volume 2, Subsection 2.6.3.3. Waste Water Treatment Facilities Page 202; Volume 7, Subsection 7.2.2.6 Permafrost SD 2-6 Table 16 Water Balance; Section 4.6 Tiriganiaq Area; Appendix C Mine Site Water Quality Predictions	EC recommends that salinity in Lake B4 and its effects on permafrost stability be considered.	See detailed response provided in attachment
6.2.5	Volume 2, Table 2-33, Page 173; Table 2-34, and Table 2-35 Page 174; SD 7-3 Conceptual Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan (AEMP)	EC recommends: • A more comprehensive approach to selecting parameters that will be monitored for operational purposes; and • A working group be set up to further develop the AEMP in advance of construction.	See detailed response provided in attachment
6.3.1	SD 2-16 Spill Contingency Plan; SD 8-2 Oil Pollution Emergency Plan; and SD 2-15 Risk Management and Emergency Response Plan.	EC recommends that the Proponent undertake: a) Shoreline characterization and segmentation work within the Melvin Bay area, including Itivia Harbor and Panorama Island, that includes the ship-to-ship fuel transfer area of operations; and b) Environmental sensitivity mapping of biological and ecological resources within the intertidal areas of Melvin Bay.	Agreed to in principle - Need to understand limits of such work
6.3.2	SD 2-16 Spill Contingency Plan; SD 8-2 Oil Pollution Emergency Plan; and SD 2-15 Risk Management and Emergency Response Plan.	EC recommends that the Proponent develop other potential scenario descriptions that may better represent a worst case incident presenting potential impacts to receiving water bodies, which may better help to “identify potential risk areas” such as marine shorelines, rivers or waterway crossings.	See detailed response provided in attachment
6.3.3	SD 2-16 Spill Contingency Plan; SD 8-2 Oil Pollution Emergency Plan; and SD 2-15 Risk Management and Emergency Response Plan.	EC recommends that the Proponent: a) Undertake hydrologic trajectory modeling for potential spilled diesel product for the fuel transfer area of operations within Melvin Bay, the access passage area, and the area surrounding Panorama Island; and b) As a best practice, pre-deploy containment boom for all fuel transfers from the small tanker to the onshore transfer point at Itivia Harbour. Alternatively, that specific criteria be developed as a precautionary protective measure for the pre-deployment of containment boom for ship-to-shore fuel transfer activities.	See detailed response provided in attachment

REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
6.4.1	FEIS SD 8-1 Shipping Management Plan EC submission for the DEIS, Technical Review Comment 125 (as submitted), Commitment 75 EC submission for the DEIS, Technical Review Comment 125 (as submitted), commitment 76 List of Commitments from NIRB's Technical Meeting for AEM's Meliadine Project (NIRB File 11MN034)	EC recommends that the setback distances be included in the Shipping Management Plan.	Agreed to in principle
6.4.2	FEIS Volume 2 Project Description Subsection 2.2 FEIS Volume 4 Impact Assessment Subsection 4.5.2.4 FEIS Volume 8 Marine Environment Subsection 8.3.6.1	EC recommends that the Proponent include the Mary River Project when assessing cumulative effects on Marine Birds in Hudson Strait, including annual reporting.	See detailed response provided in attachment
6.4.3	FEIS SD 8-1 Shipping Management Plan, Subsections 4.2 and 4.3 FEIS SD 8-1 Shipping Management Plan, Appendix B	EC recommends that: a) The data presented during annual reporting include observations of marine birds; vessel-marine bird interactions; and observations of large congregations of birds; and b) AEM/shipping contractors use well-established methodology for recording marine bird data to ensure it is comparable to existing baseline data and can be integrated with regional databases on seabird distribution in support of cumulative effects monitoring.	Agreed to in principle
6.4.4	FEIS Volume 8 Marine Environment, Subsection 8.3.6.6.1	EC recommends that monitoring of spills should include reporting of the presence of oily sheens on the water near vessels at the port site and mitigation measures be implemented to reduce these discharges.	Agreed to in principle
6.4.5	SD 2-16 Spill Contingency Plan	EC recommends that AEM identify the steps that would be taken to protect wildlife (including marine birds) in the event of a spill and incorporate this into the Meliadine Gold Project Spill Contingency Plan.	See detailed response provided in attachment
6.4.6	FEIS Volume 8 Marine Environment, Subsection 8.33.6.4.1; Merkel, F.R., and Johansen, K.L. 2011. Light-induced bird strikes on vessels in Southwest Greenland. Marine Pollution Bulletin 62: 2330-2336.	EC recommends that: a) A vessel is checked for bird strikes after a suspected event; b) Wildlife monitoring reports include information on any bird collisions with vessels, specifically the date, time, spatial coordinates, wind speed and direction, visibility, precipitation, sea state, number of birds found dead or injured on the deck and on the water, and whether search lights or vessel lighting were active at the time; c) Where collisions occur more than once during the same period, at the same location or under similar meteorological conditions, adaptive management should be implemented to attempt to reduce the likelihood of collisions occurring in the future; and d) AEM consult with EC to determine suitable adaptive management and mitigation measures as well as consider the suitability of mitigation measures outlined by Merkel and Johansen (2011).	Agreed to in principle
6.4.7	FEIS Volume 8 Marine Environment, Subsection 8.3.4 Pathway Analysis	EC recommends that ship speed be reduced sufficiently to ensure that wakes are equal or less than the mean natural seasonal wave height to prevent wake action from negatively impacting migratory bird nests in low lying shoreline habitat.	See detailed response provided in attachment
6.4.8	FEIS SD 6-4 Terrestrial Environment Management and Monitoring Plan, Section 3.1.4; FEIS Volume 8 Marine Environment, Subsection 8.3.2.2.1.4	EC recommends that: a) Species listed on other SARA Schedules or under consideration for listing on SARA, including those designated as at risk by COSEWIC, be considered in the assessment in a similar manner, including the Harlequin Duck; and b) The Spill Contingency Plan include mitigation measures to avoid adverse effects to species at risk and migratory birds (including Harlequin Ducks) from spills as well as details regarding monitoring of effects of a spill on species at risk and migratory birds.	See detailed response provided in attachment
6.4.9	FEIS SD 6-4 Terrestrial Environment Management and Monitoring Plan, Subsection 3.1.4	EC recommends that: a) Scientifically sound approaches be used to determine the likelihood that migratory birds, their nests or eggs are present in a particular location; b) Where further investigation is required to determine the presence of breeding birds, an area search for evidence of nesting be undertaken using non-intrusive search methods to prevent disturbance; c) The Proponent use the setback distances outlined in the Terrestrial Environment Management and Monitoring Plan (Subsection 3.1.4 Migratory Bird Protection) to establish buffer zones to protect any nests found or indicated nests; and d) Information on the success of these mitigation measures be included in annual wildlife monitoring reports.	Agreed to in principle
6.4.10	FEIS Volume 6 Terrestrial Environment, Subsection 6.7.4.2; FEIS SD 6-4 Terrestrial Environment Management and Monitoring Plan, Section 3.1.4 Diavik Diamond Mines Inc. (DDMI) 2011. Wildlife Monitoring Program Report – 2010. 115 pp.	EC recommends: a) That mitigation measures are implemented to prevent the use of water attenuation ponds by waterfowl and waterbirds; and b) Monitoring is conducted to determine the use of the water bodies (observations documented) and whether further mitigation measures or deterrent measures are required.	Agreed to in principle



REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
6.4.11	FEIS Volume 2 – Project Description, Subsection 2.6.11.3	EC recommends that: a) Unguyed communication towers be used to reduce the risk of bird collisions; b) The Proponent consider different lighting types in order to reduce the attraction of birds; and c) AEM consult with EC regarding best management practices to minimize bird collisions with communication towers.	Agreed to in principle - not sure that unguyed towers are always feasible in this area of Nunavut but where feasible we will try and avoid use of guy wires
6.4.12	FEIS Volume 2 Project Description, Appendix B: Air Traffic Management Plan;  FEIS SD 6-4 Terrestrial Environment Management and Monitoring Plan, Subsection 3.1.2	In order to reduce aircraft disturbance to migratory birds, EC recommends that the Proponent, subject to pilot discretion regarding safety, ensure aircraft: • Fly at times when few birds are present (e.g., early spring, late fall, winter) and minimize flights during particularly sensitive periods (i.e., during migration, nesting, and moulting); • That must fly when birds are present, plan flight paths to minimize flights over habitat known or likely to have birds and maintain a minimum flight altitude of 650 metres (2,100 feet); • Avoid known concentrations of birds (e.g., bird colonies, moulting areas) by a lateral distance of at least 1.5 kilometres. If avoidance is not possible, maintain a minimum flight altitude of 1,100 metres (3,500 feet) over these areas; • Avoid areas used by flocks of migrating waterfowl by three kilometres; • Avoid excessive hovering or circling over areas known or likely to have birds; and • Pilots are informed of these recommendations and of areas known to have birds.	Under consideration - Unsure how this would apply at Rankin Inlet airport - Are airport activities governed by such rules now?
6.4.13	FEIS SD 2-5 Environmental Management and Protection Plan;  FEIS SD 2-11 Landfill and Waste Management Plan, Subsection 4.2;  FEIS SD 6-4 Terrestrial Environment Management and Monitoring Plan, Subsection 3.1.3;  FEIS SD 6-4 Terrestrial Environment Management and Monitoring Plan, Appendix III	EC recommends that AEM: a) Consult the document “Preventing Wildlife Attraction to Northern Industrial Sites” (Canadian Wildlife Service 2007) which details mitigation methods such as installing bird spikes on horizontal surfaces, particularly near heat sources, reducing sheltered surfaces that could provide nest sites, establishing proper waste management practices and reducing the ability of terrestrial predators to den underneath buildings. EC will provide the Proponent a copy of the aforementioned document upon request; b) Implement mitigation measures and monitoring programs to limit the attraction of predators and scavengers to project facilities as outlined in the Terrestrial Environment Management and Monitoring Plan and the Landfill and Waste Management Plan. This should be done as the Environment Protection Plan (within SD 2-5 Environmental Management and Protection Plan; Section 2: Activity-based Operational Standards) is developed prior to construction of all phases of the Project; and c) Refer to the above comments and previous submissions with advice regarding minimizing potential effects of the Project on migratory birds.	Agreed to in principle
6.4.14	FEIS Volume 2 Project Description, Subsection 2.6.1.8;  FEIS SD 2-6 Surface Water Management Plan, Subsection 3.2.1;  FEIS Volume 6 Terrestrial Environment, Subsection 6.4.2.2.2;  FEIS SD 6-4 Terrestrial Environment Management and Monitoring Plan, Subsection 3.1.3;  FEIS Volume 7 Freshwater Environment, Subsection 7.5.5;  EC submission for the DEIS, Technical Review Comment 130 (as submitted)	EC recommends that mitigation measures, such as dewatering outside of periods where there is high migratory bird use of these ponds (i.e., nesting, brood rearing and/or migration periods) and to describe these measures s in Table 6.7-21 and Section 6.7.4.2 of Volume 6 Terrestrial Environment and Subsections 3.1.3 Project-related Mortality and 3.1.4 Migratory Bird Protection of SD 2-6 Terrestrial Environment Monitoring and Mitigation Plan. In addition, EC recommends mitigation measures be provided in the fish salvage plan and implemented during field activities.	Agreed to in principle
6.4.15	FEIS Volume 6 Terrestrial Environment, Subsections 3.0 and 6.7.3.2.1;  AEM’s response to EC IR 132 (as submitted)	EC recommends that the error with regards to shorebird species classification be corrected in forthcoming reports and management plans (Migratory Bird monitoring through PRISM).	Agreed to in principle

REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
TC-1	Volume 2 Project Description, section 2.6.5.5: Interactions, Potential Effects and Mitigation Measures During Marine Shipping	Transport Canada recommends AEM provide details on what mitigation measures will be conveyed to the vessels employed. In addition to the above recommendation, Transport Canada recommends AEM make clear that the proposed mitigation measures employed by vessels when approaching marine wildlife are, 'subject to safe navigation considerations as determined by the Master of the vessel'.	See detailed response provided in attachment
TC-2	Volume 8, SD-8-1, Page 5 Shipping Management Plan 1.3 Lightering Procedures - 1.3.1 Dry Cargo	Transport Canada recommends AEM note that they (or their contractors) must comply with the Cargo Fumigation and Tackle Regulations (CFTR) for lifting appliances.	See detailed response provided in attachment
TC-3	Volume 8, SD-8-2, Oil Pollution Emergency Plan	Transport Canada recommends that AEM provide an updated and compliant OPEP to Transport Canada prior to the commencement of the Project. Transport Canada recommends AEM provide details of outside response resources without incorporating CCG resources to respond to a larger spill.	See detailed response provided in attachment
TC-4	Volume 2, Section 2.6.2.1 Rankin Inlet Fuel Storage Area, Page 183	Transport Canada recommends AEM comply with the requirements of the safety standards for highway tanks as referenced in the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations.	Agreed to in principle
TC-5	Volume 2, Section 2.6.5.4 Shipping Routes and General Lightering Procedures at Itivia Harbour Explosives and Hazardous Materials, Page 257	Transport Canada recommends AEM comply with the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act, 1992 and Regulations.	Agreed to in principle
TC-6	Volume 2 SD 2-13 Hazardous Materials Management Plan, Section 4.3 Cyanide Transport, Page 10	Transport Canada recommends AEM comply with Section 7 Emergency Response Assistance Plans of the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act, 1992.	Agreed to in principle
TC-7	Volume 2 SD 2-14 Explosives Management Plan, Section 3.1 Transport, Page 8	Transport Canada recommends AEM comply with the requirements of the safety standards for highway tanks as referenced in the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations.	Agreed to in principle
TC-8		Transport Canada recommends AEM comply with Section 7 Emergency Response Assistance Plans of the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act, 1992.	Agreed to in principle

REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
NRCan - 1	Explosives Manufacture and Storage, Emulsion Plant-	NRCan notes that the new Explosives Regulations, 2013, are in force and are applicable to this project. Additionally, NRCan has updated its Guidelines for Bulk Explosives Facilities: Minimum Requirements. NRCan has the following recommendation for NIRB's consideration: 1. The proponent or its explosives contractor should consult these guidelines for the development of their explosives manufacturing facilities.	Agreed to in principle
NRCan - 2	Access Road and Borrow Site Development- NIRB Guidelines: 6.0 (6.6.7), 7.3, 7.6, 8.1.4, 8.1.5 FEIS: Vol 1 (sec. 2.3, 6.2, 6.3, Table 1.0-A-3), Vol. 2 (inc. SD 2-4A, 2-4B, 2-9, 2-10), Vol. 6 (inc. SD 6-1)	The proponent has agreed to consider NRCan's recommendation. The department has included this recommendation for the NIRB's consideration: 2. The proponent should conduct additional site specific geotechnical investigations in areas of sensitive terrain along the road alignment, where necessary to support detailed design and implementation of mitigation techniques to reduce terrain impacts such as ground movements, drainage changes and erosion.	Agreed to in principle
NRCan - 3	Mine waste storage facility design and stability- NIRB Guideline: 6.0 (6.1, 6.6), 7.3, 7.6, 8.1.4, 8.16, 9.4.6 FEIS: Vol. 1 (sec 2, 2.3, 5, 6.2, 6.3, Table 1.0-A-3), Vol. 2 (inc. SD 2-3, 2-8, 2-17), Vol 5, Vol. 6 (sec. 6.3, App. 6.3, SD 6-1), Vol. 7 Response to NRCan IR-139, 140, Response to AANDC IR-13, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 32, 34, 47, Response to EC IR-105	The proponent has agreed to consider NRCan's recommendations. The department has included these recommendations for the NIRB's consideration: 3. The proponent should conduct the more detailed thermal analysis to support detailed design of the dikes and the tailings storage facility including seepage and stability analysis. 4. The proponent should conduct additional analysis to determine the extent of talik at B7 which considers the effect of nearby water bodies to support the thermal analysis for the TSF design. 5. The proponent should conduct thermal analysis utilizing site specific conditions to support detailed design for the WRSF to determine that the proposed cover thickness is adequate to maintain the active layer in the NAG cover. 6. The proponent should develop and implement an effective monitoring program for TSF and WRSFs (including dikes) that includes elements to monitor the thermal condition and stability of these facilities (including deformation of the cover), to determine whether adjustments are required during operation to ensure the facilities perform as intended.	Agreed to in principle
NRCan - 4	Borehole M11-1257 and the Westbay monitoring well Volume 7, Appendix 7.2-C	NRCan has the following recommendation for the NIRB's consideration: 7. The proponent should tabulate water pressure, density and fresh water head data together for both past and future measurements (as discussed in the next section).	Agreed to in principle
NRCan - 5	Hydrogeological conditions: hydraulic head- FEIS: Volume 7 Appendices 7.2-A, 7.2-C and 7.2-D table 7.2-2 Section 7.2.4	Although some progress has been made in the purging of drilling fluids from monitoring well M11-1257, complete purging will provide greater confidence in fresh water head measurements by restoring the water densities in the borehole to those of the surrounding groundwater. Measured water pressures, estimated densities (via measured conductance or total dissolved solids), and calculated fresh water heads should be tabulated and reported together for every round of measurements (past and future). Interpretation could include calculating vertical gradients with respect to both Lakes B7 and D7 but should also include the calculation of vertical gradients between the measurement ports. NRCan previous recommendations made during the DEIS review are still appropriate and are presented below for the NIRB's consideration: 8. The proponent should document its methods for monitoring of hydraulic head and re-collect reliable head measurements to validate the conceptual and numerical models, during project development.	Agreed to in principle
NRCan - 6	Conceptual groundwater flow model - FEIS: Volume 7, figures 7.2-B8, 7.2-B9 and 7.2-B10, Section 7.2.4	In order to better define vertical and horizontal groundwater flow and obtain data that would contribute to the verification of conceptual and numerical models, NRCan presents the following recommendations for the NIRB's consideration: 9. AEM should use current and proposed new data to verify the conceptual model and validate the numerical model. 10. AEM should, where appropriate, collect new hydraulic data (e.g. from new monitoring wells) in key areas during the pre-development, construction and operation phases to better define vertical and horizontal groundwater flow.	Agreed to in principle
NRCan - 7	Saline water management- FEIS: Volume 2; SD 2-1	NRCan presents the following recommendation for the NIRB's consideration: 11. The proponent's development and implementation of its saline water management plan should recognize that there is uncertainty in the prediction of saline water inflow, and adapt as more data on groundwater quantities and flow are collected.	Agreed to in principle
NRCan - 8	Tailings Characterization and Management- FEIS: SD 2-8, SD 6-3.	NRCan presents the following recommendation, which applies to the overall review of the information related to acid rock generation/metal leaching and waste management, for the NIRB's consideration: 12. The proponent should conduct continuous monitoring and validation of the predicted behaviour of waste rock and tailings during the operations and make adjustments, as appropriate, for closure planning.	Agreed to in principle



REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
4.0	Structure of report	The Proponent's adaptive management strategy is defined in the FEIS with reference to the identified VEC/VSECs. The Proponent's strategy is still conceptual in nature and does not provide VEC-specific strategies. It is suggested that VEC/VSEC specific strategies be provided to regulators for their review and consideration prior to the regulatory approval of the Environmental Management Plan.	Agreed to in principle
4.1	DEIS Volume 1, Part 1, page 23 Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement For Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.'s Meliadine Project (NIRB File No. 11MN034), Guidelines 9.4.6 and 9.4.7 Response provided to IR #20 Response to TC #3	INSUFFICIENT GEOTHERMAL ANALYSIS AND MONITORING PLAN OF PERMAFROST TEMPERATURES AND THICKNESS AANDC recommends that a detailed analysis of the influence of stockpiling of waste rock on permafrost under and around the stockpile area is conducted by the Proponent at the upcoming detailed design phase of the Project's development (feasibility studies and regulatory process).  AANDC recommends that the Proponent prepare a permafrost map showing permafrost temperature, thickness of seasonal thaw, and amount of ground ice in the terrains which are present at the mine site during the upcoming detailed design phase of the Project's development.	Agreed to in principle
4.2	FEIS Volume 2, SD 2-3 Tailings Storage Facility Preliminary Design, Section 4.7 FEIS Volume 2, SD 2-17 Preliminary Mine Closure and Reclamation Plan, Section 5.4.2 Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement For Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.'s Meliadine Project (NIRB File No. 11MN034), Guideline 9.4.6 Refer to IR #13 Response to TC #8	POTENTIAL LONG-TERM EFFECT OF TAILINGS STORAGE FACILITY IF TAILINGS THAW AANDC recommends that additional information on potential environmental effects due to post-closure failure of the geomembrane while tailings are in a thawed state be provided during the upcoming detailed design phase of the Project's development. This information should include a discussion of the potential environmental issues which could arise, what measures the Proponent will have in place to monitor/detect environmental changes and an outline of the proposed mitigation measure the Proponent will employ.	Agreed to in principle
4.3	FEIS Volume 2, SD 2-6 Surface Water Management Plan, Section 8 FEIS Volume 7, Pg.7-271 FEIS Volume 2, SD2-6 Surface Water Management Tables Responses to TC #17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 73	INSUFFICIENT DETAIL REGARDING SURFACE WATER QUALITY MONITORING AANDC has noted the Proponent's comment that Project-specific details for monitoring will be included in the water licence application. However, AANDC requests that the Proponent reference the Technical Comments provided during the review of the EIS as well as their commitments made in their Information Request responses in future water licence applications. AANDC requests that Proponent provide all details of the surface water monitoring plan (including sampling locations, compounds to be measured, and schedule) in future applications for water licences.	Agreed to in principle
4.4	FEIS Volume 2, SD 2-6, Surface Water Management Plan, Section 4.3 Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement For Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.'s Meliadine Project (NIRB File No. 11MN034), Guideline 8.1.7 Response to IR #45 Response to #24	INCOMPLETE DETAILS REGARDING SURFACE WATER MONITORING AANDC requests that the Proponent provide information on proposed methods and equipment that will be used to remove any blockages. A discussion is required outlining potential risks associated with missed blockages and the resulting overflows. This information should be submitted during the upcoming regulatory review phase of the development assessment process.	Agreed to in principle
4.5	FEIS Volume 2, SD 2-6 Surface Water Management Plan, Section 5.1 Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement For Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.'s Meliadine Project (NIRB File No. 11MN034), Guideline 8.1.7 Response to IR #4 Response to #23	POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF MELTING PERMAFROST ON THE SURFACE WATER ATTENUATION POND DESIGN AANDC recommends that an assessment of slope stability in dewatered lake basins be undertaken during the development of mine attenuation ponds. The slope stability should also be assessed during pond operation. Furthermore, an assessment of the presence or absence of permafrost under the lakes which will be dewatered should be undertaken prior to attenuation pond development as these water retention structures are better suited (i.e. more environmentally sound) in lake depressions underlain by permafrost. AANDC requests that the Proponent provide an assessment of lake slope stability for review prior to completion of the detailed design and issuance of Water Licences.	Agreed to in principle
4.6	FEIS Volume 2, SD 2-17, Section 5.7.2 Closure Methods and Strategies (FEIS Volume 2, SD 2-11, Section 1.3 Landfill Design, page 2, paragraph 4) Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement For Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.'s Meliadine Project (NIRB File No. 11MN034, Guideline 9.7.1 (& 9.4.7) Response to IR #44 (& IR #35)	INSUFFICIENT ATTENTION TO LEACHATE COLLECTION AT MINE LANDFILL AANDC recommends that the Proponent commit to designing the landfill to a recognized standard so that clear requirements can be determined and assessed for the design, operation and closure plans for the landfill during the upcoming regulatory review stage of the development assessment process.	Under consideration - need to know what standard is being referenced and if appropriate for the type of landfill proposed for the Meliadine Project where putrescible wastes are not being disposed off.

REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
4.7	FEIS Volume 6, SD 6-1 Permafrost Thermal Regime Baseline Studies, Section 2.3, Climate. Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement For Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.'s Meliadine Project (NIRB File No. 11MN034), Guideline 8.1.2.1 Response to IR #21 Response to #58	PROVISION OF A DETAILED PERMAFROST MAP TO FACILITATE A REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF PERMAFROST CONDITIONS AANDC suggests that the Proponent provide a detailed permafrost map for terrain units over the Project site. The permafrost map should show, at a minimum, permafrost temperature, thickness of seasonal thaw, and amount of ground ice. The map should also depict areas of terrain where mine development will not result in dramatic changes to soil stability as well as areas which may be more sensitive to construction activities. This map should be provided to regulatory authorities for review and discussion prior to approval of the water licences and land use authorizations.	Agreed to in principle
4.8	FEIS Volume 9, SD 9-2 Socio-Economic Management Plan, Sections 9.2.8, 9.4.6 and 9.5.6	COLLABORATIVE MONITORING AND MITIGATION OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS AANDC is proposing the following Terms and Conditions with respect to socio-economic monitoring: 1. The Proponent shall engage in the work of the Kivalliq Socio-Economic Monitoring Committee along with other agencies and affected communities, and it should endeavor to identify areas of mutual interest and priorities for inclusion into a collaborative monitoring framework that includes socio-economic priorities related to the Project, communities, and the Kivalliq region as a whole. Regional Kivalliq SEMC reports and frameworks will be submitted to NIRB's monitoring officer. 2. The Proponent, in collaboration with other monitoring groups, shall establish a socio-economic monitoring working group to meet Project specific monitoring requirements throughout the life of the Project. The working group shall agree on a Terms of Reference that outlines each member's roles and responsibilities within six (6) months of the issuance of a Project Certificate, and submit a copy to NIRB's Monitoring Officer. 3. The Proponent, in collaboration with other monitoring groups, shall develop a Meliadine socio-economic monitoring program that is designed to monitor the predicted impacts outlined in the FEIS as well as regional concerns identified by the Kivalliq SEMC. The program should include a process for adaptive management and mitigation in the event of unanticipated impacts. This process shall include other members of the socio-economic working group as appropriate. The first report should be submitted within one (1) year of the issuance of a Project Certificate and every March 31st thereafter.	Agreed to in principle
4.9	FEIS Volume 9, Section 9.4 Commitment #9	LABOUR FORCE ANALYSIS AND PROJECTIONS It is recommended that the Proponent work with the proposed Socio-Economic Monitoring Working Group identified in Technical Comment 4.8 Term and Condition #2 to include on-going monitoring of the labour force impacts of the project in the socio-economic monitoring program referred to in proposed Term and Condition #3.	Agreed to in principle
4.10	FEIS Volume 3, SD 3-1 Public Engagement and Consultation Baseline, Sections 4 – 7 Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement For Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.'s Meliadine Project (NIRB File No. 11MN034), Guidelines 7.1 and 7.7 Response to TC #54	UNCLEAR METHODOLOGY FOR SELECTING KEY COMMUNITY CONCERNS IN THE FEIS AANDC recommends that the Proponent verify that no key concerns are absent in Table 7-1 based on raw data from SD 3-1, particularly regarding communication policies, employment election processes and social impacts related to drug and alcohol abuse. Where there are absent key concerns, AANDC recommends the Proponent respond and provide commitments consistent with the format in SD 3-1, Table 7-1.	See detailed response provided in attachment
4.11	FEIS Volume 9, Sections 9.4.3.2.3 and 9.4.3.3.3 Pages 9-196 to 9-200. Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement For Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.'s Meliadine Project (NIRB File No. 11MN034), Guidelines 8.2.3.1 and 8.2.3.2 Response to TC #81	PROJECT IMPACTS ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING INFRASTRUCTURE It is recommended that the Proponent work with the members of the Socio-Economic Monitoring Working Group and the Kivalliq Socio-Economic Monitoring Committee referred to in Technical Comment 4.8 proposed Terms and Conditions #1 and #3 to review and monitor education utilization rate trends on an on-going basis to understand if the project is having an impact on the education system of the Kivalliq region and any communities in particular.	Agreed to in principle
4.12	FEIS Volume 9, Section 9.5.3.2.2 and 9.5.3.3.2 Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement For Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.'s Meliadine Project (NIRB File No. 11MN034), Guidelines 8.2.3.2 Response to TC #83	EFFECTS OF MINE CLOSURE ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING Considering any socio-economic impacts arising from temporary, final and post-closure phases are speculative, it is recommended that the Proponent include these phases and effects in their collaborative socio-economic monitoring program and apply mitigation measures as necessary. AANDC has recommended in Technical Comment 4.14 that explicit reference to the inclusion of temporary, pre-mature, closure and post-closure phases be included in the Terms of Reference for the Meliadine Socio-Economic Monitoring Working Group referred to in Technical Comment 4.8 proposed Term and Condition #2.	Agreed to in principle
4.13	Volume 9 Volume 4, Appendix 4.1-A Response to TC #84	LINKAGES BETWEEN VEC'S AND VSEC'S It is recommended that the Proponent work with the Socio-Economic Monitoring Working Group and the Kivalliq Socio-Economic Monitoring Committee referred to in Technical Comment 4.8 proposed Terms and Conditions #1 and #3 to collaboratively monitor the impacts of the project in areas of concern to communities, particularly areas related to harvesting, food security and traditional activities as applicable. It is recognized these VSEC's have multiple linkage points to various VEC's including components related to wildlife and environment.	Agreed to in principle
4.14	FEIS Volume 9, SD 9-2 Socio-Economic Management Plan, Sections 9.2.8, 9.4.6 and 9.5.6 Response to TC #86	COLLABORATIVE SOCIO-ECONOMIC MONITORING AND MITIGATION OF TEMPORARY, PRE-MATURE AND/OR FINAL CLOSURE In order to reflect the Proponent's commitments on page 20, the Terms of Reference for the Socio-Economic Monitoring Working Group referred to in Technical Comment 4.8 proposed Term and Condition #2 should also clearly identify that the term "throughout the life of the Project" includes post-closure of the Meliadine mine (planned or premature).	Agreed to in principle
4.15	FEIS Volume 9, SD-4 Human Resources Plan, Section 2.3 Access to Training Programs Response to TC #87	PROPOSED WORK READINESS AND LIFE SKILLS TRAINING PROGRAM The Proponent is encouraged to release any available information regarding training programs and plans in advance of the final hearing. Once training programs have commenced, the Proponent is encouraged to work with the Socio-Economic Working Group proposed in Technical Comment 4.8 Term and Condition #2 to monitor the training outcomes in the socioeconomic monitoring program proposed in Technical Comment 4.8 Term and Condition #3.	See detailed response provided in attachment



REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
TC AANDC-1	Volume 1, Popular Summary, page 1lxxiv, Paragraph 4	AANDC requests that the Proponent commit to providing statements in the summary and main body of the text that are consistent with the actual conditions and/or predicted conditions for surface water quality. RESPONSE: AANDC agrees with the response from the Proponent, however, there is no evidence of change in the FEIS. See 4.1 in Narrative Comments	See detailed response provided in attachment
TC AANDC-9	TC AANDC-9; Volume 2, SD2-3 Section 5.2 & Section 6.6; NIRB Guidelines 9.4.6; Response provided to IR33	AEM has committed to undertake a more thorough assessment of the tailings and dike design for detailed design (Type A water license). Response: See Narrative 4.1	Agreed to in principle
TC AANDC-12	TC AANDC-12; Volume 2, SD 2-5 Environmental Management and Protection Plan, Section 3.2; NIRB Guidelines 9.3; Response to IR#2	AANDC has noted the Proponent's response, but for clarity seeks additional consideration as noted in the Narrative Introduction.	See detailed response provided in attachment
TC AANDC-17	TC AANDC-17; Volume 2, SD 2-6 Surface Water Management Plan, Section 8, page 53, Paragraph 1; NIRB Guidelines 9.1; Refer to response to IR#4	Proposed downstream water quality monitoring locations are described in the AEMP. Detailed water quality monitoring plan design, including sampling stations, will be determined following consultation with communities and regulatory agencies, and will be included in the AEMP design document during the water licensing process. RESPONSE: See Introduction to Narrative Comments	Agreed to in principle



REC Number	Reference to FEIS	Recommendation	AEM Response
Panegoniak1	SD 2-9	I suggest, the mine to install roadside markers, with reflective night visible markers, to prevent workers from being lost, because of a blizzard. We have a few experiences with people getting lost while the blizzard hits, and some of them don't return. In order to prevent these types of accidents, I suggest the mine install roadside metal posts, with reflectors to guide the workers.	Agreed to in principle - this is what AEM did at Meadowbank