AGNICO EAGLE

August 28, 2026 NWB File No.: 2AM-MEL1631

Ali Shaikh
Nunavut Water Board
PO Box 119
Gjoa Haven, NU X0B 1J0

Re: Response to Second Round Comments to 2AM-MEL1631 Water Licence Amendment – Operational Update – Information Requests / Completeness Check

Dear Mr. Shaikh

In response to the second round of comments received on August 21, 2026 from the Nunavut Water Board (NWB) regarding the 2AM-MEL1631 Water Licence Amendment Information Requests, Agnico Eagle has provided responses to the outstanding comments received from the KivIA, DFO, and CIRNAC in the enclosed.

In our view, the information that has been provided to date is sufficient for the NWB to decide that the "information request" licensing stage is now complete, and that the file is now ready to move on to the "technical comment stage". We encourage the NWB to move forward based on the details that have been provided in this submission and the August 7, 2026 submission.

Should you have any questions or require further information, please contact the undersigned at your convenience. We look forward to continuing to the next stage in the process.

Regards,



Colleen Prather
colleen.prather@agnicoeagle.com
Superintendent, Permitting & Regulatory Affairs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS ii

KIVALLIQ INUIT ASSOCIATION (KivIA) 1

CROWN-INDIGENOUS RELATIONS AND NORTHERN AFFAIRS CANADA (CIRNAC) 5

ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE CANADA (ECCC) 10

FISHERIES AND OCEANS CANADA (DFO) 11

KIVALLIQ INUIT ASSOCIATION (KivIA)

Interested Party:	**KivIA**	**Rec No.:**	**KivIA-IR-1**
Re:	**Effects of traffic**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
a) Please provide the number of trips, return, for the increased fuel tanker traffic for the period of 2026-2036. This should be compared to the predicted traffic levels from the 2014 FEIS.

b) Please provide the number of trips, return, for the increased passenger vans/buses and transport trucks for the period 2026-2036. This should be compared to the to the predicted traffic levels from the 2014 FEIS.

c) Please provide details of how fuel trips will be scheduled between sea lift and caribou migration seasons and options for scheduling workforce shift changes during caribou migrations in the event of AWAR closures.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request (August 7, 2026):
Response to bullet a):
The 2014 FEIS, as summarized in Table 6-1 of the Roads Management Plan (Appendix 5-P), predicted approximately 8 round-trips per day by fuel trucks of 45,000 L capacity (equal to 5,840 one-way trips per year). Agnico Eagle does not expect to exceed the 2014 FEIS estimate of 5,840 one-way trips for fuel transport, even with the additional storage of fuel. For comparison, in 2025, traffic associated with fuel transport consisted of 2,909 one-way trips by fuel tankers (40,000 L) and 443 one-way trips by fuel trucks (15,000 L), for a total of 3,352 one-way fuel transport trips (Appendix 25 of the 2025 NWB Annual Report).

To provide context for this Application, the number of fuel transport trips can also be expressed in terms of fuel delivery capacity, noting that each tanker or truck has sufficient capacity to fully load the proposed storage tanks (e.g., total capacity of 20 ML onsite).

2014 FEIS Predictions	Current (2025) AWAR Monitoring
• Fuel Trucks: 5840/2 round trips x 45,000 L = **131.4 ML**	• Fuel Tankers: 2909/2 round trips x 40,000 L = 58 ML • Fuel Trucks: 443/2 round trips x 15,000 L = 3.3 ML **TOTAL = 61.5 ML**

Response to bullet b):
As described in the Roads Management Plan, traffic volumes on the AWAR are expected to remain generally consistent with those assessed in the 2014 FEIS. The proposed Operational Update primarily extends the mine life and does not materially increase the intensity of operations or associated passenger road traffic. Accordingly, current estimates remain consistent with the FEIS projections for passenger van/buses in Table 6-1 of the Roads Management Plan (Appendix 5-P of the Application).

Response to bullet c):
Fuel deliveries will continue to be managed through existing logistics planning and coordinated with caribou migration mitigation measures. The proposed increase in fuel storage capacity provides additional flexibility to maintain on-site fuel inventories during periods of temporary AWAR restrictions. In the event of AWAR closures during caribou migration, Agnico Eagle will continue to implement the TEMMP and associated road closure protocols. Operational contingencies may include adjusting delivery schedules, relying on on-site inventories, and modifying workforce transportation schedules as required. As the Operational Update primarily extends mine life and does not materially increase the intensity of operations, no changes to existing fuel delivery or workforce transportation practices are being proposed.

===

Request Made by Interested Party (August 21, 2026):
Bullet (a) The text of the Proponent's response states 5840 one-way trips for fuel trucks in the 2014 FEIS, however the table in the response states 5840 two-way trips. In addition, the text of this response states 3352 one-way trips for fuel trucks in the 2025 AWAR Monitoring, however the table In this response states 3352 two-way trips. Can the Proponent clarify the correct number of one-way and two-way trips and the related fuel amount that is hauled to the Meliadine site annually for the 2014 FEIS and the 2025 AWAR Monitoring.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request (August 28, 2026):
For context:

- The 2014 FEIS defined a complete trip (or round trip) as a full fuel truck from Rankin Inlet to Meliadine Mine, followed by an empty fuel truck from Meliadine Mine to Rankin Inlet.
- The 2025 AWAR monitoring counts the number of one-way trips (either Rankin Inlet to Meliadine Mine, or Meliadine Mine to Rankin Inlet).
- The capacity of fuel transferred is equal to the number of full fuel truck trips (Rankin Inlet to Meliadine Mine) multiplied by the capacity of the fuel tank.

To clarify the initial response

- **2014 FEIS:**
  - The 2014 FEIS predicted 8 round per day (see Table 6-1 of the Roads Management Plan, Appendix 5-P of the Application); that is 8 full fuel truck trips to the Mine site daily, and 8 empty return trips to Rankin Inlet.
  - This is equivalent to:
    - 2,920 full fuel truck trips per year (8 × 365 days)
    - Fuel hauled annually = **45,000 L × 2,920 full fuel truck trips = 131.4 ML/year**
- **2025 AWAR Monitoring:**
  - The 2025 AWAR Monitoring records the total number of trips from Rankin Inlet to Meliadine Mine, and Meliadine Mine back to Rankin Inlet
  - The 2025 AWAR Monitoring recorded:
    - 2,909 total trips by 40,000 L fuel tankers
    - 443 total trips by 15,000 L fuel trucks
  - This is equivalent to:
    - 1,455 full fuel truck trips by 40,000 L fuel tankers per year (2,909 ÷ 2)
    - 222 full fuel truck trips by 15,000 L fuel trucks per year (443 ÷ 2)
  - Fuel hauled annually = **(40,000 L × 1,455 full fuel truck trips) + (15,000 L × 222 full fuel truck trips) = 61.5 ML/year**

Interested Party:	**KivIA**	**Rec No.:**	**KivIA-IR-6**
Re:	**Mill Capacity Expansion and Duration of Additional Milling Beyond 2036**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
a) Based on the increased production per annum please provide information on the possibility of a Mill Expansion.

b) Based on the year end stockpile for 2036 of 6,036,061, how many additional years of milling would be required beyond the end of mine life in 2036.

c) Additional years of milling beyond the end of mine life in 2036 would require that the Closure and Post-Closure timelines be modified. Please provide reasonable estimates of changes to the periods of time for the Closure and Post-Closure activities

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request (August 7, 2026):
Response to bullet a):
There will be no increase in annual production as part of this Amendment (Section 3.3.1 of the Main Application Document).

Response to bullet b):
As noted in the Ore Management Plan (Section 4), the intent is to mill all ore from the stockpiles with no ore stockpiles remaining at closure. Agnico Eagle will continue to report on the stockpile remaining at year end in each annual report. Information provided in the application was based on a likely mine plan, but this will continue to be refined through annual operations. If any ore remains after 2036, the treatment of this stockpiled ore and any potential extension of operations beyond 2036 will be evaluated as part of future mine planning and regulatory processes.

Response to bullet c):
Should milling continue beyond 2036 to process the remaining ore stockpile the overall duration of the Closure (7 years) and Post-Closure (10 years) periods is not expected to change; the schedule would be shifted accordingly.

===

Request Made by Interested Party (August 21, 2026):
Bullet (b): The total ore milled for the 2027-2036 period is 37,007,24.3 t (Table 3.2, Appendix 5M), which based on an 8500 tpd mill capacity will require 4345 days to mill. This is 704 days, or 1.93 years, longer than the 3650 days in the 2027-2036 period. The KivIA requests more detailed Information on the required changes in schedule for the life of mine.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request (August 28, 2026):
As stated in the August 7, 2026 response, the mine plan presented in the Application represents the most likely mine plan at the time of submission. Actual mined ore may be lower than those currently forecasted. Therefore, while the Application presents the planned mining schedule through 2036, the total ore ultimately processed may vary. Agnico Eagle will continue to report on the stockpile remaining at year end in each annual report. If any ore remains after 2036, the treatment of this stockpiled ore and any potential extension of operations beyond 2036 will be evaluated as part of future mine planning and regulatory processes.

CROWN-INDIGENOUS RELATIONS AND NORTHERN AFFAIRS CANADA (CIRNAC)

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-IR-01**
Re:	**Updated security estimate**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
CIRNAC recommends that Agnico Eagle provide their revised security estimate as part of this completeness review stage.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request (August 7, 2026):
The security estimate is not required as part of the completeness review stage. As per standard Water Licence Amendment processes, Agnico Eagle reiterates that reclamation security will be reviewed with CIRNAC and the KivIA throughout the Amendment process, to be finalized prior to the Public Hearing.

===

Request Made by Interested Party (August 21, 2026):
CIRNAC requested a revised security estimate and Agnico did not provide their estimate or specify when they will, other than stating security would be reviewed "throughout the amendment process". Once the formal review process is started, fixed timelines limit the time for evaluating and discussing proposed reclamation security. CIRNAC would like to ensure it has all the information necessary before proceeding to the next stage so our initial information request remains unchanged.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request (August 28, 2026):
Agnico Eagle does not agree with the recommendation and reiterates, an updated security reclamation estimate will be provided after the technical review stage has been initiated. It is also in Agnico Eagle's interest to allow for time to review with the KivIA and CIRNAC and feel with approximately 5 months between the initiation of the Technical Review and the Public Hearing that there is sufficient time for that review. The other party in the reclamation security (KivIA) appears to be aligned with this approach as well.

Once the reclamation security is issued to the KivIA and CIRNAC, Agnico Eagle will arrange meetings to review and discuss with both parties.

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-IR-12**
Re:	**Temporary tailings storage**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
CIRNAC recommends that Agnico Eagle:

a. *Provide information/records related to prior modification requests and approvals for this temporary storage facility;*
b. *Provide storage capacity, pad designs and operational details for subsequent post-storage handling of tailings that are stored in temporary storage areas; and*
c. *Clarify why approval is not being requested for the post-storage handling facilities.*

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request (August 7, 2026):
Response to bullet a):
In 2023, Agnico Eagle first approached the NWB for the use of a temporary tailings storage pad as additional storage for dry tailings during the caribou migration. The implementation of a temporary pad was required for the migration, based on caribou migration work suspension protocols. The 2023 submission and approval from NWB for the Temporary Tailings Storage Pad is provided on the NWB registry.

Agnico Eagle again requested the temporary tailings storage pad for use during the caribou migration in 2024, 2025, and 2026.

Response to bullets b) & c):
As stated in Section 3.3.4 of the Main Application Document, all post-storage options are still under evaluation. A detailed design report will be submitted at least 60 days prior to any option selected for approval. See also response to **KivIA-IR-4.**

===

Request Made by Interested Party (August 21, 2026):
a) resolved

Part b) of the request was for the "storage capacity, pad designs and operational details for subsequent post-storage handling of tailings that are stored in temporary storage areas". Agnico replied they are still considering four different options and once they had decided, would submit a design report at least 60 days prior to use. This level of uncertainty at the water licensing stage does not allow holistic evaluation of post-storage handling of tailings from the proposed temporary tailings storage area. Similar information requests were made by the Kivalliq Inuit Association and Environment and Climate Change Canada, supporting the argument that the entire tailings handling operational cycle needs to be planned to integrate a new tailings storage facility in the water licence.

For part c) of CIRNAC's request, we understand Agnico is not requesting approval for post-storage handling facilities at this stage as they are planning to do so through a construction approval. CIRNAC acknowledges a detailed design report is not necessary at this stage, however operational details of the post-storage option including its capacity, location and contact water capture mechanisms are required.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request (August 28, 2026):
Agnico Eagle does not agree with the statement regarding "*integrate a new tailings storage facility in the water licence."* This is not a new tailings facility; rather as stated in the Main Application Document, it is an Interim Extension Tailings Storage Pad which is for contingency use only under upset conditions and not intended to replace the existing approved tailings storage. The use of the pad is temporary until the tailings can be moved to the TSF. We do not discount the need for appropriate management of tailings on this Interim Tailings Pad; however, referring to it as a tailings storage facility is not accurate.

Further, Agnico Eagle is of the view that the Interim Tailings Pad is no different between past temporary use during the caribou migration versus other events, such as a blizzard.

Response to bullet b):
Again, Agnico Eagle reiterates that evaluations continue. Following the conditions of the Licence, a detailed design report will be submitted at least 60-days prior to any option selected for approval. The following information is provided to support CIRNAC's request while evaluations continue.

The following scenarios were presented in the Main Application Document:

1. *Placed and compacted on the TSF, subject to geotechnical approval and material condition (e.g., frozen or snow-contaminated).*
2. *Transported underground to be used as backfill, which would require a new and distinct transit pad within the confines of the Portal 2 Ore Pad (Figure 3.3-2);*
3. *Temporary placement on an inactive TSF cell to allow thawing prior to final placement and compaction*
4. *Temporary storage in a designated area near the Church, potentially the low-lying area between the Church and the TSF highlighted in Figure 3.3-3, to allow material to thaw prior to final disposition on the TSF in the summer.*

Under scenarios 1 and 4, should the material be approved by the geotechnical engineer, it will be loaded into trucks and placed as described in section 4.5 of the Mine Waste Management Plan. If not approved, the material will be moved to an inactive cell as per normal practice.

Under scenario 3, the material will be loaded into trucks, hauled to an inactive cell within the TSF footprint and within the TSF water management system, and stockpiled. The material will be left to thaw. Once the tailings are in a thawed condition and are at a suitable moisture content, they will be loaded into a haul truck and transported to the active placement front where they will be blended with fresh tailings and placed within the TSF as per section 4.5 of the Mine Waste Management Plan.

Further evaluation is required for scenario 2 and thus has been presented as a concept only at this time.

Response to bullet c):
Scenarios 1 and 3 are within the approved TSF and its water management system. No additional storage capacity is required.

Scenario 4 is outside of the approved TSF footprint; however, it is within the TSF water management system. The pad may be able to store approximately 5,000m^3 (35mx35mx4m). The smaller area is to account for berms on the sides of the pad. Again, a detailed design report will be submitted at least 60 days prior to any option selected for approval, following the conditions of the Licence.

Further evaluation is required for scenario 2. Some considerations will include appropriate water management collection and control.

ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE CANADA (ECCC)

No further comments at this time.

FISHERIES AND OCEANS CANADA (DFO)

Interested Party:	**DFO**	**Rec No.:**	**DFO-IR-01**
Re:	**Hydrology Modeling - Baseline Considerations**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
DFO requests that the Applicant provide hydrology modeling under different climate scenarios, that compares baseline conditions (i.e. no Project water use or inputs) to:

1. current operational Water Licence approved water use (1,100,296 m3/yr);

2. proposed operational Water Licence approved water use (1,112,296 m3/yr); and

3. closure Water Licence approved water use (8,676,481 m3/yr).

The application includes a hydrology model for Meliadine Lake water levels, that compares maximum freshwater withdrawal (1,110,296 m3/yr) to current water withdrawal (519,502 m3/yr) for the operational period (2026-2036), but not to baseline conditions (i.e. no water use scenario). Similarly, the model does not compare closure period water use (2037-2043) to baseline (no water use) conditions. The lack of baseline comparison prevents the proper assessment of the impacts of Project water use and the proposed increase in water use, on fish and fish habitat.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request (August 7, 2026):
Agnico Eagle will consider evaluations of maximum freshwater withdrawals during the Operation and Closure phases of the project. Updated lake level modelling provided in Appendix 4-D indicates no meaningful change in Meliadine Lake levels under the proposed maximum freshwater withdrawal scenario of 1,110,296 m^3/year, which represents less than 0.5% of the lake's average annual inflow. The effect of the proposed increase in maximum annual freshwater withdrawal is therefore negligible, with the average annual water level change during Operations estimated at approximately 1 cm.

In addition, as per Agnico Eagle's response to Technical Comment DFO-TRC-02 during the 2024 Water Licence Amendment (Agnico Eagle 2024), Meliadine Lake levels were modelled in the 2014 FEIS. The annual withdrawal volume from Meliadine Lake for pit filling as set in the 2014 FEIS was 17,060,000 m^3/year, no concerns to fish and fish habitat were identified at that time. In comparison, the withdrawal volume proposed during Closure in the Operational Update is substantially smaller at 8,676,481 m^3/yr. Impacts to fish and fish habitat are anticipated to be less than those previously assessed in 2014 for which offsetting was not required.

Reference:
Agnico Eagle. 2024. Re: Agnico Eagle's Response to Technical Comments on the Meliadine Water Licence Amendment Application 2AM-MEL1631. Submitted to Nunavut Water Board. May 10, 2024.

===

Request Made by Interested Party (August 21, 2026):
The response provided by the Applicant does not address the lack of baseline comparison. As such, DFO retains its position that the application is lacking information to determine project related impacts on natural lake levels and discharge rates in the Meliadine River and Diane River. Comparing project activities to baseline conditions is required to assess impacts associated with the proposed water withdrawal.

It is DFO's understanding that the Applicant only began hydrological monitoring in 2024. DFO requests the Applicant provide any data available (lake level or river discharges) that predates operational water withdrawal (i.e., conditions prior to mine related impacts) to represent baseline conditions.

DFO requests that the Applicant provide a link to the 2014 FEIS referenced and include a section or page number where information pertaining to DFO-IR-01 can be found.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request (August 28, 2026):

Agnico Eagle does not agree with the comment on a lack of baseline data. Again, this topic was discussed with DFO during the 2024 Water Licence Amendment and as a result Agnico Eagle are completing hydrological monitoring as outlined throughout responses. As noted in the response of August 7, 2026, Agnico Eagle will consider evaluations of maximum freshwater withdrawals during the Operation and Closure phases of the project.

Volume 7, Section 7.4.5.3.6 (page 7-287) of the 2014 FEIS addresses DFO's request regarding the estimated annual withdrawal volume (17,060,000 m^3/year) from Meliadine Lake for pit filling as set in the 2014 FEIS. This document is on NIRB registry (Public Registry Identification: 287556).

In conclusion, should further discussion be required, Agnico Eagle would request it is completed through the technical review stage. Agnico Eagle views this request as more of a technical comment than information request, this item should not delay moving from the "information request" to the "technical review" stage in the NWB amendment process.

Interested Party:	**DFO**	**Rec No.:**	**DFO-IR-02**
Re:	**Hydrology Modeling – Winter/Under-ice Considerations**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
DFO requests that the Applicant provide hydrology modeling for the winter period in addition to the summer period. This should include ice formation as a factor influencing water volumes, how the timing of open water may be impacted, and how associated outflows in Meliadine River and Diane River may be impacted. In the arctic, ice formation in winter can lock up a substantial amount of water and can significantly impact river flows and water movement. As such, understanding impacts on water use under winter conditions can be of vital importance for fish and fish habitat. The Meliadine Lake Hydrology Model considers only summer (ice-free) conditions when quantifying future water availability and notes that ice cover in winter may be explaining some of the anomalies seen in the model results, highlighting the impacts of ice formation on water quantity during winter.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request (August 7, 2026):
Agnico Eagle started hydrological data collection in 2024, including water levels and flows at both outlets of Meliadine Lake. This forms part of a multi-year monitoring program beginning in 2024 with results to be provided in the 2026 Annual Report. This data collection effort, combined with Water Survey of Canada hydrometric records and watershed modelling, is intended to generate the data required to support a comprehensive understanding of the Meliadine Lake water balance across seasonal conditions.

===

Request Made by Interested Party (August 21, 2026):
The response provided by the Applicant does not address the need for monitoring and modeling specifically under winter conditions. Under ice monitoring and modelling is required to confirm adherence to DFO's Protocol of Winter Water Withdrawal from Ice covered Waterbodies in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut (2010) and DFO's Framework for Assessing the Ecological Flow Requirements to Support Fisheries in Canada (2013).

DFO retains its position that data collection and modeling of under-ice conditions is required to review projects impacts to fish and fish habitat for a large portion of the year.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request (August 28, 2026):
Agnico Eagle does not agree with the recommendation and defers this to technical review stage. Agnico Eagle views this request as more of a technical comment than information request, this item should not delay moving from the "information request" to the "technical review" stage in the NWB amendment process.

Interested Party:	DFO	Rec No.:	DFO-IR-03
Re:	Hydrology Modeling – Downstream Effects		

Request Made by Interested Party:
DFO requests that the Applicant provide modeled outflows for the Meliadine River and Diane River, in addition to the modeled water levels in Meliadine Lake that were included with this application. The modeling and assessment of Meliadine River and Diane River should include analysis and discussion related to maintaining instantaneous flow alteration below 10% and mean annual discharge alteration below 30%, in the Meliadine River and Diane River, under different water use and climate scenarios. The importance of these thresholds is included in the following:

- *DFO. 2013. Framework for Assessing the Ecological Flow Requirements to Support Fisheries in Canada. DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Sci. Advis. Rep. 2013/017.*

In addition, the inclusion of a cross section of the outflows can be important in understanding fish passage capabilities to and from Meliadine Lake at different water levels. Maintaining the environmental flow needs in these rivers is vital to the long-term viability of fish habitat and fish use of these systems. Both Meliadine and Diane River are important for Arctic char migration, and maintaining their use is critical to local char populations. A model that accurately predicts the hydrological impacts of water use on these systems is necessary for DFO to assess and understand potential downstream impacts on fish and fish habitat.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request (August 7, 2026):
Agnico Eagle will consider additional analysis and discussion related to lake volume, lake level, and flows for the Operation and Closure phases to evaluate the effects of proposed water use on fish and fish habitat (including Arctic Char).

See response to DFO-IR-02 for more details on multi-year hydrology studies being conducted on Meliadine Lake outflows.

See response to DFO-IR-01 for comment on potential effects to Meliadine Lake levels as assessed in the 2014 FEIS.
===

Request Made by Interested Party (August 21, 2026):
The response provided by the Applicant does not address the need for downstream modeling. DFO retains its position that modeling downstream effects is required to review project related impacts to fish and fish habitat.

DFO reiterates its request that the Applicant assess downstream impacts in the Meliadine and Diane Rivers using the thresholds and guidance provided in DFO's Framework for Assessing the Ecological Flow Requirements to Support Fisheries in Canada (2013).

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request (August 28, 2026):
As per responses to DFO-IR-01 and DFO-IR-02, Agnico Eagle views this request as more of a technical comment than information request, this item should not delay moving from the "information request" to the "technical review" stage in the NWB amendment process.

Interested Party:	DFO	Rec No.:	DFO-IR-04
Re:	Hydrology Monitoring Plan		

Request Made by Interested Party:

DFO requests that the Applicant provide a hydrology monitoring plan that includes:

1. *Details of the hydrology monitoring that was used to collect data for the Meliadine Lake Hydrology Model; and*
2. *Details on future monitoring throughout operation and closure.*

This plan should include:

- *How, when, and where data is collected;*
- *Considerations of summer and winter conditions; and*
- *Justification on how the plan is suitable for assessing the impacts of the Project's water use on fish and fish habitat in Meliadine Lake, Meliadine River, and Diane River.*

To date, the Project has not provided a hydrology monitoring plan for assessing effects of water withdrawal on the receiving environment (i.e. Meliadine Lake water levels, and Meliadine River and Diane River discharge rates). The information being requested is necessary for DFO to assess how data is being collected for hydrological modeling and for the development of the discharge rating curve. Similarly, it is needed to understand how flows in Meliadine River and Diane River, and water levels in Meliadine Lake are being assessed by the Project. As this type of information (i.e. data collected to assess effects on the aquatic receiving environment) is typically included within an AEMP, it would be logical and prevent future confusion, if the hydrology monitoring were incorporate into the Project's AEMP. This would provide a reliable location for reviewing the design plan and monitoring results.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request (August 7, 2026):

Agnico Eagle does not agree that a hydrology monitoring plan is required.

During the 2024 Water Licence Amendment process, Agnico Eagle committed to a 3-year hydrologic monitoring program for Meliadine Lake, spanning from 2024 until 2026. The final results of the monitoring program will be reported in the 2026 Annual Report.

===

Request Made by Interested Party (August 21, 2026):

DFO retains its position that the project requires a hydrological monitoring plan to reliably record and report project related impacts to lake levels and discharge in the Meliadine River and Diane River, particularly during closure when proposed water use significantly increases. Results from the 3-year hydrologic monitoring program for Meliadine Lake may partially inform reviewers of these impacts, but currently there is no information detailing the methods of monitoring in the 3-year plan to determine if it is sufficient for DFO's assessment. The information provided to date is not sufficient to properly assess project related impacts as describe in comments 1-3.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request (August 28, 2026):

Agnico Eagle does not agree with the recommendation and defers this to technical review stage. Agnico Eagle views this request as more of a technical comment than information request, this item should not delay moving from the "information request" to the "technical review" stage in the NWB amendment process.

Interested Party:	DFO	Rec No.:	DFO-IR-05
Re:	Response Framework / Action Levels for Water Quantity		

Request Made by Interested Party:
DFO requests that the applicant provide a conceptual response framework that includes discussion of action levels for water quantity parameters such as flow rates and timing of the open water season for Meliadine River and Diane River. A response framework that includes action levels is necessary for DFO to evaluate the Project's mitigation of risk associated with water use on fish and fish habitat.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Updated lake level modelling provided in Appendix 4-D indicates no meaningful change in Meliadine Lake levels under the proposed maximum freshwater withdrawal scenario of 1,110,296 m^3/year, which represents less than 0.5% of the lake's average annual inflow. The effect of the proposed increase in maximum annual freshwater withdrawal is therefore negligible, with the average annual water level change during Operations estimated at approximately 1 cm. No delay to the open water season for the Meliadine and Diane rivers due to increased water withdrawals from the Operations is expected.

Based on negligible changes to water levels at the maximum water withdrawal rate, the need for a water quantity response framework is not warranted at this time as a change in water level of 1 cm would not be distinguishable from natural variability (i.e., climate driven factors such as precipitation, snow melt, evaporation, runoff in any given year).

===

Request Made by Interested Party (August 21, 2026):
As described above, project related impacts on key variables effecting fish and fish habitat (lake level compared to natural conditions and river discharge rates) are unknown. Should the Applicant provide the modelling requested in DFO IR 01-04, this information will assist DFO in determining if a response framework is required.

DFO requests the Applicant provide further information supporting the conclusion that "no delay to the open water season for the Meliadine and Diane rivers due to increased water withdrawals from the Operations is expected".

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request (August 28, 2026):
Agnico Eagle does not agree with the recommendation and defers this to technical review stage. Agnico Eagle views this request as more of a technical comment than information request, this item should not delay moving from the "information request" to the "technical review" stage in the NWB amendment process.

Per the Meliadine Lake hydrodynamic model, changes in water level peaks under existing conditions to the requested volume during operations and closure will result in changes in elevation of less than 1 cm, while impacts on the average annual lake level are predicted to be less than 2 cm. This amount of change is largely indistinguishable from natural variability, and unlikely to have any effect on the timing of flows (i.e., freshet) in either of the Meliadine or Diane Rivers.