

December 19, 2018

Tara Arko
Director, Technical Services
Nunavut Impact Review Board
P.O. Box 1360
Cambridge Bay, NU X0B 0C0

Stephanie Autut
Executive Director
Nunavut Water Board
P.O. Box 119
Gjoa Haven, NU X0B 1J0

RE: NIRB File No. 18MN047 - Results of the NIRB's Conformity Review of Agnico Eagle's Ltd.'s FEIS Addendum Submission for the Whale Tail Pit Expansion Proposal, Whale Tail Pit Project.

Dear Ms. Arko and Ms. Autut:

In response to the non-conformity determination on December 10, 2018, Agnico Eagle is re-submitting to the NIRB the Whale Tail Pit Expansion - Final Impact Statement Addendum. Agnico Eagle has included the guidance from NIRB in its letter and recent teleconferences; we are confident the resubmission addresses the non-conformities and general concerns on clarity raised by NIRB. Agnico Eagle believes this resubmission will ensure a fulsome review of the proposed Whale Tail Pit Expansion and reconsideration of NIRB Project Certificate No. 008.

As per instructions provided by NIRB in the letter dated November 16, 2018 and December 10, 2018, Agnico Eagle has uploaded a complete and final Whale Tail Pit Expansion Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) (Volume 1 to 8) Addendum, dated December 2018, to the NIRB portal. In addition, Agnico Eagle will upload the December 2018 FEIS Addendum to the Agnico Eagles Nunavut website at the following link: <http://aemnunavut.ca/media/documents/> Given the inconsistencies noted by NIRB, NIRB has removed the November 2018 submission on their portal.

More specifically, in response to the "general areas of deficiencies" stated in the NIRB non-conformity letter dated December 10, 2018, as part of the re-submission, Agnico Eagle has addressed "1) Environmental Management Plans" and Table 1 and Table 2 non-conformities by updating and providing all relevant management plans to NIRB in the re-submission as described in a revised Volume 8. This includes, but is not limited to, an updated Terrestrial Ecosystem Management Plan and Core Receiving Environment Monitoring Program as per Table 2 non-conformities.

In response to the "2) General Comments" it should be noted that during our review, minor spelling and grammar errors were corrected or have been addressed. Golder have thoroughly reviewed Volumes 1 to 8 for formatting and referencing errors. As demonstrated in December 2018 FEIS, Volume 1 to 8 are a series of complementary documents to provide a full

understanding of the consultation, technical and scientific aspects of the Project and will include FEIS Addendums to Whale Tail Pit Project:

- Volume 1 – Project Description;
- Volume 2 - FEIS Addendum Overview;
- Volume 3 – Assessment Methods;
- Volume 4 – Atmospheric Environment;
- Volume 5 – Terrestrial Environment;
- Volume 6 – Freshwater Environment;
- Volume 7 – Human Environment; and
- Volume 8 – Monitoring, Mitigation, and Management Plans.

Agnico Eagle considers these documents final and the earlier version (dated November 2018) to be obsolete as they are now replaced by this December 2018 version.

Lastly, for improved clarity Agnico Eagle have also provided to NIRB:

- all supporting baseline reports (refer to Volumes 4, 5, and 6);
- an updated conformity table (refer to Volume 2, Appendix 2-A); and
- responses to NIRB's Table 1 and Table 2 conformity dated December 10, 2018 (refer to Attachment A).

Agnico Eagle is appreciative of the expeditious reconsideration decision by NIRB on November 13, 2018 and awaits a forthcoming ministerial decision. We are looking forward to receiving a timely determination of the coordinated process timelines with the NWB, and to commence the reconsideration process with NIRB immediately. If you require any further information in relation to this application, please contact the undersigned via email or telephone.

Regards,



Jamie Quesnel
Jamie.Quesnel@agnicoeagle.com
819.856.0821.
Superintendent –
Permitting and Regulatory Affairs Nunavut



Ryan Vanengen MSc.
ryan.vanengen@agnicoeagle.com
819.651.2974
Permitting Lead - Nunavut

copy to: Nunavut Impact Review Board
 Nunavut Water Board

Table 1: NIRB FEIS Conformity Determination Review Table 1. Evaluation of the Agnico Eagle's submission(s) for the Whale Tail Pit Expansion Project proposal to determine whether, the submission(s) satisfies the minimum EIS requirements set out in NLCA Section 12.5.2 and NuPPAA subsection 101(3). (Note: Items highlighted in **red** signify that the section does not appear to meet the requirements of the minimum EIS Guidelines- Decemember 10, 2018.)

Requirements under Section 12.5.2 of the NLCA	Requirement under NuPPAA subsection 101(3)	Location within Project Proposal			Notes	Agnico Eagle Response (December 19, 2018)
		Volume	Chapter	Page Numbers		
(a) project description, including the purpose and need for the project;	(a) a description of the project, the purpose of, and need for, the project;	Volume 1	1.1 to 1.10	1-37	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required
(c) anticipated effects of the environment on the project;	(b) the anticipated effects of the environment on the project, including effects associated with natural phenomena, such as meteorological and seismological activity, and climate change;	Volumes 4 and 5	4.2.3; 5.3.3.2; 5.5.3.5	77-79; 130-133; 167-169	Effects of the project on the environment are discussed in the referenced sections, as per below guideline. However, only Section 4.2.3 discusses effects of environment on project. (i.e. Geotechnical hazards including slope movement, differential or thaw settlement, frost heave, and ice scour - reference Section 5.3.3 provided does not contain a thorough discussion of subject information.)	Agnico Eagle has updated concordance to reflect the NIRB request. Additional information has been provided in Volume 5, Section 5.3.3.2.
(b) anticipated ecosystemic and socio-economic impacts of the project;	(c) the anticipated ecosystemic and socioeconomic impacts of the project, including those arising from the effects referred to in paragraph (b);	Volumes 4, 5 and 6	4.0 to 4.4; 5.0 to 5.5; 6.0 to 6.5	74-110; 112-177; 178-279	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required
	(d) the measures proposed by the proponent to:					
(d) steps which the proponent proposes to take including any contingency plans, to avoid and mitigate adverse impacts;	(i) avoid and mitigate adverse ecosystemic and socio-economic impacts, including contingency plans,	Volumes 4, 5 and 6	4.0 to 4.4; 5.0 to 5.5; 6.0 to 6.5	74-110; 112-177; 178-279	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review. Lacking monitoring and mitigation plans as identified in Volume 8, Table 8.2-1.	Agnico Eagle has updated Volume 8. Refer to Table 8.2-1 for a summary of monitoring and mitigation plans submitted in support of the reconsideration. Plans provided in Appendix 8-A through 8-F. Note: Appendix 2-A: Concordance has been updated.

Requirements under Section 12.5.2 of the NLCA	Requirement under NuPPAA subsection 101(3)	Location within Project Proposal			Notes	Agnico Eagle Response (December 19, 2018)
(e) steps which the proponent proposes to take to optimize benefits of the project, with specific consideration being given to expressed community and regional preferences as to benefits;	(ii) optimize the benefits of the project, with specific consideration given to expressed community and regional preferences in regard to benefits,	7	7.4.1 to 7.4.2	304-305	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required
(f) steps which the proponent proposes to take to compensate interests adversely affected by the project;	(iii) compensate persons whose interests are adversely affected by the project, and	7	7.4.2	305	Referenced as "n/a - compensation is confidential". No detailed non-confidential information provided. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	Agnico Eagle has provided a link to publicly available Inuit Impact Benefit Agreement in the FEIS Addendum in Volume 2, Section 1.2.1.2, pg. 15 and Volume 8, Section 7.4.5, pg. 310. The IIBA can be accessed from Agnico Eagle website http://aemnunavut.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Whale-Tail-IIBA2017-06-15-.pdf
	(iv) restore ecosystemic integrity after the permanent closure of the project;	8-F	8-F.1	Full Document	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required

Requirements under Section 12.5.2 of the NLCA	Requirement under NuPPAA subsection 101(3)	Location within Project Proposal			Notes	Agnico Eagle Response (December 19, 2018)
(g) the monitoring program that the proponent proposes to establish with respect to ecosystemic and socio-economic impacts;	(e) any monitoring program of the project's ecosystemic and socio-economic impacts that the proponent proposes to establish;	Appendices 8-A to 8-F	8-A.1 (Waste Rock Management Plan); 8-A.3 (Thermal Monitoring Plan); 8-A.4 (Landfarm Design and Management Plan); 8-A.5 (Incinerator and Composter Management Plan); 8-B.2 (Water Management Plan); 8-B.3 (Water Quality and Flow Monitoring Plan); 8-E.3 (Groundwater Monitoring Plan); 8-E.4 (Conceptual Whale Tail Pit Offsetting Plan); 8-E.5 Operational ARD-ML Sampling and Testing Plan); 8-E.8 (Archaeology Management Plan); 8-F.1 (Interim Closure and Reclamation Plan)	Full Documents	Lacking monitoring and mitigation plans as identified in Volume 8, Table 8.2-1. The following plans were <u>not</u> provided to support the review of the FEIS Addendum, including but not limited to: Meadowbank Tailings Storage Facility Management Plan for Whale Tail Pit Expansion; Tailings Storage Facility Operation, Maintenance and Surveillance Manual; Water Quality Monitoring and Management Plan for Dike Construction and Dewatering; Landfill Design and Management Plan; Operation and Maintenance Manual - Sewage Treatment Plant; Air Traffic Management Plan; Transportation Management Plan - All-weather Private Access Road; Whale Tail Pit Haul Road Management Plan; Ammonia Management Plan; Bulk Fuel Storage Facility Environmental Performance Monitoring Plan; Emergency Response Plan; Hazardous Materials Management Plan; Oil Pollution Emergency Plan; Shipping Management Plan; Marine Mammal Management and Monitoring Plan; Spill Contingency Plan; 2018 Freshet Action and Incident Response Plan; Air Quality Monitoring Plan; Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan; Erosion Management Plan; Aquatic Effects Management Program; Core Receiving Environment Monitoring Program; Habitat Compensation Monitoring Plan; Meteorological Monitoring Plan; Noise Monitoring and Abatement Plan; Socio-economics Management and Monitoring Plan; Occupational Health and Safety Plan; Terrestrial Ecosystem Management Plan; and Migratory Birds Protection Plan;	Agnico Eagle has updated Volume 8. Refer to Table 8.2-1 for a summary of monitoring and mitigation plans submitted in support of the reconsideration. Plans provided in Appendix 8-A through 8-F. Note: Appendix 2-A: Concordance has been updated.

Requirements under Section 12.5.2 of the NLCA	Requirement under NuPPAA subsection 101(3)	Location within Project Proposal			Notes	Agnico Eagle Response (December 19, 2018)
(h) the interests in lands and waters which the proponent has secured, or seeks to secure;	(f) the interests in land and waters that the proponent has acquired or seeks to acquire;	Volume 1	1.1.5	12	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required
(i) options for implementing the proposal; and	(g) options for carrying out the project that are technically and economically feasible and the anticipated ecosystemic and socio-economic impacts of those options; and	Volume 1; Appendix 2-E	1.1; 2-E	1-13; Full Document	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required
(j) any other matters that NIRB considers relevant.	(h) any other type of information relating to a matter within the Board's jurisdiction that the Board considers relevant in the circumstances.	Volumes 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7	Throughout documents	n/a	Presence of information verified for topics including but not limited to: technical innovations, Inuit Quajimaningit, consultation principles, significant effects analysis, valued ecosystem components, sustainability analysis, planned future developments and application incorporation of current facilities approved pursuant to Project Certificate 004.	No Response Required
	Additional Items from Scoping Meetings of Whale Tail Pit Project:					No Response Required
	a) Project description	Volume 1	1.0 to 1.10-6	1-37	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required
	b) Information on the use of Meadowbank mine facilities	Volume 1	1.2 to 1.3	13-29	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required
	c) Gap between the closure of Meadowbank and commencement of Whale Tail; Whale Tail and Whale Tail Expansion project timelines.	Volume 1 and 3	1.4; 3.3	29; 58	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required

Requirements under Section 12.5.2 of the NLCA	Requirement under NuPPAA subsection 101(3)	Location within Project Proposal			Notes	Agnico Eagle Response (December 19, 2018)
	d) Shipping impacts to wildlife	Volume 3; Appendix 3-A	Table 3.4-2; 3-A (Addendum Marine Environment Summary)	66; Full Document	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required
	e) Compensation from the project; benefits to communities	Volume 7; Appendices 3-C and 7-B	7.4; Table 3-C-10; 7-B-1	303-307; 3-C-32; 1-25	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required
	f) NIRB monitoring of the project	Volume 8; Appendices 8-A to 8-F	All Chapters	308-318	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required
	g) Description of fish out program, impacts to fish, monitoring and mitigation measures	Volume 6 and 8; Appendix 8-B.2 and 8-E	6.5 (Fish and Fish Habitat); 8-B.2 (Water Management Plan) Section 3; 8-E.4 (Conceptual Whale Tail Pit Expansion Offsetting Plan)	247-280; 22-26; Full Document	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required
	h) Description of dewatering process and mitigation measures	Volume 1 and 6; Appendix 8-B.2 and 8-B.3	1.2.6.3, 1.4; 6.3.3.1.3, 6.5 (Fish and Fish Habitat); 8-B.2 (Water Management Plan) 3.1.4.3; 8-B.3 (Water Quality and Flow Monitoring Plan) 2.3.1	23, 30; 223, 247 280; 23	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required
	i) Closure plans	Volume 1 and Appendix 8-F.1	1.2 and 1.4; 8-F.1 (Interim Whale Tail Closure and Reclamation Plan)	1-31	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required

Requirements under Section 12.5.2 of the NLCA	Requirement under NuPPAA subsection 101(3)	Location within Project Proposal			Notes	Agnico Eagle Response (December 19, 2018)
	j) Impacts to caribou, migration routes, and monitoring and mitigation plans	Volume 5 and Appendix 3-C	5.5, 5.5.2, 5.5.5.2; 3-C-3 (Addendum Pathway Analysis)	147-156	Updated Terrestrial Ecosystem Management Plan not provided with current application. Monitoring and Mitigation plans not available (5.5.5.2 and 8.2-1)	Refer to Volume 8, Appendix 8-E.9: Terrestrial Ecosystem Management Plan, Version 6, December 2018.
	k) Vegetation impacts, monitoring and mitigation plans	Volume 5 and Appendix 3-C	5.4; 3-C-2 (Addendum Pathway Analysis)	133-146	Updated Terrestrial Ecosystem Management Plan not provided with current application. Monitoring and Mitigation plans not available.	Refer to Volume 8, Appendix 8-E.9: Terrestrial Ecosystem Management Plan, Version 6, December 2018.
	l) Employment opportunities	Volume 7 and Appendix 7-B	7.4.1; 1.4.3	304-305; 9-12	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required
	m) Baseline studies on streams downstream of Whale Tail lake	Appendix 6-C	6-C (2016 Hydrology Baseline)	Full Document	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required
	n) Potential impacts to permafrost from dewatering program	Volume 5 Appendix 8-A.3	5.3.3; 8-A.3 (Thermal Monitoring Plan)	124-131	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required
	o) Studies conducted on marine life and marine environment related to impacts between Baker Lake and Chesterfield Inlet	Appendix 3-A	3-A (Addendum Marine Environment Summary)	Full Document	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required

Requirements under Section 12.5.2 of the NLCA	Requirement under NuPPAA subsection 101(3)	Location within Project Proposal			Notes	Agnico Eagle Response (December 19, 2018)
	p) Studies on aquatic environment	Volume 6; Appendix 3-C	6.5; 3-C-7	247-280; 3-C-22 to 3-C-25	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review. AEMP (Aquatic Effects Management Program) not provided. Updated Core Receiving Environment Monitoring Program not provided (most recent dated May 2018).	Refer to Volume 8, Appendix 8-E.10, Updated Core Receiving Environment Monitoring Program (CREMP): 2015 Plan Update -Whale Tail Pit Expansion Addendum_NIRB, dated December 2018 Update to Aquatic Effect Management Program (AEMP) deferred to NWB Type A Water Licence Amendment Application submission. Refer to Volume 8, Appendix 8-E.13 for copy of the current plan.
	q) Baseline and operational hydrogeological studies	Volume 6; Appendices 6-A and 6-B	6.4; 6-A (Addendum Hydrogeology Baseline Report) and 6-B (Addendum Hydrogeological Assessment and Modelling)	231-247; Full Document; Full Document	Presence of information verified. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required
	r) Socio-economic effects related to any gaps between closure of Meadowbank and opening of Meliadine	n/a	n/a	n/a	Not specifically addressed, however this may not be applicable for the expansion project.	Socio-economic effect related to any gap between closure of Meadowbank and opening of Meliadine was assessed in the Approved Project. With approval by NIRB and NWB development of the Whale Tail Approved Project, there is no gap as Meadowbank will continue to operate therefore gap not applicable to the current Expansion Project.

Requirements under Section 12.5.2 of the NLCA	Requirement under NuPPAA subsection 101(3)	Location within Project Proposal			Notes	Agnico Eagle Response (December 19, 2018)
	s) Other - Information requirements for the FEIS Addendum to be clearly referenced and locations identified throughout the document to assist in the review process and public ease of access.	Appendix 2-A	2-A (NIRB FEIS Addendum Concordance)	1-5	Multiple deficiencies identified regarding location of reference material especially when referred to within the Concordance Table. For example in the NIRB FEIS Addendum Concordance, Scope of the Assessment Conformity Table, Section 1 a., the reference Volume 4, 4.1.2.3, pg. 77; the incorrect page number is given. Another example, in TOC both Appendices 8-C and 8-D are listed, however location of materials is not provided and not included in FEIS Addendum submission.	Concordance has been updated refer to Appendix 2-A (December 19, 2018) verified and supplemental information provided, where appropriate. Inconsistencies have been resolved.

Table 2: NIRB FEIS Conformity Determination Review Table 2. Evaluation of original project proposal with FEIS Addendum submission - discrepancies noted in November 1, 2018 Project Description.
 (Note: Items highlighted in **red** signify that the section does not appear to meet the requirements of the minimum EIS Guidelines based on December 10th, 2018 letter from NIRB.)

Questions	Proponent Response	Location within Project Proposal			Notes	Agnico Eagle Response (December 19, 2018)
		Volume	Chapter	Page Numbers		
“...Agnico Eagle proposes to mine for an additional four years for a total of 15.2 million tonnes of ore.” Clarification required as Table 1.2-1C notes that the total ore to be mined would be A3:F10for a total of 23.5 million tonnes of ore and text under page 16 notes that the Expansion Project mine operations will generate approximately 15.2 Mt of tailings.	For clarification, Table 1.2-1 and statement in the Plain Language Summary are correct. The Expansion Project is projected to yield 15.2 Mt of ore. The Expansion Project combined (15.2 MT of ore) combined with projected amount of ore for the approved project (8.3 Mt of ore) totals a combined ore for the Whale Tail Pit Expansion Project if approved would be 23.5 Mt of ore. Language on page 16 reflects the summary data provided in the subsequent tables. The summary total reflects 15.2 Mt of ore mined and 15.2 Mt ore processed/tailings produced.	Volume 1	Plain Language Summary	i	Presence of information confirmed, quality of information to be confirmed during technical review	No Response Required
Information required on how much the Whale Tail open pit would be expanded by.	The Whale Tail Pit expansion is further described in the FEIS Addendum (Volume 5, Appendix 5-E). In summary, Whale Tail Pit will be expanded to extract an additional 100.4 Mt of ore and waste rock. Refer to Section 1.2.2.1	Volume 1	1.2.2	15-17	Volume 5, Appendix 5-E does not address the expansion of Whale Tail pit as part of the Expansion Project (i.e. expected tonnage increase and specific improvements related to the Whale Tail open pit).	Agnico Eagle has provide the expected tonnage increase for the Whale Tail Open Pit. The Whale Tail Pit will be expanded to extract an additional 100.4 Mt of ore and Waste Rock. Refer to Volume 2, Section 1.2.2.1, Table 1.2-1D.

Questions	Proponent Response	Location within Project Proposal			Notes	Agnico Eagle Response (December 19, 2018)
Additional information is required on why Agnico Eagle is proposing to upgrade the haul road from 9.5 metres to 15 metres in width. Application notes "for safety reasons" but this is not sufficient as it does not appear that the volume of trucks on the road would be changing.	Efficiency of traffic movement on the haul road is dictated by safety. In 2018, Agnico Eagle conducted an assessment which included field trials with the long haul trucks to determine optimal safety, efficiency and production of hauling from Whale Tail Pit. It has been determined that a 15 m road width would allow long haul trucks to pass each other safely, which a 9.5 m road width does not allow. Furthermore, during wintertime, snow tends to pile up on one side of the road and, as such, the proposed expansion will improve driving conditions. Refer to Section 1.2.8 of the Project Description.	Volume 1	Executive Summary; Table 1.1-1 (site access); 1.2.8	vi; 3; 24-25	Presence of information confirmed. Quality of information to be confirmed during technical review.	No Response Required
Noted that transportation to the mine site including marine barging would remain the same as authorized. Need further clarification as additional fuel tanks are being developed at the Baker Lake Fuel Storage Facility which means that additional fuel would be delivered/year. Additional barges might be needed for the construction phases. Currently, the total number of barges (fuel and cargo) averages to about 37/year (2017 Meadowbank Annual Report).	To clarify, additional tanks are being built under the current Meadowbank Type A Water Licence (2AM-MEA1826) to support current operations needs associated with the Approved Project. As this activity was occurring at the time of our submission of this application, we stated no additional tanks would be developed. Mitigation of impacts related to any potential increase (if any) in shipping for the Approved Project would be monitored under the current Project Certificate.	Volume 1	Executive Summary	vi	No reference provided for information on marine barging; no reference listed for where "...we stated no additional tanks would be developed." can be found.	Refer to FEIS Addendum Appendix 3-A, Table 3.A-3. The Expansion Project shipping volumes will remain consistent with those identified for the Approved Project. There are no changes to the number of ships anchored outside Chesterfield Inlet from the Approved Project. Refer to Volume 1, Section 1.2.12 which states "The approved fuel storage facilities at Whale Tail Pit, Meadowbank Mine, and following upgrades currently under review of Type A Water Licence (2AM-MEA1526, to support current operational needs associated with the Approved Project), the Baker Lake marshalling area will not change as a result of the Expansion Project."



MEADOWBANK DIVISION

Questions	Proponent Response	Location within Project Proposal			Notes	Agnico Eagle Response (December 19, 2018)
<p>Agnico Eagle noted that tailings would be stored at the existing Meadowbank Mine Tailings Storage Facility as approved by NIRB Project Certificate No. 008; however, the In-Pit Tailings Storage Facility Amendment to the Meadowbank Project indicated that the tailings storage facility has shown an increase in seepage at the downstream toe of the Central Dike. If the In-Pit Tailings Storage Facility Amendment is not approved by the Minister, how will Agnico Eagle deal with the current issues observed with additional tailings to be stored in the tailings storage facility as an additional 15.2 million tonnes of tailings would be produced from the Expansion Project on top of the 8.3 million tonnes predicted for the original Whale Tail Pit Project? On page 18, Agnico Eagle noted that "...Agnico Eagle proposes to process the ore resulting from the expansion at the existing Meadowbank Mine and dispose of the tailings in the approved Tailings Storage Facility (TSF), No consequential amendments to Project Certificate No. 004 are needed at this time (Addendum Volume 2)."</p> <p>As noted above, currently there is an amendment with the Minister for approval to discharge tailings from the processing plant into 3 pits (in-pit tailings disposal) to accommodate the additional tailings to be processed from Whale Tail. How will Agnico Eagle</p>	<p>Agnico Eagle thanks NIRB for this question. We would like to clarify that the expansion application is a reconsideration of Whale Tail Pit Project Certificate No.008, not the Meadowbank Project Certificate No. 004. As the approved Meadowbank tailings storage facility capacity under Type A 2AM MEA1526 is sufficient for storage of Meadowbank and Whale Tail Pit tailings to 2023, upon acceptance of the in-pit disposal, the TSF will provide greater flexibility, safer and increased storage capacity to accommodate the expansion proposed. As discussed previously with intervenors, Agnico Eagle would like to clarify that the Central Dike seepage does not impact dike performance. The seepage is below the foundation (i.e., in the bedrock) and is not part of the dike structure itself and will permit storage until 2023 or an additional 8.3 million tonnes, as per the approved projects. The NIRB is correct in noting challenges in the in-pit approval process has caused; not receiving approval for in-pit disposal in a timely fashion may cause increased challenges for safe disposal of tailings. Options evaluated in the Meadowbank Tailings Storage Facility Multiple Accounts Analysis identified in-pit as the best option based on capacity to store tailings, best technology and environmental protection, which will accommodate the additional 15.2 million tonnes required for the expansion. If in-pit disposal is not approved, secondary or tertiary options evaluated in the MAA will be evaluated and could be implemented for milling and storage of tailings for the Whale Tail Pit expansion, beyond 2023 to accommodate the expansion.</p>	Volume 1	Executive Summary & Processed Ore Containment (Tailings Storage Facility)	vii & 18	<p>Presence of information confirmed. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.</p>	No Response Required

Questions	Proponent Response	Location within Project Proposal			Notes	Agnico Eagle Response (December 19, 2018)
deal with the consequences if the In-Pit Tailings Disposal Modification is not approved?						

Questions	Proponent Response	Location within Project Proposal			Notes	Agnico Eagle Response (December 19, 2018)
Clarification is required with respect to the comment "Agnico Eagle believes the scope of the Project defined in the Approved Project FEIS (Agnico Eagle 2016) has not changed significantly with the proposed expansion...". The expansion of the Whale Tail Pit, a second pit with associated infrastructure, dewatering of additional lakes, underground operations and additional quarry sites were not part of the original scope of the project. In addition, the expansion of the haul road to 15 metres was not part of the original scope.	As part of the cover letter provided with the application on November 1st, 2018, Agnico Eagle has completed a self-assessment of the scope changes with NuPPAA Section 90 as per NIRB guidance. Outcomes of this assessment show that this expansion project will not cause significant adverse effects and that proposed changes mainly relates to waste and water potential impacts. Please refer to the FEIS Addendum (Volumes 2 to 8) for documentation supporting this conclusion.	Volume 1	Project Definition	1	Volumes 2 to 8 are too large and too broad to conduct a search criteria to confirm response. Presence of information confirmed. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required
Figure notes that Meadowbank Mine to Whale Tail road is 71.5 km long. However, the Whale Tail Pit Project states that the road is 64.1 km long. Clarification is required on the difference in length regarding the haul road.	For clarification, 64.1 km represents the distance between Whale Tail and Vault Pit, which is part of the Whale Tail Pit approved project, but does not include the Vault Haul Road. Seventy one and a half kilometers (71.5 km) is the distance between Whale Tail Pit and Meadowbank Mine.	Volume 1	Figure 1.1-1	2	Presence of information confirmed. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Clarification Required
Why are the on-site facilities for the Whale Tail Pit expanding to accommodate a maximum of 390 persons from the approved 210 people at the main camp?	NIRB is correct. Agnico Eagle is proposing the addition of four (4) wings to accommodate an additional 390 employees, mainly to support underground operations. The proposal to expand the accommodation camp to 390 is reflective of the high-end of a potential temporary peak in workforce requirements during operation.	Volume 1	Table 1.1-1 (On-site facilities)	4	Reference to information regarding four (4) wing additions not included in the addendum. The question was addressed; however, clarification required on whether the expansion in personnel is from 210 to 390 OR whether it is an additional 390.	Agnico Eagle would like to confirm with NIRB that the expansion of camp accommodation is for an additional 390 employees.

Questions	Proponent Response	Location within Project Proposal			Notes	Agnico Eagle Response (December 19, 2018)
Further information is required on the inclusion of an incinerator, compost site and landfarm. Why was it not considered for the original Whale Tail Pit Project?	Agnico Eagle thanks NIRB for the opportunity to clarify this. Agnico Eagle proposes to add an incinerator, a composter, and a landfarm on-site to reduce traffic on the haul road and to improve waste and contaminated soil management. Reduced traffic will result in less interactions with caribou and safer road conditions. Refer to Section 1.2.13 of the Project Description.	Volume 1	Table 1.1-1 (On-site facilities)	4	Presence of information confirmed. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required
The Expansion Proposal indicate that the ore-stock piles will be consistent with the Approved Project, and ore will be stockpiled in a series of stockpiles located adjacent to the pits. However, there are additional ore stockpiles for IVR located next to the Whale Tail Pit as noted in Figure 1.2-1. The statement contradicts the figure.	Agnico does not believe that the statement contradicts the figure. As illustrated in Figure 1.2-1, ore will primarily be stockpiled adjacent to the Whale Tail Pit. The additional stockpiles are proposed to facilitate blending of ore types and will be used only temporarily in support of above-mentioned permanent stockpiles. Agnico Eagle would like to reiterate that our intent is to store ore efficiently and with minimal impact to the environment. Refer to Section 1.2.2.2 of the Project Description.	Volume 1	Table 1.1-1 (ore stockpile)	6	Presence of information confirmed. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required

Questions	Proponent Response	Location within Project Proposal			Notes	Agnico Eagle Response (December 19, 2018)
<p>The Expansion proposal indicates that the “approved Bulk Fuel Storage Facility will be expanded for an additional 0.5 million litre tank” (page 9) and further indicates that “fuel storage at the Whale Tail site will be in one above ground storage tank with approximately 5,000,000 L capacity and one above ground storage tank with approximately 500,000 L capacity” (page 26). However, the original Whale Tail Pit Project proposal indicated that the “[f]uel storage at the Whale Tail site will be in one above ground storage tank with approximately 500,000 L capacity” (page 1-33, Volume 1, Project Description, Whale Tail Pit Proposal). This was also confirmed during the PHC and Final Hearing presentation by Agnico Eagle for the Whale Tail Pit Project. So, from the above, it appears that for the Expansion project Agnico Eagle is proposing to add 5,000,000 L (5 ML) of fuel at the Whale Tail Pit site not 500,000 litres (0.5 ML). Clarification is required on the differences in numbers. In addition, Figure 1.2-1 shows an additional storage area for fuel located at the Vent Raise WHL #2 for a total of 200,000 litres (4x50000 litres). Clarification is requested with respect to this additional fuel storage area.</p>	<p>NIRB is correct, the reference to 5,000,000 L is an error in the text. For clarification, Agnico Eagle was approved to store 500,000 L of diesel fuel under NWB Licence 2AM-WTP1826 to support open pit activities and 1,900,000 L of diesel fuel under NWB Licence 2BB-MEA1828 to support underground development and exploration activities. Under License 2AM-WTP1826, Agnico Eagle adjusted the size of the fuel tank to one 1,500,000 L tank which was included with our 60 day notice to NWB. As part of the proposed Whale Tail Pit Expansion Project, Agnico Eagle is proposing to add: one above ground storage tank with approximately 500,000 L capacity within the vicinity of the current Whale Tail Pit Fuel Farm and 700,000 L storage capacity between five (5) key storage locations illustrated in Figure 1.2-1 (i.e., close to vent raises, TDS treatment plant and cement re-filling plants). In total, the proposed fuel storage capacity required for the Approved Whale Tail Pit Project and the Expansion Project is a total of 2.7 million litres.</p>	Volume 1	Table 1.1-1 (fuel and hazardous wastes) Figure 1.2-1	9; 26 & 14	Presence of information confirmed. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	No Response Required

Questions	Proponent Response	Location within Project Proposal			Notes	Agnico Eagle Response (December 19, 2018)
<p>“additional 390 jobs will be created with the Expansion Project”</p> <p>Further information on this number is required. Will this be construction or during operations? Is this in addition the proposed additional 931 people on rotation during operations for the original Whale Tail Project?</p>	<p>Agnico Eagle would clarify this statement to reflect that, while the proposed expansion of the camp accommodation is designed to accommodate up to 390 additional workers, the average annual additional employment positions created by the Expansion Project over and above those created by the Approved Project is 235. Average annual employment is reported for the purpose of the FEIS to avoid overstating or understating the employment benefit of the Project. Total operational employment fluctuates to a small degree with varying activities on-site. As a result, there may be temporary peak periods of activity wherein total employment is greater than the average annual used for the purpose of the economic assessment. The proposal to expand the accommodation camp to 390 is reflective of the high-end of a potential temporary peak in workforce requirements. For additional information refer to Volume 7, Section 7.4.1.</p>	Volume 1	Table 1.1-1 (employment)	10	<p>Presence of information confirmed. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.</p>	No Response Required

Questions	Proponent Response	Location within Project Proposal			Notes	Agnico Eagle Response (December 19, 2018)
<p>"...only an updated record of consultation including government engagement undertaken since June 2016 is provided in Addendum Volume 2."</p> <p>This means that Agnico Eagle consulted the communities, RA and stakeholders on the proposed expansion/amendment while undergoing a review of the Whale Tail Pit Project (started September 2016). This most likely added to the confusion for the public to understand the current approved project and the proposed expansion. More information will be needed from Agnico Eagle on their consultation process, how they ensured that there was minimal confusion between presenting the original Whale Tail Pit project and the proposed expansion project. How comments were received and noted to be related to the original Whale Tail Pit Project or to the expansion proposal, etc.</p>	<p>Consultation undertaken by Agnico Eagle is further described in FEIS Addendum (Volume 2, Section 2 and Volume 7). Consistent with the Approved Project, Agnico Eagle has taken a holistic approach to collecting IQ for the Expansion Project through the LOM and is illustrated in Volume 2, Figure 2-1. Additional IQ and Project-related concerns and issues have been provided by community members and representatives (i.e., Hunters and Trappers Organization and Kivalliq Inuit Association) since the FEIS submission was made in 2016 for the Approved Project. This information was identified through a review of the consultation record for the Approved Project and community consultation notes for the Expansion Project. The IQ and Expansion Project concerns have been categorised by topic (e.g., wildlife, fish, water quality) and are included in each respective discipline sections, and integrated into the assessment, where appropriate. The expansion concerns and mitigation measures are also listed in Addendum Appendix 2-D, Table 2-D-2.</p>	Volume 1 and 2	1.1.6 Consultation; Section 2, Fig 2-1	12 to 13; 42-43	<p>Presence of information confirmed; Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.</p>	No Response Required

Questions	Proponent Response	Location within Project Proposal			Notes	Agnico Eagle Response (December 19, 2018)
Table 1.2-1C shows an increase in ore mined between 2021 and 2024 compared to other years. Will the amount of trucks transporting the ore between the Whale Tail Pit site and Meadowbank increase to accommodate the increase in ore mined? Will the ore be stored in the stockpiles at Meadowbank until processed or stored in stockpiles at the Whale Tail Pit site? Provide the estimate traffic numbers for the haul road if the numbers are going to be different from the approved Whale Tail Pit Project.	The haul road traffic volumes for the Expansion Project are consistent with those applied to the Approved Project. Daily vehicle traffic on the haul road is shown in Volume 4, Appendix B, Table 4-B-20. In addition, the Approved Project, assumed that long haul trucks "daily vehicle passages" on the haul road would be 154 trucks per day on average and up to 173 trucks per day. (Volume 4, Appendix 4.B-8, Table 4-B-15). The average and upper limit number of long haul trucks has not changed for the Expansion Project as compared to the Approved Project, as it is based on a maximum throughput at the mill of 9,000 to 12,000 t/day. Ore will be stockpiled at both Meadowbank and Whale Tail Pit sites.	Volume 2	1.2.2.1 (Table 1.2-1C)	16 to 17	Volume 4, Appendix 4.B-8 refers to Power Plant and Camp Heater emissions, Table 4-B-15 refers to Wind Erosion. Information not present as referred to in these documents. Information provided only in proponent response and Volume 4, App B, Table 4-B-20. Quality of information to be assessed.	The haul road traffic volumes for the Expansion Project are consistent with those applied to the Approved Project Agnico Eagle refers NIRB to Approved Project FEIS Volume 4, Appendix 4-B, Table 4.B-8 (Steady-State Emission Factors for Off-road Diesel Engines) and Approved Project Volume 4, Appendix 4-B, Table 4-B-15 (Daily Vehicle Traffic on the Haul Road). Approved Project Table 4-B-15 referenced above is consistent with Table 4-B-20 provided in the FEIS Addendum
Certain sections note that the Expansion Proposal is for three to six more years (operation) while other sections note three to four more years. Clarify the discrepancies in numbers.	Refer to FEIS Addendum (Volume 3, Section 3.3, Figure 3.1-1) to understand the timeline for the project Approved vs. Expansion. For clarity in the Project Description Agnico Eagle has inserted "Years" to represent the approximate timelines of activities. These "Years" are consistent with the figure identified above and list of activities provided in Table 1.4-1.	Volume 3	3.3	58	Incorrect Figure reference #. Figure 3.3-1 provides the information likely being referred to. Quality of information to be assessed during technical review.	The NIRB is correct; the correct figure number is 3.3-1.