



**NIRB File No.: 16MN056**  
**NWB File No.: 2AM-WTP1826**

February 25, 2019

Ryan Vanengen  
Environment Superintendent – Nunavut  
Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.  
PO Box 549  
Baker Lake, NU X0C 0A0

*Sent via email: [ryan.vanengen@agnicoeagle.com](mailto:ryan.vanengen@agnicoeagle.com)*

**Re: Information Request received from Parties regarding Agnico Eagle Mines Limited's "Whale Tail Pit Expansion Project" Proposal**

---

Dear Ryan Vanengen:

On January 10, 2019 the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB or Board) initiated the public technical review of the revised Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) Addendum submitted by Agnico Eagle Mines Limited (Agnico Eagle, or Proponent) for the "Whale Tail Pit Expansion Project" proposal by requesting that interested parties submit Information Requests (IRs) to facilitate their technical review of the FEIS Addendum.

On or before February 21, 2019 the NIRB received IR submissions from the following parties:

- Kivalliq Inuit Association – 64 IRs
- Government of Nunavut – 28 IRs
- Government of Canada:
  - Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada – 9 IRs
  - Environment and Climate Change Canada – 25 IRs
  - Fisheries and Oceans Canada – 7 IRs
  - Health Canada – 7 IRs
  - Natural Resources Canada – 11 IRs

All documentation associated with the Whale Tail Pit Expansion Project proposal, including IR submissions, can be accessed via the NIRB's public registry: [www.nirb.ca/project/125418](http://www.nirb.ca/project/125418).

The NIRB has completed its review of the IRs received and hereby requests that Agnico Eagle respond to those IRs which have been determined to be relevant to the Proponent, to the current stage of the Reconsideration and Review process, and necessary to facilitate parties'

technical review of the FEIS Addendum and subsequent development of technical review comments.

Following a review of parties' IR submissions to the Board, the NIRB is also providing five (5) additional Information Requests directed to Agnico Eagle for its consideration and response (see [Appendix A](#)). The NIRB's development of these IRs considered issues which do not appear to have been raised by other parties through IR submissions, but which warrant that additional information or clarification be provided by Agnico Eagle.

Certain IRs contained within parties' submissions either appear to be outside the scope of information required for this phase of the Reconsideration and Review process and may therefore be more appropriately addressed through technical review comment submissions. While it is the Board's expectation that the Proponent will review all IRs, at this time the NIRB has provided a listing of specific requests (see [Appendix B](#)) for which the Proponent is either expected to provide a partial response, or is not expected to address within its response to IRs (IR Response Package); the latter are being forwarded on for information only, or for which the nature and limits to provision of data may prevent the Proponent from responding fully.

The NIRB notes that several parties identified issues with lack of detail in the FEIS Addendum, and timelines of availability for additional baseline collection being delayed until the component design is considered. Where the information/models requested cannot be provided without additional baseline, the Proponent must clearly identify when this information will be forthcoming, or which alternate method the Proponent will use to address the issue or concern.

When preparing its IR Response package, the NIRB recommends that the Proponent consult with parties as necessary to ensure the information to be provided meets the expectations of reviewers moving forward. Furthermore, where multiple IRs have outlined the same or similar information requirements, the Proponent is advised to provide one response that will adequately address these requests, avoiding unnecessary duplication.

The Board respectfully requests that Agnico Eagle review all submissions as available via the NIRB's online public registry and supply the NIRB with an indication of an anticipated date for submission of its IR Response Package, on or before **March 11, 2019**.

If you have any questions regarding the NIRB's assessment of the "Whale Tail Pit Expansion Project" proposal, please contact Erin Reimer, Technical Advisor I, at [ereimer@nirb.ca](mailto:ereimer@nirb.ca) or at (867) 857-4566 or Sophia Granchinho, Manager, Impact Assessment at [sgranchinho@nirb.ca](mailto:sgranchinho@nirb.ca) or (867) 857-4829.

Sincerely,



Sophia Granchinho  
Manager, Impact Assessment  
Nunavut Impact Review Board

cc: Whale Tail Pit Distribution List  
Jamie Quesnel, Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.  
Manon Turmel, Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.

Attachments: Appendix A: NIRB Information Requests to Agnico Eagle Mines Limited for the Final Environmental  
Impact Statement Addendum for the Whale Tail Pit Expansion Project Proposal  
Appendix B: Information Requests Identified by the NIRB as Requiring a Modified or No Response

**APPENDIX A:**  
**NIRB INFORMATION REQUESTS TO AGNICO EAGLE MINES LIMITED FOR THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT ADDENDUM FOR THE WHALE TAIL PIT EXPANSION PROJECT PROPOSAL**

<b>Information Request #:</b>	<b>NIRB-001</b>
<b>To:</b>	Agnico Eagle Mines Limited
<b>Reference(s):</b>	Throughout FEIS Addendum document, for example Appendix 4-D, and FEIS Addendum Table 4.4-0, p 94
<b>Subject:</b>	Use of existing baseline data with no new information gathered or submitted for the Addendum.
<b>Issue/Concern:</b>	Throughout the document, the Proponent submitted baseline data and other information unchanged since the 2016 submission for the approved Project. While this may be appropriate for the approved Project, the Proponent should provide justification why no additional baseline data was submitted as part of the Addendum other than the simple statement it was already reviewed and received conformity approval in the past. Further, the Proponent should provide an indication when additional baseline data for the Addendum will be submitted and the assessment updated accordingly.
<b>Information Request:</b>	The Proponent is requested to provide an indication when additional baseline data will be provided for the assessment and a justification as to why the provided information does not need to be updated.
<b>Information Request #:</b>	<b>NIRB-002</b>
<b>To:</b>	Agnico Eagle Mines Limited
<b>Reference(s):</b>	FEIS Addendum, Table 1.1-1, p 3; App 8-C.1 Whale Tail Haul Road Management Plan
<b>Subject:</b>	Lack of information regarding the use of the haul road as an airstrip.
<b>Issue/Concern:</b>	FEIS Addendum, Table 1.1-1 states part of the Haul Road will be used as an airstrip, however the Road Management Plan contains no reference to using it as such, no discussions or plans regarding safety, traffic management, or other related issues.
<b>Information Request:</b>	The Proponent is requested to provide information regarding how it will operate and manage a combination haul road and/or airstrip.
<b>Information Request #:</b>	<b>NIRB-003</b>
<b>To:</b>	Agnico Eagle Mines Limited
<b>Reference(s):</b>	Figure 1.2-1; Figure 2-2; Vol 8-D.2 Bulk Fuel Storage Facility Management Plan
<b>Subject:</b>	Fuel storage at the Whale Tail Bulk Fuel Storage Facility
<b>Issue/Concern:</b>	The FEIS Addendum indicates that the Expansion Project will require " <i>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 key storage locations illustrated in Figure 1.2-1.</i> " The location of the

	additional five storage locations is not clear based on the available information. One location is noted on Figure 1.2-1 near Vent Raise WHL #2 Heat Unit for 4*50,000L Fuel (total 200,000L), however no additional locations are visible on the figure, with the exception of the fuel tank farm. In addition, Vol 8 App D.2 Meadowbank & Whale Tail Bulk Fuel Storage Facility Environmental Performance Monitoring Plan does not make mention of the additional 700,000L storage sites.
<b>Information Request:</b>	<p>The Proponent should provide the planned location of these additional storage sites to accommodate the additional 700,000L of fuel as proposed.</p> <p>The Proponent should update the management plan(s) to include these additional sites, confirming that the Canadian Council of Ministers for the Environment (CCME) guidelines are followed with regards to construction and secondary containment, as well as the management of surface water drainage from these locations.</p>
<b>Information Request #:</b>	<b>NIRB-004</b>
<b>To:</b>	Agnico Eagle Mines Limited
<b>Reference(s):</b>	Volume 1 Section 1.2.12;
<b>Subject:</b>	Baker Lake Bulk Fuel Storage Facility
<b>Issue/Concern</b>	Currently there is an application with the Nunavut Water Board for the expansion of the Baker Lake Bulk Fuel Storage Facility (BFSF) under the Approved Project water license for an additional two (2) ten million litre fuel tanks. The FEIS Addendum notes that there will be no change to the Baker Lake BFSF as a result of the expansion however it appears that some components are changing to accommodate the Expansion Project and that the use of these facilities will be extended by at least an additional four (4) years as a result of the Expansion Project. Extended use of the Baker Lake facility and potential impacts are not discussed as part of the FEIS Addendum.
<b>Information Request</b>	<p>The Proponent should provide a discussion of the potential impacts that could result from the four (4) additional years of use from the expansion project at the Baker Lake facilities.</p> <p>The Proponent should provide an indication on whether it foresees likely changes or capacity increases of the Baker Lake BFSF as a result of the Expansion Project.</p> <p>The Proponent should provide updated management plans for the Baker Lake BFSF including updates to the extended timelines of the use of the facilities for the Expansion Project.</p>
<b>Information Request #:</b>	<b>NIRB-005</b>
<b>To:</b>	Agnico Eagle Mines Limited
<b>Reference(s):</b>	FEIS Addendum Document
<b>Subject:</b>	Approved Project supplemental information and lessons learned

<b>Issue/Concern:</b>	<p>It has been noted throughout review of the FEIS Addendum that the main document and many of the supporting documents provided are very similar in format and content to the Approved Whale Tail Pit FEIS. In review of parties' comments submitted for the Approved project as well as Agnico Eagle's responses at that time, it appears much of the supplemental information provided for the Approved Project has not been incorporated into the FEIS Addendum for the Expansion project. As the Expansion project will be an Amendment to the Approved project and a reconsideration of Project Certificate 008 terms and conditions, it is apparent that any supplemental information from the Approved Project is very much relevant to the review of the Expansion Project.</p>
<b>Information Request:</b>	<p>Agnico Eagle should explain how parties concerns from the review and assessment of the Approved Project, such as information requests, technical review comments, final written submissions, as well as supplemental information provided by the Proponent following the Pre-hearing Conference have been addressed in the FEIS Addendum for the Expansion Project. Agnico Eagle should clarify how these concerns and information have been carried forward and incorporated into the current application as those concerns are relevant to support the review of the Expansion Project.</p> <p>The NIRB requests that if the information as listed has not been incorporated that Agnico Eagle provide an explanation on why the information was not included and whether Agnico Eagle plans to incorporate the information within the FEIS Addendum.</p>

**APPENDIX B:  
INFORMATION REQUESTS IDENTIFIED BY THE NIRB AS REQUIRING A MODIFIED OR NO  
RESPONSE**

In the table below, the NIRB has attempted to identify those Information Requests (IRs) which either require a modified response, or which do not appear to meet the criteria to qualify as an IR required for the development of technical review comments as part of this stage of the Reconsideration and Review for the Whale Tail Pit Expansion Project proposal. Generally, each of the following items appeared to be either: editorial comments on content; issues more appropriately addressed through technical review comments; requests for data to facilitate independent analysis; or it was unclear to the NIRB how the IR in question would facilitate development of technical review comments (e.g. comments on items outside of the scope of the NIRB's Reconsideration and Review Process).

While the Proponent will not be explicitly required to address the following items within its IR Response Package, the NIRB strongly recommends that Agnico Eagle thoroughly review each item and make its own determination regarding the need for or its ability to, provide an appropriate response.

IR #	Issue	NIRB Direction
<b>Kivalliq Inuit Association (KivIA)</b>		
<b>KivIA-IR-04</b>	KivIA requests that AEM substantiate statements regarding caribou passage across the Whale Tail haul road that acknowledges the differences between AWAR (service road with substantially lower traffic levels but with hunting allowed) and the haul road (high frequency of haul truck vehicles but harvesting along the road unlikely).	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic.
<b>KivIA-IR-08</b>	Please provide additional rationale to substantiate the predicted impacts from mercury associated with the longer flood time of Whale Tail Lake. As part of this discussion, please provide a sensitivity analysis using higher levels of accumulation to provide more confidence in the proponent's capacity to manage and mitigate project effects associated with mercury. Please outline management options that are available should greater concentrations of methyl mercury result from project activities than are currently predicted.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic along with management options as requested, with the sensitivity analyses more appropriately addressed through the technical review period.
<b>KivIA-IR-11</b>	Please provide a discussion regarding impacts associated with the flooded IVR Pit Lake at closure on underlying groundwater in the far future when a through talik has formed.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic.
<b>KivIA-IR-13</b>	Please provide rationale as to why the water balance was only run using mean annual precipitation. Please provide a sensitivity analysis	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing rationale on the topic,

IR #	Issue	NIRB Direction
	on site that includes increased and decreased precipitation conditions and discuss any implications to water management.	with the sensitivity analysis more appropriately addressed through the technical review period.
<b>KivIA-IR-14</b>	Please provide hydrodynamic modelling to describe the stability of the water column, the settled precipitate and underlying unconsolidated tailings in the closure and post closure environments. Please provide additional details as to the water quality treatment that will be used to meet water quality closure objectives in the Portage and Goose Pits.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic.
<b>KivIA-IR-15</b>	Please provide refined closure objectives within the ICRP to provide confidence that proposed changes associated with the project are reversible. Specifically, we request the proponent include a commitment to ensure water quality in the RSA returns to baseline conditions or meets CCME WQOs for the protection of aquatic life at closure.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic.
<b>KivIA-IR-18</b>	Please provide a figure showing the location of sampling sites for the human health assessment. Please discuss potential impacts of the 1-hour NO <sub>2</sub> levels on workers at the Whale Tail mine site.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing an updated figure as requested, with discussion of impacts more appropriately addressed through the technical review period.
<b>KivIA-IR-19</b>	Please re-assess the human health and aquatic life risks associated with arsenic based on a revised water quality model which calculates total arsenic concentrations and 75th percentiles. Please indicate what toxicity information and benchmarks were used in the risk assessments. Please discuss the likelihood that affected waterbodies could be fished in future, and over what time period carcinogenic risks associated with arsenic are expected to continue in affected waterbodies.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic.
<b>KivIA-IR-22</b>	1. Please provide an estimate of how much additional rock will need to be extracted to construct the expanded haul road.	Topics as requested under 22(1) and 22(2) are expected to be addressed at this stage of the assessment while



IR #	Issue	NIRB Direction
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Please provide information on the location of the four new borrow pits in relation to watercourses (in text and a figure).</li> <li>3. Please discuss potential impacts on surface water quality and associated mitigation measures.</li> <li>4. Please provide a schedule for monitoring haul road borrow pits and explain the procedure for dealing with any acid generating and metal leaching materials should they be found during monitoring.</li> </ol>	information requested under 22(3) and 22(4) are limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification with the requested information more appropriately addressed through the technical review period.
<b>KivIA-IR-23</b>	Please explain how any ongoing cases of poor or incomplete detonation will be managed to maximize detonation and minimize the loss of ammonia.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic.
<b>KivIA-IR-41</b>	<p>Please provide either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Updated model results using the maximum authorized concentration, or</li> <li>b) A sensitivity analysis using 0.2 mg/L of arsenic, or</li> <li>c) A rationale discussing why neither option a or b were completed.</li> </ol>	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing a rationale as requested in 41c) with requested information under 41a) and 41b) more appropriately addressed through the technical review period.
<b>KivIA-IR-42</b>	Please compare water quality impacts within the receiving environment from the actual (measured discharge concentrations of phosphorus and nitrate) and assumed treatment (currently modeled concentrations of phosphorus, 1 mg/L, and nitrate, 10 mg/L-N).	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic.
<b>KivIA-IR-43</b>	Can AEM please update the source terms and model results once kinetic testing results are available to validate loading rate assumptions? We would expect that this would be available for the expansion project Water Licence application or amendment of the existing Whale Tail Water Licence.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic.
<b>KivIA-IR-47</b>	Can AEM please update their water quality model to reflect realistic parameter concentrations in precipitation?	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic.
<b>KivIA-IR-49</b>	Can AEM compare the results from their hydrodynamic modelling with observations made at other flooded mine pits in northern climates to comment on the degree of mixing predicted, any	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic.

IR #	Issue	NIRB Direction
	<p>anoxic conditions that develop and any associated internal loading of phosphorus from pit sediments which is considered a COPC? Can AEM please provide more details with regards to the biannual stratification including the length of stratification and modeled profile including dissolved oxygen concentrations?</p>	
<b>KivIA-IR-52</b>	<p>Can AEM please update model predictions to represent total concentrations as this would not only be a conservative approach, but also more appropriate for effluent limit, guideline and site-specific objective comparison since all these metrics represent total concentrations?</p>	<p>IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic.</p>
<b>Government of Nunavut (GN)</b>		
<b>GN IR #15</b>	<p>The GN requests the Proponent provide the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Justification for using the measured ambient noise levels instead of the assumed ambient sound level, yet not adjusting the PSLs by claiming the A2 Adjustment to establish site-specific PSL values;</li> <li>2. Analysis with revised tables showing a consistent approach of using either 1) default values (assumed ambient of 35 dBA <math>L_{eq}</math> and default nighttime PSL of 40 dBA <math>L_{eq}</math>), or 2) site specific values (measured ambient of 30 dBA and the site specific PSL calculated using the A2 Adjustment); and</li> <li>3. Based upon the analysis requested in 2) above, the GN requests the following information: Whether the Expansion Project is predicted to comply with AER Directive 038.</li> </ol>	<p>Topics as requested under 15(1) are expected to be addressed at this stage of the assessment while information requested under 15(2) and 15(3) are limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification while the requested information on the revised analyses to be addressed through the technical review period.</p>
<b>GN IR #16</b>	<p>The GN requests the Proponent provide the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Justification for choosing the Rmax point on the LSA boundary, where the LSA distance is 5 km, rather than the Rmax point on a 1.5 km boundary;</li> <li>2. Analysis as to whether a revised PSL assessment using the Rmax point on a 1.5 km boundary still indicates compliance with AER Directive 038; and</li> <li>3. An explanation as to why the assessment outlined in Meadowbank Mine does not indicate compliance with AER Directive 038.</li> </ol>	<p>IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification to topic 1) and 3), with analysis requested under topic 2) to be addressed through the technical review period.</p>

IR #	Issue	NIRB Direction
<b>Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC)</b>		
<b>CIRNAC IR#:</b> <b>1</b>	CIRNAC recommends that the FEIS be revised to include comparative analyses of environmental modelling and predictions conducted on the Approved Project and the Expansion Project. The analyses should be quantitative and, where substantive changes in the environmental modelling results have occurred between the two projects, the rationale for the changes should be provided. The additional information is necessary to evaluate the incremental environmental impacts associated with the Expansion Project.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic with the comparative analyses more appropriately addressed through technical review period.
<b>CIRNAC IR#:</b> <b>2</b>	CIRNAC recommends that AEM clearly indicate the spatial extent within all surface water receivers in which concentrations of potential contaminants may exceed the SSWQO or other applicable criteria. The evaluation should identify and characterize potential ecological impacts in areas where the proposed water quality criteria may be exceeded. Using the findings of the assessment noted above, CIRNAC recommends that AEM clearly indicate the monitoring and compliance points that will be used to assess performance against the SSWQO.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic with the evaluation more appropriately addressed through the technical review period.
<b>CIRNAC IR#:</b> <b>3</b>	CIRNAC recommends that AEM perform quantitative sensitivity analyses of their water quality modelling. The analyses should systematically quantify potential variability in all major source terms and associated pathways (e.g., elevated arsenic seepage from pit walls, WRSF and mine areas). CIRNAC acknowledges that some sensitivity analyses have already been performed (e.g., variable hydraulic conductivities) but a more comprehensive analysis of all variables is justified. The additional information is necessary to verify the proponent's conclusion that their modelling results are highly conservative and that they likely over-predict any potential impacts.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic with the sensitivity analyses more appropriately addressed through the technical review period.
<b>CIRNAC IR#:</b> <b>4</b>	CIRNAC recommends that the following additional information be provided prior to the Technical Review phase. The information is necessary to determine potential long-term environmental impacts associated with the proposed project.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic with the sensitivity analyses more appropriately

IR #	Issue	NIRB Direction
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) AEM should conduct a sensitivity analysis to assess the water quality impacts associated with 1% contamination of WRSF covers with ARD/ML material (e.g., komatiite and iron formations). The sensitivity analysis should also evaluate the impacts associated with similar contamination of other mine infrastructure such as mine roads, lay down areas, etc.</li> <li>b) If AEM uses the Meadowbank WRSF seepage results as evidence for the current application, AEM should specify the date at which the facility is predicted to reach its field capacity.</li> </ul>	addressed through the technical review period.
<b>CIRNAC IR#:</b> <b>5</b>	<p>CIRNAC recommends that the following additional information be provided prior to the Technical Review phase. The information is necessary to understand the scope of the proposed project, why any changes are justified and to assess any incremental environmental impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) AEM should justify all proposed changes to water intake/discharge infrastructure and operational practices (e.g., effluent mixing), emphasizing why the requirements have changed since the Approved Project.</li> <li>b) AEM should explicitly identify and describe the environmental impacts associated with any incremental chemical loadings caused by the Expansion Project. In addition, AEM should specify the water quality implications to surface water receivers if arsenic loading rates are higher than currently predicted and/or the duration of discharge is longer than planned. In situations where there are potential exceedances of applicable water quality criteria, potential mitigation measures should be evaluated (e.g., more stringent effluent criteria to reduce the probability and severity of impacts to surface water receivers).</li> <li>c) AEM should confirm it is not proposing alternate water intake or discharges, other than those described in detail and explicitly assessed in the FEIS.</li> </ul>	Topics as requested under 5a) and 5c) are expected to be addressed at this stage of the assessment while information requested under 5b) are limited to to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the environmental impacts associated with any incremental chemical loadings with more details provided and addressed through the technical review period.
<b>CIRNAC IR#:</b> <b>6</b>	CIRNAC recommends that AEM provide a consolidated summary indicating the information	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing

IR #	Issue	NIRB Direction
	gaps and uncertainties associated with the hydrogeological regime. At minimum, the summary should identify gaps and uncertainties related to the following three variables: groundwater quality, hydraulic conductivity and hydraulic gradients. Using sensitivity analyses, the summary should quantitatively demonstrate that an appropriate level of conservatism has been used in the FEIS.	additional clarification on the topic with the sensitivity analyses more appropriately addressed through the technical review period.
<b>CIRNAC IR#: 8</b>	<p>CIRNAC recommends that the following additional information be provided prior to the Technical Review phase. The information is necessary to understand the predicted incremental risks to humans and the environment that could be caused by the proposed project. We also want to verify that potentially impacted parties have been fully informed of those incremental risks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) CIRNAC recommends that the full HHERA be provided for review prior to the Technical Review Period.</li> <li>b) CIRNAC recommends that AEM specify which project changes are primarily attributable for the incremental risks calculated for the Expansion Project (i.e., as compared to the Approved Project).</li> <li>c) CIRNAC recommends that AEM confirm whether local residents were consulted when determining which land use scenarios should be used in the HHERA.</li> <li>d) CIRNAC recommends that AEM confirm whether community consultation regarding the Expansion Project has included summaries of the HHERA findings. Specifically, please confirm that land users were informed the HHERA predicts the Expansion Project will result in elevated risks to people and aquatic life.</li> </ul>	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic with the full HHERA more appropriately addressed through the technical review period.
<b>Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC)</b>		
<b>ECCC-IR#: 3</b>	<p>ECCC requests that the Proponent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Clarify what climate change scenarios were used to inform the proposed Expansion Project.</li> <li>b) Clarify whether the highest emissions scenario (RCP8.5) was included.</li> </ul>	Topics as requested under 3a) and 3b) are expected to be addressed at this stage of the assessment while information requested under 3c) limited to

IR #	Issue	NIRB Direction
	c) Provide an incorporation of RCP8.5 into climate change models for the proposed Expansion Project and the following Project elements listed above.	Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the climate change models with updates to the models further investigated during the technical review period.
<b>ECCC-IR#: 6</b>	ECCC requests that the Proponent: a) Provide revised air quality modeling which employs appropriate receptor grid spacing, from a relevant air modeling guideline. b) Present new results for predicted air pollutant concentrations, including isopleth maps and all discrete receptors.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic with revised modelling more appropriately addressed through the technical review period.
<b>ECCC-IR#: 12</b>	ECCC requests that the Proponent: a) Provide the detailed ecological risk assessment analyses for Semipalmated Sandpiper under baseline and Approved Whale Tail Project conditions including an analysis of ingestion of water and/or sediment at the Tailings Storage Facility as an exposure pathway. b) Revise the TEMP to include monitoring commitment #14 related to shorebird use of the Tailings Storage Facility and other contact water ponds.	Information requested under 12b) are expected to be addressed at this stage of the assessment while information requested under 12a) are limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic with the risk assessment analyses more appropriately addressed through the technical review period.
<b>ECCC-IR#: 14</b>	ECCC requests that the Proponent: a) Clarify if habitat loss estimates and displacement of birds in Section 5.5.3.2 of the FEIS Addendum include predicted flooding. b) Revise bird displacement predictions of the proposed Expansion Project due to the loss of habitat while accounting for the preliminary 2018 bird survey results. c) Provide a revised analysis and determination of residual impacts for migratory bird VECs for the proposed Expansion Project while accounting for the preliminary 2018 bird survey results.	Topics as requested under 14a) are expected to be addressed at this stage of the assessment while information requested under 14b) and 14c) are limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the predictions and revised analyses through the technical review period.



IR #	Issue	NIRB Direction
<b>Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO)</b>		
<b>DFO IR#: 3</b>	For the regulatory phase of the review, AEM provide an updated fish-out plan for the waterbodies affected by the Expansion Project. The updated fish-out plan should incorporate lessons learned from the Whale Tail Lake North Basin fish-out, and should include, but is not limited to, the design/method of the fish-out, number(s) and duration(s) of net sets, types of nets and calculations to be used for population estimates.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional information on the consultation process with DFO and communities on the development of the updated fish-out plan.
<b>Health Canada (HC)</b>		
<b>HC IR #1</b>	Health Canada requests a) An updated HHRA be provided prior to the start of the Technical Review phase so that apparent gaps in the noise assessment approach can be identified and considered. b) Clarification if the PSL exceeds or does not exceed the PSL at Grave Site 30 is currently not clear. c) Confirm whether additional human receptor locations have been identified and considered in the assessment. d) Health Canada recommends further evaluation of human health impacts, including vulnerable persons, with regards to noise.	Topics as requested under 1(b) and 1(c) are expected to be addressed at this stage of the assessment while information requested under 1(a) and 1(d) are limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the updated HHRA and additional evaluation through the technical review period.
<b>HC IR #2</b>	Health Canada recommends: a) An updated HHRA be provided prior to the start of the Technical Review phase so that apparent gaps in the assessment approach can be identified and considered. b) Further evaluation of impacts on human health, including vulnerable persons, with regards to recreational and drinking water quality, including those used for hunting. If increased contaminants may have an effect on human health through other exposure routes, a quantitative risk assessment that includes cumulative risks, is recommended.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic with the evaluation of impacts more appropriately addressed through the technical review period.
<b>HC IR #3</b>	Health Canada recommends: a) An updated HHRA be provided prior to the start of the Technical Review phase so that apparent gaps in the assessment approach can be identified and considered.	Topics as requested under 3c) and 3d) to be addressed at this stage of the assessment while information requested under 3a) and 3b) are

IR #	Issue	NIRB Direction
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) Further evaluation of human health impacts, including vulnerable persons, with regards to country foods consumption. If such impacts are found, and if the same contaminants may have an effect on human health through other exposure routes a quantitative risk assessment, such as an HHRA, is recommended.</li> <li>c) Considering the pit expansion predicted changes to fish tissue quality and potential health impacts to high fish consumers. Include hazard quotients and risk mitigation, as applicable.</li> <li>d) Considering a mercury monitoring plan for country foods.</li> </ul>	<p>limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic with the updated HHRA and evaluation of human health impacts more appropriately addressed through the technical review period.</p>
<b>HC IR #4</b>	<p>Health Canada recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) An updated HHRA be provided prior to the start of the Technical Review phase so that apparent gaps in the assessment approach can be identified and considered.</li> <li>b) Further evaluation of human health impacts, including vulnerable persons, with regards to air quality.</li> <li>c) The evaluation is not limited to Grave Site 30 but also include identified areas for hunting, travelling, camping, recreational water use, and areas cultural importance.</li> </ul>	<p>Topics as requested under 4b) and 4c) to be addressed through the technical review period while information requested under 4a) are limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic with the updated HHRA and evaluation of human health impacts more appropriately addressed through the technical review period.</p>
<b>HC IR #5</b>	<p>Health Canada recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) An updated HHRA be provided prior to the start of the Technical Review phase so that apparent gaps in the assessment approach can be identified and considered.</li> <li>b) Emissions of VOCs and PAHs should also be considered as Air Quality VC indicators, especially if extensive use of diesel powered equipment is anticipated during any phase of the Project.</li> <li>c) Information regarding the location of the Project and distance to all potential human receptors for different uses (residential, recreational, traditional land users, etc.) within the area affected by the Project.</li> </ul>	<p>Topics as requested under 5a) and 5b) are limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic with the information as requested more appropriately addressed through the technical review period.</p> <p>Topics as requested under 5c), 5d) and 5e)</p>



IR #	Issue	NIRB Direction
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d) Modelled ambient concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> should be compared to the CAAQS.</li> <li>e) The proponent assesses whether the currently proposed mitigation strategy for reducing NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> will be sufficient to reduce future concentrations below the CAAQS.</li> </ul>	to be addressed at this stage of the assessment.
<b>HC IR #6</b>	<p>Health Canada recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) An updated HHRA be provided prior to the start of the Technical Review phase so that apparent gaps in the assessment approach can be identified and considered.</li> <li>b) Further information and discussions on dusting events that are known to occur along the haul road. The dusting events have the potential to impact country foods which are consumed.</li> <li>c) Providing further discussion on why PAHs were not included as a CAC associated with transport generated dust along haul road in the assessments and if required update the effects assessment.</li> </ul>	Topics as requested under 6b) and 6c) to be addressed at this stage of the assessment while information requested under 6a) are limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic with the updated HHRA with the assessment of human health impacts more appropriately addressed through the technical review period
<b>Natural Resources Canada (NRCan)</b>		
<b>NRCan #9</b>	Please provide the effect of a log-linear variation of hydraulic conductivities with depth on modeling results (inflow rates/volumes and flow directions).	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic.