Application for Water Licence Amendment

Document Date: April 2013

Application Submission Date: 11/21/2013
Month/Day/Year

P.O. BOX 119
GJOA HAVEN, NUNAVUT
XOB 1J0
TEL: (867) 360-6338
FAX:(867) 360-6369

ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᐃᓚᓕᕆᔨᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᖏᑦ
NUNAVUT IMALIRIYIN KATIMAYIT
NUNAVUT WATER BOARD
OFFICE DES EAUX DU NUNAVUT

DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT

Original Document Date: April 2010

DOCUMENT AMENDMENTS

	Description	Date
(1)	Updated for public distribution as separate document from NWB Guide 7	June 2010
(2)	Updated NWB logos and reformatted table to allow rows to break across page	May 2011
(3)	New NWB logo; request for background information; and change to Block 24	April 2013
(4)		
(5)		
(6)		
(7)		
(8)		
(9)		
(10)		

P.O. BOX 119
GJOA HAVEN, NU X0B 1J0
TEL: (867) 360-6338
FAX: (867) 360-6369

ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᐃᒪᓕᕆᔨᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᑦ
NUNAVUT WATER BOARD
NUNAVUT IMALIRIYIN KATIMAYIT
OFFICE DES EAUX DU NUNAVUT

APPLICATION FOR WATER LICENCE AMENDMENT

The applicant is referred to the NWB's Guide 7: *Licensee Requirements Following the Issuance of a Water Licence* for more information about this application form.

Where possible, provide background information regarding the original licence application or attach previously submitted information.

EXISTING LICENCE NO: 2BB-MEL0914

1. LICENSEE CONTACT INFORMATION

Is the licensee the same as that referred to on the existing licence?

X Yes ☐ No

If No, a licence assignment must be completed and approved by the NWB. **An amendment will only be issued in the name of the current licensee in the absence of assignment of the licence.**

If the licensee is the same, but the name of the licensee has changed, attach a certificate of name change.

Name: Agnico-Eagle Mines Limited
Attention: Stéphane Robert, Manager Regulatory Affairs Nunavut

Address: 10 200, route de Preissac, Rouyn-Noranda, Québec, J0Y 1C0

Phone: (819) 759-3700 ext. 5188 Mobile Phone: (819) 763-0229
Fax: (819) 759 3663
e-mail: stephane.robert@agnicoeagle.com

2. LICENSEE REPRESENTATIVE CONTACT INFORMATION – If different from Block 1.

Name:

Address:

Phone:
Fax:
e-mail:
(Attach authorization letter.)

3. NAME OF PROJECT

Has the name of the project changed?

☐ Yes X No

If Yes, indicate the name of the project including the name of the location: _____

4. LOCATION OF UNDERTAKING

Does the proposed amendment change the location of the amended undertaking?

☐ Yes X No

Provide the project extents and camp locations. Identify proposed changes.

Project Extents

NW:	Latitude: (63 ° 04 ’ 40” N)	Longitude: (92 ° 22 ’ 03” W)
NE:	Latitude: (63 ° 04 ’ 40” N)	Longitude: (92 °01’ 18 ” W)
SE:	Latitude: (62 ° 57 ’63 ” N)	Longitude: (92 °01’ 18 ” W)
SW:	Latitude: (62 ° 57 ’63 ” N)	Longitude: (92 ° 22 ’ 03” W)

Camp Location(s)

Latitude: (63 ° 01 ’ 30” N) Longitude: (92° 10’ 20” W)

5. MAP

Does the proposed amendment change the locations of any of the main components of the undertaking?

☐ Yes X No

Attach a topographical map, indicating the main components of the undertaking. Identify proposed changes.

NTS Map Sheet No.: 55 N/1 Map Name: Meliadine Lake Map Scale: 1:50,000

The figures can be found at the end of the amendment application.

Figure 1 shows the location of the advanced exploration site in relation to Rankin Inlet.

Figure 2 shows the location of the proposed landfarm in relation to the main infrastructure at the advanced exploration site. The landfarm would be located immediately next to the bulk fuel storage area and in the old bladder farm containment area. This has an impermeable liner.

6. NATURE OF INTEREST IN THE LAND

Does the proposed amendment change the nature of the interest in the land?

☐ Yes X No

If Yes, indicate changes. _____

Check any of the following that are applicable to the proposed undertaking (at least one box under the 'Surface' header must be checked).

Sub-surface

X Mineral Lease from Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (NTI)

Date (expected date) of issuance: *various times after Nunavut Land Claim Agreement signed*
Date of expiry: *varies, renewed as required*

Agnico-Eagle has 3,430 ha of sub-surface Nunavut Tunngavik Inc. (NTI) concessions where the subsurface mineral rights are administered directly by NTI.

X Mineral Lease from Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC)
Date (expected date) of issuance: *before NLCA signed*
Date of expiry: *varies – earliest 2017 for some claims, others later; renewed as required.*

Mineral leases (51,286 ha) and claims (887 ha) are grandfathered under the Canada Mining Regulations and are administered by Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development.

Surface

☐ Crown Land Use Authorization from Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC)
Date (expected date) of issuance: _____ Date of expiry: _____

☐ Inuit Owned Land (IOL) Authorization from Kitikmeot Inuit Association (KIA)
Date (expected date) of issuance: _____ Date of expiry: _____

X IOL Authorization from Kivalliq Inuit Association (KivIA)
Date (expected date) of issuance: *commercial lease, July 1, 2002*
Date of expiry: *June 30, 2014*,(*renewed every 2 years)*

☐ IOL Authorization from Qikiqtani Inuit Association (QIA)
Date (expected date) of issuance: _____ Date of expiry: _____

☐ Commissioner's Land Use Authorization
Date (expected date) of issuance: _____ Date of expiry: _____

☐ Other _____

Date (expected date) of issuance: _____ Date of expiry: _____

Is the name of the entity(s) holding authorizations the same as that considered in the existing water licence?

X Yes ☐ No

If No, a licence assignment must be completed and approved by the NWB.

Name of entity(s) holding authorizations:

7. NUNAVUT PLANNING COMMISSION (NPC) DETERMINATION

Indicate the land use planning area in which the existing project is located.

☐ North Baffin	X Keewatin
☐ South Baffin	☐ Sanikiluaq
☐ Akunniq	☐ West Kitikmeot

Does the proposed amendment change the land use planning area?

☐ Yes X No

If yes, indicate the land use planning area in which the amended undertaking is located.

☐ North Baffin	☐ Keewatin
☐ South Baffin	☐ Sanikiluaq
☐ Akunniq	☐ West Kitikmeot

Was a land use plan conformity determination required from NPC prior to the issuance of the existing water licence?

X Yes ☐ No

If Yes, indicate date issued and attach copy. *May 11, 2007. A copy is attached.*

Does the proposed amendment change the original NPC conformity determination or the need to obtain one?

☐ Yes X No

If Yes, indicate date issued (or expected) and attach a copy. _____
If No, provide written confirmation from NPC confirming that a land use plan conformity review is not required.

8. NUNAVUT IMPACT REVIEW BOARD (NIRB) DETERMINATION

Was a screening determination required from NIRB prior to the issuance of the existing water licence?

X Yes ☐ No

If Yes, indicate date issued and attach copy. *NIRB File # 07EN044, Issued 3 June 2007. A copy is attached.*

Does the proposed amendment change the original NIRB screening determination or the need to obtain one?

☐ Yes X No

If Yes, indicate date issued (or expected) and attach a copy. _____
If No, provide written confirmation from NIRB confirming that a screening determination is not required.

9. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

Does the proposed amendment change the description of the undertaking?

☐ Yes X No

List and attach plans and drawings or project proposal. Identify proposed changes.

Landfarm Management Plan - a copy is attached.

10. OPTIONS

Does the proposed amendment change any of the alternative methods and locations that were considered to carry out the project?

☐ Yes X No

Provide a brief explanation of the alternative methods or locations that were considered to carry out the project. Identify proposed changes.

11. CLASSIFICATION OF PRIMARY UNDERTAKING

Indicate the primary classification of undertaking for the existing licence by checking one of the following boxes:

☐ Industrial
☐ Agricultural
X Mining and Milling (includes exploration/drilling/exploration camps)
☐ Conservation
☐ Municipal (includes camps/lodges)
☐ Recreational
☐ Power
☐ Miscellaneous (describe below):
_____

Does the proposed amendment change the classification of primary undertaking?

☐ Yes X No

If Yes, indicate the primary undertaking of the amendment:_____

Information in accordance with applicable Supplemental Information Guidelines (SIG) must be updated and submitted with an Application for Amendment. Indicate which SIG(s) are applicable to your application.

☐ Hydrostatic Testing
☐ Tannery
☐ Tourist / Remote Camp
☐ Landfarm & On-Site Storage of Hydrocarbon Contaminated Soil
☐ Onshore Oil and Gas Exploration Drilling
☐ Mineral Exploration / Remote Camp
X Advanced Exploration (*The completed form is attached.)*
☐ Mine Development
☐ Municipal
☐ General Water Works
☐ Power

12. WATER USE

Indicate, using the boxes below, the types of water use(s) approved in the existing licence.

X To obtain water for camp/ municipal purposes
X To obtain water for industrial purposes
☐ To cross a watercourse
☐ To alter the flow of, or store water
☐ Other: _____
☐ To divert a watercourse
☐ To modify the bed or bank of a watercourse
☐ Flood control

Does the proposed amendment change the type(s) of water use(s)?

☐ Yes X No

If Yes, indicate using the boxes below, the proposed change(s) to the type(s) of water use(s) noting any water use(s) that are to be added, continued, or removed.

☐ To obtain water for camp/ municipal purposes
☐ To obtain water for industrial purposes
☐ To cross a watercourse
☐ To alter the flow of, or store water
☐ Other: _____
☐ To divert a watercourse
☐ To modify the bed or bank of a watercourse
☐ Flood control

13. QUANTITY OF WATER INVOLVED

Does the proposed amendment change the source of water? ☐ Yes X No

Indicate the water source(s). Identify proposed changes:

Water for camp use (45 m^3/day) comes from Meliadine Lake. Water for drilling (245 m^3/day) comes from Lake A8 and small ponds near drill sites. There will not be any changes.

The landfarm could in dry years use a small amount of water obtained from approved sources (<5 m^3 per year), these being Meliadine Lake, Lake A8 or a nearby small pond. Water may be required over the summer period for dust suppression originating from the landfarm, and possibly to supply the microbes in the landfarm with moisture. These microbes are expected to remove petroleum hydrocarbons from the contaminated soil.

(show location(s) on map) *Figure 2 shows Meliadine Lake, Lake A8 and nearby small ponds.*

Does the proposed amendment change the quality of the water source and/or its available capacity?

☐ Yes X No

Describe the quality of the water source(s) and the available capacity(s). Identify any changes.:_____
_____

Does the proposed amendment change the overall quantity of water to be used?

☐ Yes X No

Provide the overall estimated quantity to be used. Identify proposed changes. : _____ m^3/day

Does the proposed amendment change the quantity of water to be used from each source?

☐ Yes X No

Provide the estimated quantity(s) of water to be used from each source. Identify proposed changes:
_____

Does the proposed amendment change the quantity of water to be used for each purpose?

☐ Yes X No

Provide the estimated quantities to be used for each purpose (camp, drilling, etc.). Identify proposed changes:

_____

Does the proposed amendment change the method(s) of extraction? ☐ Yes X No

Describe the method(s) of extraction. Identify proposed changes. :_____

Does the proposed amendment change the quantity(s) of water returned to source(s)?

☐ Yes X No

Estimated quantity(s) of water returned to source(s). Identify proposed changes. : _____0_____ m^3/day

Does the proposed amendment change the quality(s) of water returned to source(s)?

☐ Yes X No

Describe the quality(s) of water(s) returned to source(s). Identify any changes. : _____
_____

14. WASTE

Check the appropriate box(s) to indicate the types of waste(s) approved in the existing licence.

X Sewage *(BIOdisk treatment)*
X Solid Waste *(onsite landfill)*
X Hazardous *(sent south for disposal)*
X Bulky Items/Scrap Metal *(shipped south)*
☐ Animal Waste
☐ Other (describe):_____
X Waste oil *(collected and sent south for recycle)*
X Greywater (*BIOdisk treatment)*
X Sludges *(Sewage sludge – used in reclamation)*
☐ Contaminated soil and/or water

Does the proposed amendment change the type(s) of waste(s) to be generated or deposited?

X Yes ☐ No

If Yes, indicate using the boxes below, the proposed change(s) to the type(s) of waste(s) to be generated and/or deposited noting the addition, removal or continued generation and/or disposal of waste(s).

☐ Sewage
☐ Solid Waste
☐ Hazardous
☐ Bulky Items/Scrap Metal
☐ Animal Waste
☐ Other (describe):_____
☐ Waste oil
☐ Greywater
☐ Sludges
X Contaminated soil and/or water

15. QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF WASTE INVOLVED

Does the proposed amendment change the quantity(s) of the types of wastes involved?

☐ Yes X No

Does the proposed amendment change the composition(s) of the types of wastes involved?

☐ Yes X No

Does the proposed amendment change the method(s) of treatment for the types of waste involved?

X Yes ☐ No

Does the proposed amendment change the method(s) of disposal for the types of waste involved?

X Yes ☐ No

If Yes to any of the above, describe the proposed changes: *Hydrocarbon contaminated soil will be landfarmed in a containment area having an impermeable liner. The lined area was previously used to hold fuel bladders.See Landfarm Management Plan for details.*

_____

For each type of waste indicated in Block 14, describe its composition, quantity in cubic meters/day, method of treatment and method of disposal.

Type of Waste	Composition	Quantity Generated (tonnes/year)	Treatment Method	Disposal Method
Solid Waste	Scrape wood, scrape shingles, cardboard boxes, plastic materials, glass, hoses, etc.	15 to 30	No treatment	Landfill. Small quantities of scrape wood and cardboard could be incinerated
Bulky items / scrape metal	Drill steel, broken machinery, 205 litre barrels, old skidoos, etc.	50 to 100	All waste is cleaned of hydrocarbons and electronics removed before disposal. Scrap metal also sent south for recycling.	Landfill and recycling in the south
Incinerator Ash	Ash, tin cans, glass	22 to 45	Waste from offices, rooms and kitchen are all incinerated + anything in contact with food	Landfill or shipped to a southern certified waste management facility for treatment and disposal
Hydrocarbon Contaminated Soil	Soil having diesel, gasoline or other light hydrocarbons	Varies annually based on the number of spills	Aeration and biological treatment of contaminated soil	Landfarm
Sewage sludge	Sludge remaining following waste water treatment	Estimated at 3 to 20 m3/year (varies with the annual quantity removed from the BIOdisk treatment plant)	Pumped from the treatment plant and passed through a filter press to retain the solids	Used in reclamation of disturbed land at drill sites or in the landfarm.

16. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

Does the proposed amendment change the need for other authorizations in addition to the sub-surface and surface land use authorizations provided in Block 6?

X Yes ☐ No

If Yes, indicate any additional authorizations required, which authorizations are no longer required, and which authorizations continue to be required.

For each provide the following:

The advanced exploration project is located on Inuit Owned Land. The Kivalliq Inuit Association must approve the establishment of a landfarm on the commercial lease held by AEM. No other approvals are required.

For each provide the following:

Authorization: *Approval from the Kivalliq Inuit Association to establish a landfarm on the commercial lease. A copy of the letter sent to KIA is attached.*

Administering Agency: *Kivalliq Inuit Association*

Project Activity: *Approval of landfarm.*

Date (expected date) of issuance: *20 Dec 2013* Date of expiry: *AEM's commercial lease is renewed every two years. Next expiry date is July 1, 2014*

17. PREDICTED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF UNDERTAKING AND PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES

Does the proposed amendment change the predicted environmental impacts of the undertaking or the mitigation measures?

☐ Yes X No

Describe direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts related to water and waste. Identify any changes.

18. WATER RIGHTS OF EXISTING AND OTHER WATER USERS

Was compensation paid and/or an agreement(s) for compensation been entered into with any existing or other users of water during consideration of the existing licence?

☐ Yes X No

If Yes, provide the names, addresses and the nature of water use by those persons or properties.

Does the proposed amendment adversely affect any known persons or property including those that hold licences for water use in precedence to the application, domestic users, in-stream users, authorized waste depositors, owners of property, occupiers of property, and/or holders of outfitting concessions, registered trapline holders, and holders of other rights of a similar nature?

☐ Yes X No

If Yes, provide the names, addresses and the nature of water use of those persons or properties.

Advise the Board if compensation has been paid and/or an agreement(s) for compensation has been reached with any existing or other water users with respect to the proposed amendment.

19. INUIT WATER RIGHTS

Was compensation paid/ or an agreement(s) for compensation been entered into with any Designated Inuit Organization (DIO) during consideration of the existing licence?

☐ Yes X No

If Yes, which DIO(s) _____

Does the proposed amendment substantially affect the quality, quantity or flow of waters flowing through Inuit Owned Land (IOL)?

☐ Yes X No

If Yes, advise the Board if negotiations have commenced or an agreement to pay compensation for any loss or damage has been reached with one or more DIO(s) with respect to the proposed amendment.

20. CONSULTATION - Provide a summary of any consultation meetings including when the meetings were held, where and with whom. Include a list of concerns expressed and measures to address concerns.

Please see the attached record of public and regulatory consultation in 2012 – 2013.

21. SECURITY INFORMATION

Does the proposed amendment change the financial security assessment?

☐ Yes X No

Does the proposed amendment change the estimate of the total financial security for final reclamation?

☐ Yes X No

Provide an estimate of the total financial security for final reclamation equal to the total outstanding reclamation liability for land and water combined sufficient to cover the highest liability over the life of the undertaking. Estimates of reclamation costs must be based on the cost of having the necessary reclamation work done by a third party contractor if the operator defaults. The estimate must also include contingency factors appropriate to the particular work to be undertaken. Identify any changes in the financial security assessment resulting from the proposed amendment.

Where applicable, the financial security assessment should be prepared in a manner consistent with the principals respecting mine site reclamation and implementation found in the *Mine Site Reclamation Policy for Nunavut,* Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, 2002.

Reclamation security presently furnished under water licence 2BB-MEL0914 with the Minister of AANDC totals $639,000.00. Presently, the estimated cost for reclaiming the site determined by AANDC, including the Phase 1 all-weather road, is $905,231. There is no change expected to the security because of the landfarm.

22. FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Is the statement of financial security the same as that considered in the existing water licence?

X Yes ☐ No

Provide an updated statement of financial security.

AEM is a publically traded company listed on both the TSX and NYSE under the symbol AEM. Its head office is in Toronto, and the company has mines in Quebec, Nunavut, Finland and Mexico. It latest annual financial report can be found at the following web address: http://www.agnico-eagle.com/English/Investor-Centre/Financial-Reporting/default.aspx

If the applicant is a business entity please answer the questions below:

Is the list of the officers of the company the same as those considered in the existing water licence?

☐ Yes X No

Provide a list of the officers of the company.

Officers for the company can be found at the following web address: http://www.agnico-eagle.com/English/Our-Company/Officers-AEM/SrVPOfficers/default.aspx

Is the Certificate of Incorporation or evidence of registration of the company name the same?

X Yes ☐ No

Attach a copy of the Certificate of Incorporation or evidence of registration of the company name.

AEM is a publically traded company listed on both the TSX and NYSE under the symbol AEM. Its head office is in Toronto, and has mines in Quebec, Nunavut, Finland and Mexico.

23. STUDIES UNDERTAKEN TO DATE

List and attach updated studies, reports, research etc.

A draft Environmental Impact Statement was prepared for the Project. The EIS contains many baselines reports, management plans and assessment reports. These documents can be found on the NIRB ftp site at the following address: ftp://ftp.nirb.ca/02-REVIEWS/ACTIVE%20REVIEWS/11MN034-AEM%20MELIADINE/

Provide a compliance assessment and status report including a response to any inspector's reports. The licensee must contact the NWB for licence specific direction in completing the assessment and report.

A July 8, 2013 inspector's report was received by AEM and is attached. AEM was found to be in compliance with the terms and conditions of the licence. However, as the Project changes and AEM looks to employ enhanced environmental methods, the Inspector found that the proposed landfarm was not approved in the water licence. This amendment seeks to use the old fuel bladder farm to treat soils contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons. The containment berm for this area has an impervious liner.

If in non-compliance, a licence may not be issued until compliance is achieved. If in non-compliance, attach plans/reports for consideration. Application will not be processed if significant issues of non-compliance exist.

24. PROPOSED TIME SCHEDULE

When are proposed amendments scheduled to be undertaken: *The inspector requested this amendment be submitted to the NWB by March 1, 2014. AEM is hoping to store contaminated materials in the old bladder farm containment area as soon as it is practical.*

Does the proposed amendment change the time schedule considered in the existing licence for any phase of development?

☐ Yes X No

Indicate the start and completion dates for each applicable phase of development (construction, operation, closure, and post closure). Identify proposed changes.

Construction: *No construction will be required for the landfarm. It will use the existing old fuel bladder containment area. This area has containment berms on all sides and an impervious liner.*

Operation: *The landfarm will be used for the life of the licence. This would include all renewals.*

Closure: *The landfarm would be closed following the successful treatment of the contaminated soil it holds. This is likely to be 2 years following AEM's decision to close the landfarm. Once AEM makes the decision to close the landfarm, no new contaminated soil or snow will be added.*

Post – Closure: *The contaminated soil in the landfarm will be monitored annually. Once the contaminated soil in the landfarm meets GN remediation guidelines, the facility will closed and there would not be any further monitoring.*

For each applicable phase of development indicate which season(s) activities occur.

Construction
☐ Winter ☐ Spring X Summer ☐ Fall ☐ All season

Operation
☐ Winter ☐ Spring X Summer ☐ Fall ☐ All season

Closure
☐ Winter ☐ Spring X Summer ☐ Fall ☐ All season

Post - Closure
☐ Winter ☐ Spring X Summer ☐ Fall ☐ All season

25. PROPOSED TERM OF LICENCE

On what date does the existing licence expire? July 31, 2014

Is the Licensee applying for a combined renewal and amendment of the existing licence?

☐ Yes X No

If Yes, indicate the proposed term of the renewal (maximum of 25 years): _____

Requested date of renewal issuance: _____ (month/year) Requested Expiry Date: _____ (month/year)

(The requested date of renewal issuance must be at least three (3) months from the date of application for a type B water licence and at least one (1) year from the date of application for a type A water licence, to allow for processing of the water licence application. These timeframes are approximate and do not account for the time to complete any pre-licensing land use planning or development impact requirements, time for the applicant to prepare and submit a water licence application in accordance with any project specific guidelines issued by the NWB, or the time for the applicant to respond to requests for additional information. See the NWB's *Guide 5: Processing Water Licence Applications* for more information)

26. ANNUAL REPORTING

Will the proposed amendment change the content of annual reports or the annual report template?

X Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide details regarding the content of annual reports and a proposed outline or template of the annual report.

The quantity of contaminated added to the landfarm will be reported annually as well as the quantity of soil and water successfully treated. The analytical results in testing contaminated soil will be reported.

27. CHECKLIST

The following must be included with the application for Amendment for the water licensing process to begin.

Completed Application for Water Licence Amendment form.

X Yes ☐ No If no, date expected _____

Information addressing Supplement Information Guideline (SIG), where applicable (see Block 11)

X Yes ☐ No If no, date expected _____

Compliance Assessment / Status Report (see Block 23).

X Yes ☐ No If no, date expected _____

Indication of Renewal Requirement (see Block 26)

X Yes ☐ No If no, date expected _____

English Summary of Amendment Application.

X Yes ☐ No If no, date expected _____

Inuktitut and/or Inuinnaqtun Summary of Amendment Application.

X Yes *(Located in Appendix C)* ☐ No If no, date expected _____

Application fee of $30.00 CDN (Payee Receiver General for Canada).

☐ Yes X No If no, date expected *To follow by Canada Post*

Water Use Fee Deposit of $30.00 CDN (Payee Receiver General for Canada). The actual water use fee will be calculated by the NWB based upon the amount of water authorized for use in accordance with the Regulations at the time of issuance of the licence.

☐ Yes X No If no, date expected *The total quantity of water used will not change.*

28. SIGNATURE

Stephane Robert	**Manager, Regulatory Affairs Nunavut**		**28 February 2014**
Name (Print)	**Title (Print)**	**Signature**	**Date**

FAX TRANSMISSION

DATE: May 14/07

TO: NAME Leslie Payette

DEPARTMENT N.I.R.B.

FAX NUMBER (867) 983-2574

Number of pages to follow: 5.

Original to follow: ______ Yes ______ No

Comments: If you have any questions, please let us know.

FROM: **Brian Aglukark**, Director, Regional Planning ☐
Annie Ollie, Interpreter/Translator/Administrator ☐
Bobby Suluk, Co-ordinator, Regional Planning ☑
(Vacant), Regional Planner ☐
________________ ☐

Nunavut Planning Commission
P.O. Box 419
Arviat, Nunavut
Office (867) 857-2242
Fax (867) 857-2243

May 11, 2007

Leslie Payette
Nunavut Impact Review Board
Box 1360
Cambridge Bay, NU

Fax (867) 983-2574

Dear Ms. Payette,

Re: 07ENO## Comaplex Minerals Corp, KIA-KVCL102J168
NWB-070112-2BE-MEL-2007
Comaplex Minerals Corp - Meliadine West Gold Underground Exploration and Bulk Sample

The NPC has completed its review of the above noted project proposal. It conforms to the Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan.

Attached, for your files, is a copy of the list of conformity requirements to which the applicant has undertaken to comply to.

Yours truly,

Bobby Suluk
Regional Planning Co-ordinator, NPC

Attachment

cc. Phyllis Beaulieu, NWB
Mark Balog, Comaplex Minerals Corp
Sandy Barham, Comaplex Minerals Corp
John Hodgson, Kivalliq Inuit Association

Application # Underground Exploration and Bulk Sample – Meliadine West Project

NUNAVUT PLANNING COMMISSION
APPLICATION TO DETERMINE CONFORMITY
WITH THE KEEWATIN REGIONAL LAND USE PLAN

All applicants for a project proposal shall comply with the requirements listed below. The relevant sections of the plan are noted in each requirement.

GENERAL

2. **Environmental Protection:** *s2.4.9:* The applicant undertakes to prevent any new occurrences of pollution, garbage and contamination at the site of the development.

   (Yes) No

3. **Removal of Fuel Drums:** *s2.4.9:* The applicant undertakes to remove all drums safely from the site and dispose of the drums in a safe manner.

   – almost all fuel is in bulk fuel tanks

   (Yes) No

4. **New Site Restoration and Clean Up:** *s2.4.15 and Appendix 2, s1:* The applicant undertakes to clean up the site and restore the site to its natural condition to the greatest extent possible.

   (Yes) No

5. **Old Site Restoration and Clean Up:** *s2.4.10:* The applicant undertakes to clean up the site and restore the site to its original condition to the greatest extent possible, including any work required due to the applicant's action prior to this application.

   (Yes) No

6. **Low Level Air Flights:** *s5.4.4 and Appendix 2, s3:* Will the applicant avoid low-level flights?

   (Yes) No

   i. If not, explain why such flights are or may be absolutely necessary.

FLIGHTS BETWEEN RANKIN INLET AND CAMP WILL BE FLOWN AT HIGH ALTITUDE AVOIDING KNOWN CABINS, COMMUNITIES AND WILDLIFE AREAS TO MAXIMUM EXTENT POSSIBLE.

ii. If such flights are or may be absolutely necessary, will they avoid disturbance to people and wildlife?

(Yes) No

iii. If not, explain why it is not possible to avoid such disturbance.

ARCHEOLOGY

9. **Reporting of Archaeological Sites:** *s4.4.3 and Appendix 3, s2 and s8*: Will the applicant immediately report the discovery of all suspected archaeological sites to the Department of Culture, Language, Elders and Youth (GN)?

(Yes) No

MINING

10. **Mining Development:** *s3.4.4*: Is the proposal for mining development?

(Yes) No

As discussed on the morning of May 14/07, Comaplex views the as an advanced exploration bulk sampleng program.

If yes, include with the application a mine closure and restoration plan. CONTACT: KIA - attn: Luis Manzo, Rankin Inlet

23. **Code of Good Conduct for Land Users:** *Appendix 2:* The applicant undertakes to adhere to the Code of Good Conduct at all times.

(Yes) No

I, B. Barham for Comaplex Minerals Corp. (name of applicant), certify that the information I have given in this application is true and correct and hereby make the above undertakings which form part of my application for a project proposal within the meaning of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement.

Date: May 14/07 Signature of Applicant: B. Barham for Comaplex Minerals Corp

Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan
Appendix G
Code of Good Conduct for Land Users

1. The landscape of each camp and other land use sites will be restored to its original condition to the greatest degree possible. Water quality will be preserved, and no substances that will impair water quality will be dumped in water bodies. When possible and feasible, old sites will be restored to the natural state.

2. All land users shall assist communities and government(s) in identifying and protecting archaeological sites and carving-stone sites, as required by law.

3. Generally, low-level flights by aircraft at less than 300 metres should not occur where they will disturb wildlife or people. If such flights are necessary, they should only take place after consultation with the appropriate communities. All land users are responsible for reporting to the land managers any illegal or questionable low-level flight.

4. All activities on the land will be conducted in such a fashion that the renewable resources of the area in question are conserved.

5. Whenever practicable, and consistent with sound procurement management, land users will follow the practice of local purchase of supplies and services.

6. Land users will establish working relationships with local communities and respect traditional users of the land.

7. During the caribou calving, post-calving and migrating seasons, land use activities should be restricted to avoid disturbing caribou, in general, and activities will be governed more specifically by caribou protection measures such as those contained in Appendix H.

8. Artifacts must be left where they are found. All land users are responsible for reporting to the location of, or any removal or disturbance of, artifacts to CLEY.

9. The mining industry is encouraged to assist in identifying local carving-stone deposits and report any discoveries to KIA. Industry is also encouraged to identify and report old waste sites that need to be cleaned up.

10. All land users shall obey the laws of general application applying to land use.

SCREENING DECISION REPORT
NIRB FILE NO.: 07EN044

NIRB File No.: 07EN044
KIA File No.: KVCL102J168

July 3, 2007

Tongola Sandy
President – Kivalliq Inuit Association
Rankin Inlet, Nunavut

Via email: tsandy@kivalliqinuit.ca

Re: Screening Decision for Comaplex Minerals Corporation – Meliadine West Gold Underground Exploration and Bulk Sample

---

Dear President Sandy:

The primary objectives of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement are set out in section 12.2.5 of the Land Claims Agreement. This section reads:

In carrying out its functions, the primary objectives of NIRB shall be at all times to protect and promote the existing and future well-being of the residents and communities of the Nunavut Settlement Area, and to protect the ecosystemic integrity of the Nunavut Settlement Area. NIRB shall take into account the well-being of the residents of Canada outside the Nunavut Settlement Area.

Section 12.4.4 of the Nunavut Land Claim Agreement states:

Upon receipt of a project proposal, NIRB shall screen the proposal and indicate to the Minister in writing that:

a) the proposal may be processed without a review under Part 5 or 6; NIRB may recommend specific terms and conditions to be attached to any approval, reflecting the primary objectives set out in Section 12.2.5;
b) the proposal requires review under Part 5 or 6; NIRB shall identify particular issues or concerns which should be considered in such a review;
c) the proposal is insufficiently developed to permit proper screening, and should be returned to the proponent for clarification; or
d) the potential adverse impacts of the proposal are so unacceptable that it should be modified or abandoned.

NIRB Assessment and Decision

After a thorough assessment of all material provided to the Board (please see Procedural History and Project Activities in Appendix B), in accordance with the principles identified within section 12.4.2 of the NLCA, the decision of the Board as per section 12.4.4 of the NLCA is:

> **12.4.4 (a)**: the proposal may be processed without a review under Part 5 or 6; NIRB may recommend specific terms and conditions to be attached to any approval, reflecting the primary objectives set out in Section 12.2.5

Recommended Project-Specific Terms and Conditions, pursuant to 12.4.4(a) of the NLCA

The Board is recommending the following or similar project-specific terms and conditions be imposed upon the Proponent through all relevant legislation:

1. Comaplex Minerals Corporation (the Proponent) shall otherwise operate in accordance with all commitments stated in all documentation provided to NIRB, namely:
    a. Correspondence dated June 15, 2007 from Mark Balog to Carolanne Inglis-McQuay regarding the Response to Reviewer Comments – Meliadine West Underground Exploration and Bulk Sampling Program NIRB # 07EN044
        i. Attachment A: J.S. Redpath letter to NIRB re: Mine Rescue Plan
        ii. Attachment B: Comaplex Waste Management Plan
        iii. Attachment D: Nuna / M&T Environmental Procedures Manual
    b. Application to Conduct Underground Mineral Exploration and Assemble a Bulk Sample, dated May 2007
    c. Field Operations – Advanced Exploration: Drilling Environmental Management System Meliadine West Gold Project, dated May 2007
    d. Fuel Management and Spill Contingency Plan Comaplex Minerals Corp. Meliadine West Project, dated January 2007
    e. Application to Access Inuit Owned Lands and Water Use

2. The Proponent shall maintain a copy of this Screening Decision at the site of operation at all times.

3. The Proponent shall forward copies to NIRB of all authorizations obtained and required for this project prior to the commencement of the project.

4. The Proponent shall operate the project in accordance with all applicable Acts, Regulations and Guidelines.

5. The Proponent shall submit an annual report with copies provided to the NIRB, INAC, the KIA, and the Government of Nunavut – Department of Environment (GN-DOE), by January 31 each year that the project is in operation, commencing January 31, 2008. The report must contain, but not be limited to, the following information:
    a. A summary of activities undertaken for the year, including any progressive reclamation work undertaken, and a work plan for the following year –site photos should be provided where relevant;
    b. A summary of how the Proponent has complied with NIRB conditions contained within this Screening Decision.
    c. Results from the Mitigation and Monitoring Program:

i. An analysis of the impact of the project upon the bio-physical and socio-economic environments, including the cumulative impacts from other activities within the project area;
ii. An analysis of the effectiveness of mitigation measures;
iii. The identification of any unanticipated environmental impacts (if any) and any follow-up required (if relevant);
iv. Compliance with applicable regulations and all authorizations associated with the project activities, including any exceedences of CCME-FWAL criteria (as reported to Environment Canada, the Nunavut Water Board, and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada)
v. Any necessary adaptive mitigation strategies employed (if relevant);
vi. Any modifications made to the Mitigation and Monitoring Program;
vii. Description of the progress made on the development of component-specific thresholds used to determine the necessity for adaptive mitigation and management strategies.

d. A summary of community consultations undertaken and the results; and
e. A summary of site-visits by inspectors with results and follow-up actions.

6. Mitigation and Monitoring Program
   a. Prior to commencement of the Underground Exploration and Bulk Sample project proposal activities, the Proponent shall develop a comprehensive Mitigation and Monitoring Program for the project proposal. As indicated in the Application to Conduct Underground Mineral Exploration and Assemble a Bulk Sample, dated May 2007, this is anticipated to be on **July 16, 2007**. This Mitigation and Monitoring Program must be developed for all stages of the project activities, including construction, operation, closure, and post-closure. The Mitigation and Monitoring Program should be developed in accordance with the following objectives:
      i. To detect unanticipated environmental impacts (if any)
      ii. To assess the effectiveness of proposed mitigation and the need to modify the measures or implement contingency plans
   b. The Mitigation and Monitoring Program must monitor in accordance with the Monitoring Plan described on pgs 44 and 45 of the Application to Conduct Underground Mineral Exploration and Assemble a Bulk Sample, dated May 2007 but must be updated to include monitoring for those components identified as being potentially impacted (pg 38):
      i. Air quality
      ii. Noise
      iii. Vegetation
      iv. Wildlife and critical wildlife habitat
      v. Water quality including acid rock drainage, metal leaching and ammonia run-off
   c. The Mitigation and Monitoring Program may contain elements of the Environmental Management System, but must be operated as a stand-alone program.
   d. The Mitigation and Monitoring Program must identify component-specific thresholds that will be used to determine the necessity for adaptive mitigation and management strategies.

7. The Proponent shall ensure that all hazardous material is managed, removed from site and disposed in accordance with the *Environmental Protection Act (EPA),* the Nunavut Territorial Regulations and Guidelines, and the Nunavut Hazardous Waste Disposal Manual.

8. The Proponent shall ensure that the disposal of combustible camp wastes comply with the *Canadian Wide Standards for Dioxins and Furans*, and the *Canadian Wide Standards for Mercury*. Efforts made to achieve compliance shall be reported to the NIRB as part of the annual report.

9. Between May 15 and July 15 of each year, the Proponent shall suspend operations (such as blasting, flights by aircraft at any altitude below 610m, and the use of mechanized vehicles) if wildlife monitoring indicates that caribou cows and/or calves are within 1km of project operations.

10. During the migration of caribou, the Proponent shall not conduct any operation so as to block or cause substantial diversion to migration.

11. During the migration of caribou, the Proponent must cease all activities within 1km of migrating caribou.

12. The Proponent is prohibited to conduct aircraft flights below 610m except for takeoffs and landings and is prohibited to allow aircraft take-offs if wildlife monitoring indicates presence of caribou within 1km of the ice airstrip or helipad.

The Proponent shall adhere to conditions stated in attached Appendix A *Archaeological and Palaeontological Resources – Terms and Conditions for Land Use Permit Holders*.

Other NIRB Concerns and Recommendations

In addition to the project-specific terms and conditions, the Board is recommending the following:

1. The Kivalliq Inuit Association (KIA) impose mitigation measures and/or conditions upon the Proponent pursuant to the Commercial Lease (KVCL102J168) which reduce the likelihood of adverse impacts to:
    a. Water quality – from drilling activities, explosives use, waste rock and portal rock storage and usage, construction activities, waste disposal, fuel storage and fuel transfer
    b. Vegetation – from water deposition activities and abandonment and restoration activities
    c. Air quality – from incineration activities
    d. Wildlife and wildlife habitat – from overland hauling activities, general use of the project area, aircraft activities
    e. Navigable waters
    f. Human health and safety – from underground bulk sampling activities

2. The KIA should consider the importance of conducting regular Land Use Inspections, pursuant to the authority of the Commercial Lease (KVCL102J168), while the project is in operation. The Land Use Inspections should be focused on ensuring the Proponent is in compliance with the conditions imposed through the Commercial Lease.

3. The Nunavut Water Board (NWB) must review all geochemical analysis data pertaining to the waste rock and ore body samples prior to the issuance of the amendment to the water license (2BE-MEL0709). The review must consider appropriate conditions, mitigation measures and monitoring protocols to reduce the potential for adverse effects to water quality from Acid Rock Drainage (ARD) and/or Metal Leaching (ML).

4. During the amendment to the water license (2BE-MEL0709), the NWB must ensure an appropriate quality assurance / quality control (QA/QC) program is developed by the Proponent to test for water quality in the run off from waste rock, ore piles, disposal sites and the camp-site. NIRB is recommending the use of berms to collect runoff in the immediate locations around the ore stockpile and waste rock areas. If the collected runoff is deposited onto the tundra through spray irrigation techniques, the Proponent should conduct water quality monitoring downstream of the irrigation locations using the Canadian Council of Ministers for the Environment Guidelines for the Protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life (CCME-FWAL).

Regulatory Requirements

The Proponent is also advised that the following legislation may apply to the project:

1. The *Migratory Birds Convention Act* and *Migratory Birds Regulations* which state that no person disturb or destroy the nests or eggs of migratory birds, and that no person shall deposit or permit to be deposited oil, oil wastes or any other substance harmful to migratory birds in any waters or any area frequented by migratory birds (http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/showtdm/cs/M-7.01)

2. Section 36(3) of the *Fisheries Act* (http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/showtdm/cs/F-14///en) which states that no person shall deposit or permit the deposit of a deleterious substance in any type in water frequented by fish or in any place under any conditions where the deleterious substance may enter such a water body.

3. *The Canadian Environmental Protection Act* (http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/C-15.31/index.html)

4. *The Species at Risk Act* (http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/showtdm/cs/S-15.3).

5. The *Nunavut Act* (http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/showtdm/cs/N-28.6) which requires that no person alter or disturb any archaeological or palaeontological sites in Nunavut unless permission is first granted through the permitting process.

6. The *Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations*, *Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act* (http://www.tc.gc.ca/tdg/menu.htm), and the *Environmental Protection Act* (http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/C-15.31/text.html) which present the requirements for the handling, storing, managing and transportation of dangerous goods, including hazardous wastes, fuel and contaminated material.

Validity of Land Claims Agreement

Section 2.12.2
Where there is any inconsistency or conflict between any federal, territorial and local government laws, and the Agreement, the Agreement shall prevail to the extent of the inconsistency or conflict.

Dated _____July 3, 2007____ at Sanikiluaq, NU.

_____
Lucassie Arragutainaq, A/Chair

Appendix A
Archaeological and Palaeontological Resources Terms and Conditions for Land Use Permit Holders

BACKGROUND: Archaeology

As stated in Article 33 of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement:

The archaeological record of the Inuit of Nunavut is a record of Inuit use and occupancy of lands and resources through time. The evidence associated with their use and occupancy represents a cultural, historical and ethnographic heritage of Inuit society and, as such, Government recognizes that Inuit have a special relationship with such evidence, which shall be expressed in terms of special rights and responsibilities. [33.2.1]

The archaeological record of Nunavut is of spiritual, cultural, religious and educational importance to Inuit. Accordingly, the identification, protection and conservation of archaeological sites and specimens and the interpretation of the archaeological record is of primary importance to Inuit and their involvement is both desirable and necessary. [33.2.2]

In recognition of the cultural, spiritual and religious importance of certain areas in Nunavut to Inuit, Inuit have special rights and interests in these areas as defined by Article 33 of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement. [33.2.5]

BACKGROUND: Palaeontology

Under the Nunavut Act1, the federal Government can make regulations for the protection, care and preservation of palaeontological sites and specimens in Nunavut. Under the *Nunavut Archaeological and Palaeontological Sites Regulations*2, it is illegal to alter or disturb any palaeontological site in Nunavut unless permission is first granted through the permitting process.

Definitions

As defined in the *Nunavut Archaeological and Palaeontological Sites Regulations*, the following definitions apply:

1 s. 51(1)
2 P.C. 2001-1111 14 June, 2001

"archaeological site" means a place where an archaeological artifact is found.

"archaeological artifact" means any tangible evidence of human activity that is more than 50 years old and in respect of which an unbroken chain of possession or regular pattern of usage cannot be demonstrated, and includes a Denesuline archaeological specimen referred to in section 40.4.9 of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement.

"palaeontological site" means a site where a fossil is found.

"fossil" includes:

(a) natural casts
(b) preserved tracks, coprolites and plant remains; and
(c) the preserved shells and exoskeletons of invertebrates and the eggs, teeth and bones of vertebrates.

Terms and Conditions

1) The permittee shall not operate any vehicle over a known or suspected archaeological or palaeontological site.

2) The permittee shall not remove, disturb, or displace any archaeological artifact or site, or any fossil or palaeontological site.

3) The permittee shall immediately contact the Department of Culture, Language, Elders and Youth (867) 934-2046 or (867) 975-5500 or 1 (866) 934-2035 should an archaeological site or specimen, or a palaeontological site or fossil be encountered or disturbed by any land use activity.

4) The permittee shall immediately cease any activity that disturbs an archaeological or palaeontological site encountered during the course of a land use operation, until permitted to proceed with the authorization of the Department of Culture, Language, Elders and Youth, Government of Nunavut.

5) The permittee shall follow the direction of the Department of Culture, Language, Elders and Youth and DIAND in restoring disturbed archaeological or palaeontological sites to an acceptable condition.

6) The permittee shall provide all information requested by the Department of Culture, Language, Elders and Youth concerning all archaeological sites or artifacts and all palaeontological sites and fossils encountered in the course of any land use activity.

7) The permittee shall make best efforts to ensure that all persons working under authority of the permit are aware of these conditions concerning archaeological sites and artifacts, and palaeontological sites and fossils.

8) The permittee shall avoid the known archaeological and/or palaeontological sites listed in Attachment 1.

9) The permittee shall have an archaeologist or palaeontologist perform the following functions, as required by the Department of Culture, Language, Elders and Youth:

a. survey
b. inventory and documentation of the archaeological or palaeontological resources of the land use area
c. assessment of potential for damage to archaeological or palaeontological sites
d. mitigation
e. marking boundaries of archaeological or palaeontological sites
f. site restoration

The Department of Culture, Language, Elders and Youth shall authorize by way of a Nunavut Archaeologist Permit or a Nunavut Palaeontologist Permit, all procedures subsumed under the above operations.

Appendix B
Procedural History and Project Activities

Procedural History

On May 3, 2007 the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB or Board) received the Meliadine West Gold Underground Exploration and Bulk Sample (Bulk Sample) project proposal from Comaplex Minerals Corporation (Comaplex). On May 10, 2007 an application for this project proposal was forwarded to NIRB by the Kivalliq Inuit Association, and on May 14, 2007 NIRB was notified by the Nunavut Planning Commission that the project proposal had received a positive conformity determination (Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan). NIRB has assigned this project proposal file number, 07EN044.

NIRB requested that interested Parties review the application and provide NIRB with comments by **June 6, 2007** regarding:

- Whether the project proposal is likely to arouse significant public concern; and if so, why;
- Whether the project proposal is likely to cause significant adverse eco-systemic and socio-economic effects; and if so, why;
- Whether the project is of a type where the potential adverse effects are highly predictable and mitigable with known technology, (please provide any recommended mitigation measures); and
- Any matter of importance to the Party related to the project proposal.

On or before June 6, 2007 NIRB received comments from the following interested Parties (see Comments and Concerns):

1. Health Canada
2. Environment Canada
3. Transport Canada
4. Natural Resources Canada
5. The Government of Nunavut Department of Environment
6. The Government of Nunavut Airports
7. The Kivalliq Inuit Association

All comments provided to NIRB regarding this project proposal can be viewed on NIRB's ftp-site, at the following location: ftp://ftp.nunavut.ca/nirb/NIRB_SCREENINGS/COMPLETED_SCREENINGS/

On June 7, 2007 NIRB provided an opportunity for the Proponent to respond to the Parties' concerns. The Proponent provided a response to each Party's concerns on June 15, 2007. The Proponent responded to the Parties' comments and concerns by providing the following documentation:

1. Correspondence dated June 15, 2007 from Mark Balog to Carolanne Inglis-McQuay regarding the Response to Reviewer Comments – Meliadine West Underground Exploration and Bulk Sampling Program NIRB # 07EN044
2. Attachment A: J.S. Redpath letter to NIRB re: Mine Rescue Plan
3. Attachment B: Comaplex Waste Management Plan
4. Attachment C: Meliadine West camp incinerator specs
5. Attachment D: Nuna / M&T Environmental Procedures Manual
6. Attachment E: site air photo with hydrology

Project Activities

The following is a summary of the *main* project activities[3]:

- Overburden removal
- Use of existing 2.7km all-weather road
- Increase in personnel use (18-25 people) of existing camp, and construction of minor upgrades to camp (covered under existing permits)
- Transportation to project site of 150-250 tonnes of equipment for underground operations
- Fuel transportation from Rankin Inlet via overland haul route
- Fuel storage of approximately 1 million litres of fuel (diesel, fuel oil, aviation, gasoline, propane)
- Explosives transportation
- Total explosives use of approximately 115,000 kg; on-site storage facilities (magazines) for approximately 36,000kg
- Chemical transportation and storage of approximately 68,000kg of calcium chloride
- Portal and underground ramp construction
- On-site sample processing of approximately 12,860kg of mineralized rock
- Off-site sample processing of a 10 tonne sample of mineralized rock
- Use of some waste rock as construction material for pads and road beds and excess waste rock to be stored on waste rock pad
- Ore storage on ore pad adjacent to ramp portal
- Stockpiles of topsoil, and frozen and unfrozen till
- Abandonment and site restoration

The project is located in the Kivalliq Region, and the nearest communities are Chesterfield Inlet and Rankin Inlet.

3 As described in *May 2007 Project Proposal – Application to Conduct Underground Mineral Exploration and Assemble a Bulk Sample* and *NIRB Part 1 Summary Application Form in English*

English Summary

Agnico-Eagle Mines Limited (AEM) has an unused fuel bladder containment area at the Meliadine camp that previously held fuel bladders filled with diesel fuel. The containment area has berms on all sides and an impervious liner.

AEM is planning to use the old fuel bladder containment area site as a landfarm. It will receive, hold and treat soils contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons, mostly diesel fuel. When a spill occurs, the contaminated soil will be excavated and put into the landfarm for treatment. When the treatment of the soil is completed and it meets the Government of Nunavut soil remediation guidelines, the soil will be removed from the landfarm and used on site.

ᐃᓄᒃᑎᑐᑦ ᓇᐃᔨᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ

ᐊᓗᓂᑯ ᐃᔾᔪ ᐅᓴᖅᑕᕆᐊᓕᕆᓚᐅᑦ ᓕᒥᑎᑦ (AEM) ᐊᑐᖏᑎᑐᒥᒃ ᐅᖅᓯᐊᓂᓯᕐᕕᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐃᓂᑎᓴᐅᔪᒥᒃ ᐱᖅᒃᖅᑐᑦ ᑕᓯᖁᐊᖅᒥᑦ ᐅᖅᓯᐊᓂᓯᕐᕕᐅᑎᖅᑕᕆᓕᐅᖅᑐᑦ ᓄᓇᒃᑯᑭᑎᖅᖁᐊᓄᑦ ᐅᖅᓯᐊᓂᖓᓄᑦ. ᐃᓂᑎᓴᐅᔪᖅ ᐊᓪᓚᖅᑲᐅᓂᒃᑯᑦᑐᖅ ᓴᓂᕐᖏᑎᑐᒍᑦ ᐊᒪᓂ ᑯᐊᑎᑦᑎᓯᖓᕐᕕᒃ ᐃᓂᓵᑕᖅᑲᖅᓴᒪᒥᒃ ᓄᓇᒃᑯᑭᑎᖅᖁᐊᓄᑦ ᐅᖅᓯᐊᓂᐊᓚᑦ.

(AEM)-ᑯᑦ ᐊᑐᑭᒪᔪᖏᑦ ᐅᖅᓯᐊᓂᓯᕐᕕᐅᑕᐅᖅᑐᖅ [landfarm]-ᖏᓐᓂᐊᒍ. ᐱᖅᑲᑕᖅᓂᐊᓂᓂ, ᑕᖅᓀᓂᑦᓂᑎᑦ ᐱᑕᓚᐊᓗᐊᓂᑦᓂᐊ ᓄᓇ ᐊᒃᑐᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᖅ ᐅᖅᓯᐊᓂᖏᓪᓕᐊᑐᖅᑐᒃ, ᓄᓇᒃᑯᑭᑎᖅᖁᐊᓄᑦ ᐅᖅᓯᐊᓂᐊᐃᓇᓂᐊᑦ. ᑯᕕᔪᖅᑲᐅᑦ, ᓄᓇ ᐅᖅᓯᐊᓂᖏᒃ ᑯᕕᖏᕕᐅᔪᖅ ᐊᖅᑕᐅᓂᐊᖅᑐᖅ ᐊᒪᓂ [landfarm]-ᒧᐊᖅᑕᐅᓂᓂᓂ ᐱᑕᓚᐊᖏᓂᐊᖅᓂᓂ. ᓄᓇ ᑯᕕᖏᕕᐅᑕᐅᖅᑐᖅ ᐱᑕᓚᐊᖏᔪᖅ ᐱᐊᓂᒃᐅᑦ ᑎᑭᐅᑎᓯᒪᒃᐅᑕᓂ ᓄᓇᕐᑦ ᑲᖏᒪᒃᑯᖓᑕ ᓄᓇᒥᒃ ᐊᑦᑭᒃᓯᓂᖓᓂᒃ, ᓄᓇ ᐊᖅᑕᐅᓂᓂ [landfarm]-ᒥᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᓂᓂᓂ ᑕᖏᓐᓄᑦ.

GJOA HAVEN, NT X0E 1J0
TEL: (867) 360-6338
FAX: (867) 360-6369

kNK5 wmoEp5 vtmpq
NUNAVUT WATER BOARD
NUNAVUT IMALIRIYIN KATIMAYINGI

Water Licence 2BB-MEL0914
Amendment Application for a Landfarm
Supplementary Questionnaire
for Advanced Exploration
(Underground drilling, bulk sampling, etc.)

SECTION 1:

GENERAL

1. Applicant *Agnico Eagle Mines Limited*
10 200, route de Preissac,
Rouyn-Noranda,
Québec, J0Y 1C0,

(819) 759-3700 ext. 5188 *(819) 759 3663*
(Telephone number) (Fax)

stephane.robert@agnicoeagle.com
(E-Mail)

Corporate Address (If different from above)

145 King Street East, Suite 400
Toronto, ON M5C 2Y7
(Corporate Office Address)

416 947 1222 *416 367 4681*
(Telephone number) (Fax)

lconnell@agnicoeagle.com
(E-Mail)

Project Name *Meliadine Gold Project*

Location *Meliadine Lake, Kivalliq, Nunavut, 25 km north of Rankin Inlet*

Closest Community *Rankin Inlet*

Latitude/Longitude *Lat 63° 01' 30" N* *Long 92° 10' 20" W*

Show the location of the project on a general location map. *See Appendix A, figure 1*

2. Environmental Manager *Stéphane Robert* *(819) 759 3700 ext. 5188,*
(819) 763-0229 (Mobile)
(Name) (Telephone No.)

3. Indicate the status of the exploration activity on the date of application. (Check the appropriate space.)

Surface and underground drilling will test gold deposits in 2013 – 2014 and also look for new deposits. The larger part of the drilling is to convert resources to minable reserves. The ramp or underground decline is being extended to allow drilling of deep ore deposits.

Design	_____
Under construction	_____
In operation	X *(Advanced exploration)*
Suspended	_____
Care and Maintenance	_____
Abandoned	_____

4. If a change in the status of the exploration activity is expected, indicate the nature and anticipated date of such change.

Agnico-Eagle Mines Limited (AEM) has submitted a draft Environmental Impact Statement to the Nunavut Impact Review Board for the Meliadine Gold Mine. AEM anticipates continuing to define mineral reserves and explore for new resources under the existing water licence following receipt of the Project Certificate from the NIRB.

5. Indicate the present (or purposed) schedule for the exploration activity.

Hours per week	*168 hours per week*
Days per week	*7 days per week*
Weeks per year	*40 to 52 weeks. (Activities can be suspended at times in winter.)*
Number of employees	*120 - 250 persons on site depending on activities and time of year.*
Number of Inuit employees	*20 to 40*

6. Estimate the term (life) of the exploration activity.

Diamond drilling is expected to continue for term of license. The licence expires July 31, 2014 and AEM will be seeking a renewal. AEM claims and concessions are quite extensive (see Appendix A, figure 1) and exploration of the full extent of these is anticipated to continue well into the future.

7. How will the project affect the traditional uses on Inuit Owned Lands?

The development of a landfarm is a progressive step in protecting Inuit lands. The landfarm will be within the unused, existing old fuel bladder containment area. This area has berms on all sides and an impermeable liner. It will be used to receive, hold and treat petroleum hydrocarbon contaminated soils during exploration and possibly during mine construction. Once the Meliadine Gold Mine is in operation, the landfarm will be closed and decommissioned.

Meliadine Lake is a popular destination for local hunters and fishers . A few cabins located on Meliadine Lake are within 3 kilometres of the exploration activities. AEM is not aware of any issues concerning the traditional enjoyment of the Meliadine Lake area.

8. Have the Elders been consulted on effects to the traditional use on Inuit Owned Land? If so, list them. If not, why not?

See the attached list of consultations carried out from 2010 to 2013 in Appendix B. Elders were present at public, HTO, and CLARC meetings where they outlined their knowledgeof the area, expectations for the Meliadine Gold Mine and their concerns. Inuit elders who worked at the North Rankin Nickel mine visited the surface and underground exploration areas in 2008.

9. Has the proponent consulted Inuit Organizations in the area? If so, list them.

Please refer to the chronology of community consultations 2010 to 2013 in Appendix B. The Inuit associations consulted included the Kivalliq Inuit Association, Hunters and Trappers Organization, and the Community Land and Resource Committee.

10. Has the proponent consulted surrounding communities on traditional water use areas? If so, list them. If not, why not?

AEM has consulted Rankin Inlet, Chesterfield Inlet and Whale Cove, the latter two communities are on either side of Rankin Inlet. The advanced exploration project is 25 km north of Rankin Inlet. Both Chesterfield Inlet and Whale Cove are in different drainage basins and do not use water or fish resources from the Meliadine drainage basin.

11. Attach a detailed map drawn to scale showing the relative locations (or proposed locations) of the exploration activity, sewage and solid waste facilities, and containment areas. The plan should include the water intake and pumphouse, fuel and chemical storage facilities. Ore and waste rock storage piles, piping distribution systems, and transportation access routes around the site. The map also should include elevation contours, water bodies and an indication of drainage patterns for the area.

Refer to attached Appendix A, figures 1 to 5. Exploration activity is located at Tiriganiaq, F zone, Pump, Wesmeg and Discovery as shown on figure 5.This figure also shows the Phase1 All-Weather Access Road, the various drainages it crosses, and borrow pits and quarries used in building the road.

Water intakes are located at Mel 1 and 2 on figure 2. The operations pad on figure 2 is where the underground decline is located while figure 3 provides more detail on the same. Figure 2, Mel 5 is to monitor water discharges from the fuel bladder containment area. Fuel storage is located immediately east of the fuel bladder containment area. Sewage treatment occurs at the camp and Mel 4 and MEL 7 monitors the quality of the treated discharge.

12. If applicable, provide a brief history of property development which took place before the present company gained control of the site. Include shafts, adits, mills (give rated capacity, etc.) waste dumps, chemical storage areas, tailings disposal areas and effluent discharge locations. Make references to the detailed map.

Rankin Inlet was established as a mining community in the early-to-mid-1950s with the discovery and subsequent development of a nickel mine. North Rankin Nickel Mines identified gold mineralization in the area of Meliadine Lake during an exploration program for nickel and copper in the early 1960s. The first mineral claims in the project area were staked by Comaplex and Asamera Minerals Inc. in 1987, with the Discovery deposit being found on the eastern half of the property in late 1989.

Successive exploration programs by Asamera, Rio Algom Ltd., and Comaplex from 1990 to 1994 identified gold mineralization along the 80-kilometre-long east-west-trending Pyke Fault, with the first holes drilled into the Tiriganiaq, F Zone, and Pump deposits by Comaplex in 1993 and 1994. From 1995 to 2000, substantial exploration by WMC International Ltd., through an option on the western half of the Meliadine property, significantly expanded the Tiriganiaq deposit, led to the discovery of the Wolf deposit, and expanded the F Zone and Pump deposits. Work by Comaplex in 1996 and 1997 concentrated on the Discovery deposit on the eastern half of the property, known as Meliadine East.

In the ensuing years, and until late 2003, Comaplex and its partners continued exploration on Meliadine East, while little field work was completed by WMC on Meliadine West. In late 2003, Comaplex acquired WMC International's interest in the Meliadine West property. From 2004 onward, Comaplex devoted the majority of its efforts to outlining new, higher-grade gold resources in the deeper parts of the Tiriganiaq deposit, and to reconnaissance work on outlying targets. Sporadic exploration was conducted on Meliadine East.

In 2007 and 2008, Comaplex conducted an underground exploration and bulk sample program on the Tiriganiaq deposit. In early 2009, Comaplex completed a preliminary assessment for the Meliadine property using independent mining consultant Micon International Ltd. This assessment indicated that the property had the potential to support a mining operation. On the basis of this information, Comaplex elected to advance the project to the feasibility level, and initiated the regulatory process to permit a mining operation on the property.

On July 6, 2010, AEM completed its purchase of Comaplex, making it a wholly owned subsidiary. The first drilling by AEM was carried out on the property's Wesmeg deposit. AEM also undertook more underground exploration with another 10,000 tonnes of ore extracted. AEM continued with Comaplex's earlier decision to pursue the development of a gold mine. An Environmental Impact Statement was preared and submitted to the Nunavut Impact Review Board in 2013.

A single lane All Weather Access Road has been completed and it joins Rankin Inlet to the Meliadine site.

13. Give a short description of the proposed or current freshwater intake facility, the type and operating capacity of the pumps used, and the intake screen size.

AEM operated two water supply pumps, one on Meliadine Lake servicing the camp site (figure 1, MEL 1) and one on Pump Lake that provides water for activities in the vicinity of the portal for the underground exploration program (figure 2, MEL 2).

The pump at MEL-1 (figure 2) is electric and operates off the main camp power supply. An insulated pipe carries the water to storage tanks in the camp, which is then distributed throughout the camp via a pressurized system of plastic piping. The waste water flows from the kitchen, dry and washrooms to the Biodisk treatment system before exiting to a wetland for polishing.

The pump at MEL-2 is gasoline powered and connected to the Tiriganiaq – Wesmeg area with a flexible hose system. The pump at MEL-2 serves diamond drills during the spring when the smaller ponds are frozen. During summer months, it is more convenient to use nearby small ponds as a water source for the diamond drills.

The intake screen sizes on all pumps are less than 2 mm.

13. At the rate of intended water usage for the exploration activity, explain water balance inputs and outputs in terms of estimated maximum draw down and recharge capability of the water source from fresh water will be drawn.

The Meliadine Lake watershed covers 586 sq. km. Total water use for camp and diamond drilling is limited to 290 cubic metres per day as per 2BB-MEL0914, of which up to 25 cubic metres per day use is drawn from Meliadine Lake

at MEL 1 for camp use (figure 2). RL&L Limited (now Golder Associates Ltd.) estimated the Meliadine Lake watershed to contain 63.66 million cubic meters of water below a 2 metre ice cover.

Lake A8 (MEL-2) discharges on average ≤86 m^3/day during the open water period. Conservatively, greater than 95 percent of the water used for drilling is returned to the drainage basin, very little water is lost. Flow from Pump Lake will not significantly change due to diamond drilling within the drainage basin.

14. Will any work be done that penetrates regions of permafrost?

The entire underground exploration program took place within the permafrost layer, which is thought to extend at least 400 meters below surface. Most (>90%) of the surface diamond drilling is within permafrost. Diamond drill holes penetrating deeper than 400 vertical metres sometimes encounter unfrozen rock. These drill holes immediately freeze following completion of the drill hole and extraction of the drill equipment. Artesian conditions have not been encountered after more than 1000 drill holes completed on the property.

The decline is presently being extended and will eventually reach 400 metres below surface. Exploration drilling has commenced from the underground to access deeper ore deposits.

16. If "YES" above, is the permafrost continuous or discontinuous?

The permafrost is continuous above approximately 400 metres vertical depth.

17. Were (or will) any old workings or water bodies (be) dewatered in order to conduct the exploration activity?

No encroachment on any water body is required for exploration activities. Some of the shallow ponds adjacent to the development area may be drilled through during early spring drilling when the ponds have either 1.5 to 2 meteres of ice or are frozen to bottom. License 2BB-MEL00914 lists terms and conditions for such activities.

The use of the old fuel bladder farm as a landfarm will not encroach on any water body and will be located approximately 200 metres from the nearest waterbody and 500 metres downslope to Meliadine Lake (see figure 2)

18. If "YES" above, indicate the name of the water body, the total volume of water to be discharged and the chemical characteristics of the water.

Not applicable

Water body (if unnamed give Latitude/Longitude)_____
Total volume _____ cubic metres
Receiving Watercourse _____
Dewatering flow rate into above _____ cubic metres / sec

Chemical characteristics of discharge:

T/Pb	_____mg/L	Total Ammonia	_____ mg/L
T/Cu	_____mg/L	Suspended solids	_____ mg/L
T/Al	_____mg/L	Specific conductivity	_____ uhmo/cm
T/HCN	_____mg/L	pH	_____
T/Hg	_____mg/L		

T/Zn _____mg/L
T/Cd _____mg/L
T/As _____mg/L
T/Ni _____ mg/L
T/Mn _____ mg/L

19. Was (or will) the above discharge (be) treated chemically? *Not applicable*

20. If "YES" above, describe the applied treatment.

21. Briefly describe what will be done with the camp sewage.

Rotating biological disk sewage treatment plants (BIOdisks) are employed at the Meliadine camp. A single BIOdisk is rated for a maximum of 150 people and seeing the advanced exploration camp reaches 250 persons on occasion, two BIOdisk units were installed to meet sewage treatment needs.

Treated sewage is discharged to a wetland area located approximately 100 metres from Meliadine Lake. The wetland polishes the treated waste water before it reaches Meliadine Lake.

SECTION 2 :

GEOLOGY AND MINERALOGY

22. Briefly describe the physical nature of the mineralization, including known dimensions and approximate shape.

The underground exploration program and bulk sample at the Tiriganiaq Gold Deposit confirmed important aspects of the concentration and continuity of gold within two parallel zones in the Tiriganiaq gold deposit. The gold deposit occupies part of a tabular zone interpreted from diamond drilling to be approximately 1.5 km long and dipping north at about 60°. Gold bearing rocks have been intersected at more than 400 metres vertical depth. In 2010, the Wesmeg deposit was found 300 metres to the south of the Tiriganiaq deposit. This deposit parallels Tiriganiaq.

The F Zone deposit dips north with a strike length of approximately 1.5 kilometers. It is located approximately 3 kilometres southeast of the Tiriganiaq. Several potential open pits, 50 to 100 metres apart, have been defined. In order to excavate the westernmost pit at F Zone, a small bay of Lake A6 would be closed by a 250- metre long dike and subsequently dewatered.

The Pump gold deposit is about three kilometres south of the Tiriganiaq open pit. To date there has been insufficient drilling to fully define the extent of the resource envelope. However, drilling to date indicates that open pits are feasible for this deposit, and more drilling in the future will allow the sizes of the open pits to be better defined.

The Discovery deposit is located approximately 22.4 kilometres east-southeast of the proposed main site.

While the Tiriganiaq deposit is the best defined, the other deposits require further drilling to determine their extent. All deposits remain open along strike and at depth. Underground mining is planned for Tiriganiaq but cannot be discounted at any of the other deposits.

23. Briefly describe the host rock in the general vicinity of the mineralization (from the surface to the mineralized zone.)

The host rock for the mineralization is predominantly sediments (iron formation and greywacke) with some mineralization hosted by carbonate rich mafic volcanic rocks.

24. Provide a geological description of the mineralized zone. (If possible, include the percentage of metals.)

The mineralized gold-bearing areas consist predominately of multiple, parallel, north-dipping zones that average about 1 to 3 meters in width. They consist of quartz veins with mostly free gold accompanied by 1-5% pyrrhotite and arsenopyrite.

Describe the geochemical tests which have been (or will be) performed on the ore, host rock, and waste rock to determine their relative acid generation and contaminant leaching potential. Outline methods used (or to be used) and provide test results in an attached report (ie. static tests, kinetic tests.)

*The ARD and metal leachate testing of all rock types at all deposits has been carried out. Information to date suggests the rocks are not acid generating but leach some metals at low concentrations. Full details are provided in the report, "**SD 6-3 Geochemical Characterization of Waste Rock, Ore, Tailings and Overburden Meliadine Gold Project, Nunavut**". This report can be found in volume 6 of the draft Environmental Impact Statement. The draft EIS can be found on the NIRB's ftp site: ftp://ftp.nirb.ca/02-REVIEWS/ACTIVE%20REVIEWS/11MN034-AEM%20MELIADINE/*

26. Estimate the percentage of sulphide in the mineralization:

pyrite	
pyrrhotite	*2*
pyrite / pyrrhotite mixture	
arsenopyrite	*5 - 15*

SECTION 3:

THE CONTAINMENT AREAS

42. What is the (Proposed) method of disposal of the mine water, mill or process plant tailings (ie. sump, subaqueous, surface tailings pond, settling pond) ?

No tailings have been produced.

AEM monitors water draining off operations pad at downstream locations shown on figure 2 and 3. Data collected at these points are presented in the 2008 to 2012 Annual Reports and in the monthly reports submitted to the NWB. As expected, some nitrogen compound (ammonia) and metal concentration issues are present at times in waters in the primary containment pond (figure 2, P-1). The containment pond is tested in the spring before the water is

pumped downstream. AEM will continue to regularly monitor and report results to the NWB as per the present schedule. Further monitoring is carried out downstream of the primary containment pond at A54, A38, and Mel 2

MEL 5 on figure 2 previously measured the water quality of drainage from the bladder farm. (The landfarm will be located within the old bladder farm containment area).

43. Attach detailed scale plan drawings of the proposed (or present) containment area. The drawings must include the following:

Detailed plans are included in the Meliadine Gold Project's "Waste Rock and Ore Storage Plan – August 2010". Figures 3 provides details on the primary containment area while figure 4 provides overview of local drainage basins. The primary containment area is approximately 150 metres upstream of Lake A54.

The proposed landfarm is in an area immediately adjacent to the fuel storage area. Drainage is towards Meliadine Lake, approximately 0.5 km to the northeast. The location is shown on figure 2.

a) details of pond size and elevation;
b) details of all retaining structures (length, width, height, materials of construction, etc.);
c) details of the drainage basin;
d) details of all decant, siphon mechanisms etc., including water treatment plant facilities;
e) details with regard to the direction and route followed by the flow of wastes and / or waste water from the area; and
f) indicate of the distance to nearby major watercourses.

44. Justify your choice of location for the containment area design by rationalizing rejection of other options. Consider the following criteria in your comparisons: subsurface strata permeability, abandonment, recycling/reclaiming waters, and assessment of runoff into basins. Attach a brief summation.

Authorized under Water Licence 2BB-MEL0914

45. The average depth of the existing or proposed containment area is dependent on the volume of water encountered.

As shown on figure 4, the volume of the Primary Containment area is 14,400 m^3. The average depth is less than 0.5 metres.

46. Indicate the total capacity for the existing or proposed containment area by using water balance and stage volume calculations and curves. (Attach a description of inputs and outputs along with volume calculations.)

The Primary Containment Area covers 14.2 hectares and the annual yield is approximately 100 mm resulting in a capacity of 14,400 m^3. See figure 3 for drainage area.

47. Has any evaporation and/or precipitation data been collected at the site ? _____ if so, please include the data.

Data on evaporation and precipitation is included in the Aquatic Synthesis Report, which can be found on the NWB ftp site.

48. Will the present or proposed containment area contain the entire production from the mill or processing plant complex for the life of the project ?

There is no mill or processing plant associated with the Primary Containment Area. It holds the water running off the waste rock pads as well as water that collects due to precipitation. The water is tested in the spring and if found acceptable, pumped downstream.

49. Will the proposed tailings deposition area engulf or otherwise disturb any existing watercourse?

Not applicable

50. If "Yes", attach all pertinent details (Name of watercourse, present average flow, direction of flow, proposed diversions, etc.)

51. Describe the proposed or present operation, maintenance and monitoring of the containment area.

The Primary Containment Area holds the water running off the waste rock pads as well as water and snow that collects due to precipitation. The water is tested before being pumped downstream in the spring.

SECTION 4:

WATER TREATMENT

52. If applicable, will the mine water, mill or process plant water be chemically treated before being discharged to the containment area? If so, explain the treatment process (Attach flow sheet if available.

No treatment; ponds downstream of containment (figure 3: A54, A38) act as polishing ponds. Both ponds freeze to bottom during the winter. Lake A8 is the first major water body downstream that does not freeze to bottom. Water from Lake A8 is tested monthly during the open water season. It is also used as a water source for drilling.

53. Will (treated) effluent be discharged directly to a natural water body or will polishing or settling ponds be employed? Describe location, control structures, and process of water retention and transfer. Attach any relevant design drawings.

See #52 above.

54. Name the first major watercourse the discharge flow enters after it leaves the area of company operations.

The first major water body downstream is Lake A8. Refer to figure 3 for its location.

SECTION 5:

ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING PROGRAM

55. Has Traditional Knowledge in the area been considered? If so, how? If not, why not?

Traditional and local knowledge studies were completed in 1999, 2011 and 2013.

56. Has any baseline data been collected for the main water bodies in the area prior to development?

Yes, baseline data has been collected from the 1998 to present.

57. If "Yes", include all data gathered on the physical, biotic and chemical characteristics at each sampling location. Identify sampling locations on a map.

Baseline water conditions in the areas of the gold deposits are described in the draft Environmental Impact Statement reports:

- *SD 7-1 Aquatics Baseline Synthesis Report, 1994 to 2009 - Meliadine Gold Project, Nunavut, and*
- *SD 7-2 2011 Aquatic Baseline Studies - Meliadine Gold Project, Nunavut.*

The sampling locations are in many ponds and lakes within the proposed area of development. The locations are shown on maps within the above noted documents.

The reports can be found at the NIRB ftp site:
ftp://ftp.nirb.ca/02-REVIEWS/ACTIVE%20REVIEWS/11MN034-AEM%20MELIADINE/2-REVIEW/

58. Provide an inventory of hazardous materials on the property and storage locations.

- *Diesel Fuel - double walled envirotanks –in camp and at bulk fuel facility – (figure 3) with storage capacity of 1 670 000 litres.*
- *Jet A Helicopter Fuel - double- walled envirotanks located at the helipad with a storage capacity of 320,000 litres; and*
- *A small number of barrels of gasoline located within secondary containment at the main fuel storage area.*

59. Provide a conceptual abandonment and restoration plan for the site, detailing the costs to carry out the plan, and a proposal for a financial assurance which covers the costs to carry out the plan.

An updated Meliadine Gold Project Reclamation and Closure Plan – November 2010 was forwarded to the NWB in late 2010. It can be found on the NWB's ftp site.

SECTION 6:

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND MONITORING

60. Has this project ever undergone an initial environmental review? If yes, by whom and when.

See NWB File 2BB-MEL0709, NIRB file 07EN044. The environmental screening was carried out by the Nunavut Impact Review Board for the advanced exploration project.

No initial environmental review was carried out for the landfarm alone.

61. Has any baseline data collection and evaluation been undertaken with respect to the various biophysical components of the environment potentially affected by the project (eg. Wildlife, soils, air quality), ie. In addition to water treated information requested in this questionnaire?

Yes X No _____ Unknown _____

62. If "Yes" please attach copies of reports or cite titles, authors and dates.

A complete list of reports are can be found in the draft Environmental Impact Statement prepared by AEM. These include:

- *Volume 5.0 Atmospheric Environment and Impact Assessment*
- *Volume 6.0 Terrestrial Environment and Impact Assessment*
- *SD 6-2 2009 Terrestrial Vegetation and Wildlife Baseline Synthesis Report – Meliadine Gold Project, Nunavut*
- *Volume 7.0 Freshwater Environment and Impact Assessment*
- *SD 7-1 Aquatics Baseline Synthesis Report, 1994 to 2009 - Meliadine Gold Project, Nunavut,*
- *SD 7-2 2011 Aquatic Baseline Studies - Meliadine Gold Project, Nunavut,*

The reports can be found at the NIRB ftp site:
ftp://ftp.nirb.ca/02-REVIEWS/ACTIVE%20REVIEWS/11MN034-AEM%20MELIADINE/2-REVIEW/

63. If no, are such studies being planned?

Not applicable.

64. Has authorization been obtained or sought from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans for dewatering or using any waterbodies for containment of waste?

No such action is contemplated within the context of the proposed landfarm as there will not be any dewatering or using waterbodies for the containment of waste.

The proposed landfarm will be located approximately 500 metres from Meliadine Lake.

65. Has a socio-economic impact assessment or evaluation of this project been undertaken? (This would include a review of any public concerns, land, water and cultural uses of the area, implications of land claims, compensation, local employment opportunities, etc.)

Yes No X Unknown _____

The establishment of a landfarm is not expected to have a socio-economic impact.

66. If “Yes” please describe the proposal briefly.

67. If “No” is such a study being planned? Yes_____ No X

AEM believes that a socio-economic assessment is not warranted for the use of the old fuel bladder storage area as a landfarm.

68. Describe any cumulative impacts the project may create?

No sustained industrial or commercial activity has been conducted on the Meliadine River drainage in the past; therefore, no environmental effects of past activities are evident. Some of the effects of diamond drilling conducted during the course of the historic exploration program can be observed on aerial photographs. These drill sites will re-vegetate and fade as observable effects of surface mineral exploration over the next 5 - 10 years.

The establishment of a landfarm in an existing facility, the old fuel bladder storage area, is not expected to have cumulative effects.

The draft Environmental Impact Statement addresses cumulative effects in a comprehensive and systematic manner for the proposed Meliadine Gold Mine.

69. Does the project alter the quantity or quality or flow of waters through Inuit Owned Lands?

No.

70. If yes, has the applicant entered into an agreement with the Designated Inuit Organization to pay compensation for any loss or damage that may be caused by the alteration.

Not applicable.

71. If no compensation arrangement has been made, how will compensation be determined?

Should the Meliadine Gold Mine proceed, a comprehensive Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement as contemplated by Article 26 of the NLCA will be negotiated in the context of an application for mine development and operations on Inuit Owned Land.

Approval for the landfarm is being sought from the Kivalliq Inuit Association, as it will be on the commercial lease AEM holds with the KIA. No compensation requirement is anticipated as an existing facility will be used for the landfarm.

Appendix A: Figures

Figures have been sent separately due to file size limitations in Nunavut.

Insert figure1

Insert figure 2

Insert figure 3

Insert figure 4

Insert figure 5

Appendix B: Public Engagement and Consultation with Communities, Inuit Organizations and Authorizing Agencies 2010 – 2013

Date	Place	Parties Present and Subjects of Meeting
2010		
March 16	Kivalliq Chamber of Commerce	Annual symposium of the Kivalliq Chamber of Commerce where an update was provided and contacts made with businesses capable of providing goods and services to the Meliadine Project.
June 10	Chesterfield Inlet	Mark Balog and John Witteman from Comaplex sponsored a town hall meeting providing an update on the Project and the building of an All-weather Access Road. The road could link to the planned road to Chesterfield Inlet.
June 11	Rankin Inlet	Mark Balog and John Witteman from Comaplex sponsored a town hall meeting providing an update on the Project and the building of an All-weather Access Road. The meeting was particularly well attended and there were no objections to the routing to the All-weather Access Road. The spur road to Meliadine Lake was of particular interest.
August 9-31	Rankin Inlet	11 meetings were held in Rankin Inlet to familiarize local leaders with AEM and to update them about AEM's preliminary plans for the Meliadine Gold Project. Organizations that participated in these meetings included: the Kivalliq Inuit Association, Kivalliq Chamber of Commerce, Hunters and Trappers Organization, Mayor and Hamlet Council, Board of Directors of Sakku Investments Corp., M.L.A. Lorne Kusugak, Shawn Maley of the Government of Nunavut Community, and representatives of government services. AEM also participated in a meeting of the Kivalliq Socio-economic Monitoring Committee.
August 31	Rankin Inlet	Update on the Meadowbank mine and the Meliadine Project to the Kivalliq Socio-economic Monitoring Committee with an emphasis on socio-economic data collected by AEM and services provided by local businesses.
September 15	Rankin Inlet	AEM hosted a one-day visit to the Meadowbank gold mine by 40 community leaders and Elders from Rankin Inlet, including the mayor and council, hunters and trappers, community Elders (including a number who had worked underground at the North Rankin Nickel Mine in their younger days) and business leaders. The objective was to show the group the type of mining operation constructed and operated by AEM, and to let them see for themselves the number of Inuit already employed at Meadowbank.
October 18	Rankin Inlet	AEM hosted a dinner with invited community representatives and Elders at the Sinniktarvik Hotel in Rankin Inlet. The dinner was an informal event to allow community members to meet the

Date	Place	Parties Present and Subjects of Meeting
		management team from Agnico-Eagle Mines and ask about the current status of the Meliadine Project. A total of 28 Elders and community leaders attended.
Nov 22- 25	Rankin Inlet	AEM was a participant in the Kivalliq Trade Show highlighting its Meadowbank mine and upcoming Meliadine development.
2011		
January 6	Cambridge Bay	Eric Lamontagne, Denis Gourde and John Witteman met with Ryan Barry, Kelli Gillard, and one more staff member, NIRB, to describe the status of the Project and in particular the All-weather Access Road. AEM described what had been done in regards to gathering baseline information for the road, regulatory permits required and use of the road - having it open access.
February 7-9	Rankin Inlet	Larry Connell and John Witteman met with the Lands Division of KIA to discuss the road and other matters. A meeting with the HTO was cancelled due to a blizzard.
February 8	Community & Government Services, Rankin Inlet	Location of the tank farm for the mine, right-of-way lease for the AWAR on municipal land, HTO Traditional Knowledge of overflow in the spring at Meliadine bridge location.
March 1	Rankin Inlet	John Witteman, Bertho Caron and Selma Eccles of AEM attended a meeting with the HTO in Rankin Inlet. The HTO raised a number of concerns with the route of the road, bridge location over the Meliadine River, wildlife monitoring along the road, plans for the Itivia harbour area, fish concerns with the bridge.
March 22	Rankin Inlet	Annual symposium of the Kivalliq Chamber of Commerce where an update was provided and contacts made with businesses capable of providing goods and services to the Meliadine Project.
March 23	Rankin Inlet	Denis Gourde, Eric Lamontagne, Larry Connell, Selma Eccles, John Witteman met with the Hamlet Council to describe the AWAR and ongoing activities at the Meliadine site. The Hamlet council supports the All-weather Access Road and a letter of support can be expected. The underground program was explained and what is hoped to be gained from carrying out this work - getting needed information on the deep ore. The question of dust control was raised and lands available in town for development. The underground development was discussed.
March 23	Rankin Inlet	Denis Gourde, Eric Lamontagne, Larry Connell, Selma Eccles, John Witteman hosted a town hall meeting with the community to discuss the All-weather Access Road and the proposed mine. A PowerPoint presentation in English and Inuktitut was presented.

Date	Place	Parties Present and Subjects of Meeting
		The meeting was well attended with over 100 persons present. The road is widely supported by the community as it offers access to Meliadine Lake and also is expected to lead to more economic activity. The question of jobs and careers was frequently raised and what must be done to get jobs such as supervisors and managers. Education was emphasized by AEM as well as on-the-job training. Support was voiced for the road and the proposed mine.
March 29 - 30	Kittilä, Finland	Forty Nunavut leaders, largely from the Kivalliq region, visited AEM's Kittilä Gold Mine to observe an operating mine in an Arctic environment. Mining using open pit and underground are both employed, the same as proposed for the Meliadine Project. It also showed how local community members benefited from the mine and how those educated assumed supervisory and managerial positions in the mine.
March 31 - April 1	Sisimuit, Greenland	The Greenland School of Minerals and Petroleum in Sisimuit, Greenland was toured on the return trip from Finland. The Government of Greenland placed a priority education and while there are no operating mines in Greenland, there will be a trained work force should a mine open.
April 6	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada, Iqaluit	Technical discussion on the RECLAIM model and unit costs. This model is used to determine the cost of reclaiming the Meliadine exploration camp.
April 7	Regulatory Agencies, Iqaluit	Update on the Meliadine Gold Project.
April 7	Iqaluit	Meeting with NIRB and NWB in Iqaluit during the Nunavut Mining Symposium. PowerPoint presentation was made on the proposed Meliadine AWAR and our application to amend our Type B water license to allow for construction of this road. Good exchange with NIRB an NWB pointing out omissions in what was presented.
May 6	Geovector, consultant to KIA (conference call)	AWAR – quarry locations and need to check for ground ice, geochemistry of the waste rock and potential quarries, snow drifting along road, design of culverts, lessons learned from Meadowbank.
June 6-8	Cambridge Bay	Presentation to NIRB, NWB, Regulatory Agencies in Iqaluit. Discussions on next steps in EA process, possible predevelopment

Date	Place	Parties Present and Subjects of Meeting
	Gjoa Haven Iqaluit	activities, class A water licence, AEM's use of municipal infrastructure, need to submit a land use permit for crown land to be crossed by the AWAR, quarries along road.
June 13	Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Edmonton	No Net Loss Plan for the Meliadine Gold Project, risk management framework used by DFO and its application to lakes/ponds impacted by the Project.
June 14	KIA, Mayor of Rankin Inlet	Possible predevelopment, Hamlet motion to approve AWAR, build only 1 lane at this time.
July 15	Rankin Inlet	Carey Sibbald of Stantec met with the HTO to discuss the use of marine area in Melvin Bay by the community. Information was sought on marine mammal use, fish caught in the bay but not as many today, Nunavut Health saying to not eat the mussels, cabins on Melvin Bay, concerns by HTO on increased use of the port area (Nunami-Stantec was contracted by AEM to do baseline work on the marine environment in Melvin Bay).
August 31	Regulatory agencies, Iqaluit	Information session on mini-EIS for the Phase 1 AWAR.
September 14	NIRB, conference call	Mini-EIS for the Phase 1 AWAR, Class B water licence for the Phase 1 AWAR, consultation with Lutsel K'e on caribouc
October 17 October 18 October 19 October 20 November 1 November 2	Rankin Inlet Chesterfield Inlet Baker Lake Arviat Coral Harbour Repulse Bay	Kivalliq community tour to meet with the Hamlet council in the afternoons and with the community in the evenings. This was an Extensive pre-EIS tour to inform Kivalliq Inuit and other stakeholders of the plans for developing the proposed Meliadine Gold Mine. VECs and VSECs were discussed with all communities mentioning caribou, and employment and training as all important components. The complete record of these consultations follows in Appendix C (Whale Cove was missed due to weather).
October 26	Baker Lake	Update on the Meadowbank mine and the Meliadine Project to the Kivalliq Socio-economic Monitoring Committee with an emphasis on socio-economic data collected by AEM and services provided by local businesses.
October 28	Rankin Inlet	KIA lands division met with the CLARC and transmitted the results of the meeting to AEM. CLARC is concerned with road management and noise and the effects on fish. CLARC wants to visit the site more often and see the construction, and the issue of spring overflow on the Meliadine River was raised; this was addressed by AEM by raising the height of the Meliadine bridge.

Date	Place	Parties Present and Subjects of Meeting
		The CLARC support the building of the All-weather Access Road as it will cut down on the helicopter traffic.
October 31	Rankin Inlet	Larry Connell and John Witteman met with the HTO. A PowerPoint presentation was made on the All-weather Access Road and developments at the Meliadine site. The HTO wanted to discuss the alignment of the AWAR to the Meliadine site and the arrangement of AEM facilities at Itivia harbour. A more southerly route was proposed by the HTO but AEM indicated it was too long and had too many water crossings. The HTO want a role and contract in monitoring wildlife along the AWAR. The arrangement at Itivia harbour was raised but AEM did not have maps of the area. Discussion was deferred to the next meeting when AEM would bring maps of the harbour and surrounding area. Agreement was reached on a ski-doo trail along the east side of the laydown area.
November 4	NIRB & NWB, conference call	Phase 1 AWAR – next steps, information requests, amendment application to date with the NWB.
November 14-28	Kivalliq Communities	AEM was an observer at the NIRB's scoping meetings. AEM was called on occasionally to answer questions. After the presentation, AEM did interact with the community members attending the meeting.
November 17-18	Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Toronto	No Net Loss Plan for Meliadine Gold Project, methods used in calculating the loss of habitat.
December 15	Transport Canada, Edmonton	Navigable Waters Protection permit for the Meliadine River bridge, information session on the Meliadine Gold Project.
2012		
January 11-13	Rankin Inlet	A workshop with the KIA and NTI to discuss per-EIS concepts.
January 31	Rankin Inlet	AEM participated in the EIS guidelines workshop chaired by the NIRB. Federal and territorial government department were represented.
February 1	Rankin Inlet	Meeting with Fisheries and Oceans Canada and Environment Canada on the Multiple Accounts Analysis carried out on selecting a Tailings Storage Facility. The location was highlighted, the waste rock wrapping around the TSF and eventual cover at end of mine life with 2 m of waste rock. Discussed the WestBay groundwater

Date	Place	Parties Present and Subjects of Meeting
		well to obtain water samples, exploration using the decline.
February 29	Rankin Inlet	A public meeting with the community. The meeting covered the status of the Meliadine Project with emphasis on the planned construction of the Phase 1 AWAR between Rankin Inlet and the Meliadine Project site. Options for a bypass road around the hamlet were presented with support for keeping AEM traffic outside the community. Other topics touched on the fate of the existing Char River bridge, the formation of a Liaison Committee for Rankin Inlet, plans for the Itivia harbour area and employment opportunities in the building of the road.
March 14	Conference call	First meeting on the Wildlife Mitigation and Monitoring Plan with Government of Nunavut, Environment Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Golder Associates wildlife biologists and AEM.
April 16-19	Iqaluit	Participation to the Nunavut Mining Symposium.
April 18	Iqaluit	Presentation made to the NIRB and the NWB on the proposed Meliadine All-weather Access Road and update on the exploration project.
April 23	Rankin Inlet	Meetings with the CLARC and HTO. Discussions covered an update on the Phase 1 AWAR, blasting at the rock quarry on municipal land, alternatives for the hamlet bypass road, use of the Itivia harbour area by the community, wildlife problems with foxes at the Meliadine site, use of the Phase 1 road, bridges over the rivers.
May 7-9	Rankin Inlet	Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement negotiation between KIA and AEM.
June 18	Rankin Inlet	A presentation was given to the Kivalliq Wildlife Board, which provided an update on wildlife management at Meliadine.
June 21	Rankin Inlet	A site visit was made by two representatives of the GN, Kivalliq Regional Wildlife Manager and the local conservation officer, and two representatives of the HTO, Chairman and vice-Chairman. The focus of the visit was wildlife management.
July 10-12	Rankin Inlet	Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement negotiation between KIA and AEM.
August 15-17	Rankin Inlet	A site visit to the Meliadine Advanced Exploration Camp by Nicola Johnson and Elizabeth Patreau of Fisheries and Oceans Canada. The focus of the visit was the review of and feedback on the No-Net-Loss Plan and proposed monitoring plan.
August 16	Rankin Inlet	Site visit of the Phase 1 AWAR by two representatives of the Hunters and Trappers' Organization. Progress on the bridges and road was viewed.

Date	Place	Parties Present and Subjects of Meeting
August 23	Rankin Inlet	A Hunters and Trappers' Organization Board Meeting was attended to discuss wildlife management in Meliadine.
August 24	Rankin Inlet	Site visit of Meliadine Advanced Exploration Camp by the Hamlet Council, KIA and HTO.
September 5	Rankin Inlet	Site visit by AANDC and KIA. Discussions centered on AEM's future submission of the DEIS.
September 11	Rankin Inlet	Site visit of the Phase 1 AWAR by KIA and CLARC representatives. Progress on the bridges and road was viewed.
October 1 October 2 October 3 October 4	Rankin Inlet Chesterfield Inlet Whale Cove Arviat	Community public consultation to review VECs and VSECs for the Meliadine Project. All communities mentioning caribou, employment and training as very important components.
October 4	Arviat	A meeting with DOE - Wildlife Division, AEM and Golder on the sharing of caribou data that were collected between 1998 and 2012, and proposed wildlife mitigation measures once the mine is being constructed and operating
October 10	Igloolik	A meeting with DOE – Wildlife Division, AEM and Golder Associates to discuss the sharing of data for raptors and polar bears between 1998 and 2012, and proposed wildlife mitigation measures once the mine is being constructed and operating.
October 10	Rankin Inlet	A meeting with the HTO and KIA to discuss local names of landmarks along the Phase 1 All Weather Access Road construction area.
October 9-11	Rankin Inlet	Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement negotiations between KIA and AEM.
October 17	Rankin Inlet	A meeting with DOE, KIA and HTO to discuss the wildlife management at Meliadine and along the Phase 1 All Weather Access Road (AWAR).
October 16-17	Rankin Inlet	Regional Socio-Economic Monitoring Committee meeting where AEM shared the socio-economic data collected with the Government of Nunavut and other members of the Committee.
October 24	Whale Cove	To gather traditional knowledge on fish harvesting activity in the Pistol Bay area (Possible habitat enhancement under NNL Plan
2013		
Feb 13	Rankin Inlet	Meeting with the HTO, CLARC, KIA and GeoVector (KIA's consultant) to present an update on the Meliadine Project
Feb 13	Rankin Inlet	Community Consultation where an update on the Meliadine Project was presented. No questions were asked by those attending.

Date	Place	Parties Present and Subjects of Meeting
Feb 14	Chesterfield Inlet	Consultations with the Hamlet Council and the community. An update on the Meliadine Project was presented and answers provided to the questions asked.
Feb 22	Winnipeg	Meeting with Transport Canada to present the Project, specifically as it related to Navigable Waters and the Canada Shipping Act.
October 16-17	Rankin Inlet	Regional Socio-Economic Monitoring Committee meeting where AEM shared the socio-economic data collected with the Government of Nunavut and other members of the cCommittee.
June 13	Rankin Inlet	Meeting with Community & Government Services and town staff on Phase 1 AWAR, Apache Pass and future of old bridge over the Char River