



NIRB File No.: 03MN107
NIRB File No.: 16MN056

November 7, 2018

Marie-Pier Marcil
Senior Compliance Technician
Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.
Meadowbank Division
P.O. Box 549
Baker Lake, NU X0C 0A0

Sent via email: marie-pier.marcil@agnicoeagle.com

Re: The Nunavut Impact Review Board's 2017-18 Annual Monitoring Report for the Meadowbank Gold Project and the Whale Tail Pit Project with Board's Recommendations

Dear Marie-Pier Marcil:

The Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB or Board) is hereby releasing its *2017-18 Annual Monitoring Report for Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.'s Meadowbank Gold Project (NIRB File No. 03MN107) and the Whale Tail Pit Project (NIRB File No. 16MN056)* [Monitoring Report] along with the 2018 Site Visit Report for the NIRB's monitoring of the Meadowbank Gold Project and the Whale Tail Pit Project (Appendix I within the Monitoring Report) and the 2018 Public Information Meeting Summary Report (Appendix II within the Monitoring Report). The NIRB is responsible for post environmental assessment monitoring of projects in accordance with Part 7 of Article 12 of the *Agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada (Nunavut Agreement)* and s. 135 of the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*, S.C. 2013, c. 14, s. 2 (*NuPPAA*) and the associated Project Certificates.

This report provides findings that resulted from monitoring of the Meadowbank Gold Mine Project from October 2017 to September 2018 and the Whale Tail Pit Project from March 2018 to September 2018.

By way of a motion carried during its regular meeting held in October 2018, the Board has issued the following recommendations to assist Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd. (Agnico Eagle or the Proponent) in achieving compliance with the Meadowbank Gold Mine Project Certificate No. 004, Amendment 2 and the Whale Tail Pit Project Certificate No. 008. These recommendations ensure that the NIRB has all the information necessary to adequately discharge its mandate with respect

to provisions within Section 12.7 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 135 of the *NuPPAA* as they pertain to both the Meadowbank Gold Mine Project and the Whale Tail Pit Project.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE MEADOWBANK GOLD MINE PROJECT

All materials pertaining to the NIRB's ongoing Monitoring program for the Meadowbank Gold Mine Project can be accessed online from the NIRB's online public registry at www.nirb.ca/project/124588.

Spill Management – Condition 26

In review of Agnico Eagle's 2017 annual report, and similar to the concern expressed by the Kivalliq Inuit Association and the Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada, it is noted that even though there was a slight decrease in the number of reportable spills from 2016 to 2017, the number of spills still remain high for the 2017 monitoring period. In addition, it is noted that the number of non-reportable spills have increased since 2014. No discussion was provided by Agnico Eagle on the possible reasons for why the number of non-reportable spills continue to rise even though additional training has been implemented based on the Spill Reduction Action Plan.

Recommendation 1: The Board requests that Agnico Eagle provide a written submission explaining the conditions which contributed to the increase in spills on site for 2017 (both reportable and non-reportable spills) and provide a discussion on what is being done at site to reverse this trend. The Board recommends that Agnico Eagle increase its spill reporting frequency to occur each quarter, to improve the ability to determine the effectiveness of its spill reduction efforts.

The requested information should be provided to the Board within *30 days* following the issuance of this recommendation.

Recommendation 2: The Board requests that, within future annual reporting, Agnico Eagle present the number of reportable and non-reportable spills (from 2011 onward) in a table or graph for ease of review.

Agnico Eagle is to include the requested information commencing in its 2018 Annual Report submission to the NIRB.

Placement of local area marine monitors – Term and Condition 36

Term and Condition 36 for Project Certificate No. 004, Amendment 2 requires that Agnico Eagle place/hire local area marine mammal monitors onboard all vessels transporting fuel or materials for the Project through Chesterfield Inlet. Even though approximately 36 ships with fuel and goods arrived in Baker Lake from Chesterfield Inlet in 2017, only one (1) marine mammal monitor was hired for the period between July 25 to July 28, 2017. Agnico Eagle did not provide a reason on why marine mammal monitors were not hired for the other ships that were travelling through Chesterfield Inlet.

Recommendation 3: The Board requests that Agnico Eagle provide a written explanation of why local marine mammal monitors were not utilized for all vessels transporting fuel or materials for the Project during the 2017 season, with a description of any alternative

monitoring and mitigation employed by the Proponent and its effectiveness. Confirmation of planned efforts to achieve full compliance with Term and Condition 36 of Project Certificate No. 004 amendment 02 in the future must also be provided.

The requested information should be provided to the Board within *30 days* following the issuance of this recommendation.

Participation in Surveys –Terms and Conditions 51 and 54

In 2016 and 2017, Agnico Eagle suspended the harvest data collection for both the Creel Surveys (fish harvesting) and the Hunter Harvest Survey (HHS) due to decrease in participation rates. This issue of non-compliance was brought up by the Board in 2017 as Agnico Eagle noted that the HHS would be implemented during the fall migration of 2017. However, the study was not implemented in 2017 and no reason other than participant fatigue and the overall need for renewal was noted. In response to the Board's 2017 Recommendations, Agnico Eagle noted that it would be exploring other ways to gather harvest data in consultation with stakeholders. This appears to contradict the information that was provided in the 2017 Annual Report as it gives the impression that Agnico Eagle will not implement the Creel Surveys and the HHS in 2018 as required by Term and Conditions 51 and 54 of Project Certificate No. 004, Amendment 2. The NIRB is concerned that both the Creel and Hunter Harvest surveys are not being completed and the NIRB and other agencies are not seeing results and a gap in available knowledge is developing which needs to be addressed. This is important as Agnico Eagle is proposing additional development in the region and plans to be in the region for the long term.

Further, as requested by the Board in its 2017 Recommendations, a plan that includes a clear indication of timelines, next steps in development of the Creel Surveys and the Hunter Harvest Surveys, measures for success, contingency planning and limitations on the effectiveness of the current studies employed at the Meadowbank Project was not provided by Agnico Eagle.

Recommendation 4: The Board requires that Agnico Eagle provide clarification on when and how it will meet the objectives of both Term and Conditions 51 and 54 of Project Certificate No. 004, Amendment 2 moving forward.

The requested information should be provided to the Board within *30 days* following the issuance of this recommendation.

Recommendation 5: The Board requests that Agnico Eagle provide an action plan regarding development of the Creel Surveys and the Hunter Harvest Surveys, with a clear indication of timelines, measures for success and contingency planning. The submission should highlight any identified limitations on the effectiveness of studies currently employed at the Meadowbank Gold Mine Project with a discussion of the feasibility of alternative studies and mechanisms designed to ensure that a gap in available knowledge is not developing.

The action plan should be provided to the Board within *30 days* following the issuance of this recommendation.

Suppression of surface dust – Term and Condition 74

Term and Condition 74 of Project Certificate No. 004, Amendment 2 directs the Proponent to employ environmentally protective techniques to suppress any surface road dust. As noted in previous NIRB annual reports, in review of annual reports and during site visits (see Appendix I for the 2018 site visit report), Agnico Eagle has limited its dust suppression techniques to haul roads at the mine site, between the Meadowbank gatehouse (at the airstrip) and Exploration Camp site, between the Baker Lake marshalling facility and the Baker Lake gatehouse and the airstrip. Agnico Eagle utilizes calcium chloride at most of the aforementioned sites; however, it uses water on the mine site haul roads (including the Vault road) and the airstrip. Dust suppression is only applied at five (5) key areas identified by the community of Baker Lake along the all-weather access road (AWAR) between Baker Lake and Meadowbank, and monitoring results in 2017 indicated that rates of dustfall were effectively reduced in those locations.

In its response to the Board's 2017 recommendations Agnico Eagle noted that six (6) locations were identified to have high priorities for dust suppression. As such, clarification is required to determine whether it is five (5) or six (6) locations that have been identified along the AWAR as high priorities for dust suppression. In addition, Agnico Eagle maintained that it is meeting Term and Condition 74 of Project Certificate No. 004, Amendment 2 and that the approach where chemical suppressants are used in an intermittent fashion along a long-distance roadway in priority areas only is similar to other project sites in Nunavut. No references to the other project sites were provided to be able to compare methodologies.

The NIRB acknowledges the efforts made by Agnico Eagle to suppress dust around the Meadowbank and Exploration Camp sites, and further recognizes the dustfall monitoring program conducted along the AWAR since 2012 and the additional studies that are ongoing since 2016. With the exception of continuing the dustfall monitoring along the AWAR and applying dust suppressants along the high priority areas, Agnico Eagle has not indicated any further commitment to apply dust suppressant to the whole AWAR in the future. Term and Condition 74, requires the application of dust suppression measures along all project roads including the AWAR [emphasis added]. The Proponent has not fully met the requirements of Condition 74, as dust suppression techniques were not being applied along the AWAR from Baker Lake to the mine site. The NIRB stresses that Term and Condition 74 applies to all mine roads including the AWAR. The NIRB notes that Agnico Eagle has been in non-compliance with this condition since the Project entered operations, as no dust suppression measures have been employed along the AWAR from Baker Lake to the mine site with the exception of the five (5) areas since 2017 as identified by the community to be of importance.

Recommendation 6: The Board reminds Agnico Eagle that Term and Condition 74 of Project Certificate No. 004, Amendment 2 applies to the suppression of dust on all surface roads including the all-weather access road (AWAR). As such, Agnico Eagle must provide a plan of action on how it will meet the objectives of Term and Condition 74 along the AWAR moving forward, with a clear indication of timelines and discussion of proposed alternative management measures should Agnico Eagle be unable to meet this condition.

The action plan should be provided to the Board within *30 days* following the issuance of this recommendation.

Recommendation 7: The Board requests that Agnico Eagle provide clarification regarding its references to other project sites in Nunavut which use the same/similar approach to applying chemical suppressants in a discontinuous fashion along a long-distance roadway.

The requested information should be provided to the Board within *30 days* following the issuance of this recommendation.

In 2017 the Board made two (2) additional recommendations to Agnico Eagle related to dust suppressants and monitoring: 1) provide a submission which describes its assessment of the effectiveness of dust suppression efforts using water to date and demonstrates its consideration for the use of alternative dust suppressants (e.g., TETRA flakes, Dust Stop®, EnviroKleen®) and more frequent application; and 2) report on the quality assurance and quality control protocols used to ensure data reliability and proper functioning of the dust monitoring equipment used for the dust sampling program along the all-weather access road. In response to these recommendations, Agnico Eagle noted that the monitoring data indicated that dust is effectively being controlled onsite, that application of alternative dust suppressants is not considered onsite and that the dust sampling methodology along the all-weather access road is more effective compared to the methods employed at other mine sites.

Recommendation 8: The Board requests that Environment and Climate Change Canada review and comment on the information provided by Agnico Eagle in response to the NIRB's 2017 Annual Report related to dust, including whether it agrees with Agnico Eagle's conclusions that alternative dust suppressants at the mine site are not required and that the dust methodology using canisters on the ground along the all-weather access road is more effective compared to other methodologies currently used. Limitations on the effectiveness of the current dust suppression employed for the Meadowbank Project (including the all-weather access road) should also be discussed.¹

The Board respectfully requests that Environment and Climate Change Canada provide a response to this recommendation within *30 days* ' receipt of the Board's correspondence to Environment and Climate Change Canada.

Recommendation 9: The Board requests that Environment and Climate Change Canada confirm whether it agrees with Agnico Eagle's conclusion that based on the dust monitoring results to date along the all-weather access road, it is unlikely that Final Environmental Impact Statement predictions are being exceeded and that impacts to valued ecosystemic components (vegetation community productivity and wildlife) from dust dispersion are not occurring beyond the smallest assumed zone of influence (100 metres).¹

The Board respectfully requests that Environment and Climate Change Canada provide a response to this recommendation within *30 days* ' receipt of the Board's correspondence to Environment and Climate Change Canada.

¹ Note that the Board will be inviting Environment and Climate Change Canada to comment on these matter under separate cover, and that Agnico Eagle is not responsible for a response to these recommendations. They have been included here for information only.

Air Quality

In the review of the available 2017 Incinerator Daily Report Logbook, the NIRB noted that there were several recorded temperatures below 1000°C temperature in the secondary chamber (October 3, October 4, November 16, and December 1) with the lowest temperature recorded as 251°C. In its 2017 Annual Report, Agnico Eagle noted that for 2017 there were no recorded temperatures below 1000°C in the secondary chamber and considers that maintenance work conducted at the incinerator between 2014 and 2016 was effective in improving efficiency of the unit. This contradicts the available record and Agnico Eagle should clarify the discrepancies.

Finally, it is noted that Agnico Eagle indicated within the 2016 Annual Report that it will revise the Incinerator Management Plan with the operators and continue to sensitize the employees to the importance of good waste segregation. However, this does not appear to have been done as Agnico Eagle notes in the 2017 Annual Report that the Incinerator Waste Management Plan will be updated to reflect the stack testing schedule.

Recommendation 10: The Board requests that Agnico Eagle provide an explanation for the incinerator having not achieved the recommended temperature of 1000°C and above in 2017, and whether additional steps have since been undertaken to ensure that the incinerator stays above 1000°C in the secondary chamber.

The requested information should be provided to the Board within *30 days* following the issuance of this recommendation.

Recommendation 11: The Board requests that Agnico Eagle provide regulatory authorities with an updated Incinerator Management Plan for review.

The updated Incinerator Management Plan should be provided within *60 days* to the Board and regulatory authorities following the issuance of this recommendation.

Appendix D, the Annual Report and the PEAMP

The NIRB notes that Agnico Eagle's 2017 Annual Report provided a detailed analysis of results from its 2017 monitoring program and that it compared observed impacts noted in 2017 to predictions made within the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Agnico Eagle's evaluation focused on the valued ecosystemic components (VECs) that had been identified in the FEIS, including the aquatic environment, the terrestrial and wildlife environment, noise quality, air quality, permafrost and socio-economics. The NIRB acknowledges that Agnico Eagle has worked to improve upon its reporting of findings within its post-environmental assessment monitoring program (PEAMP) and notes the general clarity of the presentation of information in its tables of potential impacts, potential cause(s), proposed monitoring, monitoring conducted for the year, predicted values and measured values/observed impacts. However, the NIRB found that the discussion and analysis within the PEAMP could be expanded upon especially to include trends that may be observed. The NIRB recognizes Agnico Eagle previously conveyed interpretation of Appendix D as not explicitly dictating that the PEAMP involve producing a trend analysis of previous years' monitoring data; however, the Board would like to note that the objective of the PEAMP as detailed in Appendix D is to provide this trend analysis as part of the summary report.

In reviewing the Annual Report and as noted by regulatory parties, there was an increase in a number of water quality parameters that are exceeding predictions from the year to year since 2012. The overall lack of reference to baseline data or to data from previous years makes it difficult to quantify or measure the relevant effects of the Project. While comparison between monitoring as proposed in the FEIS and monitoring undertaken in 2017 was helpful, rationale for why these were different was not always clearly presented.

Recommendation 12: The Board requires that Agnico Eagle provide a comprehensive update on the post-environmental assessment monitoring program for the Project. This must include a discussion that references the baseline and previous years' monitoring data and identifies any trends for each valued ecosystem component where an effect has been observed. The update must identify where original impact predictions can no longer be supported based on project experience to date and include an analysis of the effectiveness of management and mitigation strategies employed. The update must also provide a summary of lessons learned from the Project which can be used to improve future performance at this and other mining developments in Nunavut.

The comprehensive update should be provided to the Board within *30 days* following the issuance of this recommendation, and also be included in the annual reports thereafter.

Aquatic Environment

As in previous years, the post-environmental assessment monitoring program (PEAMP) section of the 2017 Annual Report did not provide any discussions on the Core Receiving Environment Monitoring Program (CREMP) or Agnico Eagle programs or any discussion on the changes observed/detected at the aquatic stations. Further, there was no discussion on the changes observed over time at these stations since operations commenced, or what the cause may be for the changes observed at these stations. As noted previously, a year-to-year comparison would provide a robust analysis and would have been useful to help identify trends in the data collected for the aquatic environment, specifically for the water quality and sediment quality data.

In review of Agnico Eagle's Annual Report, and as noted by regulatory parties, there was an increase in a number of parameters that are exceeding predictions from the year to year since 2012 or trigger exceedances in several parameters for both water quality and sediment chemistry. In response, Agnico Eagle stated that the CREMP continues to detect changes in some general water quality parameters that appear to be related to mining activity or that trends observed in sediment samples are due to natural spatial heterogeneity. Agnico Eagle also noted that these changes were reflected in higher concentrations of some parameters when compared to the model predictions in Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Agnico Eagle set thresholds and/or triggers at the 95th percentile of baseline data and concluded while that these results represent mine related changes, the observed concentrations are still relatively low and unlikely to adversely affect aquatic life. Further, Agnico Eagle indicated that due to the low likelihood of adverse effects on aquatic life, a discussion was not required on the management actions with respect to trigger exceedances observed in water.

Further, similar to the Kivalliq Inuit Association's concern, it was noted that the updated water quality model indicated that treatment may be required for aluminum, arsenic, cadmium, chromium, copper, fluoride, iron, nickel, and selenium so that the pit water quality will meet the

Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME) criteria at mine closure, while silver is no longer anticipated to be a problem at closure due to low loadings in the 2016 mill effluent. This represents a change from the previous annual report.

Recommendation 13: The Board requires Agnico Eagle to provide a trend analysis and discussion on the observed project effects on the aquatic environment based on the data collected to date under the Core Receiving Environment Monitoring Program. Further, a clear indication regarding whether outcomes align with the predictions made within the Final Environmental Impact Statement must be included. This is required under Appendix D for the post-environmental assessment monitoring program (PEAMP) and may be satisfied through inclusion in the broader PEAMP update required for the Project.

The requested information should be provided to the Board within *30 days* following the issuance of this recommendation, and also be included in the annual reports thereafter.

Recommendation 14: The Board requests that Agnico Eagle qualify why it considers the exceedances of the thresholds to be “relatively low” and provide evidence to support the statement that it is “unlikely to adversely affect aquatic life” with reference to findings from the biotic surveys (i.e., phytoplankton and benthic invertebrate community) conducted in 2017. In addition, a discussion of management actions with respect to trigger exceedances in water is to be provided, even if the likelihood of adverse effects on aquatic life is considered to be low.

The requested information should be provided to the Board within *30 days* following the issuance of this recommendation.

Recommendation 15: The Board requests that Agnico Eagle explain why there has been an increasing trend in the number of parameters predicted to require treatment at closure.

The requested information should be provided to the Board within *30 days* following the issuance of this recommendation.

Noise Quality Monitoring

With respect to noise quality monitoring, the 2017 Annual Report did not provide a comparison of data to the final environmental impact statement (FEIS) predictions for noise levels nor was a trend analyses provided. It was noted in review of the 2017 Annual Report that the exceedance of predicted sound levels were resolved at station R5 which has been elevated in previous years. No discussion in the annual report was provided on how the exceedance of predicted sound levels were resolved.

Further, Agnico Eagle committed to evaluate the noise model in the 2017 Annual Report and predicted impacts within the FEIS would be discussed further. This information was not provided within the 2017 Annual Report as submitted by Agnico Eagle in April 2018.

Recommendation 16: The Board requests that Agnico Eagle clarify how the exceedance of predicted sound levels was resolved at noise monitoring station R5, recognizing that the levels have been above the predicted sound levels in previous years.

The requested information should be provided to the Board within *30 days* following the issuance of this recommendation.

Recommendation 17: The Board requests that Agnico Eagle clarify whether an evaluation was undertaken for the noise model and, if so, whether the results were compared to the predictions within the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Project.

The requested information should be provided to the Board within *30 days* following the issuance of this recommendation, and also be included in the annual reports thereafter.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE WHALE TAIL PIT PROJECT

All materials pertaining to the NIRB's ongoing Monitoring program for the Whale Tail Pit Project can be accessed online from the NIRB's online public registry at www.nirb.ca/project/124683.

Outstanding Submissions and Updated Plans

As the Whale Tail Project Certificate is in its first year post-issuance, this first recommendation is being made to track reporting required through the first six (6) months of it being in place, which was September 2018. Some of the items have been updated by Agnico Eagle and relevant authorities as noted in each subsections below; however, due to the number of items still outstanding, a recommendation is being made to track the progress of development and submission for these documents.

Update to existing Dust Management and Monitoring Plan – Term and Condition 2

As required by Term and Condition 2 of Project Certificate No. 008, Agnico Eagle has not provided the updated Dust Management and Monitoring Plan for the Meadowbank Mine site including verification of commitments made to the utilization of dust suppressants along the all-weather access road, the Amaruq haul road and other roads and trails associated with the Project. However, it is noted that Air Quality and Dustfall Management Plan was submitted by Agnico Eagle in June 2018 but the information within this plan does not appear to address the requirements of the Term and Condition.

Site-specific Permafrost Monitoring, Mapping and Thermal Analysis –Term and Condition 10

Term and Condition 10 of Project Certificate No. 008 requires the Proponent to consult with applicable regulatory agencies to undertake additional site-specific permafrost monitoring mapping and thermal analysis with the results of these studies provided to the NIRB at least 30 days prior to the start of construction of project infrastructure such as the Whale Tail pit, water management structures, mine site and haul roads, waste rock storage facilities, etc. During the 2018 site visit in August, construction of several of the above-mentioned infrastructures has commenced; however, the NIRB has not received any information from the Proponent on the results of the studies as requested. Agnico Eagle did provide a Thermal Monitoring Plan in May 2018 which summarized the current permafrost conditions based on data collected up to October 2017. Further, Agnico Eagle provided a copy of a presentation provided to Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada in July 2018 that covers the hydrogeological model (to meet Term and Condition 6) but does not appear to provide the information related to additional site-specific permafrost monitoring

mapping and thermal analysis to document permafrost conditions, including season thaw and amount of ground ice. In addition, the information as presented within the presentation does not inform the detailed design of project infrastructure as outlined above. As Natural Resources Canada was not consulted on this information and the results not provided to the NIRB, it appears that Agnico Eagle has not met the requirements of Term and Condition 10.

Invasive Species Mitigation Plans – Term and Condition 25

Agnico Eagle has not provided an Invasive Species Mitigation Plans, Protocols, Monitoring and Inspection Program as required by Term and Condition 25 of Project Certificate No. 008 to date. This was to be provided to the NIRB for review at least 30 days prior to the first shipment of equipment and supplies to the site. In correspondence received in October 2018, Agnico Eagle indicated that it is working on developing a plan for the 2019 barge season.

Finalized Terms of Reference – Term and Condition 27

Term and Condition 27 of Project Certificate No. 008 requires that Agnico Eagle provide a finalized Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Terrestrial Advisory Group (TAG) to the NIRB within six (6) months of issuance of the Project Certificate. Within the Terrestrial Ecosystem Management Plan provided to the NIRB in June 2018, Agnico Eagle noted that it is committed to the establishment of a TAG consisting with the appropriate representatives and that the TOR will be discussed and completed by Q4 of 2018 for the TAG. To date, the finalized TOR has not been provided to the NIRB.

Initial Listing of Formal Certificates and Licences – Term and Condition 52

Term and Condition 52 of Project Certificate No. 008 requires that Agnico Eagle develop and maintain an easily referenced listing of formal certificates and licences that may be acquired via on-site training or training during project employment. The initial listing was to be provided to the NIRB within six (6) months of the Project Certificate being issued. To date, no listing of formal certificates and licences have been provided for review. In correspondence received in October 2018, Agnico Eagle indicated that it is working on developing a listing which would be provided by November 2018.

Occupational Health and Safety Plan –Term and Condition 57

An updated Occupational Health and Safety Plan was to be provided to the NIRB within six (6) months of issuance of the Project Certificate (No. 008) as per Term and Condition 57. To date, no updated plan has been provided. In correspondence received in October 2018, Agnico Eagle indicated that it is working on developing a listing which would be provided by November 2018.

Recommendation 1: The Board requests that Agnico Eagle provide an action plan for provision of the following outstanding information required by Project Certificate No. 008: an updated Dust Management and Monitoring Plan, evidence of consultation with applicable regulatory agencies to undertake required site-specific permafrost monitoring mapping and thermal analysis, an Invasive Species Mitigation Plan, finalized Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Terrestrial Advisory Group, development of an easily referenced listing of formal certificates and licences that may be acquired via on-site training or training, and an updated Occupational Health and Safety Plan.

The action plan should be provided to the Board within *30 days* following the issuance of this recommendation.

Recommendation 2: The Board requests that Environment and Climate Change Canada review the Air Quality and Dustfall Management Plan submitted by Agnico Eagle in June 2018 and provide feedback regarding whether the plan meets the requirements under Terms and Conditions #1 and #2 of Project Certificate No. 008.¹

The Board respectfully requests that Environment and Climate Change Canada provide a response to this recommendation within *30 days* receipt of the Board's correspondence to Environment and Climate Change Canada.

Recommendation 3: The Board requests that Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada and Natural Resources Canada review the information provided by Agnico Eagle for Term and Condition 10 of Project Certificate No. 008 in relation to the additional site-specific permafrost monitoring mapping and thermal analysis studies and confirm whether the information is complete and that this condition has been satisfied.^{2,3}

The Board respectfully requests that Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada and Natural Resources Canada provide a response to this recommendation within *30 days* receipt of the Board's correspondence to both Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada and Natural Resources Canada.

Viability of flooded South Basin as an effective offset for habitat loss – Condition 24

In review of the Whale Tail Fisheries Habitat Offsetting Plan submitted by Agnico Eagle in May 2018, it is not clear if the requirements under Term and Condition 24 of Project Certificate No. 008 have been met. The NIRB would like confirmation from Fisheries and Oceans Canada that the plan as submitted meets the requirements of Term and Condition 24 and whether the concern that the increased surface area of Whale Tail Lake is a viable offset to habitat losses resulting from the development of the Project and whether Whale Tail end pit would support fish in the post closure scenario has been addressed.

Recommendation 4: The Board requests that Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) provide confirmation that the Whale Tail Fisheries Habitat Offsetting Plan as submitted meets the requirements of Term and Condition 24 of Project Certificate No. 008 and whether the increased surface area of Whale Tail Lake is accepted as a viable offset to habitat losses resulting from the development of the Project. The Board further requests

² Note that the Board will be inviting Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada to comment on these matter under separate cover, and that Agnico Eagle is not responsible for a response to these recommendations. They have been included here for information only.

³ Note that the Board will be inviting Natural Resources Canada to comment on these matter under separate cover, and that Agnico Eagle is not responsible for a response to these recommendations. They have been included here for information only.

that DFO clarify whether previously raised concerns regarding whether Whale Tail end pit would support fish in the post closure scenario have been satisfactorily addressed.⁴

The Board respectfully requests that Fisheries and Oceans Canada provide a response to this recommendation within *30 days* ' receipt of the Board's correspondence to Fisheries and Oceans Canada.

If you have any questions or require further clarification regarding these recommendations in particular or relating to the NIRB's monitoring programs for the Meadowbank Gold Mine Project or the Whale Tail Pit Project, please contact the undersigned directly at (867) 857-4829 or sgranchinho@nirb.ca.

Sincerely,



Sophia Granchinho, M.Sc., EP
Manager, Impact Assessment
Nunavut Impact Review Board

cc: Manon Turmel, Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.
Robin Allard, Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.
Martin Archambault, Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.
Nancy Duquet Harvey, Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.
Ryan Vanengen, Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.
Jamie Quesnel, Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd.
Meadowbank Distribution List

Enclosure (1): The Nunavut Impact Review Board's *2017-2018 Annual Monitoring Report for the Meadowbank Gold Project [03MN107] & Whale Tail Pit Project [16MN056]*

⁴ Note that the Board will be inviting Fisheries and Oceans Canada to comment on these matter under separate cover, and that Agnico Eagle is not responsible for a response to these recommendations. They have been included here for information only.