

**From:** [Maggie Putulik / Brian Zawadski](#)  
**To:** [Info](#)  
**Subject:** Comment on AEM's Waterline Consultations Report, 28 August, 2020  
**Date:** Monday, September 7, 2020 8:23:27 PM

---

Good Day.

I reviewed Agnico Eagle Mines "Waterline Consultations Report" dated 28 August, 2020 and wish to make some comments.

The first comment pertains to the first bullet in the Introduction in which AEM says they have aligned their public participation approach with guiding principles set out by NIRB, specifically ... "consultations generally take place before a project proposal is developed and decisions are made regarding the project." I suppose the word "generally" in this statement gives AEM a means around adhering to strictly following this principle but in my opinion AEM knew well in advance, perhaps twelve months or more, that a waterline was something they would aggressively pursue. The signs are clear their intention was to do consultations after their decision to proceed was made given a project proposal had been developed and presented to NIRB in March 2020 just around the time community consultations started. Further, pipes had already been ordered for shipping in 2020. I find it insincere for AEM to begin the consultation report expressing a principle they are only giving lip service to.

The second comment pertains to this statement on page 14: "On March 11<sup>th</sup>, Agnico Eagle hosted a public open house event at the Rankin Inlet Community Hall to discuss the waterline project with the community members." I do recall hearing the announcement on the local radio informing the public of the open house however the word "waterline" was not part of the message. The message only said it was being held to "update" the community on AEM's plans with no specifics on what those plans might be. So it is true the community was made aware of the meeting, however the announcement lacked sufficient detail as to the nature of the meeting from which an person could decide whether to attend or not.

Third, Appendix 1, Point 9 on page 9 states: "Agnico Eagle will bury/cover between 80-90% of the waterline and will continue to work with the HTO, KIA, Elders, and the community on site specific locations. This will replace commitment 1 to build crossings if this is the preferred mitigation method." This for sure is progress in the right direction to address concerns about the impact of the waterlines on migrating caribou and appears to be a reasonable alternative to address community concerns. However, AEM has built an "if" into this statement which gives them a way to back out of covering the pipes and I hope they will go for this option unless a better option becomes available.

One thing that has not been made clear to the public, to my knowledge, is that the waterline will have to be "snaked" because of water pressure building up in the pipes ("water hammer"). All drawings that I have seen show the waterlines following the course of the road, which we likely envision as being straight line, however the pipes will have to be laid in a serpentine manner which may present another level of complexity by increasing the ground surface area impacted. In addition, where the distance from the road base increases due to the outward curve of the pipes, there will be a requirement to place more fill to make the pipes crossable by caribou.

Four. The report says in Appendix III – Consultation Plan (Round 1 & 2), page 14 “Attempts have been made throughout July and August to reach Mr. Zawadski – if a meeting is possible before the end of the month, Agnico Eagle local Staff will meet with him.” I cannot say what efforts were made by AEM staff to meet me but I can say that I was not contacted. My phone number is in the phone book so it is reasonable to assume AEM staff could have called by phone, however no phone call was received nor were any messages left on the answering machine. To be fair, I was out of town from July 19 to August 6. We all know Rankin Inlet is not a large community and we all know there are other ways of contacting a person in this community, so I find this comment about not being able to contact me difficult to comprehend.

Five. In Appendix IV – Complied Comments and Questions, page 37, one of the comment summaries from the Radio Show 2 is from comments I made during the radio show, specifically: “He also mentioned a mine causing a flood in Quebec in their underground pit and being fined for it.” Well the summarization is partially correct about the Quebec mine but not about the fine – although AEM may have been fined. It was not a “fine” I was speaking about but rather a class-action suit filed by investors in 2012 – here is the link <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-investor/class-action-suit-filed-against-agnico-eagle-over-flood-at-goldex-mine/article553072/>.

Following is an excerpt from the Globe and Mail story:

**“Shareholders have filed a lawsuit against Agnico-Eagle Mines Ltd. that claims the company failed to disclose the risks at its Goldex mine, which was shuttered after flooding last year sending its stock price plunging.**

**Siskinds LLP said Monday it has filed the proposed suit in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice against the miner and some of its senior officers.**

**It alleges that the company failed to disclose specific risks regarding ongoing flooding at the mine.”**

The point I was making was one of AEM’s motivation to fast track the project proposal approval by circumventing the time consuming NIRB Assessment is possibly the fear investors/shareholders may again file a class-action suit because investors were not informed in a timely manner about the groundwater accumulation and the potential for impairment of the Meliadine’s operations leading to a possible devaluation of AEM stock. Of course this is only supposition on my part but a reasonable person would think AEM Management might want to avoid a repeat of the Goldex flooding suit. Regardless, I just want to correct the record as I did not say “fine” but rather I said “class-action suit”.

Couple of other things. AEM has referred to a couple of places that a report was prepared for them by ERM in 2020 about caribou behavior and pipelines. Should not this report be put on the public record so that we may have an opportunity to scrutinize said report?

There seems to be some confusion in the community between the surface runoff water and the underground saline water problems which are being addressed by two different reviews. I believe AEM is trying their best to differentiate these two water issues in the public forum and my comment

here is to just say confusion still exists.

Lastly, the optics of giving \$75 gift certificates to the Elders who participated in a bus tour a couple of weeks ago is not good and may be construed in ways not in alignment with the well meaning intentions.

Cheers,  
Brian Zawadski

PO Box 614  
Rankin Inlet, NU X0C 0G0

C. 867-645-6962

P. 867-645-2974