



NIRB File No.: 11MN034
NWB File No.: 2AM-MEL1631
NPC File No.: 149337

October 14, 2020

To: Meliadine Distribution List

Sent via email

Re: Commencement of the Technical Review Period for the NIRB’s Assessment of Agnico Eagle Mines Limited’s “Saline Effluent Discharge to Marine Environment” Project Proposal

Dear Parties:

On August 27, 2020 the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB or Board) initiated the public technical review of the revised Impact Statement Addendum¹ (IS Addendum) submitted by Agnico Eagle Mines Limited (Agnico Eagle or Proponent) for the “Saline Effluent Discharge to Marine Environment” Project Proposal² (NIRB File No. 11MN034) by inviting interested parties to submit Information Requests (IRs) by September 25, 2020. Following receipt of submissions and confirmation as IRs, the NIRB on September 28, 2020 requested that the Proponent review the submissions and supply the NIRB with its response to the IRs by October 13, 2020. The NIRB received the IR Response Package from Agnico Eagle and the Government of Canada on October 13, 2020.

The revised IS Addendum, IR submissions, and Response Package as received by the NIRB can be accessed online via the NIRB’s public registry at www.nirb.ca/project/125515.

The NIRB has conducted a preliminary completeness check to ensure that adequate information has been provided by the Proponent in order to commence the technical review period. Although unable to fully assess the technical quality of the responses and to determine whether they will meet with reviewers’ requirements, the NIRB is of the opinion that sufficient information has been provided to commence the technical review of the IS Addendum and to facilitate the next steps in the process including the preparation of technical review comments.

¹ Also referred to as Final Environmental Impact Statement (IS) Addendum

² Full title “Saline Effluent Discharge to Marine Environment, Rankin Inlet, Meliadine Gold Mine, Nunavut”.

CALL FOR TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMENTS

The public technical review period is meant to provide for a detailed review of the IS Addendum with the intent of analyzing the completeness and assessing the quality of the information presented by the Proponent in support of this project proposal. Parties are invited to review the IS Addendum submission and develop technical review comments. Please note that parties are encouraged to review [Appendix A](#) of this letter, which provides the NIRB's suggested format for the development of technical review comments and additional clarification regarding the information that **must** be included with the submissions as follows:

- Determination of whether Parties agree/disagree with the conclusions in the IS Addendum regarding the alternatives assessment, environmental impacts, proposed mitigation, significance of impacts, and monitoring measures – and reasons to support the determination;
- Determination of whether or not conclusions in the IS Addendum are supported by the analysis – and reasons to support the determination;
- Determination of whether appropriate methodology was utilized in the IS Addendum to develop conclusions – and reasons to support the determination, along with any proposed alternative methodologies which may be more appropriate (if applicable);
- An assessment of the appropriateness of proposed monitoring measures – and evidence to support the determination, along with any proposed alternative monitoring measures which may be more appropriate (if applicable);
- Assessment of the quality and presentation of the information in the IS Addendum;
- Any comments regarding additional information which would be useful in assessing impacts – and reasons to support any comments made; and
- Identification of any terms and conditions of the Project Certificate No. 006, Amendment 001 that are considered to require amendment to reflect the “Saline Effluent Discharge to Marine Environment” Project Proposal.

The NIRB is requesting that responsible authorities, interested parties, and those with specialist advice provide their technical review comments to the NIRB by the conclusion of the public technical commenting period on **November 12, 2020**.

NEXT STEPS IN THE RECONSIDERATION PROCESS

The next steps in the NIRB's assessment of Agnico Eagle's “Saline Effluent Discharge to Marine Environment” Project Proposal have been outlined as follows for the information of parties. Please note that the Board reserves the right to revise the next steps and timelines if circumstances dictate:

Dates	Process Step
October 13, 2020	Agnico Eagle (and other parties) submits its response to IRs; NIRB initiates 30-day technical review period.
November 12, 2020	Parties submit technical review comments to the NIRB; NIRB forwards technical review comments to Proponent (and other parties).
November 18, 2020	Agnico Eagle (and other parties) files a response to technical review comments.
November 23-26, 2020	Technical Meeting, Community Roundtable and Pre-Hearing Conference (teleconference/in-person/virtual).

Dates	Process Step
<i>December 18, 2020</i>	Pre-hearing Conference decision issued determining timing, format, and any associated logistics for the Public Hearing; Public Hearing announced.
<i>To be determined</i>	NIRB Public Hearing

Throughout the technical review period, interested parties are encouraged to work cooperatively with Agnico Eagle to discuss issues in advance of the Technical Meeting, Community Roundtable and Pre-hearing Conference. The NIRB, however, requests to be kept informed of any issues and any agreement(s) reached between the parties on specific issues related to the Saline Effluent Discharge to Marine Environment and the IS Addendum.

Once again, the NIRB requests that all interested parties submit their Technical Review Comments to the NIRB by email at info@nirb.ca or through the online public registry at www.nirb.ca on or before **Thursday, November 12, 2020**.

Should you have any questions or require further clarification regarding the next steps in the Board's assessment of the Saline Effluent Discharge to Marine Environment Project Proposal, please contact Erin Reimer, Technical Advisor I, at ereimer@nirb.ca, or the undersigned at (867) 983-4617 or kmorrison@nirb.ca.

Sincerely,



Keith Morrison
 Manager, Impact Assessment
 Nunavut Impact Review Board

Attachments: Appendix A – NIRB's Suggested Format for Parties' Technical Review Comments

cc: Jamie Quesnel, Agnico Eagle Mines Limited
 Michel Groleau, Agnico Eagle Mines Limited
 Karén Kharatyan, Nunavut Water Board
 Bert Dean, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated
 Luis Manzo, Kivalliq Inuit Association
 Natalie O'Grady, Government of Nunavut
 Adrian Paradis, Northern Projects Management Office
 Alexandre Chaikine, Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada
 Margaret Fairbairn, Environment and Climate Change Canada
 Daniel Coombs, Fisheries and Oceans Canada
 Joel Kaushansky, Health Canada
 Anita Gudmundson, Transport Canada
 Clayton Tartak, Kivalliq Wildlife Board
 Roger Pilakapsi, Kangiqliniq Hunters and Trappers Organization
 Brian Zawadski
 Chris Kanaan

For each issue raised, parties are asked to include a clear reference to the main IS Addendum volume number(s), document section, and/or page number in the IS Addendum where the relevant information may be found. Parties may find efficiencies in structuring submissions by issue, and are asked, where possible, to align their submission in accordance with the ordering of materials as presented within the IS Addendum. A tabular presentation as provided below is requested as a means of systematically organizing comment submissions and to assist with the compilation of submissions for the next steps of the Board’s assessment process.

Format & File Size

Parties are requested to provide technical review comments in a fully functional, electronically searchable Word, Excel or unlocked PDF format. Noting the current constraints with respect to internet bandwidth and speed, the NIRB requests that all submissions be submitted as electronic file(s) no larger than 25 MB.

Deadline for filing technical review comments

The NIRB is requesting that responsible authorities, interested parties and those with specialist advice provide their technical review comments to the NIRB on or before **Thursday, November 12, 2020**.

Technical review comment submissions must contain the following:

1. Executive summary

Submissions must contain a non-technical executive summary of the major issues identified during the review of the IS Addendum. The summary should not exceed two pages.

The NIRB requires executive summaries be provided in English and be translated into both **Inuktitut** and **French**. Please note that parties are responsible for sourcing this translation.

2. Table of contents

Submissions must contain a table of contents with sections that relate to the main headings of the IS Addendum for the Saline Effluent Discharge to Marine Environment Project Proposal and which identify the major issues under those headings the party intends to bring forward for discussion and intends to address at the Technical Meeting. Submissions may also address any other matter that the party considers relevant to the NIRB’s review of the IS Addendum and the proposed Saline Effluent Discharge to Marine Environment Project Proposal.

3. Introduction

All submissions should contain a statement of the party’s mandate and relationship to the project. Parties that have regulatory jurisdiction over the Saline Effluent Discharge to Marine Environment Project Proposal and the approved Meliadine Gold Mine Project, must also provide a description of that party’s jurisdiction as well as a list of the legislation, regulations, policies and guidelines administered by the party that are applicable to the Saline Effluent Discharge to Marine Environment Project Proposal.

4. Specific comments

For each issue included in the submissions, parties should provide the following:

- a. A detailed description of the issue and, where appropriate, a reference to where within the IS Addendum (volume/document, section and page number) that issue is discussed;
- b. If provided by the Proponent within the IS Addendum, identify the Proponent's conclusion(s) related to the issue;
- c. A statement regarding the conclusion(s) of the commenting party related to the issue, including reference to the justification/data/rationale supporting that conclusion;
- d. A brief discussion assessing the issue's importance to the impact assessment process; and
- e. Any recommendation(s) to the NIRB with respect to the disposition of the issue.

5. Summary of recommendations

Finally, comment submissions must contain a *summary* of the recommendations to the Board with respect to:

- Whether Parties agree/disagree with the conclusions presented in the IS Addendum regarding the alternatives assessment, environmental impacts, proposed mitigation, significance of impacts, and monitoring measures – and all evidence supporting the parties' position;
- Whether or not conclusions presented in the IS Addendum are supported by the analysis – and all evidence supporting the parties' position;
- Whether appropriate methodology was utilized in the IS Addendum to develop conclusions – and all evidence supporting the parties' position along with any proposed alternative methodologies which may be more appropriate if applicable;
- An assessment of the appropriateness of proposed monitoring measures – and evidence to support the determination, along with any proposed alternative monitoring measures which may be more appropriate (if applicable);
- An assessment of the quality and the presentation of the information presented in the IS Addendum;
- Any comments regarding additional information which would be useful in assessing impacts – and reasons to support any comments made; and
- Identification of any terms and conditions of the Project Certificate No. 006, Amendment 001 that are considered to require amendment to reflect the "Saline Effluent Discharge to Marine Environment" Project Proposal.

6. Summary of Recommendations

Review Comment Number	
Subject/Topic	
References to the IS Addendum (i.e. volume/document, section/sub-section, page number, etc.)	
Summary (include Proponent's conclusion if relevant and conclusions of commenting party)	
Importance of issue to impact assessment	

Detailed Review Comment	1. Gap/Issue 2. Disagreement with IS Addendum conclusion 3. Reasons for disagreement with IS Addendum conclusion
Recommendation/Request	