



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

September 9, 2022

To: Jamie Quesnel  
Regional Manager – Permitting and Regulatory Affairs  
Agnico Eagle Mines Limited  
Baker Lake, NU X0C 0A0

Sent via email: [jamie.quesnel@agnicoeagle.com](mailto:jamie.quesnel@agnicoeagle.com)

**Re: Information Requests received from Parties regarding Agnico Eagle Mines Limited's "Meliadine Extension" Project Proposal**

Dear Jamie Quesnel:

On August 5, 2022, the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB or Board) initiated the public technical review of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) Addendum submitted by Agnico Eagle Mines Limited (Agnico Eagle, or Proponent) for the "Meliadine Extension" project proposal by requesting that interested parties submit Information Requests (IRs) to facilitate their technical review of the FEIS Addendum.

On or before September 6, 2022, the NIRB received IR submissions from the following parties:

Party	# of IRs	Document ID No.
Kivalliq Inuit Association (KIA)	16	341601
Government of Nunavut (GN)	7	341611
Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC)	15	341616 & 341617
Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC)	13	
Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO)	22	
Health Canada (HC)	6	
Natural Resources Canada (NRCan)	20	
Sayisi Dene and Northlands Denesuline First Nation (SDFN & NDFN)	4	341602

All documentation associated with the "Meliadine Extension" project proposal, including IR submissions, can be accessed via the NIRB's public registry at [www.nirb.ca/project/125684](http://www.nirb.ca/project/125684) or by searching for the above Document ID numbers.

The NIRB has completed its review of the IRs received and hereby requests that Agnico Eagle respond to those IRs which have been determined to be relevant to the Proponent, to the current stage of the assessment process, and necessary to facilitate parties' technical review of the FEIS Addendum and subsequent development of technical review comments. The NIRB also notes that several of the IRs are directed to NIRB and GN. The NIRB requests that these parties review those IRs that are directed to them and provide a response within the anticipated process timelines by **September 23, 2022**.

Some IRs contained within parties' submissions are outside the scope of information required for this phase of the assessment process and are noted therefore be more appropriately addressed through technical review comment submissions. While it is the Board's expectation that the Proponent will review all IRs, at this time the NIRB has provided a listing of specific requests (see [Appendix](#)) for which the Proponent is either expected to provide a partial response, or is not expected to address within its response. Requests for updated or additional assessments are not information requests but pre-determinations on the adequacy of the assessment provided in the FEIS Addendum and will be further discussed through the technical review stage and technical meetings to determine where the requests for additional assessment is warranted. These IRs which do not meet the criteria of an IR, as well as items where the IR responses may not meet reviewer's expectation will be addressed during the technical review stage of the process.

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

The Board respectfully requests that Agnico Eagle and parties review all submissions as available via the NIRB's online public registry and supply the NIRB with an IR Response Package **on or before September 23, 2022**, according to the previously issued anticipated process timeline. If you have any questions regarding the NIRB's assessment of the "Meliadine Extension" project proposal, please contact Emily Koide, Technical Advisor II, at [ekoide@nirb.ca](mailto:ekoide@nirb.ca) or Tara Arko, Director, Technical Services, at [tarko@nirb.ca](mailto:tarko@nirb.ca).

Sincerely,



Karen D. Costello  
Executive Director  
Nunavut Impact Review Board

Attachments: *Appendix A: Information Requests Identified by the NIRB as Requiring a Modified or No Response*

cc: Meliadine Distribution List  
Manon Turmel, Agnico Eagle Mines Limited  
Jennifer Range, Agnico Eagle Mines Limited

Stephanie Autut, Nunavut Water Board  
Karén Kharatyan, Nunavut Water Board  
Sergey Kuflevskiy, Nunavut Water Board  
Carson Gillis, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated  
Bert Dean, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated  
Luis Manzo, Kivalliq Inuit Association  
Maria Serra, Kivalliq Inuit Association  
Agnes Simonfalvy, Government of Nunavut  
Natalie O'Grady, Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency  
Adrian Paradis, Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency  
Tracey McCaie, Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada  
Victoria Shore, Environment and Climate Change Canada  
Alasdair Beattie, Fisheries and Oceans Canada  
Julie Anderson, Health Canada  
Jackie Barker, Transport Canada  
Maximilien Genest, Natural Resources Canada  
Geoff Bussidor, Sayisi Dene First Nation  
Benji Denechezhe, Northlands Denesuline First Nation

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

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

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

IR #	Information Request	NIRB Direction
<b>Kivalliq Inuit Association</b>		
KIA-IR#2	The Proponent should provide a definition of ‘deflection’ of caribou relative to approaching and moving through the Meliadine mine and associated infrastructure, including the AWAR.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic. Additional assessment of the definition of deflection more appropriately addressed through technical review comments.
KIA-IR#3	The Proponent should provide an overall assessment of current caribou movement through the mine sites, AWAR, Discovery haul road and main Extension area (wind farm, Tiriganiaq-Wolf mining area and airstrip) using Inuit Knowledge, the mapped visible trails and collar data.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic. Additional assessment more appropriately addressed through technical review comments.
KIA-IR#4	The Proponent should provide a detailed monitoring and adaptive mitigation plan for caribou in the vicinity of the windfarm for the projected life of the Extension Project.	IR limited to clarifying where information is located; the technical review discussion is the time to discuss whether this is issue warrants a windfarm specific plan.

KIA-IR#6	<p>The Proponent should:</p> <p>A. Provide an explanation for how the model rapidly attenuates the wind turbine noise;</p> <p>B. Provide a graph showing measured noise level relative to distance for different wind speeds for the wind turbines and whether the noise is cumulative for more than one turbine;</p> <p>C. Explain if and how the modeled wind turbine noise includes Amplitude Modulation; and</p> <p>D. Make available Golder 2018b.</p>	IR limited to providing information or additional clarification requested per items A, C and D; Items B limited to clarification on cumulative noise with additional noise analyses or how information presented is more appropriately addressed through technical review comments.
KIA-IR#7 directed GN	GN-DoE should develop a DSA that will provide the Qamanirjuaq collar data to Agnico Eagle and its consultants on a regular and timely basis so that a comprehensive analysis of collar movements at broad and fine (individual collar trajectories) scales are available to assess potential impacts of the Meliadine Extension Project.	Defer to technical review discussions as development of agreements more appropriately addressed through technical comments.
KIA-IR#8 directed GN	GN-DoE should develop animations of collared caribou movements for 15 June to 25 July for 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019.	Defer to technical review comments; NIRB suggest Agnico Eagle consider how to provide visuals for the technical meetings to illustrate caribou movement around the project and proposal.
Government of Nunavut		
GN-IR#1	<p>1. An analysis of trends in caribou overlap and residency time within Local Study Area (LSA) and Regional Study Area (RSA) using collared caribou collar data for the period 1993 up to the most recent year of data available. This should report information on the following metrics (in graphical and/or tabular form): (a) For each year, the percentage of collars that enter the RSA and LSA; (b) For each year, the average number of days each collar, that entered the LSA or RSA, spent in these areas.</p> <p>2. A revised assessment of the potential to disrupt caribou movements using scenarios in which current trends in caribou interaction with the Project (as measured by the metrics in item 1 above) continue through the approved Project's lifespan and through the proposed Project's 11-year extension of operations.</p>	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic; the need for any additional or revised assessment requirements are more appropriately addressed through technical review comments.

GN-IR#3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A revised figure A1 (Appendix G4 – AEM 2022) that delineates the trail survey study area and survey effort.</li> <li>2. Clarification whether apparent differences in trail, water crossing and pinch point densities between the east and left sides of the existing project are real or a survey artifact.</li> <li>3. If the differences in trail densities, east versus west, is real please provide further information about why the east side of the Project was not considered as a site for elements of the proposed extension including airstrip and windfarm.</li> <li>4. If the difference in trail densities is an artifact of survey design, please explain why the east side of the existing project was not surveyed.</li> <li>5. Please provide further information regarding the rationale for selecting a 5km survey radius.</li> </ol>	IR limited to providing information or additional clarification requested per items 2, 3, 4 and 5; revised analysis or presentation of information in item 1 more appropriately addressed in technical review comments.
GN-IR#4	<p>The GN - DOE requests the Proponent provide the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please provide a review of the “limited” information available on barren-ground caribou responses to wind turbines (including supporting citations), as referred to in section 6.6.5.2 of the FEIS Addendum.</li> <li>2. Based on literature and/or professional opinion, please provide further discussion about how the findings from studies of semi-domesticated reindeer responses to wind turbines may differ from responses of non-domesticated, migrating barren-ground caribou, including differences in Zone-of-Influence and disruption of migratory movements.</li> <li>3. Please provide information on the predicted caribou Zone-of-Influence (ZOI) and disturbance coefficients for the windfarm including any supporting citations. A revision of the indirect habitat loss analysis is requested that incorporates these ZOI and disturbance coefficients</li> </ol>	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic; the need for any additional or revised assessment requirements are more appropriately addressed through technical review comments.
GN-IR#7 directed to Agnico Eagle and NIRB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to the Annual Site Status Report should be included in: (1) FEIS Section 9.14.6 Monitoring and Follow up and; (2) FEIS Appendix D- Cultural and Heritage Resources Protection Plan.</li> <li>• CH Term and Condition #30 should be included in Certificate 006.</li> </ul>	NuPPAA 135(5) and (6) discuss that federal and territorial monitoring under their legislation is fulfilled through their departments so the Project Certificate does not duplicate regulatory requirement. Agnico Eagle

		response limited to verifying if required information has been provided, key mitigation and monitoring requirements, and verifying compliance. Sufficiency of this information to be discussed through technical comments.
Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada		
CIRNAC-IR-04	<p>CIRNAC requests that AEM:</p> <p>a) Provide a tabular summary of all infrastructure that has been proposed or built at the Meliadine Mine since its inception, including the date it was approved, licensed, and constructed. At minimum, this should include all: pits, underground mining, mine waste storage facilities (tailings and waste rock), water management facilities (e.g., ponds, treatment plants, conveyance, discharge), transportation infrastructure and buildings. If a proposed piece of infrastructure was not built or is no longer required, please indicate why.</p> <p>b) Provide annotated figures (e.g., site maps) summarizing the information contained in a) that clearly illustrate existing infrastructure and proposed new infrastructure.</p>	IR limited to clarification on project components within the current proposal and how they relate to the approved project especially related to map representations of this infrastructure; exhaustive list should be deferred to monitoring activities. revisiting how data is represented or additional assessment deferred to tech review discussion.
CIRNAC-IR-06	<p>CIRNAC requests that AEM:</p> <p>a) Confirm the maximum discharge volumes to Meliadine Lake, as presented in the Waterline FEIS and the Meliadine Extension FEIS;</p> <p>b) Present the rationale for any differences in the volumes reported under a); and</p> <p>c) Indicate what steps will be taken to fulfill the commitment to minimize or eliminate discharges to Meliadine Lake (e.g., ongoing grouting to limit saline water inflows to the mine).</p>	IR limited to providing information or additional clarification requested per items A and B especially to focus on the general impact assessment not water licensing issues; item C more appropriately addressed in technical review comments.
CIRNAC-IR-07	<p>CIRNAC requests that AEM:</p> <p>a) Confirm that future TDS concentrations in CP1 are now predicted to remain below 1,000 mg/L;</p> <p>b) Describe the factors that resulted in predicted TDS concentrations in CP1 reducing by more than 70% under the proposed Meliadine Extension.</p>	IR limited to providing information or additional clarification requested per item A; item B more appropriately addressed in technical review comments.

CIRNAC-IR-09	<p>CIRNAC requests that AEM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Extend the modelling duration until results demonstrate that maximum concentrations within surface water receivers have been achieved;</li> <li>b) Confirm that the predicted arsenic concentrations in the Tiri Pit Lake are spatially averaged and that localized concentrations may be higher (e.g., in the vicinity of drainage from SP B7);</li> <li>c) Indicate the approximate accuracy of the water quality modelling presented in the FEIS Addendum; and</li> <li>d) Indicate whether sensitivity analyses have been performed to confirm that arsenic concentrations in Tiri Pit Lake during post-closure will not be substantively greater than predicted.</li> </ul>	IR limited to providing information or additional clarification requested per item B, C, and D; item A more appropriately addressed in technical review comments and monitoring.
CIRNAC-IR-10	<p>CIRNAC requests that AEM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Confirm that post-closure water quality modelling presented in the FEIS Addendum assumes that metal loadings from reclaimed areas of the site will be equal to loadings from background areas; and</li> <li>b) Provide evidence from other mine sites that seepage from reclaimed areas will revert to background conditions.</li> </ul>	IR limited to providing information or additional clarification requested per item A; item B more appropriately addressed in technical review comments.
CIRNAC-IR-14	<p>CIRNAC requests that AEM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Review its 2019 Analysis of the Risk of Temporary Mine Closure and make any necessary updates based on the current Meliadine Extension project proposal. Consideration should be directed toward relevant information requested under Section 8.2.1.1 and Section 8.2.1.2 of the NIRB's EIS Guidelines.</li> </ul>	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on how this topic was considered in its assessment so far; additional analyses deferred to technical review discussions.



CIRNAC-IR-15	<p>CIRNAC requests that AEM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Review its most recent Inuit Workforce Barriers Study and make any necessary updates based on the current Meliadine Extension project proposal. Consideration should be directed toward relevant information requests included in Section 8.2.3.2 of the NIRB's EIS Guidelines;</li> <li>b) Make the Inuit Workforce Barriers Study available to the NIRB for consideration in the Meliadine Extension project proposal assessment, provided there are no privacy requirements; and</li> <li>c) Submit to the NIRB a plain language summary of its main findings, if the Inuit Workforce Barriers Study cannot be shared with the NIRB for privacy reasons</li> </ul>	<p>IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic with additional analyses more appropriately addressed in technical review comments. The topic is managed through the SEMC, therefore the NIRB would encourage CIRNAC, GN, and Agnico Eagle to discuss and ensure the GN as the SEMC coordinator can provide the information on monitoring and resolution of barriers.</p>
Environment and Climate Change Canada		
ECCC-IR-03	<p>ECCC recommends that the Proponent add a plot of average wind speed for each snow season to Figure 5.3-1 to assess the possible influence, if any, of wind speed on accuracy of snowfall measurements.</p>	<p>IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic with additional analyses more appropriately addressed in technical review comments.</p>

ECCC-IR-04	<p>ECCC recommends the following information be provided in consultation with the Draft Technical Guide Related to the Strategic Assessment of Climate Change: Guidance on quantification of net GHG emissions, impact on carbon sinks, mitigation measures, net-zero plan and upstream GHG assessment (“the draft Technical Guide”):</p> <p>GHG emission estimate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ECCC recommends that the Proponent confirm any change in project throughput / capacity as a result of the proposed expansion, and the associated change to GHG emissions, if applicable.</li> <li>2. ECCC recommends that the Proponent provide more information on the GHG emission estimate, including methodologies, assumptions, emission factors, and equipment details.</li> <li>3. ECCC recommends that the Proponent provide a GHG emission estimate for construction and decommissioning phases of the expansion.</li> <li>4. ECCC recommends that the Proponent provides GHG emission reduction information on the wind turbines according to steps in Section 2.1.3. of the draft Technical Guide.</li> <li>5. ECCC recommends the Proponent provide an emission intensity according to Section 2.1.5. of the draft Technical Guide</li> </ol> <p>Mitigation measures and net-zero plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. ECCC recommends that the Proponent review and incorporate the guidance for mitigation measure principles and the Best Available Technologies / Best Environmental Practices (BAT/BEP) determination process in Section 3 of the draft Technical Guide.</li> <li>7. ECCC recommends that the Proponent develop a net-zero plan for the project according to section 3.5 of the draft Technical Guide.</li> </ol> <p>Carbon sinks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. If the project is anticipated to impact carbon sinks, ECCC recommends the Proponent performs an assessment of the project’s impact on carbon sinks. Guidance for a carbon sink impact assessment can be found in section 4 of the draft Technical Guide.</li> </ol>	<p>IR limited to providing information or additional clarification requested per items 1 to 5; items 6 to 8 more appropriately addressed in technical review comments.</p>
------------	--	--

ECCC-IR-05	ECCC recommends that the Proponent provide a comprehensive evaluation of the disposal of tailings and waste rock to mined-out pits, which examines the interactions with groundwater, effects on pit water quality and surface water quality, and considers any closure implications. This should include information on water cover depth, pore water quality, pit wall geometry and composition, tailings and rock geochemistry, and monitoring and mitigation measures.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic with additional analyses more appropriately addressed in technical review comments.
ECCC-IR-08	Given the potential sensitivity of the proposed project to future climate change, ECCC requests that AEM provide additional rationale as to why a range of climate change scenarios were not considered for the Meliadine Extension project and identify any risks associated with limiting climate change RCPs to a more moderate prediction.	IR limited to clarification, any additional analysis would be discussed through technical comments.
ECCC-IR-09	ECCC considers the airstrip to be a novel disturbance within the Project and Local Study Areas and requests the Proponent include the optional airstrip as a new pathway of effect to migratory birds and their habitat.	Additional assessment more appropriately addressed in technical review comments.
ECCC-IR-10	<p>Due to the risk of compounding or additive adverse effects to migratory birds from the airstrip and wind farm, ECCC requests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The LSA be expanded around the windfarm and airstrip to encompass the area between and around the two sites. The Proponent should consider ECCC's recommended buffer for aircraft disturbances in establishing a new buffer around the two sites and provide rationale on the new buffers.</li> <li>2. The Proponent conduct an assessment of the interactions between the airstrip and the wind farm, identify any compounding adverse effects from these two sites.</li> </ol> <p>ECCC requests that this information be used to identify mitigation, monitoring and follow-up measures.</p>	Additional and revised assessment more appropriately addressed in technical review comments.

ECCC-IR-11	<p>To address gaps in the baseline assessment, ECCC requests that the Proponent conduct additional pre-construction surveys consistent with ECCC's Wind Turbines and Birds: A Guidance Document For Environmental Assessments and the Recommended Protocols for Monitoring Impacts of Wind Turbines on birds.</p> <p>In particular, ECCC requests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Point count surveys be expanded to cover the entirety of the wind farm footprint</li> <li>2. Surveys be conducted outside the nesting season, which includes spring and fall migration</li> <li>3. PRISM-style surveys be conducted in the vicinity of the wind farm and airstrip to increase detection of species not well captured by traditional point counts</li> </ol> <p>ECCC requests that this information be used to identify mitigation, monitoring and follow-up measures.</p>	Additional analyses more appropriately addressed in technical review comments.
ECCC-IR-12	ECCC requests the Proponent provide site-specific meteorological information, including the number of days with fog or low visibility. ECCC requests that this information be used to inform the assessment of effects of the wind farm on migratory birds and to identify mitigation and monitoring measures and follow up.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional information as requested, with revised analyses more appropriately addressed in technical review comments.
<b>Health Canada</b>		
HC-IR-03	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide a robust description and analysis assessing the potential impacts to air quality from all Project-related activities (including any existing mining activities) during the construction, operation, and decommissioning phases of the airstrip.</li> <li>2. Provide additional justification to validate the approach used to assess air quality impacts from airstrip activities.</li> </ol>	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing clarification on the topic, with revised analyses and additional justification more appropriately addressed in technical review comments.

HC-IR-04	<p>1. Include all Project-related emissions, including existing operations, and construction and operation of future Project-related components in the air quality assessment, notably activities at the Project site in addition to haul road and airport activities. This could be considered in the context of a ‘cumulative effects assessment’.</p> <p>2. Provide a comparison of the new cumulative air emissions of the Project, for each air contaminant (refer to HC-IR-05), to appropriate territorial and federal guideline levels.</p>	For item 2, IR limited to providing information or additional clarification on federal guideline levels with additional comparisons more appropriately addressed in technical review comments; item 1 more appropriately addressed in technical review comments.
HC-IR-05	<p>1. Revise air quality modelling to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air contaminants associated with the Project, including but not limited to: TSP, PM2.5, PM10, CO, VOCs, PAHs, DPM, and any other contaminants from mobile and/or stationary sources, and/or provide justification why these contaminants were not included;</li> <li>• Estimates of the above-mentioned air contaminants for all phases of the Project (construction, operation, decommissioning); and,</li> <li>• Existing and recent baseline air quality data (i.e., post-2014 Environmental Impact Statement).</li> </ul>	Need for revised analyses deferred to technical review discussions.
Fisheries and Oceans Canada		
DFO-IR-01 directed to the NIRB	DFO would like the NIRB to provide clarity on the scope of the Reconsideration.	The scope of NIRB’s assessment was provided in the August 5, 2022 letter to parties but does not preclude regulators from reviewing their regulation of the project to inform their intervention but frames the focus of the NIRB’s jurisdiction and framework for decision. While the regulators may use input from communities to fulfill their duty to consult requirements, it is on that agency to fulfill their obligations.

DFO-IR-02	Please prepare and categorize a table into works that have already been constructed, works that were proposed in the 2014 FEIS but have not been constructed, and proposed works that are changes to what was approved in the 2014 FEIS.	IR limited to clarification on project components within the current proposal and how they relate to the approved project especially related to map representations of this infrastructure; exhaustive list should be deferred to monitoring activities. revisiting how data is represented or additional assessment deferred to tech review discussion.
DFO-IR-08	Please provide a revised assessment on potential impacts to Fish and Fish Habitat including lower trophic level fish and new data collected on other fish population.	Need for revised analyses deferred to technical review discussions.
DFO-IR-09	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide a rational and explanation for the definitions of Duration and revise the assessment to be based on the “duration” of the effect from the initiation of the work rather than the ability to be reversed at the end of construction and/or closure of the mine.</li> <li>2. Revise the definitions of criteria in Table 4.5-1 and the assessment of the duration of Residual Effects in the FEIS Addendum based on environmental considerations rather than mine life.</li> <li>3. Revise the FEIS Addendum to provide detailed statements of the duration of effects (in months/years from start of construction) to be included to support the determination of duration of the effects and significance.</li> </ol>	Need for revised analyses deferred to technical review discussions.
DFO-IR-10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please provide a completed table of every waterbody in the LSA, locations, years that the waterbody was sampled, sample method, and fish species captured or observed.</li> <li>2. In the Addendum, please provide an overall summary of Fish and Fish habitat, and potential for each watershed and each waterbody per watershed.</li> </ol>	IR limited to providing clarification on project components that relate to the current project proposal.

DFO-IR-12	<p>1. Please provide updates on fish and fish habitat assessments for all the lakes and channels that will be potentially impacted by the project. This should include multi-year data, data from spring and fall sampling events, and data based on sampling efforts that are suitable for potential and target species.</p> <p>2. In addition, include a revised assessment of Section 7.5.3 with new fish distribution and habitat use by life stage information.</p> <p>3. In Section 7, please include a revised assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the potential for fish migrations into waterbodies in the LSA from Meliadine Lake,</li> <li>b. an assessment of the value of small-bodied fish to the larger ecosystem, including as a food source.</li> </ul> <p>4. Update Appendix D26, Table 2.2-1 to include all the potentially affected waterbodies.</p>	IR limited to providing information requested in item 4; revised and updated assessments in items 1 to 3 more appropriately addressed in technical review comments.
DFO-IR-13	Please provide an updated Table 7.5-1 that includes a revised assessment based on the results of the AEMP, findings of additional fish and fish habitat assessments, and information collected through past works such as dewatering the ponds around Tiriganiaq pits 1&2 in 2022.	Need for revised analyses deferred to technical review discussions.
DFO-IR-14	Please identify how the increase in access from the AWAR as well as the proposed construction of boat launch facilities on Meliadine Lake may change the conclusion of the FEIS 2014 assessment.	IR limited to providing clarification on project components that relate to the current project proposal.
DFO-IR-15	Please provide a summary of the potential for loss and what the results are with new knowledge incorporated, and how changes to known distribution of Arctic Char, Arctic Grayling spawning, Ninespine Stickleback, and other fish species presence has been accounted for.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic with updates assessments more appropriately addressed through technical review comments.
DFO-IR-17	Please provide a complete table of affected waterbodies and update the discussion in Section 4 to include impacts to all fish and fish habitat.	IR limited to providing clarification on project components that relate to the current project proposal.
DFO-IR-18	Please provide ground-truthing to the measurements of waterbody boundaries and stream and channel habitats	Justification of analyses more appropriately addressed through technical review comments.

DFO-IR-19	Provide an account of the complete change in area of habitat due to the mine activities and include the change in area due to loss of seasonal flows with reduction in runoff (changed watershed capture). This is important in DFO's assessment of impacts to fish and fish habitat and in determining the potential Harmful Alteration, Disruption, and Destruction of fish habitat that may need to be offset.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic with updates to conclusions more appropriately addressed through technical review comments.
DFO-IR-21	Please revise these diagrams to include identification of all the potentially affected waterbodies in or near the boundaries identified in the figures. This includes channels that flow downstream from the "Meliadine Footprint Extension" and the "NIRB Approved Footprint".	IR limited to providing clarification on project components that relate to the current project proposal.
DFO-IR-22	1. Please provide an explanation as to why areas of waterbodies were sampled and why some lakes with insufficient data were not sampled (i.e. the area around the Discovery Mine and Lake J1). 2. Please provide a description of site conditions and water conditions during the surveys - i.e. low water period, unseasonably low water, wind conditions etc.	IR limited to clarification in item 2; evaluation of assessments more appropriately addressed through technical review comments in item 1.
<b>Natural Resources Canada</b>		
NRCAN-IR-05	1. Provide Table 9 recalculated with vertical hydraulic gradients relative to the elevation of Lake B5. 2. Assess the vertical gradients relative to Lake B5 3. Provide an assessment of the uncertainty of the vertical hydraulic gradients.	Need for revised analyses deferred to technical review discussions.
NRCAN-IR-12	1. Conduct hydrogeological modelling of closure and post-closure groundwater flow. 2. Assess the time required to reach steady state groundwater flow conditions (a drawdown cone appears to persist into 2043 on Figure 24, Appendix H6). 3. Tabulate groundwater flow in/out of lakes and pit lakes. 4. Assess vertical groundwater flow in all exhausted pits refilled with tailings and waste rock storage during closure and post-closure phases. 5. Estimate hydraulic properties of refilled underground mines, and open pits infilled with tailings or waste rock.	Need for revised analyses deferred to technical review discussions.
NRCAN-IR-13	1. Evaluate the infiltration of saline water (flow, concentration and depth of saline intrusion) into the open talik beneath B7 as a result of its operation as a saline pond (2025-2043).	Need for revised analyses deferred to technical review discussions.



	2. Ensure a saline boundary condition is implemented for saline pond B7 when conducting hydrogeological modelling of closure and post-closure groundwater flow (see NRCan-12).	
NRCAN-IR-19	1. Please indicate whether any suitable data have been acquired from new thermistor cables installed in 2020 in the vicinity of the Discovery deposit. If data have been acquired, update the thermal and groundwater models and assessments of mine water inflow.	IR limited to Agnico Eagle providing additional clarification on the topic with updates to assessments more appropriately addressed through technical review comments.
Sayisi Dene First Nation and Northlands Denesuline First Nation		
SDFN/NDFN IR-03	1. the validity of comparing the predicted noise levels from the 2014 FEIS to the predicted noise levels for the Meliadine Extension to determine the magnitude of change from the former to the latter, and 2. why “actual” noise levels from the Noise Receptor locations subsequent to the mine becoming operational were not used in the analysis.	Evaluation of assessments more appropriately addressed through technical review comments.