

Table 1: SDFN/NDFN Comments on Document # 240708-11MN034-Proponent Response to 2023 Annual Report Comments-IMRE; Revised 2023 Annual Report; Revised Appendix 26, 2023 Wildlife Observations.

<p>List of Acronyms AWAR – All Weather Access Road AEM – Agnico Eagle Meliadine SDFN/NDFN – Sayisi Dene First Nation/Northlands Denesuline First Nation NIRB – Nunavut Impact Review Board TEMMP - Terrestrial Environment Management and Monitoring Plan GN – Government of Nunavut FEIS - Final Environmental Impact Statement KivIA - Kivalliq Inuit Association TAG - Terrestrial Advisory Group ECCC – Environment and Climate Change Canada T&C – Terms and Conditions IQ - Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit TK – Traditional Knowledge</p>
--

Comment Number:	1
Subject/Topic:	Failure to meet T&C 47 and 57 in AEM response to SDFN/NDFN – in the 2023 Annual Report review (Re: June 28, 2023, incidental observation and report of a possible caribou mortality along the AWAR). Response provided by AEM to SDFN/NDFN was unsatisfactory.
References:	Please refer to SDFN/NDFN Comment #3 “Missing caribou mortality incident” (Document #240603-11MN034-NDFN SDFN Comments Re: 2023 Annual Report-IA2E) and Appendix 25, 2023 TEMMP Report, P.30, Table 12 “Wildlife Mortalities and Incidents Reported in 2023.” Also see July 8, 2024, letter response from AEM titled “RE: Opportunity to Address Comments Received for Agnico Eagle Mines Limited’s Meliadine Gold Mine Project 2023 Annual Report”, P.63 and P.70; <i>Meliadine Gold Mine, Monthly Wildlife Report - June 2023 Amended</i> , Appendix A, Summary of Wildlife Observations, P.11
Comment:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AEM failed to properly document and investigate a caribou observation (and likely mortality) reported in-person directly to former AEM Environment Department Superintendent, Matt Gillman and KivIA land officer, Craig Beardsall on June 28, 2023 at Km 12 on the AWAR at approximately 4:00 PM by TAG member, SDFN/NDFN advisor, Certified Wildlife Biologist® Dan Chranowski, during a TAG field trip. 2. The caribou was observed through a spotting scope provided by AEM during the field trip. The caribou fell over and was immobile for over ½ hour and did not get up when the field trip party departed the area. This caribou was observed approximately 200 to 300 m northeast of the Km 12 gatehouse on open tundra terrain and plainly visible. The location where the caribou was immobile (possible mortality) was reported and identified to Matt Gillman and Craig Beardsall. The immobile caribou and its location near the AWAR were

	<p>identified to former AEM staff member, Helene Boulanger, and observed by Athabasca Denesuline representative, Peter Gazandlare.</p> <p>3. This incidental caribou observation was missing in the June 2023 incidental wildlife observations (Table 12). This is contrary to Section 5.1.3 “Incidental Observations” of the TEMMP and the requirements of T&C 57 (b) of the Project Certificate.</p> <p>4. Dan Chranowski was verbally assured by Matt Gillman (AEM) and Craig Beardsall (KivIA) that the immobile caribou observation would be documented in the wildlife incidental observations log and directly reported to the GN wildlife officer, Nathaniel so that an investigation would be conducted to determine cause of death and reported back to AEM. Despite the assurances, there is no record that this observation was reported to GN. This lack of reporting is contrary to the requirements of T&C 47 of the Project Certificate which requires AEM to share information about wildlife incidents with the GN.</p> <p>5. The caribou observation was only inserted into Table 12 as a “wildlife sighting” in the <i>Revised 2023 Annual Report; June 2023 Wildlife Report</i> after this discrepancy was raised by SDFN/NDFN advisor and Certified Wildlife Biologist®, Dan Chranowski in the 2023 annual report review.</p> <p>6. AEM stated that no employee (or contractor) observed a caribou mortality on June 28, 2023, at Km 12 at the AWAR gatehouse. However, in Section 5.1.3 “Incidental Observations” of the TEMMP, it states that <u>visitors</u> can report wildlife observations. Therefore, it was not necessary for an AEM employee (or contractor) to observe the possible caribou mortality and AEM’s claim of not seeing a caribou mortality is irrelevant. The possible caribou mortality was directly reported to AEM, it was their responsibility to document and report it; especially since it was brought to the attention of the Environment Department Superintendent, Matt Gillman. This is specifically noted in Section 6.1 “General Wildlife Mitigation,” Subsection 6.1 “Employee Policies and Training” in the first bullet at the top of P.59 in the March 2025 Version 5 of the TEMMP which states “All incidents involving interactions with wildlife, use of deterrence, or injury of wildlife will be documented, evaluated by Environment Department staff, and reported in the TEMMP annual report.” Appropriate action should have been taken by AEM.</p> <p>7. The statement by AEM (in their response to SDFN/NDFN), that no employee or contractor saw a caribou mortality exhibits a lack of acknowledgement by AEM that the possible caribou mortality was reported to AEM at that site, on that day. This shows a lack of reporting integrity and discipline on behalf of AEM.</p> <p>8. SDFN/NDFN acknowledges that observing an actual mortality of a caribou is rare. However, the caribou observation report received by AEM from a qualified biologist member of the TAG (Dan Chranowski) was as close to observing an actual mortality as possible. This possible caribou mortality sighting should have been investigated by AEM for the sake of due diligence.</p> <p>9. As AEM and KivIA were both made aware of this possible caribou mortality, the expectation is that there would be proper investigation and reporting of the incident based on communication and collaboration.</p> <p>10. This lack of due diligence to document and report on a possible caribou mortality by AEM contrasts with other 2023 wildlife sightings that have been</p>
--	---

	<p>documented, reported, and investigated by AEM for potentially rabid, dead, or sick wildlife (See Tables 1 through 11):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • February 22 - Fox-running near school bus parking lot. It was observed by Shawn Lee Baines. AEM’s action was to monitor the area to determine if the fox was rabid. • April 22 - Fox was observed eating near the camp main door by Mark Miller. AEM’s action was to successfully deter the fox. • June 9 - A dead fox was observed by Kevin Smith at the Tiriganiaq Open Pit 2. The wildlife sighting log indicates that “no action required.” Yet, in Section 3.5 Wildlife Incidents, this sighting was recorded as an “incident.” AEM collected the carcass but did not determine cause of death. AEM assumed the fox died from drowning and awaited GN conservation officer direction about what to do with the carcass. This action by AEM contrasts with the “no action required” entry in the June 2023 wildlife sightings log. • July 27 - a dead squirrel was observed by Anne-Laurence Paquet at bypass road, Km 2.5. No action was required. • August 4 - dead squirrel observed by “GG” at Km 5 of the bypass road. No action required. • August 9 - a dead unknown bird was observed by “MM” on the west side of the gymnasium. No action was required by AEM. • November 25 - a sick or wounded arctic fox was observed by the haul truck drivers at the snow dump area, north of CP1. Again, no action was required. <p>The above observations on August 4, 9, and November 25 in which no action was required calls to question AEM’s due diligence in follow-up investigations. The lack of action by AEM to determine cause of death (or health condition) of wildlife near their operations is surprising and puzzling. Determining cause of wildlife death could help determine if AEM activities are linked to these deaths. Cause of wildlife death may be other than what is assumed (e.g., drowned, rabies, roadkill) and may be related to subtle bio-accumulated toxic chemical residue.</p>
<p>Conclusion/Request:</p>	<p>In the 2023 Annual Report, AEM did not indicate they investigated the incidental possible caribou mortality reported on June 28, 2023. This lack of due diligence by AEM to investigate seems contrary to the NIRB requirement to monitor the predicted threshold trigger of “no more than one ungulate mortality per year” that requires annual reporting by AEM (TEMMP Version 4, Section 5.7 FEIS Predictions and Thresholds for Wildlife, Table 12 - Summary of Predicted Effects, Monitoring Methods, and Management Thresholds for Ungulates).</p> <p>Request: AEM should acknowledge a credible report of a possible caribou mortality on June 28, 2023, was received. AEM should revise Appendix 26 of the 2023 Annual Report on the date of June 28, 2023, from a “wildlife sighting” to indicate “possible caribou mortality.” The caribou observation entry should be updated with the time (4:00 PM) and under the column “Behavior” it should state “possibly sick or wounded” and under the column “WL Action” it should state “Not reported to GN - No investigation or action taken.”</p>

	<p>This recommended correction to the 2023 wildlife observations record would accurately reflect the lack of action on the part of AEM and possibly prevent future occurrences.</p> <p>Should AEM refuse to accommodate SDFN/NDFN's request, a formal letter to NIRB will be drafted, requesting for their assistance to help resolve the matter.</p>
Comment Number:	2
Subject/Topic:	Terrestrial Advisory Group, T&C 132
References:	<p>Revised 2023 Annual Report, Section 11.11 Terrestrial Advisory Group; Appendix 32, 2023 TAG Annual Report, Section 2, TAG Action Items, Recommendations and Advice</p> <p>Meliadine Mine Terrestrial Advisory Group Terms of Reference (230224-11MN034-Meliadine TAG TOR-IT9E)</p> <p>Letter from the Minister of Northern Affairs to the NIRB, dated January 31, 2022 (220131-11MN034-Ministers Response Re: NIRB Reconsideration Report-ICHE)</p> <p>Proponent Response to 2023 Annual Report Comments, dated July 8, 2024 (240708-11MN034-Proponent Response to 2023 Annual Report Comments-IMRE)</p>
Comment:	<p>As detailed in SDFN/NDFN-6 of SDFN/NDFN's comments on the 2023 Annual Report, SDFN and NDFN raised that any Memorandums of Understanding for the TAG or other written confirmations of participation in the TAG must be filed with NIRB and circulated to the organizations listed in Section 4.1 of the TAG Terms of Reference. In AEM's Response to SDFN/NDFN-6, it confirmed that other parties had indicated in writing that they agreed to participate in the TAG; however, these Memorandums of Understanding for the TAG or other written confirmations of participation in the TAG have not been filed with the NIRB or circulated to the organizations listed in Section 4.1 of the TAG Terms of Reference.</p>
Conclusion/Request:	<p>SDFN/NDFN reiterates the recommendation that, pursuant to the reporting requirements of T&C 132, AEM file with the NIRB and circulate to the organizations listed in Section 4.1 of the TAG TOR, any Memorandums of Understanding for the TAG or other written confirmations of participation in the TAG.</p>

<p>Table 2: SDFN/NDFN Comments on 2024 AEM Annual Report and Additional Documents (250319-11MN034-Meliadine 2023-2024 Monitoring Report-OMME; 250331-11MN034-2024 Annual Report - App 17 Mock Spill Scenario Rpt-IMRE; 250331-11MN034-2024 Annual Report - App 26 TEMMP Report-Pt 2; 250331-11MN034-2024 Annual Report - App 26 TEMMP Report-Pt 3; 250331-11MN034-2024 Annual Report - App 29-17 TEMMP-Version 5 (March 2025); 250331-11MN034-2024 Annual Report - App 38 TAG Report-IMRE; 250331-11MN034-2024 Annual Report - App 30 NIRB Project Certificate Tracking Table-IMRE)</p>	
Comment Number:	1
Subject/Topic:	Waterline coverings are higher than adjacent road surface, contrary to 2020 Waterlines Addendum and Meliadine Extension waterline drawings and visuals.

References:	250319-11MN034-Meliadine 2023-2024 Monitoring Report-OMME; FEIS 2020.10 Addendum Waterline Installation Along AWAR - Appendix 7; 201013-11MN034 - Drawings - Appendix 4-IA1E; 230523-11MN034 - Attachment O Discovery Waterline Visuals-IT9E
Comment:	The observations and images of waterline coverings being higher than the AWAR road surface documented during the 2023-2024 AEM Monitoring report (Section 3.4.1 Compliance with the NIRB Project Certificate and P.24, Section 4 Findings and Recommendations, point #5) are in direct contrast to AEM documents presented during the 2020 waterlines addendum and the Meliadine Extension Discovery waterlines drawings and visuals. All waterline coverings were supposed to be lower than the road surface with some waterlines partly buried in the tundra substrate to reduce their profile above the ground. This higher waterline covering could be a possible deterrent to caribou crossing and be a danger to young caribou calves. This situation may not meet the intent of T&C 54 requiring safe passage of wildlife.
Conclusion/Request:	AEM should provide an appropriate detailed explanation as to why waterline covering installation was higher than the road surface and why AEM failed to meet the waterline coverings standards as promised in the 2020 Waterlines Addendum and Meliadine Extension application process. AEM should identify what steps will be taken to alleviate this concerning situation.

Comment Number:	2
Subject/Topic:	Mock Spill Response Scenario
References:	250331-11MN034-2024 Annual Report - Appendix 17 Mock Spill Scenario Rpt-IMRE; 230804-11MN034-Agnico Eagle Response to 2022 Annual Report Comments-IA2E
Comment:	A land-based spill response scenario has yet to be practiced by AEM despite assurances it would be implemented (See August 4, 2023, letter response from AEM to SDFN/NDFN-1 <i>Waterline spills and discharges; spill response and training</i> , P.51). A land-based spill response will generate a new set of challenges to AEM field staff. Since the waterlines are due to be commissioned in 2025, it is especially important for staff to be oriented towards an appropriate level of preparation and action for a land-based spill. It is recommended that an appropriate location for a land-based spill scenario should be at a known caribou crossing location along the AWAR and possibly some of the sites where the waterlines are left uncovered (i.e., between Km 22 and Km 27).
Conclusion/Request:	SDFN/NDFN again requests AEM's commitment to conduct a land-based spill scenario prior to waterlines discharge (as stated on P.51 in 230804-11MN034-Agnico Eagle Response to 2022 Annual Report Comments-IA2E) so that AEM staff will be prepared for a spill in which caribou may be present at an AWAR crossing location.

Comment Number:	3
Subject/Topic:	Caribou Trail Camera Program Compilation Report, 2020 to 2024 - Inconsistencies in maps and data presented. Cumulative effects monitoring comments on P.31.
References:	250331-11MN034-2024 Annual Report - Appendix 26 TEMMP Report - Pt 3; P.10, Figure 5.1-1, Locations of Motion Trigger Cameras at the Meliadine Mine,

	May-August 2024 and Table 5.1-1 Camera Deployments at the Meliadine Mine From 2020 to 2024
Comment:	<p>a. On page 9, it indicates that cameras were placed “at or near” Km 9, 12, 16, 22, and 27 (known caribou crossing sites) based on feedback from Elders. Upon review of Figure 5.1-1 however, it does not appear that cameras are located “at or near” these locations. Perhaps the coarse granularity of the map is at fault, but AEM could have improved the map by indicating the actual distance (in meters) that each camera was to the Km marker to help the reader understand how “near” the camera was to the Km location.</p> <p>b. On page 9, it states that 14 cameras were deployed along the AWAR in 2024; however, Table 5.1-1 indicates 16 cameras were deployed along the AWAR in 2024. Please clarify the inconsistency (14 versus 16 cameras deployed)</p> <p>c. On page 9, it indicates that 13 cameras were deployed around the mine site. Figure 5.1-1, however, displays 13 camera locations around the mine site (yellow) and 3 cameras “On-Site” (purple) for a total of 16 cameras. Table 5.1-1, however, indicates only 13 mine site cameras were deployed. AEM should use consistent language to be clear which cameras are which (Site versus On-Site). Please clarify the inconsistency between the text, figure, and table (13 versus 16 cameras deployed).</p> <p>d. On page 1, “Executive Summary” under “Camera Effort” it states that 45 cameras were deployed in 2024. On page 10, Figure 5.1-1 however, there are only 44 camera location dots displayed. Please clarify. Is there one camera location not displayed on Figure 5.1-1?</p> <p>e. In Appendix A: Data From Wildlife Cameras, it is suggested that in the column “Camera Location,” each camera ID (e.g., A13, CAM33) should have been shaded with the same colour as shown in Figure 5.1-1 (i.e., yellow, purple, green, red). When scanning Appendix A, then the reader would know which cameras in the appendix were placed on the AWAR (green) versus the Discovery Road (red), for example.</p> <p>f. On page 31, the sentence “The findings of this program may be incorporated with other data sources, including concurrent behaviour surveys and collar data to inform potential cumulative effects on caribou from the Meliadine Mine and associated infrastructure and development” is particularly relevant. The need to measure mitigation effectiveness by AEM with the previously mentioned monitoring methods is needed. It is hoped that AEM will also implement and design innovative monitoring using <u>additional</u> trail cameras along the AWAR to measure mitigation effectiveness after the waterlines are fully commissioned</p>
Conclusion/Request:	Please explain data and map inconsistencies and revise text, maps, and tables for clarity. Commit to additional trail cameras along the AWAR to study potential impacts to caribou crossing the AWAR and waterlines.

Comment Number:	4
Subject/Topic:	TEMMP Caribou Protection Measures and Caribou Behavior Study - Reduce group size trigger threshold
References:	250331-11MN034-2024 Annual Report - Appendix 29-17 TEMMP-Version 5 (March 2025); 250331-11MN034-2024 Annual Report - Appendix 26 TEMMP

	Report-Pt 2; SDFN/NDFN Comments and Recommended Revisions to the TEMMP Version 5 (May 2024), July 15-2024, FINAL
Comment:	SDFN/NDFN has noted the improvements made by AEM to the “Caribou Protection System” in Section 4.5.2 in TEMMP, Version 5 (March 2025) and they are appreciated. However, more caribou protection could be implemented. Not all recommendations for improved caribou protection measures to the TEMMP have been implemented by AEM. Specifically, SDFN/NDFN has consistently requested that the group size trigger threshold be reduced from 50 to 25 caribou in Levels 3 and 4 (see point #3 in SDFN/NDFN Comments and Recommended Revisions to the TEMMP Version 5 (May 2024), July 15, 2024, FINAL). This group size trigger should be evidence-based and not arbitrary. The caribou behaviour surveys completed in 2023 and 2024 have consistently determined that “small (<25 caribou) groups tended to have a higher proportion of response behaviours (running, alert) than larger groups, irrespective of disturbances” (P.34, Section 7, Summary of APP 26 TEMMP Report - Pt 2). In addition, by reducing the group size trigger threshold, AEM would be implementing a caribou protection measure that is strongly supported by IQ and TK observations that small groups are the leaders of the caribou herd in the spring and determine where the herd may go (i.e., evidence-based) in any given year.
Conclusion/Request:	Reduce the group size trigger threshold from 50 to 25 caribou in Levels 3 and 4

Comment Number:	5
Subject/Topic:	T&C 134 - Waterlines Report
References:	250331-11MN034-2024 Annual Report - Appendix 30 NIRB Project Certificate Tracking Table-IMRE; 250331-11MN034-2024 Annual Report-IMRE
Comment:	In the tracking document, it indicates this T&C is “Not Yet Applicable.” However, it states that “the Proponent shall submit a plain-language and visual-based summary of the waterlines as constructed and operatedto support the review of the waterlines design and operation by interested parties.” The “initial version of this summary shall be submitted to the NIRB and interested parties at least 60 days prior to the operation of the waterlines system”. On page 6 of the 2024 Annual Report, Section 2.1. 2.1 Waterline Construction Update, it states that the waterlines will be commissioned by an unspecified date in 2025. Given that the average first snowfall and freezing temperatures can arrive in the Rankin Inlet area by end of September, it would seem logical that AEM will attempt to complete final construction and commissioning of the waterlines by approximately September 30, 2025. Therefore, a “Waterlines Summary Report” should be submitted by AEM to NIRB and interested parties by approximately August 1, 2025 to meet the requirements of T&C 134.
Conclusion/Request:	Can AEM confirm if there will be any delays to complete the waterlines in 2025 and if not, that a summary report will be submitted 60 days prior to waterline operation to meet the requirements of T&C 134?