

Interested Party:	KitIA	Rec No.:	KIA-NIRB-01
Re:	2025 Stack Testing Results		

Request Made by Interested Party:

The KIA requests the following:

- *Please report, assess, and discuss the 2025 stack testing results in the applicable NIRB and atmospheric compliance monitoring submissions.*

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:

This omission was an oversight by Agnico Eagle. In accordance with Project Certificate No.009, Term and Condition 1, a summary of the 2025 stack testing results is provided below. Stack testing completed will be included in all future annual reports.

The source emission testing was conducted during the period of August 23-26, 2025. Source emission testing was completed with the incinerator operating under normal steady state conditions (i.e., after the primary chamber burned ignited and stabilized) for the duration of the sampling periods. The results of the 2025 testing show a reduction in dioxins and furans emissions relative to the stack testing results for 2022 (0.45 ng TEQ/Rm3) and 2019 (1.27 ng TEQ/Rm3).

- *The average concentration of particulate matter was 40.9 mg/Rm3. There are no limits specified for particulate matter emissions in the "Guideline for Burning and Incineration of Solid Waste" or the Water Licence.*
- *The average concentration of mercury was less than 0.10 µg/Rm3, which is below the CWS/Nunavut stack limit of 20 µg/Rm3.*
- *The average stack concentrations of dioxins and furans, reported on a toxic equivalent basis, was 0.18 ng TEQ/Rm3. This concentration is above the CWS/Nunavut stack limit of 0.08 ng TEQ/Rm3 at the same conditions.*

Moving forward, Agnico Eagle will be able to address any exceedances of emissions through the use of the composter. Composting diverts organic waste from the incinerator, reducing the volume of material requiring combustion and, consequently, the potential for dioxin and furan formation.

Interested Party:	KitIA	Rec No.:	KIA-NIRB-02
Re:	Expected Range of Variability for Dispersion Models		

Request Made by Interested Party:

The KIA requests the following:

Please define the concept of “expected range of variability” for air dispersion modelling and clarify the conditions under which an exceedance is considered to fall within this range.

Agnico Eagle’s Response to Request:

Gaussian puff models, such as the CALPUFF model used in the dispersion modeling predictions, are subject to uncertainty because atmospheric dispersion is governed by turbulent, stochastic, and spatially variable processes that cannot be fully resolved using routine meteorological observations or simplified Gaussian puff formulations. Although puff models better represent time-varying winds than steady-state plume models, they still approximate real plume behaviour through discrete puffs, parameterized dispersion coefficients, and finite-resolution meteorological fields. As a result, a model should not be expected to reproduce individual short-term monitored concentrations exactly in time, space, or magnitude. Gaussian models are better at estimating representative or design concentrations than reproducing every observed concentration at an exact location, as the model may correctly capture the general transport pattern while still missing the exact location of a peak concentration.

In applied air dispersion work, a factor-of-two difference between modelled predictions and observed short-term concentrations is often considered a practical scale of variability, especially for comparing model predictions to ambient monitors at fixed locations.

Interested Party:	KitlA	Rec No.:	KIA-NIRB-03
Re:	Air Dispersion Modeling Area		

Request Made by Interested Party:

The KIA requests the following:

- *Please clarify why the modelling does not include the property boundary.*

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:

The modelled mine boundary was established through the 2017 FEIS and was reviewed and approved by the air quality experts at Environment and Climate Change Canada, as well as being reviewed by other parties including the KitlA. The assessment was reviewed and approved through the NIRB process.. The ambient monitoring data presented in the report are compared to dispersion model predictions made at the locations of the monitoring sites. The extent of the modelled mine boundary is irrelevant to the comparisons between measured and predicted concentrations presented in this report.

Interested Party:	KitIA	Rec No.:	KIA-NIRB-04
Re:	Unit Conversion for NO2 Standard		

Request Made by Interested Party:

The KIA requests the following;

- *Please clarify the conversion method and assumptions used, including the temperature and pressure conditions applied.*

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:

The conversion of 42 ppb to 83 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ utilizes a temperature of 10 degrees Celsius. These values were presented in Table 2.1 for comparative purposes only, all results and comparisons in the report are presented in ppb. As the $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ value is not otherwise used in the report, future reports will omit this value.

Interested Party:	KitIA	Rec No.:	KIA-NIRB-05
Re:	Identifying Outlier Data		

Request Made by Interested Party:

The KIA requests the following:

- *Please clearly explain how data were identified as outliers and how many data points were excluded as outliers. Please also provide the same clarification for NO₂ on page 14.*

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:

Outliers are data points that are statistically separate from the rest of the data set. Outliers are identified primarily by examining the data rate-of-change to identify data that has either changed too rapidly or not changed at all. A weight-of-evidence approach is taken to invalidate any potential outliers identified in the data review. This combines instrument calibration and operational checks/records, statistics, temporal patterns, nearby monitors (if available), meteorology, and operator notes. An outlier is only invalidated when there is credible evidence of a measurement error—not simply because it is high, rare, or regulatory-significant. During the Q1-Q3 2025 monitoring period, removal of outliers was conducted for the PM_{2.5} monitor during January and February when instances of zero rate-of-change in measured PM_{2.5} values were identified for multiple consecutive measurements.

Interested Party:	KitIA	Rec No.:	KIA-NIRB-06
Re:	Number of Monitoring Stations for PM _{2.5} and TSP		

Request Made by Interested Party:

The KIA requests the following:

- *Please explain why one station is being used to monitor PM_{2.5} and TSP levels across the site.*

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:

The number and locations of the air quality monitoring stations are presented in the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) that was submitted to both Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) and the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) for their review and comment prior to implementing the current air quality monitoring program. The AQMP was also provided to the KIA for their review and comment. The NIRB/ECCC approved monitoring locations have been in operation since 2018, with results from these locations being provided to the KIA annually.

Due to its proximity to the mill, the measurements at the location of the continuous monitors are expected to provide a conservative representation of air quality throughout the Doris area. The number of monitoring stations is consistent with guidance provided by the US EPA US Consolidated Federal Regulations, Section 40, Part 58 (40CFR Part 58), Appendix D, which provides criteria for basic air monitoring requirements, including the total number of monitoring sites that will serve specific data needs.

Agnico Eagle is currently in the process of installing a second station including continuous monitoring of PM_{2.5} and TSP in the vicinity of the Madrid operations to characterize air quality in the Madrid area. Once established and functioning, results will be included within the annual reports.

Interested Party:	KitIA	Rec No.:	KIA-NIRB-07
Re:	Potential Effect of the Care and Maintenance Phase on Pollutant Concentrations		

Request Made by Interested Party:

The KIA requests the following:

- *Throughout the report, wherever comparisons are made using multi-year statistics, such as two-year means or 98th percentiles, please add a clear note warning the reader about this potential bias. Please include this note in all tables where this type of comparison is presented.*
- *Please also provide the same warning note for comparisons made with standards for any other timeframe.*

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:

It is unclear what is meant by "the 98th percentile may be unreliable".

The monitoring characterizes ambient concentrations at the time of the measurements and reflects the operational conditions of the Mine as well as the influences of meteorology at that time. The ambient monitoring program is not used to infer future compliance of the mine. However, noting the operating condition of the mine in previous years when examining historical trends and calculating CAAQS parameters can be informative and will be presented in future reports.

Interested Party:	KitlA	Rec No.:	KIA-NIRB-08
Re:	Missing Data		

Request Made by Interested Party:

The KIA requests the following:

- *Please clarify why low temperature was identified as the cause of the PM_{2.5} monitor malfunctions in January and February, but why similar data losses did not occur in March, when temperatures were lower.*

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:

The exact cause of the instrument issue that resulted in these outages was not identified; however, the outages correlate well with periods of very low temperatures in these months. The monitor was inspected and serviced in late February which resolved this issue and therefore, able to handle the cooler temperatures in March and onwards.

Interested Party:	KitIA	Rec No.:	KIA-NIRB-09
Re:	Recorded Meteorological Data		

Request Made by Interested Party:

The KIA requests the following:

- *Please double-check the meteorological summary table, correct any errors, and clarify any values or summary statistics that may be inconsistent or difficult to interpret.*

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:

Agnico Eagle has corrected the following errors and included the corrected meteorological summary table on the next page:

- Corrected July 2024 to July 2025 in the first column
- Bright sunshine hours are defined as hours for which the average solar radiation is greater than 120 W/m². This definition has been added to the footnotes of the table. Due to the northern latitude of the Mine, during wintertime there are some months where the solar radiation doesn't exceed this threshold. However, the values for this parameter for February to April 2025 were corrected.
- The terms Absolute Maximum Temperature and Absolute Minimum Temperature are defined in the footnotes to the table. A definition for Maximum Instantaneous Wind Speed has been included in the attached updated table.

Also, minor inconsistencies noted by the reviewer were due to rounding the individual values following the level of precision convention used in the report.

Table 4.15 Summary of Meteorological Measurements (Jan – Sep 2025)

Date	Average Air Temperature	Minimum Daily Air Temperature ^a	Maximum Daily Air Temperature ^b	Absolute Minimum Temperature ^c	Absolute Maximum Temperature ^d	Average Wind Speed	Maximum Instantaneous Wind Speed ^e	Time of Maximum Instantaneous Wind Speed	Total Precipitation	Total Rainfall	Total SWE ^f	Average Relative Humidity	Average Solar Radiation	Total Bright Sunshine Hours ^g	Station Pressure
(mm-yy)	(°C)	(°C)	(°C)	(°C)	(°C)	(m/s)	(m/s)	(mm/dd/yyyy)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(%)	(W/m ²)	(hours)	(kpa)
Jan-25	-27.2	-31.0	-23.2	-37.4	-11.7	5.6	21	1/30/2025 22:53	11	0.0	11	75	2.8	0	101.3
Feb-25	-24.4	-27.9	-21.1	-34.8	-11.7	7.6	22	2/1/2025 3:58	9.3	0.0	9.3	75	35	75	101.2
Mar-25	-25.4	-28.4	-22.8	-34.4	-17.5	6.3	18	3/18/2025 5:38	7.7	0.0	7.7	76	106	242	101.1
Apr-25	-16.6	-20.8	-13.0	-31.1	-0.8	5.8	19	4/7/2025 4:25	6.8	0.0	6.8	79	198	355	101.1
May-25	-4.1	-7.6	-0.9	-17.8	16.9	5.6	22	5/30/2025 17:53	15	3.6	12	83	230	406	100.9
Jun-25	5.4	2.1	8.9	-1.7	20.4	4.7	16	6/16/2025 0:21	20	20	0.0	77	220	397	100.9
Jul-25	9.4	6.2	12.9	2.0	23.6	6.0	20	7/11/2025 14:56	12	12	0.0	76	178	379	100.5
Aug-25	10.2	5.7	14.7	0.9	22.9	5.1	28	8/30/2025 17:13	25	25	0.0	76	169	337	100.8
Sep-25	5.7	2.9	8.9	-1.1	15.5	5.8	20	9/18/2025 15:53	18	18	0.0	87	65	151	100.5
Average	-7.4	-11.0	-3.9	-17.3	6.4	5.8	21		14	8.6	5.2	78	134	260	100.9
Maximum	10.2	6.2	14.7	2.0	23.6	7.6	28		25	25	12	87	230	406	101.3
Minimum	-27.2	-31.0	-23.2	-37.4	-17.5	4.7	16		6.8	0.0	0.0	75	2.8	0	100.5
Total									124	78	47				

Notes:

a - The Minimum Daily Air Temperature is the minimum of the daily average temperatures in the month.

b - The Maximum Daily Air Temperature is the maximum of the daily average temperatures in the month.

c - The Absolute Minimum Temperature is the lowest hourly average temperature recorded for the month.

d - The Absolute Maximum Temperature is the highest hourly average temperature recorded for the month.

e – The highest 1-minute average wind speed (wind gust) recorded for the month.

f – Snow Water Equivalent (SWE) is a measure of the amount of water contained in the snowpack, expressed as the depth of water that would result if the snow were to melt completely.

g - Bright Sunshine Hours is the number of hours for which the average solar radiation is greater than 120 W/m².