

ምምርታ Δ⊅Δ° ЬϽϞ⊱ዔ∩Ր℉ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

∧≻'∩ና*ጋና ውድ⊂"ው Þdው"ኒ Serving the communities of

October 13, 2011

BY-ELECTRONIC MAIL: info@nirb.ca

△∿ヘベペト Arctic Bay Sophia Granchinho Technical Advisor Nunavut Impact Review Board P.O. Box 1360 Cambridge Bay, NU X0A 0B0

P⁻·LΔ^c
Cape Dorset

ა℃°ეს∧ა Clyde River

⟨ロンペロペーク Grise Fiord

\Ժናታኑ Hall Beach

> ∆لے۔ Igloolik

کد&Δ^c Igaluit

ρ∟Γ}^ς Kimmirut

<°ኇ፨፞ን⁰ Pangnirtung

T'OLCート Pond Inlet

^γP°C'√4°

%⊳∠∆′ጋ% Resolute Bay

トのアングラ Sanikiluaq Re: Request for Comments on Notice of Part 4 Screening of 09DN018 - Department of National Defence's "Nanisivik Naval Facility" project proposal.

On September 12, 2011 the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) invited interested parties to comment on the Department of National Defence's (DND or the Proponent) "Nanisivik Naval Facility" project proposal (NIRB file: 09DN018). The Qikiqtani Inuit Association (QIA) is concerned by this proposal because it has aroused significant public concern and has the potential to cause significantly adverse eco-systemic and socio-economic effects especially if approved as is.

QIA feels that communication between the proponent and the community of Arctic Bay has been inadequate and many of the issues brought up in the following document could have been avoided if the proponent had committed to a proper consultation process with Arctic Bay residents. Based on this review of documents provided to NIRB and our own consultation with the residents of Arctic Bay, certain elements of the project proposal could be modified to greatly reduce impacts and ease public concern while many questions and concerns remain to be answered by the proponent. The following is a summary QIA's concerns, questions, and recommendations regarding specific aspects of the Nanisivik Naval Facility project proposal.

Arctic Bay Airport and All-Weather Road

The proponent has stated that it plans to use both the Arctic Bay Airport and the existing all-weather road between Arctic Bay and the project site during construction and operation to transport personnel and materials to the project site, and to access health, police and other community services in Arctic Bay (Section 2.4 - Project Specific Information Requirements, PSIR).

The limited space on scheduled airlines is a concern to the residents of Arctic Bay as they fear an influx of military personnel may increase the likelihood of being "bumped". The proponent



'የΡ∿ርԺ Δ⊅Δ° ЬϽϞ⊱ዔ∩Րʹ·ϒ° Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ለት'በናግን' ቃልሮ "ው' Þdው 'ህ Serving the communities of

> Δ⁵∧⊲'√' Arctic Bay

P°°\∆° Cape Dorset

ь℃°⊃ί∧∙ Clyde River

るかさるいで

Orise Fiord

Orise Fiord

Orise Fiord

Original

Ori

∖ራናታ• Hall Beach

> ∆لے۔ Igloolik

> کدگα Iqaluit

PLT2c Kimmirut

くっゃう。 Pangnirtung

Pond Inlet

₩P%C'≺4%

%⊳∠∆ናጋ⁴ Resolute Bay

トットック[®] Sanikiluaα has not proposed any mitigation strategies for this problem. QIA questions whether the proponent has considered utilizing chartered airlines and the still in place Nanisivik runway. Another issue is the proposed use of the Arctic Bay – Nanisivik all-weather road. In section 3.2.3 of the PSIR, DND states that they have not yet determined if the road will be maintained yet provides no indication that the local labor force could be used. There is an opportunity to create several jobs for residents of Arctic Bay maintaining the all-weather road and also transporting personnel to and from the project site to the airport.

Emergency Services and Plans for an Unmanned Facility

In section 5.3.2 of the PSIR, and as stated earlier, DND notes that they may call on Arctic Bay to utilize their emergency services such as fire, police and medical services. During consultation on September 28th 2011, residents of Arctic Bay voiced their concern with this arrangement due to the limited availability of emergency service infrastructure in Arctic Bay. This concern grew as the residents learned that DND planned to operate the Nanisivik Naval Facility seven months of the year with no one stationed at the facility. According to the project summary and section 2.2.3 of the PSIR, the facility will be unmanned from November to June each year. When the facility is unmanned, heat and power will be maintained to the minimum required to maintain equipment and provide site security. The consultation in Arctic Bay highlighted that there are presently many break and enters by the younger generation of residents and an unmanned facility may incite further criminal activity. The residents suggested that local people could be hired to check in on the facility during the unmanned season. According to those present during the consultation, there were once plans to let local rangers use the facility during the unmanned season and in doing so protect it from theft, fire, malfunctions, etc. This idea is currently not part of the project description submitted to NIRB.

In the *Emergency Response Plan* (Appendix E) the proponent has listed some mitigation measures to be implemented in the event of an emergency such as a fire. Specifically, the responsible manager/contractor is instructed to deploy additional crew and machinery as needed from Arctic Bay if applicable and current resources are found to be inadequate. The proponent has not described what machinery and crew will be stationed in Arctic Bay. Based on consultation on September 28th 2011, the Hamlet presently has only one operational fire truck. This leads OIA to ask the following questions:

- If a fire were to occur and the only Arctic Bay fire truck is dispatched to Nanisivik, what will happen if there is an accident on the way or if there is a fire back in the Hamlet?
- Since Arctic Bay is located in the High Arctic and is often subject to adverse weather
 conditions, what will happen if a blizzard prevents the travel of emergency personnel from
 Arctic Bay to the naval facility? The emergency response plan fails to describe a plan for
 this likely event.
- Will the proponent pay for a second back up fire truck to be stationed in Arctic Bay?



'የΡ∿ርԺ Δ⊅Δ΄ ЬϽ⊁⊱ዔ∩ՐΎՐ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ለትናበናቴጋና ഛር-ኮታ Þdσ ኒ Serving the communities of

> Δ'ለላ'ሩ' Arctic Bay

ρ∾ኒ∆ና Cape Dorset

ь°Г°⊃Ĺ∧• Clyde River

るかさるい。
Grise Fiord

∖ራናታኑ Hall Beach

> Δ¹عدا Igloolik

Δ۵۰۵^c Iqaluit

ριΓρι Kimmirut

く^{*}σ[®])[®] Pangnirtung

Pond Inlet

PP°C'√4°
Qikiqtarjuaq

ቕ⊳ሥΔናጋ% Resolute Bay

> トッタッタッ Sanikiluag

What type of fire suppression system is in place? Passive fire protection was chosen over a
foam fire-extinguishing system for the naval distillate tanks due to cost effectiveness
(Table 2.1 PSIR). Yet, installing a foam fire-extinguishing system would possibly prevent
the need to call in responders from Arctic Bay.

It is clear that further consultation between DND and the Hamlet is required to determine responsibility in emergency situations and to further develop plans for the unmanned operating season.

Local Harvesting

In section 4.3.3 of the PSIR, DND has referenced a hunting and fishing study that was carried out post Nanisivik Mine closure in 2003 (JWEL, 2003). This study found that hunters and fishermen from Arctic Bay harvest many types of wildlife including ptarmigan, arctic char, seal, hare, fox, caribou and narwhal. This study also found that hunting and fishing did not generally occur in the vicinity of the Nanisivik mine site. However, based on recent consultation in Arctic Bay, QIA has learned that hunting conditions have begun to change since the mine has ceased operations. Many residents agreed that whales and seals started coming back to the area since the mine closure. More importantly, residents have suggested that waters around Nanisivik are used to hunt for whales and seals and that the lands around the naval facility are traversed to hunt for caribou and geese.

Residents fear that the increased activity due to the operation of the Nanisivik Naval Facility will likely once again scare away wildlife from the Nanisivik area. Residents claim that during the summer of 2011, shipping and boat traffic in Arctic Bay had reached its highest level as of yet (a trend that will likely continue in the years to come). Residents noted that there seemed to be a lot less seals in the waters around Arctic Bay this summer (2011).

It is clear from the project description that the Nanisivik Naval Facility will bring much more naval traffic through Lancaster Sound, Admiralty Inlet & Strathcona Sound during the time of July to October each year. It is well known in Arctic Bay that whales start to come down Admiralty Inlet in June and July. In fact, July is a time when people still hunt for narwhal from the sea ice. According to our consultation, increased naval traffic has been known to interfere with Inuit harvesting in and around Nanisivik. In the past, people have lost skidoos and equipment when ice breakers have weakened the ice near hunting areas. QIA would like to remind the proponent that Article 6.3.1 of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NLCA, 1993) states that "A developer is liable absolutely, without proof of fault or negligence, for loss or damage suffered by a claimant as a result of its development activity within the Nunavut Settlement Area in respect of loss or damage to property or equipment used in wildlife harvesting." This project will undoubtedly have a negative effect on the Inuit ability to harvest wildlife in the region. Yet, the proponent has not presented any strategies to mitigate the negative effect of increased naval activity on local harvesting.



'የΡ∿ርԺ Δ⊅Δ° ЬϽ۶⊁ዔ∩Ր℉ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

Aたいいか Dec で Ddo し Serving the communities of

> Δ⁵ΛΔ′√³ Arctic Bay

Ρ⁵∿ኒ∆ና Cape Dorset

ხ⁴Ր⁴ጋს∧• Clyde River

Φ ለΔ[¢]ጋ^ቈ Grise Fiord

∖ታናታ**፥** Hall Beach

> Δ^دے⊂³ Igloolik

> کدیα Igaluit

PLT25 Kimmirut

<ጐታ^ዬንዬ Pangnirtung

Fond Inlet

'PP°C'≺4° Qikiqtarjuaq

%⊳∠∆ናጋ∾ Resolute Bay

> حاد المحاد Sanikiluaq

Wildlife Monitoring and Mitigation

The proponent has described how it plans to prevent impacts to local wildlife in the "Wildlife" Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (WMMP)". The proponent has listed the use of worker orientation, proper waste management and wildlife right-of-way to limit impacts to wildlife. However, it is not explicitly stated in the WMMP that the proponent shall be liable for any loss of wildlife due to project activities. During consultation on September 28th 2011, Arctic Bay residents recalled that in the past developers in helicopters would fly around to look for narwhal carcasses in search of tusks without compensating Arctic Bay residents. The Arctic Bay residents agreed that they do not want to see this happening anymore with any wildlife in the region. Article 6.3.1 of the NLCA states that "A developer is liable, without proof of fault or negligence, for present and future loss of income from wildlife harvesting and present and future loss of wildlife harvested for personal use..." This is most important in the case of polar bears and whales where the nearest community may have their annual quota of harvest reduced if an animal is killed for any reason. The proponent should be aware that they will be liable to compensate the community if this is the case. In addition, QIA feels that the WMMP would be more complete if the proponent were to hire experienced local Inuit to act as wildlife monitors. This simple action would benefit both the community and the project as a whole.

During the time the Nanisivik mine was operating, that proponent helped the community by making sealift less costly and they replaced any equipment loss due to project activities. They also consulted with the Arctic Bay HTA to see which path to take on the sea ice to transport mining materials to minimize impact to Inuit hunters on the sea ice. There has yet to be any discussion between the proponent and the Hamlet and Hunters & Trappers Association (HTA) regarding the boat path.

Finally, residents claim that this project is already increasing disturbance in the area and they are slowly losing their authority in decision making. The community feels that it no longer has any say regarding what goes on in and around Arctic Bay. QIA found that the Hamlet would like to be informed in advance of what type of exercises or missions will occur in specific areas. Furthermore, since it will mainly be the arctic offshore patrol ships (AOPS) using the Nanisivik Naval Facility, the Hamlet has suggested that there shouldn't be any need to patrol past Arctic Bay deeper into Admiralty Inlet.

QIA questions whether the proponent has plans to only use the naval facility as a refueling station or whether DND is planning to travel further down into Admiralty Inlet for patrolling or exercises. This is not clear in the project description.

Use of local Aggregate and Carving Stone Deposits

In section 3.2.2 of the PSIR, DND states that local aggregate is expected to be used during construction. However, even at this advanced stage of planning, the location of the aggregate quarry has not yet been determined. DND also states that aggregate sites will be investigated for carving stone. The following locations are known to have carving stone and should remain



"የየ∿ርԺ Δ⊅Δ° ЬϽ⊁⊱ዔ∩Ր℉ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ለት'በናግ' ቃልሮች Þdምህ Serving the communities of

off limits to the developer: Right below the old Nanisivik mine entrance and within the mine and also in the Kuhulu Lake area east of the naval facility.

Δいへのでも Arctic Bay

ρ^κιΔ^c Cape Dorset

ხ⁴ზეს∧ა Clyde River

⊲⊳∠Δ[¢]ጋ⁴ Grise Fiord

∖ታናታ∙ Hall Beach

> Δ¹صد Igloolik

کد&Δ° Iqaluit

P4T25 Kimmirut

<ిచారి Pangnirtung

Pond Inlet

PP°C'≺4° Qikiqtarjuaq

ጜ⊳ረ∆ናጋኈ Resolute Bay

> ちゃりュペッ Sanikiluag

Invasive Species Monitoring

In section 3.2.3 of the PSIR, DND states that water will be used at the wharf for wash-down of equipment to remove "marine growth". This practice may increase the risk of introducing invasive species to the area especially considering the number of vessels potentially using the naval facility. The proponent has not stated this as a problem nor have they introduced a mitigation strategy. QIA notes that the proponent has proposed to use a "wildlife log" to monitor wildlife in the region. This may be adequate to record terrestrial wildlife movements however it is insufficient to monitor the wharf area for changes to the ecosystem including the presence of new species. Will the proponent commit to monitoring for eco-systemic changes?

Spill Response Center and Search & Rescue

As climate change continues to lengthen the navigable season in the Northwest Passage, there is an equal increase of commercial naval traffic in those waters. Furthermore, as oil, gas and mineral development in this region continues to grow it has become apparent that our infrastructure will be heavily tested if a major emergency were to occur. It is well known that no military search and rescue resources are permanently based in the High Arctic nor are communities equipped to deal with major oil spills off the Nunavut Coast. According to section 4.2.7 of the PSIR, nearby Lancaster Sound has been designated as a Marine Area of Importance and a proposed National Marine Conservation Area. QIA would like to ask the proponent whether they will designate the Nanisivik Naval Facility as a spill response and search and rescue center with adequate equipment, resources and personnel on site to deal with an emergency of such magnitude as a major oil spill in Lancaster Sound and the high arctic.

Consultation with Arctic Bay

In the project description, the proponent states that "an objective of the Nanisivik Naval Facility is to build a sustainable relationship with the community of Arctic Bay". At this point, QIA and residents of Arctic Bay feel that consultation between the proponent and stakeholders in Arctic Bay has been entirely inadequate. The Arctic Bay Community Liaison Officer and Community Lands and Resources Committee have met with Rodney Watson from DND several times and they feel that talks have been meaningless because plans are always changing. For example, residents claim that DND once proposed building a facility in Arctic Bay that could be used by cadets and residents. Then those plans were subsequently cancelled and no longer found within the project description.



'የΡ∿ርԺ Δ⊅Δ° ЬϽ۶≻ኄ∩Ր℉ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ለት'በናግን' ቃልሮችም Þժታግሪ Serving the communities of

Conclusion

Δいへついい Arctic Bay

P^ኤኒል^c Cape Dorset

ьҮ°⊃і∧ч Clyde River

ላ⊳ሥልናጋ∾ Grise Fiord

∖ራናታነ Hall Beach

Δ¹اgloolik

کد∜∆ Iqaluit

PLT 25 Kimmirut

く^。っ^。 Pangnirtung

Fond Inlet

%P%C'≺d% Qikiqtarjuaq

%⊳∠∆ናጋ% Resolute Bay

トσΡュΦ Sanikiluaq As previously stated, on September 28th 2011, QIA undertook consultation in Arctic Bay to collect comments and questions for submission to NIRB. We feel that many concerns were brought up during this meeting that should have been addressed before an application was sent in to NIRB. This document has listed several questions, comments and concerns for your review and consideration. QIA cannot support this project until the proponent addresses these questions, comments and concerns.

Should you require more information about these comments, please do not hesitate to contact Joel Fortier, QIA Project Coordinator at 867 975 8425 or by electronic mail to projecord@qia.ca

We look forward to NIRB's response.

Sincerely,

Robert J. St. Eloi Director of Lands

Qikiqtani Inuit Association