



NIRB File No.: 05MN047  
NWB File No.: 2AM-DOH1323

November 5, 2015

To: Doris North Distribution List

*Sent via email*

**Re: Commencement of Technical Assessment for TMAC's Amendment Proposal for the Doris North Gold Mine Project**

---

Dear Parties:

On August 21, 2015 the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB or Board) initiated the public technical review period for TMAC Resources Inc. (TMAC or the Proponent) Amendment Proposal for the Doris North Project Certificate No. 003 (NIRB File No. 05MN047) by inviting interested parties an opportunity to submit information requests (IRs) on or before September 11, 2015. On August 26, 2015 the NIRB received a request from Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC) for a one (1) week extension to the deadline for submission of IRs which was subsequently approved by the NIRB, extending the IR period to September 18, 2015. Following a preliminary check of the submissions, on September 25, 2015 the NIRB requested that TMAC respond to the IRs by October 9, 2015. On October 9, 2015 the NIRB received TMAC's IR Response Package.

On November 4, 2015 the NIRB and the NWB provided confirmation that TMAC's Amendment Proposal and subsequent submissions both complied with the NIRB requirements and had been determined to be a complete water licence application by the NWB, and as a result the NIRB and the NWB commenced a coordinated public technical review period. Although unable to fully assess the technical quality of TMAC's IR responses or determine whether they will meet with reviewers' requirements, the NIRB is of the opinion that adequate information has been provided to commence the technical review of the Amendment Proposal. Now that a coordinated public technical review period has been commenced, the NIRB is able to provide notice of the 60 day technical review period, provide direction for technical review comments and schedule a Technical Meeting.

The complete Amendment Proposal, IR submissions and TMAC's response package as received by the NIRB are available from the NIRB's online registry at the following link:

<http://ftp.nirb.ca/03-MONITORING/05MN047-DORIS%20NORTH%20GOLD%20MINE/01-PROJECT%20CERTIFICATE/03-AMENDMENTS/AMENDMENT%20No.1/>

## CALL FOR TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMENTS

The technical review period is meant to provide for a detailed review of the Amendment Proposal to analyze the adequacy and assess the quality of the information presented by the Proponent in its submission. This step in the NIRB's assessment of the Amendment Proposal involves parties' development of technical review comments which outline whether they agree with the Proponent's conclusions regarding the potential ecosystemic and socio-economic impacts of the proposed activities, the adequacy of proposed mitigation and monitoring measures and ultimately whether parties support the approval of the amendment as currently proposed. 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 technical commenting period, at **12:00 pm MT Friday, January 8, 2016**. Technical review comments should include the following:

- Determination of whether Parties agree/disagree with the conclusions in the Amendment Proposal 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 Amendment Proposal are supported by the analysis – and reasons to support the determination;
- Determination of whether appropriate methodology was utilized in the Amendment Proposal to develop conclusions – and reasons to support the determination, along with any proposed alternative methodologies which may be more appropriate (if applicable);
- Assessment of the quality and presentation of the information in the Amendment Proposal; and
- Any comments regarding additional information which would be useful in assessing impacts – and reasons to support any comments made.

Please note that parties are encouraged to refer to Appendix A of this letter which provides the NIRB's suggested format and template for the submission of technical review comments.

## NEXT STEPS

The next steps in the NIRB's Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NLCA) Section 12.8.2 reconsideration of the terms and conditions of Project Certificate No. 003 for the Doris North Gold Mine Project are outlined as follows for the information of parties:

- Submission of Technical Review Comments directly to the NIRB by interested parties on or before **12:00 pm MT Friday, January 8, 2016** (60 days).
- Proponent submits responses to technical review comments on or before **January 18, 2016**.
- Joint technical meeting to start on **January 26, 2016**. The objective of the Technical Meeting would be to clarify and resolve technical issues in the Amendment Proposal. After confirming that no technical issues would prevent a decision, the NIRB will be in a position to provide notice of the Public Hearing and call for Intervenor Applications.
- Call for Final Written Submissions and Intervenor Applications, *to be determined*.
- Dates of Public Hearing, *to be determined*.

Once again, the NIRB requests that all interested parties submit their Technical Review Comments to the NIRB by email at [info@nirb.ca](mailto:info@nirb.ca) or by fax to (867) 983-2594 on or before **12:00 pm MT Friday, January 8, 2016**.

Should you have any questions or require further clarification regarding next steps in the NIRB's reconsideration of the Doris North Project Certificate please contact the undersigned at (867) 983-4619 or via email at [kgillard@nirb.ca](mailto:kgillard@nirb.ca).

Sincerely,



Kelli Gillard B.Sc., P.Ag.  
Monitoring Officer  
Nunavut Impact Review Board

cc: John Robert, TMAC Resources Inc.  
Phyllis Beaulieu, Nunavut Water Board  
Dave Hohnstein, Nunavut Water Board  
Sonia Aredes, Nunavut Water Board  
Geoff Clark, Kitikmeot Inuit Association  
John Roesch, Kitikmeot Inuit Association  
Tineka Simmons, Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency

Attachment: Appendix A – Format for Parties' Technical Review Comments

For each issue raised, parties are asked to include a clear reference to the package number, document, section, and/or page number in the Amendment Proposal 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 Amendment Proposal. 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 review process.

***Format & File Size***

Parties are requested to provide information request submissions in a fully functional, electronically searchable Word or PDF file. Noting the current constraints with respect to internet bandwidth and speed, the NIRB requests that all submissions be submitted as individual files no larger than 5 MB.

***Technical review comment submissions must contain the following:***

**1. Executive Summary and Required Translation**

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

The NIRB requires executive summaries be provided in English and be translated into **Inuktitut**.

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 Amendment Proposal and also which identify the major issues under those headings the party intends to bring forward for discussion at the Technical Meeting. Submissions may also address any other matters that the party considers relevant to the NIRB’s review of the Amendment Proposal as have been outlined above.

**3. Introduction**

Submissions should contain a statement of the party’s mandate and relationship Amendment Proposal and the Doris North Gold Mine project, a description of the jurisdiction of that party and list of the legislation, regulations, policies and guidelines administered by the party that are applicable to the Amendment.

#### 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 Amendment Proposal (package number, section and page number) that issue is discussed;
- b. If provided by the Proponent within the Amendment Proposal, 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 Board with respect to the disposition of the issue.

<b>Technical Comment Number</b>	
<b>Subject/Topic</b>	
<b>References</b> to NIRB EIS Guidelines (if applicable) and Amendment Proposal (i.e. package number, Section/sub-section, page number, etc.)	
<b>Summary</b> (include TMAC's conclusion if relevant and conclusions of commenting party)	
<b>Importance of issue to impact assessment</b>	
<b>Detailed Technical Comment</b>	<b>1. Gap/Issue</b> <b>2. Disagreement with Amendment Proposal conclusion</b> <b>3. Reasons for disagreement with Amendment Proposal conclusion</b>
<b>Recommendation/Request</b>	

#### 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 Amendment Proposal 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 Amendment Proposal are supported by the analysis – and all evidence supporting the parties' position;

- Whether appropriate methodology was utilized in the Amendment Proposal 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 quality and the presentation of the information presented in the Amendment Proposal; and
- Any comments regarding additional information which would be useful in assessing impacts – and reasons to support any comments made.

**6. Deadline for filing technical review comments**

The NIRB reminds parties that the deadline for technical review comments is **12:00 p.m. MT Friday, January 8, 2016.**