NIRB PHC Direction for FEIS	*Conformity Y/N*	*FEIS location & Comment*
NIRB PHC DECISION REPORT		
the Board would like the Proponent to include the following in the FEIS:		
Ensure that the information contained in the Updated Preliminary Project Description (January 2005) is included in the FEIS and is that it is still up to date.	Y	TR 4
Improved quality of maps	Y	FEIS
All maps should be in color with an appropriate scale, north arrow, title and color scheme.	Y	FEIS
Additional information on the winter airstrip including:	Y	
· The effects on fish and suspended sediments;	Y	
· Review of literature and/or case studies on the use of shallow lakes for winter airstrips for Hercules aircraft; and	Y	
· Contingency plans for refuelling and de-icing.	N	Has not been incorporated or developed in any detail. Can be incorporated in SD F6 ER&SCP.
An explanation of the need for a 40m x 10m rock-filled structure as a contingency measure referred to in EIS SDA7.	Y	SD A7 pg 36
Environmental Assessment Methodology		
Ensure that the definitions of: environmental effects criteria (magnitude, geographic extent, timing/duration/frequency, reversibility, and ecological/social/cultural context);	Y	TR 9 sec 9.8 - NIRB will review thoroughly during FEIS technical review
Probability of occurrence	Y	TR 9 pg 14 - NIRB will review thoroughly during FEIS technical review
Effect on ecosystem functioning and integrity	Y	TR 9 pg 14 - NIRB will review thoroughly during FEIS technical review
Capacity of resources to meet present and future needs	Y	TR 9 pg 14 - NIRB will review thoroughly during FEIS technical review
are clearly defined and appropriate for *each individual* VEC/VSEC providing detailed or quantitative definitions where possible for expressions such as “some”, “long-term”, “to a certain extent”.	Y	NIRB will review throghouly during FEIS technical review
▪ Clearly indicate the link between the environmental effects criteria ratings and the significance determination.	Y	NIRB will review throghouly during FEIS technical review
▪ Discuss the specific consultation undertaken with residents of Bathurst Inlet and Umingmaktok.	Y	TR 7 pg 3-4

NIRB PHC Direction for FEIS	Conformity Y/N	FEIS location & Comment
▪ Confirm the additional consultation was carried out in the assessment of tailings disposal alternatives.	Y	Document and provide the results of the November 2005 community consultation as stated in EIS section 1.1 no later than Dec 9, 2005
▪ Verify that sufficient quantities of clean material are available for erosion control around Tail Lake.	Y	SD A7 pg 39-40
▪ Verify the list of all Transport Canada permits and authorizations that are required.	Y	FEIS MD sec. 1.8 pg 1-13
Here the Board also finds it especially appropriate to re-iterate the need for a full assessment of alternatives as required by NIRB's Environmental Assessment Guidelines	Y	TR 3
the Board expects the Proponent to provide much more information on the potential for future exploration and development of the Hope Bay Belt. This includes the vision the Proponent has for the design of future phases and how these phases might be tied into the Project. The Board believes the potential cumulative effects from various phases of the Hope Bay Belt exploitation, along with other reasonably foreseeable projects in the region, are important considerations at the earliest phase of development in order to ensure the greatest numbers of alternatives for the design of future phases of development are left open.	Y	TR 5
APPENDIX 1		
Assessment of Alternatives to the use of Tail Lake for Tailings Disposal		
1. Document the conclusion that the concerns of Site 5 would be the same as Site 2 to provide clarity on the alternatives choice. Proper evaluation of this in FEIS. (DFO)	Y	Conclusion is that both sites do not provide for tailings storage for belt expansion TR 3 pg 3-29, 3-30
2. Document the environmental (especially birds and wildlife, other VECs) considerations and social aspects as part of the alternatives assessment for Tailings, augmenting the engineering and economic considerations in SD A3. Provide a summary table emphasizing all considerations in a format similar to the decision table in 2004 Doris EIS	Y	Document and provide the results of the November 2005 community consultation as stated in EIS section 1.1 no later than Dec 9, 2005
3. Include the potential for dusting in the wintertime for land-based options in the alternatives for Tailings.	Y	TR 3 pg 3-75

NIRB PHC Direction for FEIS	Conformity Y/N	FEIS location & Comment
4. Provide a more descriptive explanation of what the vision for Tail Lake is with respect to future mining activity in the Hope Bay Belt including a discussion on the capacity, depositional strategy, anticipated dam height etc. It is understood that this decision will be conceptual but should describe the likely approaches.	Y	TR 3 pg 3-14
5. Provide discussion of the no dam option of SATD in Tail Lake.	Y	TR 3 pg 3-47
6. Address how tailings storage volumes are affected by the reduced dry tailings density as the result of ice entrapment. (Acres)	Y	TR 3 pg 3-56
7. Provide in the alternatives assessment, consideration for how the use of hydrometric records from the larger watershed(s) may affect tailings disposal options and operations. (INAC)	N	
Tail Lake Water Quality and Management Strategy		
WATER QUALITY		
1. Include information on settling tests which have been completed for both tailings and shoreline soil samples around Tail Lake. (EC)	Y	SD A2 App. G pg 199
2. Examine the effects of nutrient loadings on downstream environment, given that the current plan is based on MMER EEM which does not include measurements of biological change. (EC)	Y	
3. Provide discussion on how tailings deposition will take place. (INAC)	Y	SD A1 pg-5
4. Provide a justification for using only the 2004 water quality results in the water quality model including a discussion of the variability within all other applicable data.	Y	SD A2 pg 21 provides new data
5. Provide a summary table in FEIS of solute loadings in from the water quality model. Also include full tables in Appendix (INAC)	Y	SD A2 App H pg 2
6. Provide sensitivity analysis of the loadings from the mill to Tail Lake, and the downstream effects on Doris Creek. Describe how this will affect the discharge strategy. Run the results of the downstream effects through risk assessment model. (INAC)	Y	SD A2 pg 61
7. Provide TSS wave resuspension calculations. (KIA)	Y	SD A2 App F
8. Explain in detail and justify why MHBL has not done 3D numerical simulation for wave resuspension (KIA clarify tailings or sediment).	Y	SD A2 App F
9. Provide a clear non-technical summary of why MHBL feels there will be no metal leaching from the tailings placed in Tail Lake. (KIA)	Y	TR 4 pg 96
10. Present yearly water balance and Copper load balance into tablular and/or graphical form (i.e. flowchart) for the proposed discharge scenario under average conditions. (Acres)	Y	SD A2 App. H & I

NIRB PHC Direction for FEIS	Conformity Y/N	FEIS location & Comment
11. Describe in detail how water will be discharged to Doris Creek from Tail Lake. Show discharge line in drawing. (Acres)	Y	SD A2 pp 81-82; TR 4 pg 4-32
12. Provide results of 2005 settling tests from soil samples collected along the shoreline of Tail Lake. (Acres)	Y	SD A2 App. G
13. Include description in FEIS of tailings properties. (DOE)	Y	TR 4 pg 4-95
14. Run TSS through water quality model to illustrate sensitivity analysis.(INAC)	Y	SD A2 pg 72
15. Correct pg 56 of SD A2 – Typo regarding predicted TSS concentrations. (INAC)	Y	
16. Provide summary table in FEIS identifying maximum predicted concentration for the proposed discharge scenario in Tail Lake. (INAC)	Y	SD A2 pg 58-59
17. Determine total mass of sediment material from shoreline erosion that could settle over the tailings. Include monitoring for and measuring depth of sediment deposition on top of tailings in monitoring program. (INAC)	Y	SD A2 pg 72
18. Greater discussion and detail of all-encompassing adaptive management plan (incorporating water quality management plan and shoreline erosion adaptive management plan) with discussion of triggers. Discuss trigger threshold levels within the adaptive management plan. Provide statement that final plan will be completed before mine operation. (INAC, NRCAN)	Y	SD A2 App E pg 26
19. Provide sample calculations to show how MHBL determined the TSS concentration of 10.3 mg/L from the estimated rate of erosion rate of 0.3 m3/m. (Acres)	Y	SD A2 App E pg 19
20. Incorporate information from risk assessment report into water quality section of FEIS to show impacts of predicted concentrations in Doris Creek.	N	Could potentially be part of table on pg 59 of SD A2
21. Clearly state commitment to meet CCME in receiving environment with the exception of Nitrite.	Y	TR 4 pg 100
22. Determine if coastal shoreline erosion studies for Roberts Bay can be effectively used as a site-specific analog for comparison studies in Tail Lake. If determined to be effective, discuss the implications for Tail Lake (INAC, NRCAN)	Y	SD A2 App E pg 15
23. Provide succinct list of predicted constituents in Tail Lake.	Y	SD A2 pg 43 Tbl 3.8
24. Provide a justification for ammonia estimates and discuss monitoring for ammonia levels.(EC)	Y	SD A2 pg 45-47
25. Correct the error in SD A2 in which phosphorus concentrations are listed as the bio-available ortho-phosphate (PO4) rather than total phosphorus (TP). (EC)	Y	

NIRB PHC Direction for FEIS	Conformity Y/N	FEIS location & Comment
26. Provide technical rationale for the depth of water cover required over the tailings. (INAC)	Y	SD A1 App B; Reference to sec 9.1 of FEIS MD is incorrect
27. Provide conceptual plans showing preventative measures and mitigation measures proposed for stabilizing the shoreline of Tail Lake at closure. Indicate under what circumstances (trigger events) preventative measures and/or mitigation measures would be implemented. Incorporate slope stabilization around Tail Lake into the proposed site specific reclamation criteria. (INAC)	Y	SD A2 App E pg23
28. Provide further justification to support the DEIS conclusions associated with the risk of sedimentation associated with short and long term shoreline erosion. (INAC)	Y	SD A2 App G
HYDROLOGY		
29. Incorporate into FEIS the information from MHBL presentation on flow velocities and depth in Doris outflow. (DFO)	Y	SD A6 App. I pg~23
30. Provide qualitative description on the manual method of measuring Doris Lake outflows to determine spring discharge rates. Provide a detailed description of the methods for analyzing water samples on ice. (INAC)	Y	SD A6 App. II pg ~32
31. Provide characterization of the ice in Doris Creek including the timing and mechanisms for ice clearing. (INAC)	Y	SD A6 App. II pg ~32
32. Provide information on the continuance of snowcourse surveys undertaken by MHBL as part of on-going water management strategy. Include as part of decant discussion. (INAC)	Y	SD A6 App. II pg ~40
33. Include minimums and maximums over the period of study in Tables 3 to 6 of supporting document SDB1. (INAC)	Y	SD B6 pg 3
34. Include in the FEIS the comparison of the overlapping record of the two hydrometric stations (Gordon River and Ellice River) to indicate if runoff differs greatly. (INAC)	Y	SD B6 pg 8
DAM DESIGN		
35. State justification and assumptions on the settlement estimate in relation to the determination of the crest of the core of the dam. (Acres, NRCAN)	Y	SD A1 pg 22
36. Provide information on how the number 33.5m was determined for the dam FSL. Explain how inflows vs outflows, tail lake capacity, and operational schedule lead to this determination. (INAC)	Y	SD A1 pg 18
37. Rationalize the GCL height in the dam design with the maximum design wave height to avoid the potential for overtopping and thermal degradation. (INAC, NRCAN)	Y	SD A1 pg 19

NIRB PHC Direction for FEIS	Conformity Y/N	FEIS location & Comment
38. Provide a descriptive checklist of all fieldwork, analysis, monitoring, etc that would be done to support the dam design prior to the licensing stage. Include a conceptual thermosyphon design that supports the permafrost prediction model for the FEIS. (INAC, NRCAN)	Y	SD A1 pg 37
39. Discuss how the above information will ensure that the integrity of the dam core is maintained throughout the operation and post closure period. (INAC, NRCAN)	Y	SD A1 pg 23, 38
40. Discuss in FEIS the decision for timing of spillway construction and provide a trigger for initiating a "developed" construction. (INAC)	Y	SD A1 pg 27
41. MHBL will provide data on addition fieldwork as it becomes available.	Y	
SURFACE INFRASTRUCTURE		
42. Clarification of runoff water management for the mill site. (INAC)	Y	SD A7 pg 35
43. Clarify sewage and sludge disposal strategy during construction season – look at Windy Camp results to determine impact on the environment during construction phase. (GN-DOE)	Y	TR 4 pg 4-26
GROUNDWATER		
44. Verification needed on the absence of hydraulic connection in the Doris vein structure and explanation of measures that will be taken if water is encountered. Provide description of how the talik will be avoided.	Y	SD B5
45. Need for future monitoring via thermistors between the Doris Lake and Tail Lake to ensure no movement of groundwater is taking place. (GN-DOE Explanation of how geothermal model determines the depth of permafrost)	Y	SD B5 pg 5
46. Given that the current Doris North project does not extend under Doris Lake, provide statement on the applicability of SD B5 (Groundwater Inflow Study) for Doris North. (Acres)	Y	SD B5
47. Explain in FEIS the assessment of potential groundwater contaminant movement. (GN-DOE)	Y	SD B5
ARD		
48. Provide data and discussion on Franklin Diabase sample from the portal and provide Quarry 4 data and discussion.	Y	TR 4 pg 88; Q4 pg 43; SD B2 pg 54
49. Identify and explain variations in Quarry NPR values and fizz test results listed in Tables 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 of SDB2. Confirm whether the relatively large variation is a result of sampling the materials. Explain how the variation effects the quarry material characterization (Acres and INAC)	Y	SD B2 pg 7

NIRB PHC Direction for FEIS	Conformity Y/N	FEIS location & Comment
50. Provide a graphical presentation of how kinetic test samples fit in the range of geological and geochemical properties of ore and waste rock.	N	
51. Clearly state in FEIS that Iron Tholeiites Basalt rock will be stockpiled temporarily near the portal and then placed back underground and that this material will not be used in construction.	Y	SD B2 pg 43
52. Determine the percentage of iron carbonate and/or ineffective NP in kinetic test sample on tailings. Incorporate result into the tailings characterization.	Y	TR 4 pg 96
53. Provide schedule, logistics and location for waste rock removed from underground and ramp decline.	Y	TR 4 pg 84
54. Confirm the source of kinetic test data in Table 3.2 of SD A2. Justify use of Boston data if applicable. Provide rationale for why the values were averaged.	Y	SD B2 pg 55
55. Provide a description of how the geochemical characterization data supports the use of selected classification criteria (DIAND) for suitable for mine construction considering both ABA and metal leaching potential materials.	Y	TR 4 sec 4.7.5
56. Provide rationale for why leach extraction tests from quarries is representative of the ramp construction rock. Also, provide rationale for why leach extraction tests from quarries 1, 2 and 3 are representative of quarry 4. (INAC)	Y	TR 4 pg 43
57. Explain and justify that the geochemical characteristics of the chip samples taken from the various quarry sites are sufficient to represent the characteristics of the subsurface rock mass encountered at the quarry sites. (Acres)	Y	TR 4 pg 42-43
58. Confirm that runoff from ore and waste rock stockpile will be collected and pumped to Tail Lake.	Y	TR 4 pg 62
59. Provide Final Humidity Cell Report in FEIS.	Y	SD B2 App. C
60. Provide a table compiling descriptions of past sample classifications into the current classifications as best as possible, and sort ABA data in a manner consistent with current classifications, highlighting samples from the immediate project area and those from outside the project area but thought to be representative of project materials. Include a significance column indicating the potential for ARD by rock type. (Acres)	Y	TR 4 pg 86-89; SD B2 tbl 2.2
61. Provide explanation and justification for the reason why small scale field trials of crushed run-of-mine rock taken from the development adit has not been done. (Acres)	Y	SD B2 pg 57

NIRB PHC Direction for FEIS	Conformity Y/N	FEIS location & Comment
62. Provide explanation why overburden material that may be disturbed as a result of mine development has not been characterised. (Acres)	Y	SD B2 pg 58
The design of the Jetty and Related Issues		
1. Describe Fish Compensation Monitoring Program details. (DFO)	Y	SD F4 pg 58
2. Provide justification and rationale regarding the chosen length of the 103m jetty, and indicate the commitment to look at 60m jetty in the detailed design stage based on optimization results. (DFO)	Y	SD A4 pg 19
3. Provide specifications for the geogrid used under the rock fill and describe and assess any potential impacts to fish habitat. (DFO)	Y	SD A4 App. G
4. Provide case studies where geogrid has been used in arctic environment. (Acres)	Y	SD A4 App. F pg 5
5. Indicate the monitoring plan for potential sediment deposition and erosion around/near jetty and the adaptive management plan to deal with potential impacts. (Acres, NRCAN)	Y	SD A5 Sec 5.3 - more detail on monitoring would be helpful
6. Provide explanation on the 50cm settlement shown in the figure of the Jetty Structure. (Acres)	Y	SD A4 App F Sec 2.6.1
7. Provide further explanation on the char run along the jetty area and the potential impacts to the char from seal predation. (Attima)	Y	TR 12 pg 11
8. Indicate the commitment that community members may use the jetty (when safe to do so) during operation of the mine. (Joseph)	Y	SD A4 pg 19
9. Ensure that clarifications from the MHBL presentations at the Technical Meeting (August 23-25, 2005) are clearly stated in FEIS. (KIA)	Y	SD A4
10. Provide a better explanation on the predicted life of the jetty, and the potential effects from frost heave, traffic-ability, etc. (NRCan)	Y	SD A4 pg 17
11. Quantify the load from the blasting residues on the quarried rock used for the jetty, and describe the potential aquatic effects on Roberts Bay. (NIRB)	Y	TR 11 pg 12
Wildlife Mitigation and Monitoring and Cumulative Effects Assessmen		
1. Verify impact area for waterfowl in Supporting Document D5. (EC)	Y	SD D5 pg 18
2. Verify that the table containing habitat classes for the Habitat Suitability Model is included in the impact assessment and clarify this point in the FEIS. (EC)	Y	various
3. Provide a map of different habitats overlayed by project footprint. (EC)	Y	various
4. With respect to the monitoring program, provide more information on study design and triggers for mitigation measures. (EC)	Y	SD F1 Sec 3, 4, 5
5. Revise the CEA to include migratory bird within the HBB. (EC)	Y	SD D6 pg 40

NIRB PHC Direction for FEIS	Conformity Y/N	FEIS location & Comment
6. Revise the site infrastructure diagram with appropriate scale for distance from mine site to the mesa. (EC)	Y	SD F1 pg 3
7. Provide rational for species based study areas in the monitoring program, based on ZOI data collected from other mines including Ekati and Diavik, for the purpose of the WMMP.	Y	SD F1 pg 20-21
8. Due to the short mine life, provide both long and short term monitoring objectives. (GN)	Y	SD F1 pg 33, 19, 28, 29
9. Incorporate local scale monitoring of muskoxen distribution and abundance and provide potential mitigation measures. (GN)	Y	SD F1 sec 4.2.2.2
10. Provide information and results from other studies undertaken in the Arctic on the establishment of Zones of Influence (ZOIs).	Y	SD F1 3-5
11. Air photo imagery with improved resolution (1 x 1m) is to be used for monitoring vegetation.	Y	SD F1 sec 3.2.2 pg 18
12. Monitoring of natural revegetation process will be undertaken and details of the monitoring will be stated in the FEIS WMMP.	Y	SD F1 pg 16-18
13. The timing for the commencement of caribou monitoring surveys will be refined and established according to baseline information.	N	SD F1 pg 27. Insufficiently refined. Narrow down to a specific week based on baseline data; if not possible provide rationale.
14. Raptors will be included in the CEA for the HBB area.	Y	SD D6 pg 43
15. Contingency measures for incinerator malfunction will be established and described in the FEIS.	Y	TR 4 pg 123
16. Discuss applicability of using information from the Northern Contaminants Program to establish baseline contaminants levels in caribou.	Y	SD F1 pg 63
17. Discuss how tissue from animals killed on-site, or found dead on site will be analyzed for contaminants. Define what is considered “on-site”.	Y	SD F1 pg 63
18. Continue to collect baseline data in 2005 and 2006 for all breeding birds. (EC)	N	No mention of 2006 studies
19. Strengthen the monitoring program for all breeding birds due to the lack of baseline data. This includes clarifying the methodology that will be used for bird surveys in the WMMP. Examine EC-CWS protocols for waterfowl survey methodology for on-going baseline data collection and monitoring (e.g. PRISM). (EC)	Y	SD F1 pg 48
20. Determine if appropriate and if so, incorporate findings from the breeding bird publication in the Journal entitled “Arctic” into the monitoring and mitigation plan. (EC)	Y	SD F1 Sec 4.5; pg 72

NIRB PHC Direction for FEIS	Conformity Y/N	FEIS location & Comment
21. Re-evaluate the habitat assessment to include the non-shrubby habitats (tussock, emergent marsh, and wet meadow) as high quality habitat for non-waterfowl birds.	Y	TR 19 pg 19-7
22. Discuss how the Tail Lake outflow will be monitored for impacts to wetlands due to decreased flow and discuss the significance of its loss for the HBB region.	N	
23. Discuss how Elders or other community members will contribute collecting monitoring data.	Y	SD F1 pg 11-12
24. Assure that sampling is established to be able to detect biologically significant changes in population sizes.	Y	unclear
25. Identify threshold levels at which adaptive management and mitigation will be triggered for VECs.	Y	SD F1
26. Monitor the effects of air traffic and provide all flight information including those scheduled for the winter airstrip. Discuss how a record book of all flights (landings and take-offs of all aircraft in the region) will be kept and corresponding wildlife reactions.	Y	SD F1 Sec 4.1.4
27. Identify in the WMMP the responsible person from MHBL and their contact information.	Y	SD F1 pg 66
28. Discuss timing of monitoring for each species and identify sensitive periods to limit the disturbance during monitoring. Present overview in a table.	N	Sensitive periods not identified and no table.
29. Monitor the population demographic for caribou during ground surveys or explain the rational for not being able to do so.	Y	SD F1 sec 4.1.4
30. Check wording for the duration of time grizzlies spend in dens.	Y	SD F1 pg 37
31. Provide more information on whether mine site will attract or deter bears.	Y	SD F1 pg 37-38
32. Remove mention of relocation for bears and other problem wildlife.	Y	
33. Update information on the defence kill which occurred at the Windy camp exploration drill site.	Y	TR 18 pg 20
34. Verify existence/location of grizzly den photo located in appendix to the baseline vegetation study undertaken by Outcrop.	Y	TR 18 pg 1
35. For the monitoring program, provide rational for sample plot sizes, number of plots, and timing for surveys.	N	Specific to grizzly bear monitoring, only the timing of surveys is rationalized, not plot size and number of plots
36. Provide map a plots sampled during vegetation baseline study.	Y	SD D5 pg 41
37. Provide mitigation measures for wolverine avoidance of site.	Y	SD F1 pg 43
38. Review data from other mine sites which have used Hair Snags for wolverine counts.	Y	SD F1 pg 45

NIRB PHC Direction for FEIS	Conformity Y/N	FEIS location & Comment
39. Reword mitigation measures for raptors who have taken up nests on mine infrastructure.	Y	SD F1 pg 57
40. Revise wildlife health monitoring program using human health triggers as the priority mitigative thresholds.	Y	SD F1 pg 63
41. Acknowledge the potential confusion between island caribou and mainland caribou during aerial surveys due to overlapping home ranges.	Y	SD F1 pg 27.
42. Clarify from a cost/benefit standpoint the applicability of weekly aerial surveys.	Y	SD F1 pg 29
43. Evaluate from a cost/benefit standpoint undertaking sediment sampling/monitoring in Tail Lake as a justification for not requiring wildlife deterrent measures for the TIA.	Y	SD F1 pg 51
44. Discuss mitigation measures for seas birds.	Y	TR 20 pg 11-13
45. Provide a full page map showing all activities for the CEA.	N	not found - provide on one map
46. Review dispersal information for wolverines.	Y	TR 17 pg 23
47. Undertake CEA based on seasonal ranges of caribou during the following stages: calving/post calving; migration; winter range. Provide details on the CEA methodology for caribou. (INAC)	Y	TR 16 pg 36
48. For CEA during winter range, include projects which are seasonally shutdown but still maintain infrastructure on-site.	Y	TR 16 pg 36
49. Indicate limitation of the HSI and RSF and explain that it was the best available model at the time of application.	Y	SD D6 pg 21
50. Explain the HSI values for different classes.	Y	SD D6 sec2.3.3
51. Replace reference to Iqaluit with Kugluktuk.	Y	SD D6 pg 46
52. Rework CEA study boundaries for grizzlies.	Y	SD D6 pg 9
53. Correct the spelling of Mathieu Dumond's name.	Y	
The Socio-economic impact of the Project on affected residents and communities of Nunavut		
1. MHBL commits to include in the FEIS a framework for a VEC socioeconomic monitoring program. (MHBL- from presentation)	Y	TR 26 pg 40-41
2. MHBL commits to working with the participating Hamlets and the KIA to continue dialogue on the draft Community Relations Plan (MHBL – from presentation)	Y	TR 25 App. 25c-4
3. MHBL commits to participating in training initiatives and will outline same in FEIS. (MHBL – from presentation) (document better)	N	Only mentions other agency roles. Does not discuss training initiatives and MHBL role.
4. MHBL commits to continue its work on the Community Investment Policy and will outline details of same in FEIS. (MHBL – from presentation) (document better)	Y	TR 26 App 26C

NIRB PHC Direction for FEIS	Conformity Y/N	FEIS location & Comment
5. MHBL commits to continue working on relationships with various training groups in the Region (i.e., Nunavut Mine Training Group; Multiple Graduations Options Pilot Project; Drilling Assistants Training Program at Windy Camp; Kitikmeot Employment and Training Partnership and will outline details of same in FEIS. (MHBL – from presentation)	Y	TR 26 pg 34
6. MHBL to indicate in FEIS any community consultations with technical experts in attendance, to take place prior to FEIS (MHBL – from presentation)	Y	TR 25 pg 7; Nov 2005 consultation
7. MHBL commits to the development of a Wellness Strategy for MHBL employees	Y	TR 25 App. 25B
8. MHBL commits to outlining in the FEIS how MHBL proposes to work with the Kitikmeot businesses in the area of capacity building	Y	TR 26 pg 35
9. MHBL will provide a draft Kitikmeot Employment Strategy for the FEIS	Y	TR 26 App. 26D
10. MHBL will provide a document titled “Socio-Economic Impact Assessment, Doris North Project”. (MHBL-from presentation)	Y	
11. MHBL will provide a document titled “Appendix A – Concerns and SEIA Addendum Response Matrix”. (MHBL-from presentation) Presented August 24, 2005.	Y	TR 25 App 25D
12. MHBL will provide a document titled “Socio-Economic Assessment Methodology”. (MHBL – from presentation) Presented August 24, 2005.	Y	TR 25 pg 3
13. Discuss the assumptions made regarding labour force supply based on the Gjoa Haven skills survey and discuss the likelihood of meeting the northern hire goal. (INAC)	Y	TR 26 sec 26.2.1
Other Issues		
Fish		
1. Verify area (ha) of Tail Lake. (DFO)	Y	SD F4 pg 28 tbl2
2. Provide data on wetland at Doris Lake and Tail Lake outflows pertaining to fish and fish habitat and comment on whether the de-watering of Tail Lake outflow could negatively impact fish habitat. (DFO)	Y	SD C1 pg 76-78; SD C6
3. Confirm in AEMP that ammonia will be monitored and at what locations. (DFO)	Y	TR 11 sec 11.3.7; SD F3 pr 14, 43.
4. Cumulative effects from Roberts Bay and Ida Bay contaminated sites to be included in cumulative effects assessment for FEIS (MHBL)	Y	various
5. Summarize the concern of contamination of fish in Roberts lake and the expected Risk to fish compensation program (DFO)	Y	SD F4 pg 60
6. Bridge – correct discrepancy between bridge length and watercourse full bank width (14 m) (DFO)	Y	
7. MHBL to work with DFO on monitoring framework issues (DFO)	Y	SD F4 pg 61

NIRB PHC Direction for FEIS	*Conformity Y/N*	*FEIS location & Comment*
8. Stream enhancement – provide map of stream E14 at larger scale to see sections of stream to be enhanced. (NIRB)	Y	SD F4 pg 50
Health		
Provide more detail on the following (9-14) as per MHBL presentation:		
9. Human use of study area will be provided in FEIS (MHBL)	Y	SD F2 pg 2
10. Show exposure ratios for each exposure media (MHBL)	Y	SD F2 pg 46
11. Include section on monitoring for human health (MHBL)	Y	TR 24 pg 37
12. Mercury and monitoring of fish tissue (MHBL)	Y	TR 11 pg 25
13. Description of project components which could affect environmental components (MHBL)	Y	TR 24 pg 11-12
14. Clarify that there will be noise monitoring in mill area for occupational health and safety. (NIRB)	Y	TR 10 pg 31
Air Quality		
15. More detail in FEIS with respect to mitigation of dust and how mitigation measures were incorporated into calculations of particulate matter in air (MHBL)	Y	TR 10 pg 14
16. Differences in wind rose plots between Doris North site and Boston sites, assess over longer period to assess if it is a result of local topography? (EC) Will be brought back (MHBL)	Y	SD B3 pg 7-8
17. Under CCME there are standards for dioxins and furans with respect to incineration. Nunavut will be including these in its EPA. Look into that standard for any incinerator to be used on site. (CCME website) (GN DOE)	Y	TR 10 pg 15
18. Guidelines for dust suppression under Nunavut EPA, update FEIS to include (GN DOE)	Y	TR 10 pg 15
19. Clarify in SD B3 that chemical dust suppressants will not be used, and that dust control efficiency will remain at 80% using water for dust control. (NIRB)	Y	SD B3 tbl 3.1&3.2
Hazardous Waste Issues		
20. More detail on what hazardous wastes will be generated (MHBL)	Y	TR 6 App 6A - NIRB strongly encourages MHBL to rework and reorganize the information on hazardous waste and management into a separate and clear document specific to this project proposal.

NIRB PHC Direction for FEIS	*Conformity Y/N*	*FEIS location & Comment*
21. More detail on how hazardous waste will be managed (MHBL)	Y	TR 6 App 6A - NIRB strongly encourages MHBL to rework and reorganize the information on hazardous waste and management into a separate and clear document specific to this project proposal.
22. More detail in hazardous waste plan for FEIS (MHBL)	Y	TR 6 App 6A - NIRB strongly encourages MHBL to rework and reorganize the information on hazardous waste and management into a separate and clear document specific to this project proposal.
23. Incorporate GN regulations and guidelines into hazardous waste management plan (MHBL)	Y	TR 6 App 6A - NIRB strongly encourages MHBL to rework and reorganize the information on hazardous waste and management into a separate and clear document specific to this project proposal.
Closure and Reclamation Issues		
24. Encourage natural re-vegetation at site, will look at current research (MHBL)	Y	ongoing SD G1 pg 102
25. Include some detail in FEIS on how further mining in area will affect closure plan (EC)	Y	SD G1 pg 21
26. Clarify whether mine workings will be flooded upon closure (EC)	Y	SD G1 pg 83
27. Will provide plan drawing and description of site after closure. (MHBL)	Y	SD G1 fig 1.3-1.7
28. Include sufficient detail on landfarm in FEIS for environmental impact assessment, include location, case studies (NIRB)	Y	SD G1 pg 84-85; Should be mentioned in project description. Provide conceptual plan and location for landfarm.
29. More detail in post-closure monitoring plan in FEIS (GN DOE)	Y	SD G1 pg 98
30. Include landfill monitoring in post-closure monitoring plan (NIRB)	Y	SD G1 pg 100
31. Clarify that permafrost encapsulation is not necessary to prevent leaching of contaminants from non-hazardous landfill. (NIRB)	Y	
32. Specify criteria to be used for clean-up of contaminated soil in closure plan. (NIRB)	Y	SD G1 pg 84-85;
Emergency Response Plan		
33. Further detail and clarification in emergency response plan as per Environment Canada's tech report comments.	Y	SD F6 - EC review

NIRB PHC Direction for FEIS	*Conformity Y/N*	*FEIS location & Comment*
34. Look at tech comments as submitted (GN DOE)	Y	SD F6 - DOE review
35. Note that Emergency Action Plan for dam failure will be completed before operations begin. (NIRB)	Y	SD F6 Sec 9 pg 32
Infrastructure		
36. Thickness of pad to maintain permafrost – details of thermal modeling for pads will be included in FEIS (Acres)	Y	SD A7 last App (4A) very last page.
37. Add to drawing of detailed mine layout in FEIS, - consideration for control of runoff water in the area of waste rock stockpile (berm on uphill side of pile) (INAC)	Y	TR 4 pg 63
38. Avoid close contact between accommodations and explosives transport in mill site design (NRCan)	Y	SD A7 pg 30-31
39. Include temporary explosives area in closure plan (NIRB)	Y	TR 4 pg 130
40. Include anticipated volume of rock for mitigation of shoreline in FEIS table (NIRB)	Y	SD A7 pg 40
41. Need to discuss with elders what would be the appropriate means for deterring animals from Tailings area.(MHBL)	Y	FEIS MD Sec. 5.3.4 pg 5-28; Document and provide further information to NIRB following the November 2005 community consultation. Submit report by Dec 9, 2005.