



## MEETING NOTES

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>File No:</b>           | <b>09MN003</b>  |
| <b>Date:</b>              | <b>Friday March 26, 2010</b>  |
| <b>Time:</b>              | Approx. 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.   |
| <b>Location:</b>          | NIRB Office, Cambridge Bay, NU  |
| <b>Objective/Purpose:</b> | Discussion of NIRB Part 5 Review process for the Kiggavik project   |
| <b>Participants:</b>      | <b>NIRB:</b> Ryan Barry, Sophia Granchinho & Amanda Hanson<br><b>AREVA:</b> Nicola Banton, Frederic Guerin & Diane Martens  |
| <b>Meeting Overview:</b>  | <p>AREVA representatives requested to meet with NIRB staff regarding the Part 5 Review process for the Kiggavik project and to provide general information on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Understanding the next steps in the NIRB review process incl. anticipated timelines</li> <li>2. AREVA's potential role as observers/resources during NIRB scoping and guideline community visits</li> <li>3. High-level discussion regarding stakeholder engagement to avoid unnecessary duplication and/or conflicting initiatives</li> <li>4. Intervener funding – What is available (NIRB, INAC, IRMA) and who should we forward requests to?</li> <li>5. Assessment methodology and EIS structure</li> <li>6. Thelon on-ice geotechnical drilling application</li> </ol>   |
| <b>Issues discussed:</b>  | <p><b>AREVA:</b> Our role during scoping visits?</p> <p><b>NIRB:</b> As observers only – AREVA staff will be acknowledged but are expected to have limited participation during the community meetings. NIRB staff will be answering project-specific questions using information contained within the submitted project proposal only. Request that AREVA provide some large wall maps for use during community meetings.</p> <p><b>AREVA:</b> Ask that NIRB provide a list of requested resources <i>[the list should also request formal permission to use photos or other materials from AREVA supplied documents]</i>.</p> <p><b>NIRB:</b> NIRB will be chartering aircraft, with no space available for AREVA.</p> <p><b>AREVA:</b> When will the list of potentially affected communities be developed and available?</p> <p><b>NIRB:</b> All communities of the Kivalliq region have been identified as potentially affected and will be visited.</p> <p><b>AREVA:</b> Are you expecting to hold one round of community meetings in 2010 only?</p> <p><b>NIRB:</b> Yes, these meetings are meant to raise awareness and get feedback, encourage participation, use information to develop the EIS Guidelines.</p> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p><b>AREVA:</b> Second set of visits after which milestone?</p> <p><b>NIRB:</b> Anticipated following submission of a draft EIS, though dependant on how much time lapses following issuance of EIS guidelines.</p> <p><b>AREVA:</b> Have participant funding deadlines or the committee members been determined by INAC?</p> <p><b>NIRB:</b> This has not been communicated as of yet, but based on previous experience it is believed this can be done rather quickly.</p> <p><b>AREVA:</b> Is eligibility for access to these funds determined by NIRB or INAC?</p> <p><b>NIRB:</b> NIRB communicates criteria to committee (Participant Funding Guide), subject to committee's discretion and final discretion of Minister of INAC.</p> <p><b>AREVA:</b> How many projects are currently undergoing review? Is this a strain on resources?</p> <p><b>NIRB:</b> There are currently 6 ongoing Part 5 Reviews, 2 of which are suspended at the request of the proponent, and 3 of which are awaiting submission of an EIS prior to further work. NIRB has a responsibility to ensure it has capacity to deal with all files before it, without compromising or extending timelines unnecessarily for this file or other files undergoing review.</p> <p><b>AREVA:</b> What are NIRB's plans to coordinate with the CNSC?</p> <p><b>NIRB:</b> Initial conversations have been held, and staff will be further discussing coordination in the days to come.</p> <p><b>AREVA:</b> Our understanding is that the identification of Valued Ecosystem and Socioeconomic Components (VECs and VSECs) are a shared proponent and NIRB responsibility. Confusion on how best to ensure AREVA efforts here are complementary and not isolated from NIRB initiatives.</p> <p><b>NIRB:</b> NIRB to draft scope and solicit feedback on VECs. EIS Guidelines will provide formal direction on recommended VECs which AREVA will need to consider and provide its own reasoning and weighting with respect to its ultimate selection of VECs. The NIRB's goal is to have the input from scoping meetings (as will be presented in its Summary Scoping Report) reflected in the EIS Guidelines.</p> <p><b>AREVA:</b> Are 3 versions of the Draft EIS Guidelines standard practice?</p> <p><b>NIRB:</b> There will be a Draft version, a Revised Draft and then the Final EIS Guidelines, which is current NIRB practice based on experience with Guideline development for other reviews. NIRB's job is solicit the advice it needs, fairly representing and weighing public input to provide certainty for AREVA and reviewers.</p> <p><b>AREVA:</b> Is engagement to be included in EIS criteria used to determine significance?</p> <p><b>NIRB:</b> It will be in the Guidelines – need to see records of engagement and to know if and how conclusions were made using this input.</p> <p><b>AREVA:</b> What correspondence with outside parties should be cc'ed to</p> |
|--|---|

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>NIRB for posting to FTP vs. included as an Appendix to EIS?</p> <p><b>NIRB:</b> Majority can go into appendices of EIS submission. Anything pertaining directly to the assessment should be cc'ed to NIRB. Also, where the Board has given direction or made a request of AREVA and due to its work with other agencies, the request/direction will not be met, cc evidence to the Board.</p> <p><b>AREVA:</b> Duty to consult – the process was recently challenged in Northern Saskatchewan. Has the process in Nunavut been subject to such a challenge?</p> <p><b>NIRB:</b> Hasn't happened to date, hopefully our commitment to conduct thorough public consultation and transparency is part of the reason. NIRB consults with the public regularly, and as well as with NIRB legal counsel, and follows the Minister's direction very closely.</p> <p><b>AREVA:</b> Would a lapse in time for re-engagement mean new intervenors could apply for funding?</p> <p><b>NIRB:</b> We are looking into this internally – the importance of allowing adequate notice when re-engaging has been discussed as a means of allowing contribution agreements to be updated as necessary. Previous Guidelines plus working with CNSC will contribute to the AREVA EIS Guidelines – will be different from reviews past.</p> <p><b>AREVA:</b> The Minister's direction highlights “technological innovation”</p> <p><b>NIRB:</b> This is reflective of the NIRB Screening Decision and wording under NLCA Article 12, as the project would be the first uranium mine reviewed under this system and in Nunavut. It will be important to identify what is (a) new for Nunavut, (b) has been undertaken elsewhere, and (c) specific adaptations (project design/implementation) that are unique to the Arctic. It is reasonable to expect that AREVA will need to work to educate and provide an adequate amount of information to address these issues and public concern regarding uranium mining.</p> <p><b>AREVA:</b> There appear to be a number of management plans listed in the NIRB Guidelines [<i>for other reviews</i>] which are normally saved for licensing stages in other jurisdictions.</p> <p><b>NIRB:</b> Draft plans will generally be required through NIRB's review process, with much less detail than would be required in licensing.</p> <p><b>AREVA:</b> Alternatives analysis has been undertaken with an “Umbrella approach”, where there is a preferred option, other options may also be requested for consideration and subject to EA to avoid changes to the project description further into the review. Meant to avoid having to go back to square one.</p> <p><b>NIRB:</b> NIRB encourages AREVA to scope their project broadly and to have a robust alternatives assessment. AREVA will be required to provide an adequate level of information on any/all options presented with a full assessment of those alternatives that may be carried forward.</p> <p><b>AREVA:</b> What of including marine shipping within in the scope?</p> <p><b>NIRB:</b> All activities within the NSA are covered by the NIRB's review, including shipping associated with project proposals. The level of detail</p> |
|--|---|

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | required will be directly correlated to the intensity of shipping and new vs. established routings.   |
| <b>Commitments made by NIRB:</b>          | <b>Will issue correspondence to AREVA requesting materials for scoping meetings and permission to use photos and other information from project proposal in NIRB presentations.</b> |
| <b>Follow-up Action/ Recommendations:</b> | <b>None.</b>  |