

Environmental Protection Operations
Qimugjuk Building 969
PO Box 1870
Iqaluit, NU X0A 0H0
Tel: (867) 975-4631
Fax: (867) 975-4645

July 30th 2012

EC File: 4703 001 006
NIRB File: 09MN003

Sophia Granchinho
Technical Advisor
Nunavut Impact Review Board
PO Box 1360, 29 Mitik
Cambridge Bay, NU X0B 0C0

Via email: info@nirb.ca

RE: Information Requests Received from Parties Regarding AREVA Resources Canada Inc.'s Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Kiggavik Project

On July 13th 2012 the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) circulated the information requests (IRs) directed to parties involved in the initial review of the Draft Environment Impact Statement (DEIS) for the AREVA Resources Canada Inc.'s Kiggavik Project. The NIRB asked parties from whom a response has been requested to review the IR and supply the NIRB with an indication regarding their readiness or ability to respond. One IR from the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board (BQCMB) was directed to Environment Canada (EC), below is the IR and EC's responses.

IR Number: BQCMB 22

To: EC

Subject: Air Quality: Dustfall predictions – Total Suspended Particulates (TSP)

IR 22.1:

The BQCMB requests that EC provide an assessment of AREVA's CALPUFF/CALMET model.

EC response:

EC can review the meteorological input data and the CALPUFF TSP dispersion modeling for the Kiggavik Mine. This can be completed by the end of August at the latest.

IR 22.2:

The BQCMB requests that EC provide a comparison with the project dispersion of Total Suspended Particulates (TSP) for Ekati, Meadowbank and AREVA projects in Northern Saskatchewan.

EC response:

EC reviewed relevant material in the DEIS, discussed its findings with the BQCMB and recommends the following:

1. TSP isopleths data should be presented in the same unit of measure in order to facilitate comparisons. EC would recommend "kg/ha/yr" as the unit measure. BQCMB concurs with this recommendation. In addition, the assessment should include several isopleths at intervals down to 20 kg/ha/yr. This additional analysis and data will support a better assessment of the extent of deposition, including comparisons with the northern Saskatchewan mines. Again, BQCMB concurs with the inclusion of additional isopleths down to 20 kg/ha/yr. EC is of the opinion this additional work is the proponent's responsibility. However, EC will be pleased to review the findings.
2. In our discussions with BQCMB, they have also raised concerns with regards to road dust, including seasonal variability (important to deposition on forage and uptake by caribou). This should also be presented using similar intervals as those identified above. Fundamentally, the modeling exercise should be considering factors like seasonal variability and dust from roads as this will be important to understanding potential effects and the degree of uncertainty. Again, EC is of the opinion this additional work is the proponent's responsibility but will be pleased to review the findings.

Should you have any questions regarding the foregoing, please contact Paula Smith at (867) 975-4631 or by email at paula.smith@ec.gc.ca.

Regards,



for Cheryl Baraniecki
Regional Director
Environmental Protection Operations
Prairie and Northern Region

cc: Carey Ogilvie (Head, Environmental Assessment-North, EPO, Yellowknife, NT)
Paula C. Smith (Environmental Assessment Coordinator, EPO, Iqaluit, NU)