



NIRB File No.: 09MN003

March 20, 2013

Nunavummiut Makitagunarningit
PO Box 1554
Iqaluit, NU
X0H 0H0

Sent via email: NunavummiutMakitagunarningit@gmail.com

Re: NIRB Response to Makita's Request for Clarification on Information Requests for the Review of AREVA Resources Canada Inc.'s Draft EIS for the Kiggavik Project Proposal

Dear Makita Members:

The Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB or Board) is in receipt of your letter dated March 18, 2013 (enclosed) regarding Nunavummiut Makitagunarningit's (Makita) Information Request (IR) submission for the NIRB's ongoing Review of AREVA Resources Canada Inc.'s (AREVA) Kiggavik project proposal. Specifically, Makita requested clarification as to whether or not IR #20, which it noted was incorrectly referenced and should have been labelled 'Request #24' – meets the NIRB's requirements to be considered as an IR.

As you are aware, on May 4, 2012 the NIRB initiated the public technical review period for the *Draft* Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) submitted by AREVA for the Kiggavik project, inviting interested parties to submit their IRs to the Board for consideration by June 4, 2012, later extended to June 29, 2012 at the request of parties. After reviewing all IRs received, on July 13, 2012 the NIRB forwarded the accepted IRs to AREVA and other parties, identifying some IRs which appeared to be outside the scope of an Information Request and would therefore be more appropriately addressed through the technical review comment submission stage in the Review **or** identifying where information requested was not within the scope of the NIRB's review. The NIRB determined that the IR from Makita labelled #20 pertaining to uranium policy in Nunavut did not meet the IR criteria as the information requested was not within the scope of the NIRB's review.

The NIRB notes that the Additional Information Request #20 submitted by Makita was directed to AREVA, the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission and the Government of Nunavut (GN) and requested historical data on the exposure of caribou to cesium, the exposure of Kivalliq residents to cesium and the results from these studies. As you are likely aware, the NIRB received

responses to IRs from AREVA and the GN which specifically provided a response to this IR on January 31 and March 19, 2013 respectively (see enclosed). While AREVA's January 31, 2013 response to Makita's IRs indicated that it would not provide a response to the Additional IR #20 owing to the NIRB's rationale as presented in the July 13, 2012 correspondence, AREVA's response did clarify that cesium would not be generated by the Kiggavik project and that no assessment of cesium levels in caribou had been completed.

The NIRB notes that IRs were to be developed and addressed to AREVA and/or other parties regarding the Kiggavik DEIS as a means to identify information gaps within the DEIS that need to be addressed so that parties can develop their respective technical review comments for submission to the NIRB. Where an IR has not been responded to, or where the response received may not have provided sufficient detail to meet reviewer's expectations, the NIRB expects that parties will indicate within their technical review comments where such a gap may exist, or where technical issues remain outstanding as a result of inadequate information.

I trust that this response assists in answering the questions raised in your March 18, 2013 correspondence; however should you have any further questions or require clarification regarding the NIRB's Review process, please do not hesitate to contact Sophia Granchinho, Senior Technical Advisor, at (867) 793-4633 or sgranchinho@nirb.ca.

Sincerely,



Amanda Hanson
Director, Technical Services
Nunavut Impact Review Board

cc: Diane Martens, AREVA Resources Canada Inc.
Kiggavik Distribution List

Enclosure: Makita Letter to NIRB Re Clarification on Requirement of IRs (*March 18, 2013*)
AREVA Letter to NIRB Re Responses to Makita IRs (*January 31, 2013*)
GN Letter to NIRB Re Responses to IRs (*March 19, 2013*)