

The NIRB final hearing included a week-long community roundtable. Several representatives from each community in the region were given seats at the table, and the opportunity to ask questions of the proponent and registered interveners. At the end of the hearing, after listening to two weeks of presentations and participating in a week of discussions, the vast majority of representatives told the NIRB that they did not believe Kiggavik should be approved at this time.

If you reject the NIRB recommendation, you will be overturning a decision by a board established by the land claim agreement, and designed to ensure that Inuit would have a voice in these discussions.

You will also be deciding against the wishes of Kivalliq residents and community-level representative Inuit organizations. We have nothing to gain and everything to lose if Kiggavik is approved now. This project will not likely be operational for ten or twenty years. There was simply too much uncertainty about AREVA's project for community members to discuss possible impacts in any serious way.

I would also like you to consider the way AREVA has dealt with our concerns during the NIRB review process. AREVA's behaviour shows that it has not taken community concerns seriously, and has not approached the NIRB process in good faith.

AREVA's letter to you includes a lot of arguments and information that was not presented at the NIRB final hearing. For example, AREVA provides examples of other projects that have apparently been reviewed without project start dates.

AREVA was aware that the lack of a project start date was a major concern for our community. If AREVA took our concerns seriously, it should have researched this concern and presented its information and arguments about it at the NIRB final hearings. Instead AREVA simply dismissed our concerns, and said that NIRB could reconsider terms and conditions. This is not the behaviour we expect from a company that says it takes Aboriginal people and community partnerships seriously.

If these new information and arguments were presented at the NIRB hearings, my community could have asked questions about it. We could have discussed AREVA's arguments with the technical experts the intervening parties brought to the hearings. This is the whole point of having a public hearing in our community – so the public can discuss concerns with the company and with independent experts.

Now that the hearings are over, there is no way for my community to participate in these discussions in an informed way. We have no way of knowing whether

the examples of other projects AREVA listed can truly be compared to the Kiggavik proposal. This would require research and consultation with experts, which we no longer have access to now that the hearing has passed.

I urge you to not grant AREVA's request.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Richard Aksawnee', followed by a horizontal flourish.

Richard Aksawnee
Chair
Baker Lake Hunters and Trappers Organization

cc:

Elizabeth Copeland, Chair, Nunavut Impact Review Board
Leona Aglukkaq, Member of Parliament for Nunavut
Cathy Towtongie, President, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated
David Ningeongan, President, Kivalliq Inuit Association
Stanley Adjuk, Chair, Kivalliq Wildlife Board
David Tuktudjuq, Chair, Arviq (Repulse Bay) Hunters and Trappers Organization
Douglas Aggark, Chair, Aqigiq (Chesterfield Inlet) Hunters and Trappers Organization
Joedee Joedee, Mayor, Baker Lake