

FILE NO.: 03MN107

3. Introduction

Submissions must contain a brief statement of the Party's mandate (if any), whether the Party has a regulatory role in the Project and in what capacity and a list of legislation, regulations, policies and guidelines that apply to the project.

4. Specific Issues

Issues must be organized by technical topic as they are listed in section 2 above. For each issue identified within each technical topic provide the following:

- a. Identify the issue in detail and where appropriate the location within the FEIS (document, section and page number);
- b. State (if known) the Proponent's conclusion related to the issue;
- c. State your conclusion related to the issue and your justification;
- d. Provide a brief discussion on the issue's importance to NIRB's impact assessment process (Nunavut Land Claim Agreement (NLCA) Section 12.2.5); and
- e. Provide a recommendation to the Board on the issue.

Also, please note that NIRB will not only focus on the FEIS, but also on NIRB's 10 minimum criteria for Part 5 Reviews (copy attached).

5. Summary of Recommendations

Finally, submissions must contain a bulleted summary of the recommendations to the Board as they pertain to the technical topics of the review.

Language of Documents

NIRB requires executive summaries to be translated into Inuktitut and requests that Parties arrange for their own executive summary translations.

The Final Hearing will be conducted in Inuktitut and English with simultaneous translation. NIRB is also required by law to conduct public hearings in French in accordance with the Official Languages Act. Please notify NIRB at least two weeks before the Final Hearing should you require interpretation in French. Additionally, those who require audio-visual equipment at the Final Hearing are requested to inform NIRB at least two weeks before the Final Hearing so that arrangements can be made in advance.

Deadline for Filing Submissions

NIRB would like to remind Parties that the deadline for written submissions is **March 10, 2006**. Executive Summary translation will be accepted up until **March 20, 2006**.

Draft Hearing Agenda

In addition, NIRB has prepared the attached draft Agenda for the Final Hearing and is asking for Parties to provide comments, should they have any, by Monday **February 27, 2006**.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at 867-983-4605 or ktunaley@nirb.nunavut.ca if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

(original signed by:)

Karlette Tunaley
Technical Advisor

Attachments: Draft Agenda – Meadowbank Public Hearing
NIRB's 10 minimum EIS Requirements

Cc: Honourable Jim Prentice, Minister Indian and Northern Affairs Canada

AGENDA – PUBLIC HEARING
Meadowbank Gold Project – 03MN107

Date: March 27, 2006 – March 31, 2006
Location: Monday – Wednesday in Baker Lake at the Community Hall
Thursday in Chesterfield Inlet at the Community Hall
Friday in Rankin Inlet at the Siniktarvik
Time: 9:00 am to 5:30 pm (subject to the Chairperson's discretion)

General Opening (Mon)

1. Opening Prayer
2. Opening Remarks by the Chairperson and introductions including:
 - i. General welcome
 - ii. Introduction of the Board and Staff
 - iii. Description of the Application
 - iv. File History
 - v. Jurisdiction
 - vi. Technical Topics to be addressed
 - vii. Method of Advertising
 - viii. Roll Call
3. Identification of any motions or objections

Technical Sessions (Mon, Tues, Thurs, Fr)

4. The presentation by the Proponent
5. Questioning of the Proponent by Interested Parties, Community Representatives, and NIRB
6. Presentation from Interested Parties who have submitted formal interventions
7. Questioning of Interested Parties by the Proponent, other Interested Parties, Community Representatives, and NIRB

Community Roundtable (Wed)

8. The presentation by the Proponent (short non-technical version)
9. Questioning of the Proponent by Community representatives
10. Questioning of the Proponent by Community in general

Closing (Fri)

11. Final Closing Statements by Interested Parties, summarizing their position vis a vis the Proponent's application
12. Final Closing Statement by Proponent
13. Closing remarks by the Chairperson and Board Members
14. Termination or adjournment of the Hearing by the Chairperson
15. Closing Prayer

Notes:

1. NIRB is arranging to bring community representatives from Chesterfield Inlet and Rankin Inlet to Baker Lake to attend the Monday and Tuesday Technical Sessions and to participate in the Community Roundtable on Wednesday.
2. Elders may speak at any time during the Hearing.
3. The Board may recess the Hearing for breaks as deemed necessary.
4. On each day there will be a lunch break of approximately one hour. Parties are responsible for obtaining their own lunches.

NIRB'S 10 MINIMUM EIS REQUIREMENTS

Proponents must comply with the following 10 minimum requirements for an Environmental Impact Statement:

1. Statement of Consultation Principles and Practices

The Proponent must conduct pre-project consultations with locally affected persons. Where at all possible, information about the project must be distributed, and comments collected with a view to resolving any differences. Discussions should include, but not be limited to, land uses, policies, resource uses, archaeological areas, infrastructure, and terrain sensitivities. Inuit cultural concerns must be highlighted throughout. The Proponent shall explain where, how, why, and with whom it conducted public consultation, and shall demonstrate an understanding of the rights, interests, values, aspirations, and concerns of the potentially affected communities. All comments from the public must be summarized, documented, and presented in the EIS.

2. Definition of Project

A definition of the project must include a discussion of any connected or subsequently related projects in order to reveal the primary purpose and better understand complex or multi-staged related proposals.

3. Statement of Project's Purpose

Based on the concepts of the Precautionary Principle and Sustainable Development, an EIS must contain a statement explaining the need for, and the purpose of the project. Where further economic development is needed for a given area, the Board expects the deficiencies in the economic status quo to be stated.

4. Anticipated Impacts Analysis

A comprehensive impact assessment must be carried out. The analysis should include short and long-term, direct and indirect, positive and negative, cumulative, eco-systemic, socio-economic, archaeological and cultural impacts. This element of the EIS must include a mitigation analysis that explains how the impacts could be avoided, minimized, cured, eliminated, or compensated for.

5. Cumulative Effects Analysis (CEA)

A comprehensive examination of all cumulative effects must be included in an EIS. Cumulative effects refer to the impact on the biophysical and socioeconomic environment that results from the incremental impact of a development when added to other past, present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Developments, regardless of what agency or person undertakes such other developments. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.

6. Significant Effects Analysis

The Board must be advised of the significant impacts of the project, with and without any proposed mitigation measures. This should be based upon:

- the project setting, taking into account the location's unique biophysical and socioeconomic characteristics, and
- the severity of the impacts, taking into account, but not limited to public health, land use plans, protected areas, habitat, or species, public concern, etc.

Ultimately, the Board will decide which effects are significant and report to the Minister accordingly.

7. Project Alternatives

This requirement includes, but goes well beyond, alternative means of carrying out the project that might be economically and technically feasible and the environmental effects of those alternative means. This assessment must include the “no-go” or “no-build” alternative, as well as the “preferred” alternative. The “no-go” alternative is not only a potentially stand-alone option; it also serves as a baseline for comparison with other development alternatives that might reasonably be proposed in the circumstances.

8. Sustainability Analysis

The EIS must contain an analysis of the ability of renewable resources affected by the project to sustain current and future generations in Nunavut and Canada.

9. Monitoring or Post-Project Analysis (PPA)

The purpose of a PPA is to:

- measure the relevant effects of a project on the eco-systemic and socio-economic environments of the Nunavut Settlement Area;
- determine whether and to what extent the land or resource use in question is carried out within the predetermined terms and conditions;
- provide the information base necessary for agencies to enforce terms and conditions of land or resource use approvals; and
- assess the accuracy of the predictions contained in the project impact statement.

10. Trans-Boundary Impact Analysis

Where relevant, an EIS must include an assessment of all significant adverse biophysical or socioeconomic transboundary impacts. Transboundary impacts refers to those impacts which occur across municipal, provincial or international boundaries.

****It is important to note that Section 12.5.2(j) of the NLCA gives NIRB the authority to add other requirements as deemed necessary. NIRB will always review each project proposal on a case-by-case basis including instructions from the Minister, and may add other requirements as per s. 12.5.2 and 12.5.5 of the NLCA.**