

**AEM EIS Guidelines Workshop – January 31, 2012 8:30am**

In Attendance

NIRB:	Ryan Barry
	Amanda Hanson
	Kelli Gillard
	Tannis Bolt
NWB	Karen Kharatyan
KIA	Steve Hartman
	Luis Manzo
	Alan Sexton
GN	Jean Daniel Blouin
	Paul Suvega
	John Prince
	Melissa Elliott
	Dianne Lapierre
AANDC	Tamara Fast
	Rosanne D’Orazio
EC	Allison Dunn
DFO	Bobby Bedingfield
AEM	John Witteman
	Larry Connell
	Stephane Robert
	Dan Walker
	Chantal Rossignol
Interpreters	Josie Tucktoo-Lacasse
	John Ayarauq
Sound (PIDO)	Ryan Dempster

**8:36 Opening Remarks (NIRB):**

- Welcome everyone. Anyone is welcome to sit at the table with the open seating.
- Housekeeping items to get out of the way. Sign-in for each day, washrooms, fire exits, watch cables, use microphones for interpreters and as we are recording the session for verification of notes.
- Workshop is being held for EIS Guidelines Development for the Meliadine Gold Mine Project and form the basis of the review.
- Opening Prayer – Jonah, Elder from Repulse Bay

- As part of the ongoing review, the NIRB is tasked with preparing and issues guidelines for AEM to use in preparing an EIS. This forms the basis of the review, and help the NIRB answer the questions related to the project, understand the impacts that result from the project, how the company plans to mitigate these impacts and the conclusions they draw around the plans.
- This is an important milestone in our process and allows us to sit down informally with AAs and DIOs and others to get assistance in preparing these guidelines. The guidelines are explicit and comprehensive in nature and the information is meant to allow the Board and the public understand and evaluate the potential impacts of this proposed project on the environment.
- The comprehensive draft EIS has a goal is to provide as much clarity as possible to AEM regarding the expectations of the NIRB and reviewers. Our goal in the next day and a half is to clarify what is currently in the guidelines before it is taken to our Board for approval.
- Encourage everyone especially the proponent to bring items forward and resolve as much as possible in the time we have. And ID any areas where discussion may be warranted and ensure the we have what we need to produce the guidelines and that the company has what it needs to understand the guidelines and reviewers are comfortable with the guidelines and with what they will see in an EIS.
- Introductions around the table
- Karen with the NWB is here supporting the Board in its process by providing technical advice on the water sections and waste for the NIRB

**8:50 AEM-Change in Scope (Larry):**

- First pass at the project was not favourable as initially stated
- New plan is to remove 3 deposits (Wolf, Discovery, Pump), AEM will still explore the sites for later development or later phases of the Meliadine project. Focus for the initial stages is Wesmeg, F-Zone and Tiriganiaq. F-zone is currently undergoing its own stand-alone assessment and this is expected to be part of the preliminary phase.
- Cumulative effects, will still discuss all deposits as the 3 will be future, probably additions, just not part of this application
- Will still construct the road over to the discovery deposit and will likely do work from here and have a camp to explore from.
- Just don't know what mine style Discovery will be, underground? Open? Combination of the two?
- Wesmeg and Tiriganiaq are "maxipits" the pit would not get larger than as shown on the map. The same idea is for the waste rock piles as shown on the map max amount of waste that will be

developed for this mine. It is more probable that the pits will be smaller than the footprint as shown. For environmental assessment purposes they will show is the maximum size.

- Maxipit – pit will not get any bigger, max size things will be.
- *3D description on the proposed site set-up on the screen*
- We will mention all 6 deposits in the EIS, but clarify that the 3 will be removed for later stages of development

### **Questions on Change**

KIA – no questions at this time

GN – no questions at this time

AANDC-The change in scope will not change the EIS guidelines?

- AEM - Will be mentioned as a cumulative effect, and not enough information on the 3 removed sites to become a mining zone at this time. So once have the information will go back to the NIRB to assess these other pits.

EC-Disposal of the Waste Rock? – Will waste rock still be disposed sub-aqueously?

- AEM-some will be deposited on water bodies. Looking at first step of EC guidelines and see if waste rock is deleterious and will make a submission to EC about waste rock to determine deleterious substances.

DFO-Tailing impoundment area?

- AEM-Chose not to reduce the tailing impoundment area even though mining a smaller area, better to have the larger impoundment area, rather than to amend for an increase at a later stage.

NIRB– will the project scope be including the road to Discovery?

- AEM - Still include the cross road over to Discover and want to engage in active exploration and base themselves out of this area with road access. Gold appears to be more on east side and so makes sense to base ourselves out of Discovery for future exploration. Road is also part of the community access to Meliadine Lake as was discussed with community.

NWB – no question

#### 9:04 Prep and Review of EIS Guidelines:

- Make it clear what your Agency will require at the Draft stage and what at the final stage. We should all communicate when certain information would be expected. Key overarching items you can stress so that the proponent is aware of at the draft stage.
- 1.3 and 7.7 – Information Expectation

#### KIA

- Luis-Make sure VEC's are included, employment, geology, mineralogy and ore deposits comments, mining transportation and processing
- Stock piles, borrow pits and quarry sites, in relation to specific quantities to be removed
- Waste mgmt. plan

#### AANDC

- Clarify that the question is a 2 part comment:
  - Stage One is that the proponent will be deferring to the FEIS – this included in guidelines currently. Basically a note from proponent so that we know what is coming later
  - Stage Two: it's more to increase efficiency of the review, either guidance from NIRB or the Proponent as to what is expected at both stages of EIS Submission. A hope to be on the same page when we are done.

AEM- will endeavour to make the DEIS as concise and complete as possible, helpful for AEM to understand the expectation of DEIS content

NIRB-Specify what will be deferred to FEIS, and explicitly state what is required for DEIS. Guidelines meant to cover both the DEIS and FEIS so very detailed. Concordance table – make notes for your readers

- AEM-our goal is to deliver a DEIS as complete as possible, will not defer things to the FEIS as much as possible
- AEM- some terminology in the guidelines that have varying definitions. Ex “design” it is not clarified as to what design is “prelim? Construction? Final? Conceptual?” what level of detail do the regulators require for information DEIS to assess the design and environmental impacts.

NIRB-Difficult to determine that for the entire DEIS, this is a more item specific question. Design requirements are specific to each regulator. The Board can clarify when a conceptual design is OK with the environmental assessment. Because a coordinated process has been requested some designs will be required at a further stage/what the design requirements are.

## AANDC

- Clarify, you mention that NIRB would endeavour to provide further guidance, is that something that would be presented in the EIS Guidelines? Or a separate document?

NIRB-expectations are within the guidelines, example is specific to NWB Water designs

- AEM-DEIS will be conceptual design and FEIS will be final design?

NIRB-generally the case the higher level of detail the better, EA designs are conceptual, closer to the final stages they become more detailed. Coordinated process= Draft Water License Application. By the time the FEIS level is reached, the design should be finalized or more advanced.

## AEM- Length of the Main EIS Document

- AEM-All the supporting studies should be part of the DEIS. How much information is required in the DEIS
  - Do you need in the main document all the details? Does everyone need the detailed information, methodologies, studies, limitations. This will take a lot of pages, and are the regulators willing to sacrifice all these pages in the main document because we are limited to the 150 page?

NIRB-the purpose for the main document being 150 documents, one document accessible to the public and can look at how the project was looked at and what was done. In the past, other companies have done a general overview. Its more the approach taken, so look at everything as a whole and not each specific study.

- AEM-We recognize that the Main is a large exec summary, we want to be careful of the expectations to fit into the 150 pages. Expectations seem to be growing and we find ourselves constantly fighting the 150 pages and information requirements. Want to understand expectations and guidance.
  - AANDC-Clarify the request, in reality the request was to provide the mitigation measures in each volume. Want to see a summary of the mitigation measures. Usually see only in management plans and while reviewing each VEC and makes it easier for the reader. We recognize that the main document is an overview
- AEM-If we have mitigation measures can we refer to them, then there will be constant repeat.
- NIRB-it is better to repeat yourself, some of the volumes and section need to be stand-alone documents. Theses must be chosen carefully, as there is nothing fundamentally wrong having to refer to other documents. Want the reader's expectation being met for the most part, use professional judgement and the Board is looking at ease of review.
- AEM-Just realize that we are trying to summarize 10000 pages into 150 pages.

- AEM-it is no longer being reviewed by one person. There is a team that reviews this full document. Part of the reason that this is getting more and more difficult
- NIRB-Reiterate, how can a document satisfy a reviewer and the Proponent? What will be helpful to a reviewer? This is not a conformity requirement we are discussing here. This is the art of environmental assessment rather than the science.
- AEM-Fully support the idea of minimizing cross-referencing. Stand-alone documents end up being larger document. Bring up the idea of how many hard copies are actually requires. Is it feasible to print so many copies, or is the idea of electronic especially at the DEIS stage.
- AANDC – we mentioned cross referencing in mitigation measures. As a reviewer to have the mitigation measures summarized and impacts in one spot so we can see the big picture all at once and not always cross referencing.
- NIRB-Electronic submissions and paper submissions, the Board generally needs one hard copy for our public registry and a few for the staff as reviewers, the Board requires the main document in hard copy. By minimizing cross referencing we are enlarging the document size. When each agency is requesting copies, try to limit the number of hard copies.
- KIA-in respect to the document, the proponent will present to KIA as specific plans. If cross reference match what is needed by the reviewer. Sometimes we do have problem with cross referencing. It is hard to put together a short document/with limited pages. Two responsibilities, proponent to reference document properly and reader to confirm everything is there.
- NIRB – be reasonable and multiple cross referencing is tough as well. Main goal, want a document parties can effectively review.
- AEM- AEM's objective is to create a document that works. Would love to hear, examples of what has worked for you in the past. Things that make it easier to tell the story. We know that some hard copies will be required. Would like to know what other format works for reviewers. We know that you cannot carry a 1000 page document. What is the best way to do the links? Any suggestions welcome.

9:45 **Regulatory Regime and Socio-Economic Environment and Impact Assessment:**

- GN-Reasoning for request on tax info. This is for the economic benefit; it is reflected in the taxes brought to the GN. GN provided extensive info on the requirement for this info. We all understand that figures presented are flexible and may change want to understand background of why things are the way they are. It is more of a projection for future purposes, and helps with mitigation on socio-economic effects

- AEM-As a public company, we felt that we are dragged into an intergovernmental squabble. Is it appropriate to bring it into the EIS discussion? We have also seen that previous submission of numbers, are usually different when it comes out to the public press is different (e.g., NTI). What are we using this info for? It seems that the Proponent is being dragged into where the money is going to be used. AEM feels that money and taxation is not necessarily a VSEC, it is part of other VSECs, but not one on its own.
- NIRB- from the Board perspective, does the EA become a proxy for larger discussions about how a project would work with a project at the two levels of government in the Territory? It is something that the Board has had challenges with keeping the document to specifically an EA. Want to know what the impacts are going to be and how they will be mitigated.
- GN- looking to understand the project, level of info, had to struggle with the Proponent in the past to understand where their information was coming from like the taxation structure in NU. It is a matter of understanding the level of claim and the proponents understanding of the project. Want to make sure misinformation is not going on.
- NIRB-wants clarification on what the definition of “offline and online” – NIRB process is a public process and is not meant to have confidential information and this is outside the scope of the assessment. Examples of what information we are discussing here and how this affects the government’s ability to participate in the EIS.
- GN-example: kind of hypothetical as some information may be a sensitive topic, used CLEY as an example. Some archaeological information is sensitive. If any confidential information that proponent doesn’t want in the public realm, up to the company to decide what is more private and more public.
- AEM-some topics are very transparent and some aren’t. Is it disclosure to the government and public? Some topics aren’t as transparent. There are some payments made to NTI or KIA, if we are to release this information, we would need permission from NTI or KIA. You can never get the complete full picture, because it is different with each organization. NTI and KIA have confidential figures. We don’t want the communities to feel left out and we don’t want to have politics getting mixed into an EIS.
- NIRB- we are on the same line. The Board does not want EA to go into a political discussion and use EA as the proxy for these political discussions. The NIRB would work with DIOs to agree on what information should be made available for the public. For AAs need to be specific when requesting, when you are requesting info, make sure it is specific.
- The NIRB will also look into the validity of taxation and other issues discussed as part of the guidelines as they currently stand.

**BREAK – 10:00**

- NIRB-what is required to be in the DEIS regarding taxation. Need some clarity on what is reasonable and what is required for the GN to evaluate. Want information to be useful to the EA.
- GN-clarification and relevance on the requirement for taxation. Baffinland had in the Mitigation. An example given where an impact identified to health care provision and mitigation would receive revenue and that would offset the impacts. If things fall to GN to respond, we need two things1. Clear understanding on what the proponent believes they are giving the GN (how the revenue that they are providing is used). And 2. An understanding of the projects so that a response can be made accordingly.
- AEM-concern is page 36-one of the VSEC's benefits royalties and taxation, if we actually do this, it leads to politics, we are looking at mitigation and don't think it is appropriate for the section that it is mentioned. Concern that tax and benefits are not an actual VEC's some of the public expect to see a system like in Alaska. Yes we do see that our project shall have some social economic impacts, but it not appropriate for the proponent to make sure that the governments are actually paying for the services required from the social needs developed from the Project. It is up to government (GN or Gov. of Can) to do the right thing. The governance and leadership, it isn't appropriate to speak to government style in an EIS. Maybe we don't understand what information is being looked for.
- NIRB-a big part of what gets in to the EIS Guidelines, the NIRB has a role in picking what is important to keep in the EIS Guidelines. In order to understand potential impacts of your project, an understanding of the schemes of how things work. if the company is saying that the company will bring in more people to Rankin Inlet. This will likely mean more housing is required, you would be correct in saying this is the GN's responsibility and we provide various taxes to GN that would offset the costs. What the GN requires is a quantification they need to be able to say that is enough. We all need to be able to look at something and make sure it is enough. VSECs the label that has happened is that what effects will we see and what will change in these areas.
- GN-gives us the ability to quantify, want a level of understanding of the project. A level of detail is why our comments were so extensive. They may not be required to go into guidelines, but with this information we can quantify the revenue coming in. We don't want to compete with other agencies and then sort out what mitigation, ensure it is feasible and practical GN is required and need to follow the mandates. We need to understand what the project is, what impacts and what increased revenue may come in then provide information to the decision makers with the right level of understanding ad then they can make informed decisions about what going on in an area.
- AEM-in principle this makes sense like for payroll, fuel. But my concern is addressing this as a VSEC. Also understand that can put information into project but just not as a VSEC



- GN-mitigation has been offered, due to the increasing revenue to the GN, there were struggles in the past to understand social cost, and to understand the mitigation or cost to the GN to response to that. GN needs a good understanding of what going on with project
- AEM-what do you mean on the Mitigation part? What would you expect a proponent to give if it isn't us who implements Government programs.
- GN-previous experience, another proponent has identified a specific impact/ cost to a social cost that the GN is responsible for and gave a cost. We need to be confident in the cost that is quoted so we can address what the social need or cost is
- NIRB-When you are the Proponent side, we recognize that this activity increases a negative social impact, e.g., need for social housing. It is understood that the proponent recognizes that this impact could exists, however they feel this would be offset by some of the revenue coming and the government needs to be able to be able to see if this is reasonable or quantify that by the projected monies that will be paid to the GN, and they can offset and mitigate the impacts by the monies sent to the GN. It is the expectation of the proponent that they set out enough information so that an understanding of the proposed project can be made by all readers. It may also be something that could be set out in the IIBA, it could be a program that is complimentary to what the GN may already have a program for.
- AEM-in past experiences, there is kind of a line that the RIA will not put monies into if they know what the GN already has programs running for. AEM sympathizes with this line that monies do not pass to Gov., these monies stay with RIA, but in the end it is not the role of the Proponent to tell the government what to do with the monies once it passes from them to the GN. Best if maybe we just stick to identifying the issues that may arise for the project. It isn't up to a proponent to tell the GN how much money will be available to deal with this. We need to balance the line of not treading on others. Also can use Meadowbank experience.
- GN-if crime used as example and need of policing. And that would bring in the GN and there may be an increase of cost. Would this be the best level of information that we will have.
- AEM-Want to be transparent and want to explain the project the best way possible, but not sure proponents place to say how GN money can be used as mitigation. The proponent needs to stick to things that they themselves can mitigate or justify in an EIS. At some point it becomes the decision of the government to enforce the mitigation measures for social issues that rise as a result of the Project.
- NIRB-There needs to be a line drawn by the AA's that define what is required in the EIS, and ultimately it is the AA's decision to accept or deny the EIS as submitted. The EIS may not be the place where all issues get resolved. The Board will ensure to have information within its mandate. It is not the Board's job to resolve all the residual effects.

- NIRB-Everyone recognizing has to be presented, whether or not it is treated a VSEC. Other sections of the Guidelines that tie the Benefits, Royalties and Taxation need to be discussed in the EIS, as a VSEC the best way that the EIS needs to deal with, not sure the EIS is right place. Residual Effects, VSEC's simply the identification if proponent can ID these items then need to be identified. Baseline information is needed, taxation structures. A proponent definitely needed to explain the socio-economic component, just is it required to be in EA? Governance and leadership is the same. The results may not have been useful yet as to how this information contributes to the EIS.
- GN-they are looking for the info to understand the project, and what the company understands of the project. We would be satisfied with getting that information, if there is consideration into this information.
- AEM-our guilt, we are thin skin thinking we have to "fix everything" and not everything can be fixed there are positive and negative ways to that as the proponent.
- NIRB-there is an assessment process, then there should be a separate discussion between the proponent and the AA outside of the EIA.
- GN-our comments were on getting more information than we have in the past. Maybe it is outside an EIS, the info that was requested however, is part of the project and still needs to be included somehow.
- NIRB- taxation as a VSEC will be withdrawn, specific info that the GN desires, the NIRB will attempt to get this information in the DEIS, and the information that the GN wants is well defined, and the NIRB can commit to changing how this information is dealt with.
- KIA-Financial portion of the project, I don't see how the number taxation is not part of the VSEC, some of the financial portions not an important part of the EIS. I am not sure how we can use these numbers as part of an EIS. The number can be put in for the GN and may only be important to proponent and GN.

#### 11:00 **Marine Shipping: Section 6.6**

- AEM-Meadowbank we are going to be using commercial shipping, the need for baseline information on the whole shipping route and we have no control over the shipping route. We feel this is outside the scope of our project. We have no intention to ship off season. 6 additional ships a year for dry cargo, and 2 additional ships for fuel. This will be a contracted out. Worried that this was way beyond what AEM could provide, e.g., ballast, baseline info
- AEM-concerns are related to defining the level of detail, in light of what being proposed in the project description, we are proposing the same shipping routes as used in history. There are examples under section 8.1.13, gives details in baseline info. Some of the issues relate to the wording. We have questions on the level of detail, are the words relating to shipping, or the full

shipping route. Have questions on level of detail. In some cases may be more appropriate to refer to individual ships. Bathymetry along whole route, but this is an existing route. Shore birds? Along the full shipping route? Or where ships come from?

- NIRB- few of the items, the potential for ice breaking, requiring an explicit statement that there will be no ice breaking is sufficient. Not enough info in the project description to say that there will be none for sure. So this could be as simple as confirming that no winter shipping will happen.
- DFO-the amount of marine shipping traffic that is coming into Rankin Inlet now, and what amount would be associated with the Meliadine project? It would help put things in perspective
- AEM-I don't think I know the precise number, but must also look at the shipping from Churchill, and all projects that have shipping associated with them. It is not an insignificant portion of the shipping, want to say is that we are increasing but must note that not creating new routes. The shipping 40,000T of dry cargo for Meliadine (peak at 45,000 T during construction), 100,000L of fuel. These numbers are based on Meadowbank.
- AEM-what we expect at Meliadine, is the same as what we have at Meadowbank, End of July to beginning of Nov. Like I said we will not be ice breaking, we will only ship during ice free season. What is the definition of the "shipping route"? Where does it start and where does it end? It is not AEM that decides the route, it is the contractor that decides the route that is taken
- DFO-you said there is 6 shipments of cargo, and 2 fuel, will it be higher during construction as opposed to operations? We think we add two more ships during construction.
- AEM – will likely need two more ships during construction, we think we will need 8 ships for dry goods plus 2 fuel.
- NIRB-from the Board perspective, we have to look at the full impact including shipping. Everyone does want to be reasonable. Looking at effects to the region for this project. It may not be a substantial component of the project is that in needing to understand the shipping for this project, we have to look at other ongoing reviews, we have to consider cumulative effects in addition to the other ongoing reviews. We look to the proponent to work with the NIRB on these cumulative effects, together we need to find a reasonable level of information.
- AEM-8.1.13.2 impact assessment. AEM needs to understand the extent of the study area to fulfill that section. Is it the entire shipping route? The guidelines could be clarified or a little more specific on the info including the definition of areas. Focus on what we need and keep us on schedule as well so we can provide information required.
- EC-LSA or NU study area. WE would look at how the habitat and Hudson Bay and Strait, EC has a map that displays all the sensitive areas for wildlife, will there be impacts to the areas, want to

know that you looked at this map and know to look at the risk to this area. If there are impacts by shipping in these shipping areas, then want to know mitigation for such things as spills.

- AEM-we will not hire a contractor until there is a go ahead for the Project. They cannot provide the shipping information as the shipper is not hired yet. We will make sure that the shipper will follow all regulations. We cannot give all information that the EIS guideline are requesting.
- NIRB-understand where this issue comes from, from a regulators perspective. The potential for impacts from shipping, those can be hard to quantify but the AAs that what is put on you is can be carried through to your contractors. Where can we find the middle ground and parties need and understanding, so what can we do to make sure a lot of issues aren't outstanding issues left over.
- EC-it has been mentioned several times that this is a specific and known shipping route. There is an expectation that there is a general shipping route that most follow and that should be.
- AEM-wouldn't you as a AA, tell TC to tell proponents to avoid areas? Hasn't this work already been done when the carriers get their authorization?
- EC - not sure how much interaction between the EC and TC have to take back to the agency.
- NIRB-TC does not dictate to shipping companies where and where not their vessels are allowed to go. The proponent can likely get information from shippers as to the general shipping routes as well as the GN. Understanding the routes isn't something that can be difficult to find out. The Board will be reconsidering what level of info requirements will be for the EIS. What would meet EC's requirements for what issues can be addressed. What would meet the expectations of EC as a reviewer?
- AEM-So the route would start at Hudson's straight to Rankin Inlet? We can use as the general shipping/impact zone?
- EC-yes
- AEM-we can use info from the current shipper, to give a general idea of the info for the EIS, our baseline info is based strictly on the LSA or within Rankin. The shipping companies have yet to have bathymetry for their routes as well so it is hard. WE didn't expect the information that is asked for in the guidelines
- DFO-feel it is important to have the shipping info included, for transparency sake. Shows that the impact was looked into, was discussed and included. Cumulative effect aspect of things is important. It is important to note these things and put things in perspective.
- GN-would like to echo DFO, it is important for Cumulative Effects, for the marine shipping.

- AANDC-we also wanted to echo DFO as well, there needs to be enough baseline info to make a Cumulative Effects assessment/review. What is effect of the number ships to be added, in comparison to the amount of ships that are already using the route now.
- AEM-page 60-have issue with what was written for sediment transport and wake effects. We want a discussion around what the expectations of what is written and where and to what degree are we to discuss these many issues written here.
- NIRB-some of the information requirements, should reasonably be toned down. A lot of the information requirements are from Mary River, I do agree that this could be toned down and adjust expectations around this. Right now, the comments I am hearing, just needing to understand the context of Cumulative Effects. Meliadine shipping effects are much slimmer on an individual scale, but must consider the Cumulative Effects with all other projects. All need to recognize that shipping in NU is different than anywhere else. Shipping/its impacts are not well understood. Remember context of everything and all of the developments going on in NU, we all need to understand/agree on what Level of detail is required.
- KIA-experience we have due to research on Meadowbank, we spent a year and half trying to find out who is responsible for Navigable water. We hit a wall in the shipping act. Ships are to be inspected prior to departure, then once underway then companies responsibility. To move forward we need to
  - 1. Put Mary river away, it is a project that has a new shipping route, year round, huge mine.
  - 2. Need to concentrate on what we have today, from Meadowbank, what we have learned today, what is missing and what we need for we would like to concentrate on the impacts in the regional area. I.e., we were missing information like in specific areas (around Chesterfield Inlet). Impacts on hunters, and all those traditional areas that may be impacted by the Project, potentially even part of the VECs. For the CE part, we need to collect that, but the transboundary area, someone has to take the authority. Who to pay for the baseline for animals that move. Hudson Bay a large area, there is information out there and we have a lot and can make it available. Do a general comprehensive study and then do a gap analysis later on in this case EC and GN will interact to see what is required.
- AEM-the discussion we just had about marine would also apply to air shipping as we are using Rankin Inlet airport. We do understand that we will have to discuss this, but just as a heads up, there will definitely be a lot of the same answers as marine shipping.
- NIRB-when something has been included and in some cases it because guidelines are becoming more standardized and in other cases your project description may not have been enough to say that this activity won't happen, stating that if there is no need to build or construct. Simply stating that in your DEIS that certain activities will not be happening will suffice for the NIRB's

review. Also focus on Nunavut, this is the only chance for Boards and AAs to get comfortable with what is being presented.

- AEM-we agree with you totally on understanding the Cumulative Effects, the guidelines will focus on project activities specifically for this Project, and we want to clarify/understand what it is that we are to collect other baseline data. We want to understand the expectation of what information we are expected to collect. Is it enough to rely on existing information or is it expected that the proponent will need to collect additional information?
- KIA-when we look at the study area, we would increase the amount of information that is available. Look at the impacts to the areas that overlap where locals hunters would overlap with the shipping route like Marble Island or closer to the communities where it may impact local hunters or users of these areas. Can define once get into Itivia harbour as well.
- DFO-for a lot of this information, a literature review would probably give info for that baseline data. E.g., bathymetric data should be available to use or much of it. But sensitive habitat and other info should be available. Traditional knowledge is also something that can have a lit review as well.
- AEM-we believe so as well, but we just want to clarify that there is no expectation that we will be going out to collect more info. We want to clarify expectations. We want to know do you want us to collect more information outside of what is readily available.
- DFO-marine wildlife, my thought is that there should be enough info out there that you would develop a good mitigation plan, i.e., based on SARA and COSEWIC. Once things are putting into perspective, we may have a few of our answers as well and some information requirements could become more general. If not, then need more information.
- AEM-where are going with the idea of getting information on the last point under marine wildlife shipping. Read quote - first point on page 61 where do we stop and how do we identify this information like how much do people eat seals.
- DFO-through TK, and lit review will get you started and then you would know if you need to gather more information. Use this to start your process.
- AEM-so do we do this for all the routes in Hudson Bay. no baseline work done on contaminant levels in seal and walruses, nothing done locally at the moment, globally there might be information available.
- DFO – if contaminate loading becomes an issue then it should be dealt with, then go deeper than what is available.
- NIRB-got to be kept in mind, the guidelines are structured to be comprehensive, in that they are around 100 pages long, speaks to any and all possible circumstances for the project. Some may not be relevant, but more difficult for the AAs to decide what is relevant or not than the

Proponent. And a Proponent wants as much certainty as they can, but as DFO pointed out that without understanding the context of things like shipping that we the AAs can't make this determination. It is important to know, if there is a gap in baseline then the proponent identifies it. It is up to the proponent to decide what is required and to be realistic.

- AEM-We understand that but we have a schedule, we need to know what information needs to be collected, or it will delay the project and may not advance at a feasible rate. If we are told that if we don't have enough in the DEIS then there will be enough of a delay that we will not be able to ever do this project. The north is a hard place to collect data, we are scared that we will hear that there isn't enough data and not a sufficient DEIS. We don't want a delay of two years if we don't have enough in the DEIS.
- NIRB- it is clear that the guidelines are presented, does not tell you that the Review must stop so you can continue your baseline collection while the Review still moves ahead. The proponent identifies what information then how it will mitigate the risk. AAs need to flag the risks or topics based on what the project description that you presented, right now realistically we don't know what you have. We can try to make things clear, you knowing what you know can tell us where your gaps are and tell us where you want increased clarity. The guidelines are meant to be able to address things to a reasonable degree within the bounds of the precautionary principle.

#### 12:02-13:10-Lunch

NIRB- we discussed baseline before lunch, but one comment we Section 7.3 that is the approval of the 12.10.2 then the baseline conditions would change and that the request for baseline would need to take this into account.

- AANDC-we noticed that exploration and baseline conditions and if the phase 1 was approved then this would change the baseline.
- AEM-I don't understand the implication of that. Just to clarify if we have the authorization from NIRB to do the Phase 1 and licence B for phase 1. If we get the authorization for the Phase 2, we don't understand what you mean by that (mean by asking for clarification)
- AANDC- it has to do with timing of the collection of baseline information. If collection is ongoing and as road was constructed than may see some overlap or impact during construction.
- AEM- the majority of the baseline is done, we don't think we have other baseline to do. The mini EIS that went in for the Phase 1 Road and the base will be the same width, we have to include for the expansion of the Road in further phases. There wouldn't be new baseline for the expansion, as it not a new activity but an expansion.
- NIRB- there are 2 scenarios. If Phase 1 is approved, then the EIS the baseline data has now changed as the Phase 1 and baseline is now a pre-disturbed state, there would be a different treatment of the area in the EIS. The area is either pristine or disturbed baseline and needs to be dealt with as such.

- AANDC-yes, that provides clarification. I understand that the baseline info for Phase 2 is also inclusive of Phase 1.
- AEM-we don't think we need baseline for the road. We don't think we need more baseline. E.g., vegetation: if phase 1 is approved, that info for phase 2 will become the "new baseline"
- NIRB- that is where I was coming at it. The current baseline has supported your road. As soon as that changes like if Phase 1 approved, then next phase, you have a disturbed state as Phase 1 is already there.
- KIA- during the community consultation of the road, we wanted baseline for the whole road. On top of that we asked the proponent to keep a monitoring program to watch the changes. All of the components have been looked at. KIA already has a deposit for the road and has a reclamation plan in place.
- NIRB-more a reminder at this point that if Phase 1 does not go ahead the baseline is in a pristine condition.
- AEM-however there may be gaps identified if literature is used for baseline information. Want to get AAs to potentially review to get a timely review of the baseline before going into the more detailed assessment and whether the info is sufficient for the DEIS. My question is whether the AA's find the information is sufficient.
- DFO-agreeable and fair and we are not certain of what information is out there.
- EC-would support a review of the baseline data as a lot of gaps that in the data and support baseline data collection and potentially if identified early then can maybe still work in the time available.
- AANDC- where relevant, can work with the Proponent on data collection methods
- GN-support baseline review, but do reiterate we will need time as we need schedule time with our experts.
- KIA-no problem to participate and collaborate with collection of baseline
- NIRB – NIRB the guidelines is our clarification and we can help answer questions as the NWB will likely do as well.

*End 13:25* **Baseline Information:**

*13:25* **VEC's and VSEC's section 7.6 and 8.1**

- NIRB – open the floor for discussion



- AEM-in the guidelines it says what will be included and the list is quite extensive, and may be overboard. Information in these items needed to be included, but are they in fact VEC's? A number that comes to mind right away, why is permafrost an important VEC.
- NIRB- From experience it is it has been treated as a VEC for maintaining permafrost integrity (i.e., shoreline structure, structure stability). Usually NRCan that brings this one up. Can you describe another one?
- AEM-Seabirds? How is this a VEC's or vitally important as it is an inland project, not too much relation to the Meliadine project as this doesn't touch the sea very much.
- EC- although it is inland, shipping cannot be excluded as an integral part of the project.
- AEM- everything is important, but we should focus on the VEC's based on some logic, rather than the way that this going now (maybe a full bathtub approach), seems that it is getting out of hand and we are including everything we need logic. E.g., Polar Bears, we are inland and have had one encounter with Polar Bear, and is it really necessary. Caribou yes we can understand this but polar bears. This list is a prescribed list and is it really helping?
- AANDC-VEC's VSEC's how else would you address these if they are not considered as VEC or VSEC. I see this as an indicator. So how is the project going to impact on these indicators and how can we come up with mitigation. If you are asking to remove these, how can we address these then. How are these to be integrated into the EIS.
- AEM-we believe that still have to be address, but are they vital important? E.g. Seabirds? Are they so important that they have to addressed as a VEC?
- KIA-Meadowbank e.g., the list for terrestrial was 61 species. Don't' you need to document all of the animals that you see and then pick from the list. You need to identify everything. Are you asking for a priority list and non-priority list?
- NIRB- Clarify that there are indicators for the determination of this list. When you have a long list of important species, the same amount of detail for each species is not necessarily the same. There is guidance with this list.
- AEM-having this list (VEC or VSEC) it requires AEM to have baseline, impact and monitoring. You make this a VEC or a VSEC because it is important.
- NIRB-I disagree, e.g., permafrost and ground stability: The inclusion of permafrost, makes sense. Need to show how things are going to stay the same and how the project will impact and see mitigation. E.g., Seabirds, may not be a VEC, but the list as a whole not seeing a lot that aren't very relevant.

- AANDC- I understand that the items may not seem relevant to you about the project, but note that a lot of this information is included from public consultation. The proponent may not see it as important but the feedback from the communities, this information is important.
- AEM-items that are brought up in community consultation, we are wondering about what is important or not important.
- KIA-based on your experience from Meadowbank, is there is a list of VEC or VSEC's that you can choose from? Or do you have a wish list of VECs or VSECs?
- AEM-don't think that there is a formal list but something we are working on. E.g., Fish: is all fish a VEC? Or could we use a representative, i.e. Char instead of 9 spined stickleback? Could greyling or arctic char be used for all species.
- DFO-the specific wording was used for a purpose, this gives the proponent the opportunity to choose the fish that could be a VEC's. Select fish that would be appropriate. One that I would offer up for removal, aquatic macrophytes. There may not be a strong presence in the project area. And the fish present in the area do not use it in their life histories.
- KIA-we want to look at cumulative impacts. You have Meadowbank and while there will be a different amount of each species for each, but because it may not appear often, the mammal still exists, and may possibly be in the area. You need to pick species that are found in the area. People don't look for things because they aren't on a list.
- AEM-it's not because it's not a VEC or VSEC, the impact assessment looks at many of these items and there are many ways that they can be looked at it's still going to be included.
- NIRB-the specific items in this list, they are not arbitrary in nature, some of these items are from scoping and specific mandates from departments, and they are required to look at. When they are looked at, the level of detail may be prescribed, but if there aren't any project interactions, then the VSEC or VEC can be very straight forward to deal with. If we look at polar bears, can go through and lay things out and you can put whatever is your analysis and if it was a likely not but maybe you still need mitigation if it does happen.
- AANDC- I agree that VEC and VSEC's will require different level of analysis, I am curious to know. There are other ways to analyse these when they are not VEC and VSEC's. How does this methodology work?
- AEM-when you come up with the significance of the impact, one input is the value to the component, with a value level, or low or high. Your significance will change depending on the value of the VEC or VSEC. The significance changes based on low, med or high and then there will be a different mitigation for each and then how it dealt with.
- AANDC-I agree with the analysis, I feel that's what you would do for a VEC or VSEC anyway? Is that something you point out for a VEC or VSEC even if you didn't call it that?

- NIRB-so if you picked up something that isn't on the list, e.g., foxes: are not on the list, if we aren't expected to have an impact on a polar bear as compared to a fox, but if there is any outside chance that there is an impact on polar bear it would have a higher significance than on a fox. There are reasons that these items are considered a VEC or VSEC the perceived significance. I am having a difficulty as to what items you are having issues with being in the EIS Guidance and what clarity we can provide.
- AEM-I don't think so. If we can look at VSEC or VEC and we don't have to write very much on them then I don't think we will have trouble looking at each of these VEC or VSEC if there. The relevance on the term significance is an aspect on evaluating the significance. What do we do if we don't see something on the list, if we make it an all-encompassing list, all the additional steps that come after the VEC or VSEC makes the list. There are other reasons why this is being asked. What we are trying to communicate is to make sure what on the list makes the criteria for a VEC or VSEC. We have to justify the reason for considering for a VEC or VSEC once they make the list, there is additional effort once they make this list.
- EC-a bit more justification on Polar Bears, they are now on the Species at Risk act and there is actual legislation must be taken into consideration must be given
- GN- DoE –our mandate has a strong component to Polar Bears, the department has dealt with bears in this community, and the bears can range inland up to 150km and just because you are further inland doesn't mean that it can't happen. So want to make sure take into consideration problem bears.
- KIA-how far away is the list from your studies that is available? What is dominant and what not dominant. Is this a realistic expectation?
- NIRB-we are approaching from a different angle, it has been brought up that what not on list going to be handled differently this list is a minimum requirement. What you may have other than the list is extra. The list is a standard; this is what you should be looking at during this assessment. This is your starting point and the steps forward
- AEM-I think we should move on from this item, we are not communicating well the goal of what we wanted. My point was your falling to a trap that as an AA, you are broadening the idea of the VEC and VSEC and we are broadening things, creep is occurring. We were not coming to remove from a list, instead we were asking how VEC and VSEC's are chosen. There is a misunderstanding that we want things removed, we don't we want to understand how things get added.
- NIRB-if you go through the list and you don't find value for what is on the list, then we will look at removing from the list. Given the holistic approach of assessment, the list hasn't really grown, but became firmer. I agree that we should move on.

- GN-inclusion of crime and housing. The GN was looking from their mandate, how could the project effect crime and housing and the causes by mobility and changes from the project.
- AANDC- in combination with GN crime and housing are something that will be occurring, in terms of the taxation what are the big components that also affect the way that AANDC. It is also important for us to understand where things are coming from as well.
- NIRB-Generally, as an EA I would not consider crime a VSEC, it is more under the direction of the individual and community well-being. Crime are an indicator of community health. Housing is a good indicator of infrastructure.
- GN-crime is an indicator for the community wellbeing as the overall infrastructure VEC
- AEM-what is meant by community infrastructure and public service? Why are we being asked to go beyond the Kivalliq region? And public service, can someone clarify this for us? Page 36
- AANDC – increased demand on the increased services required.
- NIRB-Medevac, counselling, health centre. Services to the Public, rather than the public service sector. Soft infrastructure and hard infrastructure.
- AEM-services required by the public sector rather than the public service.

---

### **Air Quality**

- AEM - we want clarification on the collection of existing baseline information. Or our using of pristine conditions for air quality. The guidelines speak to data collection rather than assume pristine conditions.
- EC-we would appreciate dust monitoring as a minimum, before construction of the road.
- AEM-why?
- EC-this is coming from my experts, we looked at the EIS guidelines, you are assuming that baseline for dust is zero.
- AEM- we are using the precautionary principle. Is it important to know what the levels of dust are presently there?
- EC-you will use data from other areas, fine for most contaminants but in terms of particulates very location and topography dependant and then use that as a baseline for the region.
- AEM-there is a baseline data collection for “pristine” conditions at Darling Lake in NWT and near an esker. We are considering the middle area pristine. We are willing to use the number 0 as baseline, and we accept the liability of saying there is NO dust there it is considered pristine. Near town you will see an increase, but we do not see anything to gain by collecting data.

- EC – accepting the risk if levels are higher?
- NIRB- it becomes more problematic when you have a high level of contamination. There is room to say that it was NOT AEM that added this contamination. Clarification that where is EC is coming from. We are looking in the future when look at impacts and when look at what natural and what can't be mitigated and then there may be an issue
- EC-seems it would be in your benefit to have the baseline information to future purposes
- AEM-it is definitely not going to be zero, but there is nothing visible to the eye. We are accepting the fact that is "pristine". And data does show that there are some particulates. Right now along the road on an eyeball perspective that this area is in pristine condition. We are willing to take the risk.
- EC-if you use darling lake it is recommended that you speak to the expert to make sure it is a good comparison and you want the best, is there a hesitation to collect the data?
- AEM- if we do dust fall, for now we want to do out impact assessment with the pristine. We are not ready to do PM 2.5 and PM 10. For this you need power, cannot do it in winter. Dust fall is easy. The guideline talks about dust only.
- EC-we are just asking what the sources are. We recommended airborne dust quantities. We were not recommending the specific particulates.
- NIRB-this specific point comes from Meadowbank, monitoring stations didn't get installed when they should have. Some of our motivations are past experiences, which makes it more sensitive to the Board.
- AEM-the reason behind that, the equipment is purchased, but the equipment needs power and proper citing also lots of cabling. But how do you do it when you don't have to capacity to power the stations. The equipment is still sitting at Meadowbank. Good clarification from EC and we can definitely do dust fall for baseline.
- NIRB – can we note that will we revisit the guidelines?

#### **14:20 Climate Change:**

- AEM-the concern that was raised had to do with the range of climate scenarios. We were looking at take the guidance and worst case scenario. We did select IBCC? There is a large range of scenarios, why can't one be enough like the Worst case scenario. How do we tackle that requirement? And "climate change" is found out throughout the EIS guidelines. Want to understand also, why must we include that? Also want to understand the sea ice, subsidence and all this information.

- NIRB-the way the guidelines are written that if a factor is not relevant, then it will not be required to be discussed in detail. Similar to having multiple scenarios does not mean infinite scenarios. Use the resources you have to help you evaluate things as best you can. If sea ice conditions are not going to affect your project, you won't have to do a full impact on sea ice conditions. This is a standard guideline and not the explicit intent.
- AEM-multiple scenario, why is the worst case scenario not sufficient? One scenario was good enough for Meadowbank, why is it not enough now?
- NIRB-refer to cited literature in the guideline. It's not just about the best guess, or best fit. Having multiple scenarios is better than just thinking the worst.
- AEM – not talking about a project that very long, need to think about things that could last longer like tailings dams, don't you want to go to the guidance from EC, why do multiple cases, and why not just the worst case? What will be done with the information?
- NIRB-there are benefits to both worst case (looking at a cautious approach) and multiple scenario benefits to both. It depends on the risk as to what scenario the best, Best guess is not always the most appropriate
- AEM-I don't understand what more needs to be done. We are building something for the life of the mine. And only the tailings will stay at the end, so what will be gained by doing this as infrastructure is there for the life of the mine
- NIRB-this is to be applied where relevant. There needs to be some cursory examination to see if this is true and see where the information. This is generalized guidance.
- AEM-Acceptable, to us the road is not being built like a highway elsewhere; we are building a road to last 25 to 50 years. If the road settles because of some thawing then we would repair.
- NIRB – understand the applicability.
- AANDC-justification on why a section was not included. Would make it easier when the reviewer is working to "accept or decline" the DEIS need to understand what the proponent was thinking. In the concordance table if you believe something isn't relevant, then put justification there and then we can agree on rational
- AEM- We agree and were stuck on a topic we didn't understand. We can give the justification and that isn't an issue. If it is in the guideline then we have to talk about it. If we can remove something now then we can have less to worry about.
- AANDC-it will help for reviewers to understand what you think is relevant to your project is project specific
- AEM-it is a general guideline and not specific to the Meliadine project.

- NIRB-to tie things together 7.10 is a general and explanation of what the expectation. I think we are all on the same general page. Those specific bullets you can speak to, we will be revisiting other sections but we won't necessarily remove items. We feel this is generalized and we need a proponent to say when not relevant.
- AEM-climate change was used and why? Page 57. Impact assessment: terrestrial wildlife and habitat, doing direct and indirect impacts to wildlife, we wonder why there would be a direct and indirect assessment on wildlife and climate change.
- EC-agreed that you have no control over that, wildlife will adapt and not something that can be assessed.
- NIRB – so noted and will investigate it
- AEM-Monitoring Plans page 75: each of the plans “**shall** include effects of stability” I have a bit of trouble in time scales and with the word SHALL, why we need to talk about protect structures if used for a fixed period
- NIRB- Change “Shall” to “Should”. This is a broadly sweeping statement for plans. If it isn't relevant then not needed to speak about it.
- AEM-if it is shall, then we need to talk about in each monitoring plan
- AANDC-if there is something that is not relevant in the monitoring plans. There should be a statement somewhere to help that. It helps reviewers to not search through.
- AEM-EIS may be set up different than the “volume” approach, we still find way to present data. Finding a balance to keep those wholly eliminated sections easily findable.
- AANDC-the concordance table be the quick place to justify where/why a topic is missed/excluded.

## **Health Break**

### **Biophysical Environment and Impact Assessment:**

- NIRB-2 specific broad points and discussion would help proponent with some clarity
- GN-country food perspective: centred around they key wildlife that is used in harvesting, how it impact security to food, access to food and brought up at the community level.
- AANDC- similar to GN, a map that shows a significant number of cabins in the area of mine. Understanding impacts that could happen like contamination and what people see out their cabins. Caribou and fish were brought up

- AEM-my question is, we understand the importance of country food. Who in government right now is actually monitoring country food quality? In Doris North We designed the monitoring the food sources that the animals depend on (pathway assessment). We monitored food sources and to actually monitor the contaminants in actual country food.
- GN-we are monitoring for Brucellosis, having a statement saying that your project will not contaminate would help a lot as assurance in the review. Health and Social services,
- AEM-the approach we should take, is where we focus on an ecological risk and mitigation assessment, this is our first line of defence. No baseline right now and we could monitor and not know what impact that we could have. Look at something similar to what was done for Doris North and monitor what food animals actually eat.
- GN-acceptable
- AANDC-as regulators we will have to have further discussions on who will be doing what?
- NIRB-We need to look at how these were looked at in our experience. Now onto inclusion of Marine Birds directed to EC overview of recommendation to the Board
- EC-was simply to be consistent to marine wildlife. A lot of the bullets from the marine section, we would like incorporated into the Birds Section. We asked that the bullets related to marine shipping for mammals, be applied also to Marine Birds.
- AEM-marine birds, we are looking at a literature search as with Marine mammals, as well as what available in other EIS's.
- NIRB-we had oversight in the original submission, and thought it would be brought up for clarification again.
- EC-the bullets that we were looking to be added related to impact assessment and marine birds and marine shipping. Would like to talk to CWS before the full answer is brought forward.
- NIRB- there is a point to be made that additional information required for on marine shipping. Don't want to be over onerous, but more so given direction to the Proponent supplies the information that AAs expect.
- EC-our expectation is marine birds be treated the same as marine wildlife.
- NIRB-we are looking for a certain level of information that would be required to be in the DEIS. Looking for more lines drawn around the specification and expectation that literature is sufficient for baseline information.
- EC – a lot of information should be available in literature research and use this as the starting point.



- NIRB – the proponent should identify any further information that may be required above what in lit review.
- AEM-I am concurrent with the same approach to marine birds as marine shipping, starting with literature as baseline. Hope that NIRB looks at Marine birds as a whole
- NIRB-the current draft of the guidelines are generalized from a lot of our other projects, but we can further define what is specific for the guidelines. Our goal at the end of the day is to help the Proponent produce a document that can satisfy all parties.
- KIA-we are fine with submissions that we put in and the Proponents response.
- GN-no more comments
- AANDC-clarify? Just the one section of the biophysical environment?. we are good
- EC-feel that a number of comments in first round not sure if comments incorporated and don't know where the changes, which not leaves me where I don't know where we stand.
- NIRB-Under the marine mammals, the title was changed to marine wildlife, the intention was to include birds. We will go through and make sure that we are clearer about where our changes are.
- DFO-8.1.12 birds and bird habitat, it would be more included with marine wildlife and not a stand-alone section.
- NIRB – we will need to see where inclusion of marine birds into marine wildlife.
- NIRB-we feel we can incorporate those comments, just not where in the actual document they will fit. Also the level of detail that will fulfill each section has been discussed. We will also see if we need to clarify things further.
- AEM-page 47- 8.4.1 baseline info and second last bullet, we want clarification on the need for geothermal and technical data of permafrost soils and rocks. What kind of information is being sought after? In situ stress on page 48 would also fall under this category and we would like clarity.
- NIRB – you want to know why this is in here?
- AEM – yes and if we are required to have this information what would you be looking for. We have collected information but you are looking for engineering properties more than the biophysical baseline
- KIA-agreeable, they do under design. And not so much study on biophysical design.

- NIRB-we typically generalized from the advice of NRCan and unfortunately they aren't here. We do want to make it clear of the expectation on that topic. May need to go to NRCan for more clarity.
- AEM-they are properties that will be required during the process, seems more appropriate to be an item at the water licencing stage or the FEIS stage.
- NIRB – look at what level of detail is required in the guidelines.
- AEM-related to greenhouse gas and trans-boundary page 45 second last bullet prior to new section. The way we interpreted this, we would be computing the total tonnage of greenhouse gases. Is the intent of this to take to final number and compare it to Canada? How does this relate to NU? To relate to Canada and such...what is the reason for your data.
- NIRB-providing context for the project itself. Significance of the emissions in relation to the general public and reviewers. In the past it has been address but giving a quantified number and putting against the numbers for Nunavut then Canada as a whole. Looking for a perspective on numbers. We have pristine conditions and need to put things in context, quantifying the contributions and putting against overall numbers.
- EC-that sounds about right. There is an inventory for Canada that is released 5 years.
- AEM-this is the only time to go to a "Canada" scale. If the information is readily available, why is it put on the Proponent to provide this information? Varying scale throughout the guidelines.
- EC-Having the comparison readily in the DEIS makes it easier for the public.
- NIRB- The big picture comes from government initiatives "does this really add to the GHG emission in Canada"
- AEM- It was not the trouble of including this information, but more so the reasoning to having it in to document, going to the national scale just seemed odd. AEM is working on this initiative and doesn't have a problem giving data.
- NIRB – may be of interest to lay person so I think we will be leaving this in.
- AEM-page 52-sediment deposition...can see the quality, specific reference to flow models and sediment models, I am not sure they added anything to visual observation. It is a potentially huge undertaking; sediment deposition is currently done visually. Is there a need to have flow models to describe this?
- NIRB-that is a standard guidelines, not specific to a comment that came from an AA, but more so the general NIRB guidelines.

- DFO-in terms of sediment deposition rates. In the instance where there are activities related to infrastructure, construction of dykes. Water management plan. Maybe looking at long term issues and what mitigation may be required.
- AEM-questioning this at the baseline stage, and should be more relevant at the later EA stage. Maybe included more where relevant than over all.
- NIRB-Agreed, should be moved to below section. And can also look at the wording “where relevant”
- NWB-for Jericho, DFO asked for these models and seems more of an assessment rather than a baseline.
- DFO-no like or dislike for the wording, no objection to moving from baseline to impact assessment.

#### **Socio-Economic Environment and Impact Assessment, section 8.2:**

- KIA-no comment at this time
- GN-we just look to the NIRB to consider the recommendations made in the comments.
- NIRB-is the NIRB hasn’t brought it up in the list for the Agenda, we do support the comments
- AANDC-no comments further than the ones brought up. There could be a perception of contamination for country food. We also included some other clarification in our comments and just wanted to make that clear.
- NIRB-most comments from AANDC will be incorporated. Question to AEM: there has been a suggested that an addition to the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet-on page 67 of the guidelines, the bullet added about perception of project on the communities and country foods. Who will be monitoring the perception?
- AEM-it is a problem to assess the perception or potential perception is very subjective; we are dealing with a very much “what-if” scenario. Could create just as much harm as good because very hypothetical but do realize that it is something that happens and it is real.
- AANDC-Noted about monitoring and perceptions maybe see if things are discussed in other forums such as the Nunavut General monitoring Program and a Regional Socio-economic Monitoring Committee (SEMC). We want to know there is a forum for these things.
- NIRB – we will note this and it is a valuable point.
- AEM-a classic example: perception that the marine mammals are gone from Chesterfield inlet. We have monitors but we are not having much interaction with animals in general.

- AANDC – want to hear interactions, need to think that this could be an issue and how are we going to deal with these things.
- NIRB-the proponent should speak in the EIS about how the project interacts with the VEC and VSEC's, and how they interact with each other. Wildlife could be seen as a VEC and a VSEC. This is something that AAs and reviews could be looking for
- AANDC – thanks that what looking for
- EC-No comments
- DFO-No Comments
- AEM-back to AANDC, page 69 8.2.10 five comments down: have asked to include the importation to include the influx of alcohol and drugs. There is no way we can collect this information
- GN does have the liquor board and illegal substances and the ability to rely on services
- AEM – how do we collect the information. I don't think we can get a good handle statistically saying what the increase in income will bring to communities.
- NIRB-is there anything more specific we are looking for like crime statistics
- GN-Liquor Enforcement Board, the illegal substances. Basically the end result of relying on the local RCMP to deal with increased rates of drugs and alcohol. If there could be a use of this service to address this issue and to incorporate into the assessment.
- AEM – where do we find the information you are looking for?
- GN-I believe the proponent is in a good position to give a general idea based on their other project in the area.
- AEM-we agree that the description is necessary. We see issues about how money is shared. A man can go home and have no money and this leads to employment not being a good thing for him. We have RCMP stats and know what is going on, but we don't have any statistical numbers. We can discuss on a descriptive.
- GN – want to see it as descriptive
- NIRB-Drawing on relevant monitoring experience we just want a good understanding on the project. Need clarity for the NIRB, trying to see
- GN – other jurisdictions may be able to provide information that may be of relevance to this situation and the issues.

- AEM – we agree, we just have to be careful not to preach the solution. We can present solutions.
- GN – look to see what information or lessons learned
- NIRB – want to see an understanding of these issues and impacts.
- AEM-the experience in Rankin Inlet will be a lot different than it was in Baker from Meadowbank. There are differences in the communities.
- AEM-Page 68: non-traditional land use: The concern is in the portion of the point where it describes us not proving any new access to the Park. We believe the first half is valid where we can describe how Phase 2 of the road and park will interact, but how do we handle the second part. Discussing capacity of the Park is not really an AEM issue, but more so a GN issue, that should not be discussed as an impact from Project.
- GN-what we are asking is in phase 2 the road will be accessible to the public therefore the park will be more accessible to ATV and such so we are looking for a discussion, what are you going to do to mitigate that.
- AEM-since the road has no connection to the Park, access to the Park is not going to be easier, as to get there now it would be snowmobile or atv and this can happen today. The road itself does not inherently increase accessibility to the park.
- NIRB – I am looking at this comment and it written in such that there will be increase to activities and how will proponent help. To GN is there something your looking for because there will be an increase? If there is an increase how the proponent will assist with park. I'm looking to see if this is appropriate.
- KIA-the Park already has an access road for several years RI has been maintaining with HTO to maintain the pristine area. The park has been impacted, but for traditional uses. I'm not sure how the road will impact the road.
- AEM-we will not allow any individual to build or use to easier access to the Park.
- GN- we did not mean that there will be an impact from the road and would be more than happy to work with you on any issues that arise from phase 2 of the road.
- AEM – concern that this would be a requirement. We are concerned about getting into the discussion about how the capacity/staff the park, we don't feel we have a role.
- NIRB-from NIRB's point, what would satisfy the GN as far as information required, a discussion around the public use of the AWR and increase public to the park. Discuss measures used to address these impacts/increases.

- AEM- small risk of the potential risk for access to the Park during summer/spring season. Anyone can access in the winter and only in first two KM. it is a very small area
- GN – we would agree with that
- AEM-8.2.10 diet page 69 4<sup>th</sup> bullet down: we are relying on published data, we will not be collecting data for this issue. We will rely on public data to address this issue.
- NIRB – are we OK with this statement
- GN-yes
- AANDC-yes

#### **Biophysical Environmental Plan 9.4:**

- AEM- we will do a No Net Loss Plan (NNLP), the plan will be included in the DEIS. There is a Section in the DEIS for No Net Loss and the Tailing Impoundment Area. WE do not believe we need two net loss plans, we will only prepare one with the Tailings impoundment area included in it.
- DFO-sure, the intent of the point was to prepare two separate documents under MMER. It is easier to refer to a standalone document.
- AEM-we realize that there are two separate document requirements. And will prepare it for Schedule 2 for DFO
- DFO – might be easier in the process, but two plans is not a requirement
- NIRB-a more comprehensive NNLP is easier for NIRB and Reviewers. Would that be acceptable for DFO?
- DFO-yes,
- AEM – we know this process exists, but for the EIS will not submit two plans. In the future we will do a separate plan.
- DFO – separation fine
- EC-we had in both comment letters, we have suggested an additional plan, to include a tailing management. plan.
- NIRB-yes, I think that was generally agreeable.
- AEM-Tailing management plan is included in the Waste Management plan.

- EC-I understand that there is an Ore Storage and Waste Rock Management Plan- is this where tailing management. Where will it be found?
- AEM-starting an interesting discussion on mining terminology and the definitions associated with the management plans. Mine wastes can include all wastes from food to sewage. A plan we will incorporate everything.
- EC-no waste mgmt. plan so far? There is a waste rock management plan
- KIA – page 76-80 risk management,
- AEM-we suggest to change 9.4.6 to “mine waste Management” and to include tailings Management and waste rock. Maybe further delineate to mine waste management plan rather than waste management plan.
- NIRB – 9.4.6 - We recognize two different streams so we are discussing the rename. Landfill has its own criteria. Mine waste – recognizing it includes
- EC – and you could also include tailings in the title, but as long as tailings included.
- NIRB – most proponents include their own name so we want some flexibility, we want clarity on what in the plans and AAs/readers can find the information that they want.

**16:35 OPEN CALL FOR LAST QUESTIONS**

- KIA-No questions
- GN-No comments/questions, we look forward to addressing any outstanding issues
- AANDC-No further concerns. How will TC’s submission be incorporated as they were unable to attend?
- NIRB-what is the question from TC specific to? A TC submission?
- AANDC – not official submission, just confirming that things are fine.
- NIRB – did proponent receive these comments?
- AEM-no communication from TC outside a meeting that we had with them.
- AANDC – not official comments.
- NIRB – at the staff level we were sent an email, but we will seek information on at a later time. We need some clarification outside of this meeting.
- EC-given the public concern for Schedule 2 MMER for tailings impoundment areas, make sure that the Proponent will take into consideration a thorough investigation of options.

- AEM-we started with 13 sites, and we have worked our way down to 4. We worked it through the guidance that has been given. We are very aware and are using our past knowledge.
- EC-we want to see alternatives and make sure that a lake is the best option.
- AEM-it would be very valuable to take EC and DFO through the process like we have with KIA to take you through our thought process. AEM-using Sept 2011 not 2008, need to change
- NIRB - noted
- DFO-no further comments. once more, we should have a little more discussion on marine shipping before the DEIS is submitted
- AEM-Thanks for participation!! EIS submission will not be March, it will going to be later in the Summer (June), may even make it to the Fall.

#### **NIRB Closing Remarks and Next Steps:**

- NIRB-comments are extremely useful for the Board, Guidelines still need some cleaning up.
- Still will present the Guidelines on the 16<sup>th</sup> and put to the Board for approval of EIS guidelines.
- NIRB's current approach to the Guidelines, currently around 100 pages. Since that time we have put a lot in the Guideline development process, it has worked to raise the bar on expectations of the EIS submission. Also to give the Proponent more specific guidelines on submitting a complete document
- We will be looking at standardizing the Guidelines as a new NIRB Guide. Need to undergo a consulting strategy. This is a heads up and we will be coming to you soon for comments.

#### **16:50 12.10.2 Questions**

- NIRB – we feel we have enough information to take to our Board and we are targeting the Feb Board meeting. The update I have is on timing. We are hoping that the Board will come to a decision. The Board had committed to coming up with a guide on the criteria and guidance on how to submit for this and we have a draft guide that has been created and we are hoping to circulate this for comment shortly. It will be a draft guide, but we will use it in the interim until finalized. I invite any questions around this while we are all in the same room.
- KIA-works very close with AEM, the Hamlet does not have GIS. I was an internal consultation within the community. Highlighted to the proponent the routing and we were able to get a good response from the community. In the last meeting with political officials we were directed to work together. I would say to NIRB that. We have an overhead cost for the consultation, we normally get funding back. Would like to make a comment that if in the future that if good



information is presented to you (NIRB), somehow work needs to be done so that participant funding (may not be the right word) is not pulled from smaller organizations, i.e., HTO's, Hamlets, at times KIA. We take what the community takes very seriously. Be cautious of what you are agreeing to in regards to the EIS guidelines. Participant funding people need to know how to apply and there should be funding available. KIA takes very seriously what the community has to say. Environment we take seriously in the Kivalliq.

- NIRB – there is always a lot of pains being the first thought the gate with the 12.10.2. There has been extra time in working through the process. Increasing the clarity of expectations would go a long ways. We will take to the Board.
- GN-we support the statements made by KIA, Consultation fatigue by all parties. We will reiterate the comments on 12.10.2 as we have previously submitted.
- AANDC-no further comments besides those already submitted
- EC-Clarity from the Board. After Feb 16 you will be issuing the Guidance document and a decision for Meliadine 12.10.2 and Mary River?
- NIRB-Putting Mary River aside, yes you are right on the timing of Meliadine 12.010.2 decision. Any determination that is made will be setting the precedent of any information received. Some of this criteria that in the guidance was communicated to the public in the various letter that were sent out and request for comments on these.
- EC-sounds kind of like putting the cart before the horse.
- NIRB- at the end of the day the Board is to decide under the NLCA. The Board will sit as a group and make a decision, the draft Guide is for the public use to see how these decisions are made, so this a step forward from the Board perspective.
- DFO-No comments
- AEM-we are basically waiting for the Boards decision.
- NIRB-We look forward to having the Board its determination, Guides, and guidelines this develops the process and gives another benchmark for the NIRB and for future projects. The Board appreciates the information it receives. On behalf on NIRB we would like to thank everyone for participating.

### **Closing Remarks:**

KIA-Thanks for bringing us together

GN-Echo that and thanks to all colleagues and follow reviewers

AANDC-thank you for everyone coming and we are more than open to have discussions on format of DEIS

EC-Thanks to the Board and everyone who came out, not always able to make it face to face. So it was nice.

DFO-good discussion and productive and hope it makes things easier on the review process. Thanks everyone

AEM-Thanks NIRB thanks for putting this on. 5 of us represent a major team that works on this EIS, thank you to the team. We are from a team of over Canada and with a staff of over 100 it is difficult to get a final decision. We are looking for innovative ways to make the EIS stick to 150 pages and how to structure it so it is easy to read and understand. We need some way to make it easier to deliver this document, i.e., e-reader, memory key. We know there has to be so many paper copies. Thank you and it has been a valuable session and will follow up as necessary and hope to stay this engaged with everyone.

NIRB-Thanks from both the NIRB and NWB, thanks to AEM for being engaged, thanks all parties for participating. Thanks to interpreters, Ryan and catering. Keep in touch with us and will be a very busy year, but I encourage communication so we can all stay on top of things.

**END 17:15 January 31, 2011**