



NIRB Public Scoping Meeting SUMMARY REPORT

for Part 5 Review of
Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation's
Mary River Project
(NIRB File No.: 08MN053)



June 2009
Nunavut Impact Review Board

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

1.0	Introduction	1
1.1	Outline of the Mary River Project	1
1.2	Brief File History	2
1.3	Objectives of NIRB Scoping Process	2
2.0	NIRB public scoping meetings	4
2.1	Overview of Public Scoping Meetings	4
2.2	Setup of NIRB Public Scoping Meetings	4
2.3	Meeting Materials	5
2.4	Agenda and Venues of Public Scoping Meetings	5
3.0	Summary of identified Issues	6
3.1	Alternative Shipping Route	6
3.1.1	East Coast of Baffin Island	7
3.1.2	Existing Nanisivik Sea Port	7
3.1.3	Milne Inlet	7
3.1.4	Open Water Shipping at Steensby Inlet	7
3.2	Ecosystem	8
3.2.1	Terrestrial Wildlife and Habitat	8
3.2.2	Marine Habitat and Marine Wildlife	10
3.2.3	Diversified Opinions regarding Impacts on Wildlife from the Project ...	12
3.2.4	Air Quality	12
3.2.5	Impacts from Noise and Vibrations	13
3.2.6	Marine Water and Fresh Water Quality	13
3.2.7	Vegetation	13
3.2.8	Human Health	13
3.2.9	Project Closure and Reclamation	14
3.3	Socio-Economic Environment	14

3.3.1	Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement (IIBA)	14
3.3.2	Benefits and Compensation for Other Jurisdictions.....	15
3.3.3	Economics	15
3.3.4	Training and Employment.....	15
3.3.5	Community and Individual Well-being.....	16
3.3.6	Land and Ice Use and Inuit Harvesting	16
3.3.7	Cultural and Heritage Site	17
3.4	Mary River Project Proposal	17
3.4.1	Baffinland and Community Relations	17
3.4.2	Concerns and Questions Regarding the Project Components	18
3.4.3	NIRB Process and Consultation	20
3.4.4	NPC and Related NBRLUP Issues.....	21
3.4.5	Other Issues	21

APPENDICES

Appendix A - Public Meeting Notice Materials

Appendix B - Meeting Notes

Appendix C - NIRB PowerPoint Presentation

Appendix D - NIRB Public Scoping Meeting Sign-In Sheets

TABLE OF PHOTOS

Photo 1: Public discussing the Mary River project in Pond Inlet.....	31
Photo 2: Meeting notes in Pond Inlet.....	35
Photo 3: Elder discussing caribou issues in Arctic Bay	39
Photo 4: Public Scoping meeting in Resolute.....	46
Photo 5: Public Scoping meeting in Grise Fiord.....	52
Photo 6: Public Scoping meeting in Igloolik	63
Photo 7: Youth participants at the Public Scoping meeting in Hall Beach.....	65
Photo 8: Public Scoping meeting in Coral Harbour	68
Photo 9: Public Scoping meeting in Cape Dorset	74
Photo 10: Public Scoping meeting in Kimmirut	77
Photo 11: Public Scoping meeting in Clyde River.....	80

Acknowledgments

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) would like to thank all those who participated in the recent public scoping meetings held in various communities in the Qikiqtani and Kivalliq regions of Nunavut, as part of the NIRB's review process of Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation's Mary River Iron Mine project proposal. The meetings were successful owing to the participation and assistance of local organizations, community members, Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation, government and non-governmental agencies. The NIRB especially thanks the many Elders who actively participated, sharing their concerns about the project and their knowledge about the region with the NIRB staff and other meeting participants.

The NIRB would also like to take this opportunity to thank all of the communities for the warm hospitality offered to the NIRB staff during their recent visits.

Sincerely,



Stephanie Autut

Executive Director, NIRB

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Outline of the Mary River Project

Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation's (Baffinland or the Proponent) proposed Mary River project (the Project) is located on Baffin Island, located approximately 160 kilometres south of Pond Inlet and 1000 km northwest of Iqaluit. This project involves the construction, operation, closure, and reclamation of an 18 million tonne-per-annum (Mt/a) open pit iron mine. High-grade iron ore will be mined and processed using conventional crushing and screening methods. A railway system will transport the ore approximately 143 kilometres from the mine site to an all-season deep-water port and ship loading facility at Steensby Inlet, where the ore will be loaded into ore carriers for overseas shipment through Foxe Basin and Hudson Strait. Year round shipping will be undertaken with a fleet of cape-sized ore carriers with the capacity to break ice, while additional non-icebreaking ore carriers and conventional ships will be used during the open water season.

The Project proposes the following major phases (as per Baffinland's March 2008 Project Description):

- 1) **Pre-construction staging:** March 2008 to April 2010 (anticipated)
- 2) **Construction phase:** 2010 to 2014
- 3) **Operation phase:** Anticipated to be 21 years, subject to additional exploration results
- 4) **Closure and reclamation phase:** Closure phase expected to be 3 years, followed by a minimum of 5 years of post-closure environmental monitoring

The proposed major project components and associated project activities include:

- 1) Iron ore mine at Mary River
- 2) Railway transportation of iron ore from Mary River mine site to Steensby Inlet all-season sea port
- 3) Open water shipping into Milne Inlet, through Eclipse Sound and Pond Inlet, via Baffin Bay and Davis Strait from southern Canada.
- 4) Transportation of supplies and materials from Milne Inlet via the Milne Inlet Tote Road to Mary River
- 5) Operation of all-season sea port at Steensby Inlet
- 6) Year round shipping (including ice breaking) at Steensby Inlet sea port through Foxe Basin and Hudson Strait to southern Canada and Europe
- 7) Air transportation

Public Scoping Meeting

8) Ongoing geotechnical exploration

All information pertaining to the Mary River Project proposal can be accessed from the NIRB's ftp site at the following link:

http://ftp.nirb.ca/REVIEWS/CURRENT_REVIEWS/08MN053-BAFFINLAND_MARY_RIVER/

1.2 Brief File History

On March 20, 2008 Baffinland submitted its Mary River project proposal to the NIRB, Nunavut Water Board and Nunavut Planning Commission. On April 30, 2008; the NIRB received a positive conformity determination from the Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC) for the Project in relation to the North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan (NBRLUP). The conformity determination also contained the provisions set forth in sections 3.5.11 and 3.5.12 of Appendix C of the NBRLUP, regarding the requirement for a joint public review by the NIRB and the NPC which would address the prospective transportation corridor proposed by the Project's railway routing and associated access roads.

The NIRB screened the Project in accordance with Part 4 of Article 12 of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NLCA), and on June 27, 2008 issued a screening decision to the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (the Minister), recommending a review under Part 5 or 6 of Article 12 of the NLCA. Pursuant to Section 12.4.7 of the NLCA, on February 11, 2009 the Minister referred the Project to the NIRB for a review of the ecosystemic and socio-economic impacts under Part 5 of Article 12 of the NLCA. On the same day, the NIRB distributed the Minister's letter and commenced the Part 5 Review of the Mary River Project.

1.3 Objectives of NIRB Scoping Process

Pursuant to the review process as set out in Article 12, Part 5 of NLCA, the NIRB will:

- Assess the ecosystemic and socio-economic impacts of proposed project;
- Gauge and define the extent the impacts will have on regions and communities; and
- Determine, on the basis of its review, whether the proposed Project should proceed, and if so, under what terms and conditions, and then report its determination to the Minister.

The first step in the NIRB's Part 5 Review process is to scope the Project proposal and the potential impacts associated with the development of the Project. Scoping is a process that identifies significant issues requiring study and analysis. This process

Public Scoping Meeting

aims to identify those components of the biophysical and/or socio-economic environment that may be impacted by the Project and/or for which there is public concern. The NIRB will solicit input from the Proponent and interested parties, including territorial and federal government departments, regional Inuit associations, and members of the public to determine:

- Which components of the Project to include in the Review;
- The temporal (time-related) and spatial (physical) boundaries of the Project;
- The issues and concerns to be considered in the Review including, but not limited to, those issues highlighted by the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada including:
 - Potential impacts related to ice breaking and shipping, and potential transboundary impacts as they relate to shipping;
 - Requirements for potential amendment to the NBRLUP, to be reviewed jointly by the NIRB and the NPC;
- Any other requirements for the assessment of the Project proposal.

Prior to the public scoping meetings, the NIRB drafted a preliminary scoping list for the Mary River Project, and requested that parties provide comments and discussion of the items contained therein, in order to facilitate the NIRB's scoping process.

The public scoping meetings held by the NIRB staff are an integral portion of the NIRB's review process. Through the public scoping meetings, the NIRB collected and categorized comments, concerns, and traditional and local knowledge received from members of the potentially affected communities, related to the project proposal. Issues raised at the public scoping meetings, combined with the input from other parties regarding NIRB's draft scoping list contribute to a complete Project scope.

Upon completion of the scoping process and in accordance with Section 12.5.2 of the NLCA, the NIRB shall issue project specific guidelines to the Proponent for its preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Project.

2.0 NIRB PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS

2.1 Overview of Public Scoping Meetings

The NIRB conducted public scoping meetings in eleven communities identified by the Board as being potentially impacted by the proposed Mary River Project. The public scoping meetings began on March 29, 2009 and were concluded on May 10, 2009. In addition to the NIRB staff, representatives of the following agencies were also in attendance at most meetings as observers:

- Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation (the Proponent): Mr. Derek Chub: Mr. Rod Cooper, Mr. Matthew Pickard and Mr. Shawn Mahoney
- Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC): Ms. Vicki Mark and Ms. Sarah Holzman
- The Government of Nunavut (GN): Ms. Martha Gibbons, Mr. Appitak Enuaraq, Ms. Rhoda Katsak
- The Nunavut Water Board (NWB); Mr. Don Carr:
- The Qikiqtani Inuit Association (QIA): Mr. Stephen Bathory

2.2 Setup of NIRB Public Scoping Meetings

To facilitate a better understanding of the Project and the NIRB's Review process, the NIRB gave a Power Point presentation at each of the scoping meetings which provided an overview of the Project proposal, the NIRB's environmental assessment process and environmental factors which may be potentially impacted by the Project. The NIRB presentation was delivered in English, with simultaneous interpretation in Inuktitut. Additionally, the presentation was divided into a few sessions which enabled attendees an opportunity to voice their concerns and to ask questions. In each community, the NIRB also presented diagrams which outlined the proposed NIRB-NPC joint review process and detailed land use planning requirements of the NBRLUP. The Proponent provided various maps from its traditional knowledge working group studies, as well as updated maps of the proposed Steensby Inlet shipping route, and other project specific information. The QIA also presented geographic maps in the communities of the North Baffin Region to help the public understand how the NBRLUP is related to the proposed Project.

When possible, the public scoping meetings began with an evening open house session during which attendees could get information and discuss the NIRB's Review process with NIRB staff members, the Proponent, and the representatives from other agencies in a very informal setting. An automatic Power Point presentation accompanied the open house session, which highlighted the NIRB's mandate and environmental assessment process. During these open house sessions, the public was encouraged to comment on the proposed project, potential environmental impacts, and any concerns related to the

Public Scoping Meeting

Project. Both written and verbal comments were accepted at these open house sessions, and were recorded by the NIRB staff members.

2.3 Meeting Materials

At each public meeting, the following materials were provided:

- The NIRB's presentation (in English and Inuktitut)
- Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada letter to NIRB regarding the Review of the Mary River Project, dated February 11, 2009 (in English)
- The NIRB's Draft Scope of the Mary River Project (in English and Inuktitut)
- Comment Forms (in English and Inuktitut)
- NIRB Guides 1 through 7 (in English)
- Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (in English)
- NIRB-NPC Joint Process Diagram (in English and Inuktitut)
- NPC North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan (in English and Inuktitut)
- NIRB Environment Assessment Brochure (in English)
- NIRB's 2008 Annual Report (in English and Inuktitut)
- Baffinland Mary River Project Development Proposal (in English)

2.4 Agenda and Venues of Public Scoping Meetings

NIRB staff scheduled the public meetings in three rounds, based on consultation with community organizations and travel requirements. The public meeting schedule was as follows:

Round Number	Community	Date
Round 1	Pond Inlet	March 29, 30, & 31
	Arctic Bay	April 2, & 3
	Resolute	April 4, 5 & 6
	Grise Fiord	April 6, 7 & 8
Round 2	Igloolik	April 16, 17 & 18
	Hall Beach	April 19, 20 & 21
	Coral Harbour	April 22 & 23
	Cape Dorset	April 25
	Kimmirut	April 26
Round 3	Clyde River	May 6 & 7
	Iqaluit	May 9 & 10

3.0 SUMMARY OF IDENTIFIED ISSUES

The following is a summary of the key issues raised verbally and in writing at the scoping meetings. Comments help to identify items to be addressed or considered throughout the environmental review process, and the NIRB will take the following into account while creating the EIS guidelines for this project.

3.1 Alternative Shipping Route

The Mary River Project development proposal submitted by Baffinland outlines two shipping routes:

- **Open water shipping route:** This routing starts at Milne Inlet, through Eclipse Sound and Pond Inlet, via Baffin Bay and Davis Strait to southern Canada
- **Year round shipping:** This routing involves ice-breaking and starts at Steensby Inlet, through Foxe Basin and Hudson Strait, to southern Canada and/or European destinations

During the NIRB's public scoping meetings, the proposed Steensby Inlet shipping route was raised as a key issue in most of the consulted communities. While members of the public generally indicated support for the proposed Project, those individuals living in communities located along the proposed shipping route expressed their concerns over the proposed year round shipping.

The concerns raised regarding the Steensby Inlet shipping route originate from the anticipated adverse impacts from shipping – in particular ice-breaking – on marine wildlife and marine wildlife habitat, in addition to the associated impact of the railway on caribou migration. Comments made by members of the public indicated that the Foxe Basin and Hudson Strait are used by a variety of marine and terrestrial wildlife species for feeding, calving, and nursing grounds and also as migration routes. Those species included polar bears, walrus, narwhals, beluga whales, bowhead whales, harp seals, ringed seals, migratory birds, and marine fishes. A number of these species were identified to be either of significant importance to Inuit culture, of to be major nutrient sources for local diet, or both. Comments were also heard regarding impacts to the entire marine ecosystem, from, for example, catastrophic fuel spills or chronic noise impacts as a result of year round shipping activity.

The following are the alternatives for the proposed Steensby Inlet shipping route, suggested during NIRB's public scoping meetings:

Summary of Identified Issues

3.1.1 East Coast of Baffin Island

Building a sea port along the east coast of Baffin Island, potentially at Clyde River, was raised as a potential alternative port site in a number of communities. Public members felt that the shipping route associated with a port along the east coast of Baffin Island would be in immediate proximity to existing marine traffic in Baffin Bay and Davis Strait. Furthermore, shipping along this route would avoid the anticipated impacts on marine wildlife in Foxe Basin and Hudson Strait. Comments also indicated that this alternate shipping route is an existing route for marine traffic, and therefore would be easier to access by rescue and emergency teams in the event of such an incident occurring.

3.1.2 Existing Nanisivik Sea Port

A second alternative to the proposed Steensby Inlet port site suggested the utilisation of the existing Nanisivik sea port. This would entail the Proponent building the railway from the Mary River mine site to the Nanisivik port across the lower portion of Borden Peninsula. Justification of this alternative port site and shipping route was based on the fact that shipping would be located remotely from most communities, and also the existing Nanisivik port would be reused, reducing the impact of port construction activities on the marine ecosystem. The alternative shipping route has previously been established and therefore would lend to lesser uncertainty regarding bathymetry along the shipping route.

3.1.3 Milne Inlet

Members of the public also suggested a potential alternative which would involve a northern rerouting of the railway from the Mary River mine site, and to locate the sea port at Milne Inlet. The public based this alternative on the fact that Milne Inlet has a previously established shipping route, and that this would therefore likely have less impact on the marine ecosystem when compared with the proposed Steensby Inlet route. In addition to this consideration, the public noted that a northward routing of the railway would not transect the caribou migration routes located between the Mary River mine site and Steensby Inlet.

3.1.4 Open Water Shipping at Steensby Inlet

Community members in Coral Harbour raised a potential alternative to year round shipping through the Foxe Basin and Hudson Strait to allow for shipping along this route only during the open water season. If the Steensby Inlet shipping route is deemed to be the only viable option, members of the public suggested that shipping only during the open water season be considered and further evaluated as an option, to eliminate the serious impacts resulting from ice breaking activities.

3.2 Ecosystem

3.2.1 Terrestrial Wildlife and Habitat

During the NIRB scoping meetings, the public provided comments and concerns on a number of issues, including: the potential impacts of project components on certain wildlife species; impacts to food chain dynamics; the consideration of cumulative impacts; and socio-economic impacts. This section summarizes the public comments and concerns:

3.2.1.1 Caribou

Impacts to caribou are of major concern to the communities in the North Baffin Region. In addition to the anticipated impacts on caribou from mine development, the community members commented on having observed impacts as a result of ongoing project activities conducted by Baffinland since the exploration commenced in the Mary River area.

a. Impacts on caribou resulting from ongoing project activities conducted by Baffinland:

- 1) Caribou populations have been declining since project activities began in Mary River and populations will be further impacted by the mine development.
- 2) Caribou are being impacted and are changing their migration patterns. They are not available in the Mary River area when compared to the past, and hunters must now travel farther to get caribou.
- 3) The low altitude helicopter flight surveys have had impacts on wildlife including caribou, and have caused changes to migration and habitat.

b. Anticipated impacts on caribou by the development the Mary River Project

- 1) The Mary River Project area is located within caribou migration and calving grounds. Caribou will therefore be affected by the mine development.
- 2) Impacts of noise from blasting, drilling, air traffic, and ground transportations.
- 3) Impacts resulting from an increased number of low level flights.
- 4) Impacts of railway construction and operation on caribou migration, and possible accidental kills.
- 5) Impacts arising from dust and resulting contaminated vegetation.
- 6) The sustainability of renewable resources for future generations, such as food and nutrient sources, and other traditional materials (caribou hide provides clothing material for local residents).

c. Caribou Monitoring

Summary of Identified Issues

- 1) Question about what types of caribou baseline studies and surveys have been conducted by both Baffinland and governments in the Project area.
- 2) Question regarding the commencement date of caribou studies, and also an anticipated timeline for the impact assessment on caribou from mine development and railway operation.
- 3) Complaints regarding a lack of communication with communities when caribou studies are carried out by the GN.
- 4) Recommendations that local residents and/or hunters should be hired for the surveys and monitoring both by Baffinland and the GN.
- 5) Recommendations for cooperation between different studies to minimize impact on caribou from studies and associated survey activities.
- 6) Recommendation to set minimum flight elevations for caribou studies by helicopters.

3.2.1.2 Other Species

- 1) In addition to caribou, the ongoing project activities have impacted other wildlife species (initially exploration, then bulk sampling). These impacts will likely increase when mine is developed.
- 2) Impacts on fox and wolf habitat in the Project area.
- 3) Migratory birds have changed their migrating routes in the Mary River project area. Hunters last year were unable to find geese where they previously had.
- 4) The Proponent should seriously consider the importance of wildlife to communities, where elders rely on hunting and country food.
- 5) Milne Inlet has a variety of wildlife such as whales, seals and fish. Concerns were raised regarding the existing and potential impacts to these species by ongoing geotechnical activities and the development of the Project.
- 6) Migratory birds and arctic char, an important part of the diet of local residents, will be impacted by the shipping.
- 7) Dust from the mine will impact fish habitat and vegetation, ultimately other wildlife as well due to interactions within the food chain.
- 8) Wildlife will be unavailable in the Mary River area due to development of the Project.
- 9) The proposed railway passes through an area used by a variety of wildlife for the purposes of habitat.
- 10) Camps are close to the Mary River; concerns were raised regarding the potential for contaminants entering the Mary River to flow into other big lakes (i.e. Angujualuk Lake). These contaminants would have impacts to not only animals, but also migratory and other bird species through rivers and lakes.
- 11) Increased contaminant loading in fish harvested by the communities.

Summary of Identified Issues

- 12) Broadly, concerns regarding impacts to wildlife resulting from: railway construction and operation; ground traffic on the Milne Inlet Tote Road; air traffic; drilling, blasting and ore processing; and dust from ore crushing and fine ore transport.

3.2.2 Marine Habitat and Marine Wildlife

Members of the public in communities located along the proposed Steensby shipping route and throughout the North Baffin Region expressed significant concerns regarding marine wildlife and marine wildlife habitat which they rely upon as food sources.

The following is a summary of the comments received in this regard:

3.2.2.1 Impacts of Shipping and Shipping Noise

- 1) Foxe Basin is very important habitat and migration corridor for marine mammals including: polar bear, seal, walrus, and beluga. The proposed shipping route will have significant adverse impacts on marine mammals, their habitat, and migration.
- 2) The impact of noise on marine mammals - some species such as seals are very sensitive to noise. Icebreakers create tremendous noise, and seals may display aversive tendencies to the noise created by the Project's marine transportation.
- 3) Impacts to seals in the spring is a significant concern, as the seals calving dens may be destroyed by ice breaking and the related movement of ice packs caused by the ice breaker.
- 4) Cruise ships have scared seals away from shipping routes and therefore, concerns were raised that the ore carriers will have a much more dramatic impact when ice breaking is taken into account.
- 5) Long term exposure to and resultant stress from shipping activities may affect the health of wildlife species, which could in turn, deteriorate the quality of meat.
- 6) There should be no shipping between mid-March and mid-July because seals have their pups and whales will be calving.
- 7) The potential change of habitat and migration routes of marine mammals resulting from ice breaking.

3.2.2.2 Potential Impacts of Shipping Spills

- 1) The Foxe Channel area has a strong ocean current, and any spills would likely spread quickly to other areas.
- 2) Onboard sewage and waste disposal and potential impacts to marine wildlife. From past experience, onboard sewage has been dumped directly into the ocean.

Summary of Identified Issues

- 3) Potential for accidents similar to the chemical (i.e. mercury) spills in rivers in Quebec associated with mining activity.

3.2.2.3 Cumulative Impacts on Marine Wildlife

- 1) Long term impacts to marine mammals given that the Project will operate more than 20 years, and Foxe Basin is an important habitat and migration corridor for a variety of marine mammals.
- 2) Other potential development will utilize the Steensby sea port and the shipping route, thereby increasing marine traffic and subsequent impacts on marine mammals.
- 3) Concerns regarding wildlife arising from past mine experience, namely that belugas have been declining in the proximity of Rankin Inlet due to the high volume of marine traffic in Hudson Bay.
- 4) The entire marine ecosystem should be carefully evaluated with respect to the impacts from shipping: from vertebrates to sea birds (sea gulls) to marine mammals (seals, walrus and polar bears), and even scavengers. The lifespan of wildlife species may change due to the impacts associated with the Project.
- 5) Residents in communities rely on marine mammals such as walrus and seals; therefore the food security will be negatively impact by the Project.
- 6) Concerns for future generations, marine wildlife, and dependence upon regional hunting areas that may be impacted by the shipping route.
- 7) Uncertainty of the impacts of the Project and shipping in particular, on the marine environment.

3.2.2.4 Monitoring and Mitigation

- 1) What baseline studies have been completed regarding bathymetry, and marine wildlife along the proposed shipping route?
- 2) A number of research projects have been completed in the past around the communities in Foxe Basin (from James Bay to Frobisher Bay) by various researchers, institutions, and government agencies. Plenty of valuable information has been collected, raising questions about how the results of these previous studies and research initiatives will be incorporated into the Proponent's studies in the Project region and how this information will be utilized by the NIRB during the review process.
- 3) Inuit should be involved in the baseline studies and monitoring activities as they have knowledge of marine wildlife, the proposed shipping route, and ice conditions along this route.
- 4) What monitoring will be employed to prevent dumping of sewage and other waste into the marine environment?

Summary of Identified Issues

- 5) The monitoring and reporting of spills and other leakage related to sea-faring vessels.

3.2.3 Diversified Opinions Regarding Impacts on Wildlife from the Project

Many members of the communities anticipated that the proposed project, and in particular the railway and shipping components, would have significant adverse impacts on wildlife. Some members of the public however, made comments which indicated that the impacts on wildlife from the Project may not be as serious as others believe. The following are some points from the public scoping meetings outlining the diverse range of opinions regarding the proposed Project:

- 1) Caribou populations are declining and they are not available in traditional hunting grounds, but this is not because of the impact from exploration, rather, it is due to natural fluctuations. Every 50-60 years, caribou change their habitat or migrate to other places as their food sources become too scarce to sustain whole populations. When previously damaged vegetation recovers, the caribou will come back again. In the Arctic, vegetation recovery is very slow, and it needs around 50-60 years. This is why the caribou cycle is approximately 50-60 years. The caribou population in the Mary River area has been low in numbers since the late 1980s.
- 2) Caribou will not be impacted by mine operation. When Nanisivik was in operation, caribou could be found in abundance along roads in the vicinity of the airport near the mine.
- 3) Some community members believe it does more harm than good to deploy radio collars and tags on wildlife.
- 4) Based on past mine experiences, the marine mammals will still be in the project area, but when researchers deploy radio collars or tags on the animals, they would disappear from where they were caught. This was misunderstood to be a negative result of mining activities.
- 5) Polar bears are not at risk, as they have a healthy population.
- 6) Impacts to the environment and wildlife from mine development can be mitigated as long as proper measures are put into place.

3.2.4 Air Quality

- 1) Air pollution resulting from fuel combustion by mine machinery, equipment, ships, and trains. This air pollution would spread globally and also deposit into water and marine habitat, and also affect marine mammals, sea birds, and migratory birds through the food chain.
- 2) The impacts of airborne dust on vegetation quality, wildlife health, and human health due to settling and deposition.
- 3) How will air quality be monitored all the time?

Summary of Identified Issues

3.2.5 Impacts from Noise and Vibrations

- 1) The potential for noise to impact wildlife and wildlife health (ongoing aircraft operations and future development).
- 2) The impact of noise on hunters, and in particular, the impacts resulting from low level flights occurring in project areas.
- 3) The potential impacts of noise on human health at and around the mine site.

3.2.6 Marine Water and Fresh Water Quality

- 1) Impacts to fresh water quality from acid rock drainage and metal leaching of mine waste rocks.
- 2) Impacts of contaminated water, snow, and soils on fresh water quality.
- 3) Impacts that sewage effluent and over flow may have on fresh water quality.
- 4) Impacts to fresh water quality from drilling water.
- 5) Impact on marine water quality by ballast water exchange, especially polluted ballast waters.
- 6) Impact on marine water quality from onboard sewage, grey water, and solid waste discharges, which have happened in past.
- 7) Potential impact on marine water quality from spills and leakage.
- 8) Polluted water will affect the country food and ultimately affect human health.
- 9) How will the public be notified when such contamination occurs? And who will be responsible for the reclamation required following such an event?
- 10) Ice is also a fresh water source and therefore should be protected.

3.2.7 Vegetation

- 1) Potential for impacts to vegetation, taking into account the slow rate of recovery of vegetation in the arctic. Vegetation in the Project area has been affected by all terrain vehicles; therefore the railway and other Project facilities will likely create some impact.
- 2) The proposed railway will impact vegetation permanently.
- 3) Vegetation quality will be affected by the dust generated by the Project, and this will ultimately impact wildlife.

3.2.8 Human Health

- 1) Potential negative effects on human health, through air quality, drinking water quality, atmospheric noise levels, and traditional foods through food chain take-ups.

Summary of Identified Issues

- 2) Potential impacts on worker health and safety from mine accidents such as those that have previously happened at Nanisivik.

3.2.9 Project Closure and Reclamation

- 1) The garbage and debris created by the Project is a significant concern, based on experiences with left over materials at mine sites such as Nanisivik and Polaris, and also by exploration activities at Milne Inlet and Mary River.
- 2) Some communities in the North Baffin benefited from Nanisivik Mine and Polaris Mine; however the communities complained about the damages and pollution to the environment after the mine closures. Similar concerns were raised regarding the Mary River Project.
- 3) Concerns and questions related to mine site cleanup and the probability of the ecosystem recovering when the mine is closed and reclaimed.

3.3 Socio-Economic Environment

Members of the public voiced various concerns regarding the benefits of the Project and the potential impacts to their social and economic environments. This section summarizes those concerns and comments:

3.3.1 Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement (IIBA)

- 1) Concerns over the IIBA negotiation progress and most updated status. The communities should be updated on progress made.
- 2) What benefits could the communities expect to gain from the Project?
- 3) Benefits for youth.
- 4) Benefit and compensation for impacted people, accidentally injured workers, and fatal accidents.
- 5) How would the benefits from the Project come to the community? As based on past experience, the community does not get the benefits from mine developments as they should.
- 6) Percentage of Inuit workers in whole labour force.
- 7) Which communities would benefit from the Project if it proceeds?
- 8) What infrastructure would Baffinland provide to help the communities improve?
- 9) What help and assistance would Baffinland provide to local hunters when they travel and hunt (i.e. fuel, sheds, and transport tools)? and does Baffinland plan to do so?
- 10) Hunters should be given benefits if the Project proceeds even if they do not work on mine site, as wildlife and harvesting will be impacted by the Project.

Summary of Identified Issues

- 11) Possibility of royalty and compensation payments due to the impact on wildlife by the Project.
- 12) Contract and business opportunities. Can local Inuit companies get contracts to provide country food for Inuit workers who are employed at the mine if the Project proceeds?
- 13) Is it possible for the IIBA to cover certain items that would allow for the communities to utilize Baffinland's shipping activities to bring in goods? or could the communities could share the cost of such shipping with Baffinland?
- 14) Compensation and standards for water and/or land contamination.
- 15) The IIBA was never implemented for the Nanisivik or Polaris Mines, and communities are happy to see that the NIRB included this in the project review.

3.3.2 Benefits and Compensation for Other Jurisdictions

The proposed Steensby Inlet shipping route passes through the Foxe Basin, which has the potential to impact communities located within the Kivalliq Region of Nunavut (i.e. Coral Harbour). Some residents in Coral Harbour expressed strong concerns that their community should receive impact benefits and compensation as a result of the Project. Furthermore, residents of Coral Harbour voiced concerns regarding how their community would be represented by the QIA, when their regional Inuit Association is the Kivalliq Inuit Association (KIA). The community was interested to know what mechanism would be in place to protect their interests and their rights.

3.3.3 Economics

- 1) The Project will benefit communities and people by providing job opportunities and increasing income, however the Project may change whole lifestyles drastically.
- 2) How would commitments and agreements change if ownership of the mine changed?
- 3) Concerns related to the effects of temporary closure and final closure of the mine on communities.
- 4) Security bonds for closure and reclamation should be in place prior to mine operation.
- 5) Concerns regarding employment opportunities and competition among the different communities surrounding the Project.

3.3.4 Training and Employment

- 1) Suggestion that heavy equipment training should start when mine construction commences, not when the mine is in operation.

Summary of Identified Issues

- 2) Concerns for job opportunities and preferential hiring. Some Inuit got the necessary training from technical programs or courses for specific jobs, but received lower-paying jobs on their return to the project site, and they have less opportunity than those from south.
- 3) Fairness in the treatment of Inuit workers at the mine site.
- 4) The gap between mine employment opportunities and the reality of an under educated local workforce, and possible solutions.
- 5) Question on job allocation among different communities.
- 6) Job training from government programmes for women.

3.3.5 Community and Individual Well-being

- 1) Carefully balanced consideration should be given when evaluating the benefits of the Project and the impacts on wildlife and the environment.
- 2) Potential impact on present and future well-being of communities as a result of the Project's impacts on wildlife, the food chain, and human health.
- 3) Concerns related to food security.
- 4) Impacts of drugs and alcohol brought into communities from the Project's workers, and also drug and alcohol abuse at the Project site itself.
- 5) Cultural conflict between Inuit workers and southerners at the work place.
- 6) Concerns over traditional livelihoods. For example, caribou skins are clothing materials and are of substantial value to communities, but this resource would be in jeopardy if impacts from the Project are not mitigated properly.
- 7) Impacts on the marine mammals in Foxe Basin will change the future lifestyle and social life of Inuit.
- 8) Questions were raised repeatedly regarding the impacts of the Project on other communities and related concerns.

3.3.6 Land and Ice Use and Inuit Harvesting

- 1) Impacts from the Project on caribou and marine mammals will ultimately impact traditional activities, diet, and lifestyle.
- 2) Traveling between communities is important to local residents, and these trips between different communities occur year round. The mine construction and operation raise concerns over how this will impact the traveling, fishing, and hunting activities in the Project area.
- 3) Impacts of ice breaking to on over-ice dog team travel.
- 4) Caribou are not available now, nor are the caribou skins. The residents have to rely on fabrics for clothing and this problem will be worse when the Project proceeds.

Summary of Identified Issues

- 5) Compensation for the loss of hunting and communication equipment and vehicles due to ice breaking, which happened in Nanisivik.

3.3.7 Cultural and Heritage Site

- 1) The Mary River area is a very sacred site to many nearby communities and has historically been the site of a number of spiritual activities.
- 2) There are many archaeological sites in the areas, burial sites, sod houses and tent rings probably exist at Steensby Inlet area and on the island where Baffinland is proposing to build the deep sea port. These sites should be identified and protected.
- 3) Archaeological and cultural sites along lakes and river systems, including Inuksuk which mark hunting and fishing areas should be protected. These imply different meanings and indications.
- 4) Potential impacts to traditional values and lifestyle due to increased cash flow in the communities.

3.4 Mary River Project Proposal

3.4.1 Baffinland and Community Relations

- 1) Concerns about the communication methods between the Proponent, and community members regarding the Project's progress and baseline study results (e.g. bathymetry study of shipping route).
- 2) Communities have not have been well-informed regarding the Project, and the information provided with respect to impacts of the Project is not complete, especially negative impacts to the environment.
- 3) Some communities were not consulted by the Proponent.
- 4) Disappointed by unfulfilled promises made by the Proponent, and communities were not notified with the reason for Baffinland closing their community liaison offices.
- 5) Baffinland should have consulted with those communities potentially impacted by the proposed shipping routes in Foxe Basin and Hudson Strait prior to submitting their Project proposal.
- 6) Baffinland must make commitments regarding the concerns from potentially impacted communities.
- 7) Residents disagreed with the placement of radio collars on polar bears, however researchers did not respect their concerns. Residents are now concerned the same will happen with the Baffinland project.

3.4.2 Concerns and Questions Regarding the Project Components

a. Shipping

- 1) Alternatives to the proposed shipping route through Foxe Basin.
- 2) Shipping seasons (open water or year round).
- 3) The shipping operation company.
- 4) The frequency of shipping operation.
- 5) The size of ore carriers.
- 6) The load of ore per ship and market value of each load of iron ore product.
- 7) Amount of fuel required per trip.
- 8) Locations and protocols for ships to exchange ballast waters.
- 9) Lessons learned from Nanisivik shipping operation.
- 10) Significant impacts on marine wildlife.
- 11) Uncertainty regarding the anticipated impacts to marine wildlife from shipping. Shipping may have unknown impacts as it has never happened before, and these may be significant socio-economic impacts as well as biophysical impacts.
- 12) Consideration regarding the impacts on shellfish and other marine creatures from shipping and related mitigation measures. Shellfish have been destroyed in the Great Lakes, and the arctic ecosystem is more vulnerable.
- 13) The safety of using the Steensby Inlet route is a concern, as strong currents and shallow water conditions exist along this proposed shipping route.
- 14) Shallow water in the proximity of Hall Beach and Coral Harbour constitute potential safety concerns.
- 15) Impacts to the marine environment and marine wildlife from blasting and dredging of shallow waters.
- 16) How will contingency plans address potential impacts?
- 17) The potential for the introduction and invasion of exotic species.
- 18) Contamination from ballast water exchange in Canadian waters.
- 19) The potential impacts of dumping onboard sewage and waste into the ocean.
- 20) Potential for spills and malfunctions. Oil or chemical spills in the ocean resulting from shipping will impact aquatic life and ultimately impact country food.

Summary of Identified Issues

- 21) Availability of new silencing technologies being used for ship manufacturing to reduce the impacts of shipping noise.
- 22) Will any new technology be deployed to clean up oil and/or fuel spills?
- 23) What procedures and guidelines are to be followed during shipping operations if the Project is approved?

b. Railway/Train Operation

- 1) Significant concerns over the railway routing, and comments on potential alternative routes.
- 2) Locomotive performance and safety in arctic climactic conditions.
- 3) Accidents (such as derailing), malfunctions, and mitigation measures related to railway operation, with specific consideration given to the high speed of travel.
- 4) Transecting caribou migration routes may cause caribou to change their original feeding ground and move further away from Project areas.
- 5) Impacts to hunting activities and ski-doo travel in the Project area, as the area the railway is proposed to pass through is located on Inuit hunting grounds.
- 6) Will any crossing structures for hunters traveling be designed and built along the rail line?
- 7) Chronic noise impacts to wildlife in the area.
- 8) Potential for caribou casualties on the railway, as the railway passes through caribou migration routes.
- 9) Transportation management should address the potential for air-borne dispersion of fine ore due to winds.
- 10) Keep railway for use by local residents after mine closure if the Project proceeds.

c. Mine and Other Project Components

- 1) The period of time the Milne Tote Road has been in operation.
- 2) Usage and processing of iron ore.
- 3) Production rate of iron ore.
- 4) Project footprint.
- 5) Quantity of total waste rock to be generated by the Project.
- 6) Mine lifespan and future development.
- 7) Clarification regarding mine life as it had been stated that the mine would operate for more than 90 years.
- 8) Worker numbers at Steensby Inlet.

Summary of Identified Issues

- 9) Fuel shipping rate and site storage capacities of the Project at Steensby Inlet and Mary River sites.
- 10) What is the water and chemical usage in iron ore processing?
- 11) Description needed of the facilities used to treat polluted soils in the Project area.
- 12) Impacts from mine dewatering and discharge management.

3.4.3 NIRB Process and Consultation

- 1) What is the NIRB's composition and the origin of its Board members?
- 2) Communities are pleased to be consulted by the NIRB staff regarding the Mary River Project and the communities feel their voices are being heard.
- 3) Communities are happy to hear that their concerns will be addressed completely, their comments will be taken seriously, and their questions will be answered by the Proponent during NIRB Part 5 Review process.
- 4) The public hope to be updated regarding the NIRB's review process, and wish that the NIRB is able to visit the communities again during the review process.
- 5) Communities in the North Baffin Region hope there are Board members who are able to address their concerns.
- 6) Public feel their interests are protected by the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement, and hope the stories they hear about what occurred in Nanisivik and Polaris will not happen again.
- 7) The communities were not well informed of the NIRB's public scoping meetings, though the community members were interested to be involved in the NIRB's review process.
- 8) Clarification requested regarding scoping definition, concerns for how to identify individual environmental components when they are interlinked.
- 9) Problems with translations were identified in NIRB's presentation materials. Also, misunderstandings occurred with interpretation during previous Baffinland community consultation, the same concerns were raised for the NIRB's community scoping meetings.
- 10) Lots of exploration projects have been approved and conducted in Nunavut, and it is very expensive to identify deposits for mine development - does that mean NIRB has an obligation to allow identified deposits to be developed into a mine and only a few people benefit from it?
- 11) Exploration and bulk sampling programs in Mary River have been conducted over the past few years. The public were of the understanding that the Project had already been approved by the NIRB.
- 12) Relationship between ongoing activities in the Mary River project area conducted by Baffinland, and the NIRB's review process. NIRB consultation

Summary of Identified Issues

might be too late given that the Project activities have been ongoing for a few years.

- 13) How will the NIRB deal with the conflicting opinions of the Hamlets and HTAs in some communities?
- 14) How will the NIRB protect the wildlife and marine mammals and residents' travel between communities?
- 15) Community is grateful for the work done by the QIA, but some communities have concerns over how to ensure their concerns are well presented by QIA when it negotiates with Baffinland. What mechanism should be put in place to guarantee that the communities' voices will be heard and addressed?
- 16) How are the other government agencies involved in the NIRB's Part 5 Review process? And how will concerns from communities be addressed?
- 17) DFO is reluctant to approve new community facilities such as docks and breakwaters. How could DFO possibly approve the Mary River Project when it may have significant impact on marine environment and marine wildlife?

3.4.4 NPC and Related NBRLUP Issues

- 1) What is the NPC? What is its mandate? And how will the NPC be involved in the NIRB's Review process?
- 2) What land use plans exist in Nunavut? And is there a land use plan for the South Baffin?
- 3) Why does the railroad involve the NBRLUP? And is the Project shipping also in a land use planning region?
- 4) Regarding the proposed NBRLUP amendment issue, when developing former Lancaster Sound Land Use Plan, tremendous efforts were made to consult in five communities of the North Baffin Region, and numerous government agencies were involved in the process. This proposed amended by the NIRB and the NPC should also involve intensive public consultation, as the plan itself is a community based land use plan.
- 5) How will the NPC and the NIRB assess the impacts of the Project on the environment?
- 6) What is the reason for the NPC's absence during the public consultation meetings?
- 7) What is the nature of the amendment the NIRB and NPC propose to make to the NBRLUP?

3.4.5 Other Issues

Beyond the Mary River Project, some other issues were also raised by members of the public during the NIRB's scoping meetings:

Summary of Identified Issues

- 1) The relationship between the proposed mine development proposal and the currently ongoing activities associated with geotechnical exploration and bulk sampling program in the Project areas. The Project appears to have been going on a while. Why is the NIRB just coming to communities to hold meetings for the NIRB review process?
- 2) Confusion regarding the approval of the Project. If the approval hasn't been given yet, why have the Project and associated activities been ongoing for some time?
- 3) The residents in the North Baffin Region have expressed concerns regarding increasing exploration activities in the high arctic and potential impacts to the environment.
- 4) Communities raised the point of defending Canadian sovereignty in the arctic, especially considering the increased navigability of arctic waters.

A1-Public Meeting Flyer Samples

(English)

THE NUNAVUT IMPACT REVIEW BOARD

PUBLIC MEETINGS

The **Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB)** will be holding Public Scoping Meetings related to **Baffinland Iron Mine Corporation's Mary River Project** and NIRB's Environmental Assessment Process.

The NIRB invites everyone to attend and learn more about:

- ⇒ WHAT IS NIRB?
- ⇒ WHAT IS THE MARY RIVER PROJECT?
- ⇒ WHAT IS THE SCOPE OF THE PROJECT?
- ⇒ HOW CAN YOU PARTICIPATE IN THE REVIEW PROCESS?

NIRB WANTS TO HEAR FROM YOU!

THIS IS YOUR CHANCE TO ASK QUESTIONS AND PROVIDE INPUT!

WHERE? - WHEN?*

POND INLET, COMMUNITY HALL	—	MARCH 29, 30 & 31
ARCTIC BAY, INUJUUAQ SCHOOL	—	APRIL 1, 2, & 3
RESOLUTE BAY, QARMARTALIK SCHOOL	—	APRIL 4, 5, & 6
GRISE FIORD, UMMIMAK SCHOOL	—	APRIL 7, 8, & 9

*MEETING TIMES TO BE ANNOUNCED ON LOCAL RADIO!

CONTACT US:

Box 1360 Cambridge Bay, NU X0B 0C0
Phone toll-free: 1 (866) 233-3033
Email: Iwan@nirb.ca
FTP site: <http://ftp.nirb.ca>



© 2006 The Authors
Journal compilation © 2006 Blackwell Publishing Ltd

በግልጽ ለደብዳቤ ጥያቄ ከባለ እር (NIRB) ለ ሰራተኛ ከባለ ሰራተኛ ለጥያቄ ለጥያቄ ለጥያቄ

በግንባታው ላይ ለሚሳተፉ ሰራተኛው ሰዎች ለሚከፈላቸው ገንዘብ ምን ያህል ሊጨምር ይችላል፡፡

Downloaded from <http://ajph.org/> at University of California, San Francisco on June 11, 2015

- [illegible]




0.4 0.4

Figure 1. Schematic representation of the experimental design. The subjects were divided into two groups: the control group (CG) and the experimental group (EG). The CG was divided into two subgroups: the control group (CG) and the control group (CG). The EG was divided into two subgroups: the experimental group (EG) and the experimental group (EG). The CG was divided into two subgroups: the control group (CG) and the control group (CG). The EG was divided into two subgroups: the experimental group (EG) and the experimental group (EG).

$$\Delta b \wedge \Delta c \wedge \Delta d \quad \Delta a \wedge \Delta b \wedge \Delta c \quad \Delta a \wedge \Delta b \wedge \Delta d \quad \Delta a \wedge \Delta c \wedge \Delta d \quad \Delta b \wedge \Delta c \wedge \Delta d \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3$$
[illegible]

5b 2d 4c 5b 2f 4b 4c 4d 4e 4f 4g 4h 4i 4j 4k 4l 4m 4n 4o 4p 4q 4r 4s 4t 4u 4v 4w 4x 4y 4z 4aa 4ab 4ac 4ad 4ae 4af 4ag 4ah 4ai 4aj 4ak 4al 4am 4an 4ao 4ap 4aq 4ar 4as 4at 4au 4av 4aw 4ax 4ay 4az 4ba 4bb 4bc 4bd 4be 4bf 4bg 4bh 4bi 4bj 4bk 4bl 4bm 4bn 4bo 4bp 4bq 4br 4bs 4bt 4bu 4bv 4bw 4bx 4by 4bz 4ca 4cb 4cc 4cd 4ce 4cf 4cg 4ch 4ci 4cj 4ck 4cl 4cm 4cn 4co 4cp 4cq 4cr 4cs 4ct 4cu 4cv 4cw 4cx 4cy 4cz 4da 4db 4dc 4dd 4de 4df 4dg 4dh 4di 4dj 4dk 4dl 4dm 4dn 4do 4dp 4dq 4dr 4ds 4dt 4du 4dv 4dw 4dx 4dy 4dz 4ea 4eb 4ec 4ed 4ee 4ef 4eg 4eh 4ei 4ej 4ek 4el 4em 4en 4eo 4ep 4eq 4er 4es 4et 4eu 4ev 4ew 4ex 4ey 4ez 4fa 4fb 4fc 4fd 4fe 4ff 4fg 4fh 4fi 4fj 4fk 4fl 4fm 4fn 4fo 4fp 4fq 4fr 4fs 4ft 4fu 4fv 4fw 4fx 4fy 4fz 4ga 4gb 4gc 4gd 4ge 4gf 4gg 4gh 4gi 4gj 4gk 4gl 4gm 4gn 4go 4gp 4gq 4gr 4gs 4gt 4gu 4gv 4gw 4gx 4gy 4gz 4ha 4hb 4hc 4hd 4he 4hf 4hg 4hi 4hj 4hk 4hl 4hm 4hn 4ho 4hp 4hq 4hr 4hs 4ht 4hu 4hv 4hw 4hx 4hy 4hz 4ia 4ib 4ic 4id 4ie 4if 4ig 4ih 4ii 4ij 4ik 4il 4im 4in 4io 4ip 4iq 4ir 4is 4it 4iu 4iv 4iw 4ix 4iy 4iz 4ja 4jb 4jc 4jd 4je 4jf 4jg 4jh 4ji 4jj 4jk 4jl 4jm 4jn 4jo 4jp 4jq 4jr 4js 4jt 4ju 4jv 4jw 4jx 4jy 4jz 4ka 4kb 4kc 4kd 4ke 4kf 4kg 4kh 4ki 4kj 4kk 4kl 4km 4kn 4ko 4kp 4kq 4kr 4ks 4kt 4ku 4kv 4kw 4kx 4ky 4kz 4la 4lb 4lc 4ld 4le 4lf 4lg 4lh 4li 4lj 4lk 4ll 4lm 4ln 4lo 4lp 4lq 4lr 4ls 4lt 4lu 4lv 4lw 4lx 4ly 4lz 4ma 4mb 4mc 4md 4me 4mf 4mg 4mh 4mi 4mj 4mk 4ml 4mm 4mn 4mo 4mp 4mq 4mr 4ms 4mt 4mu 4mv 4mw 4mx 4my 4mz 4na 4nb 4nc 4nd 4ne 4nf 4ng 4nh 4ni 4nj 4nk 4nl 4nm 4nn 4no 4np 4nq 4nr 4ns 4nt 4nu 4nv 4nw 4nx 4ny 4nz 4oa 4ob 4oc 4od 4oe 4of 4og 4oh 4oi 4oj 4ok 4ol 4om 4on 4oo 4op 4oq 4or 4os 4ot 4ou 4ov 4ow 4ox 4oy 4oz 4pa 4pb 4pc 4pd 4pe 4pf 4pg 4ph 4pi 4pj 4pk 4pl 4pm 4pn 4po 4pp 4pq 4pr 4ps 4pt 4pu 4pv 4pw 4px 4py 4pz 4qa 4qb 4qc 4qd 4qe 4qf 4qg 4qh 4qi 4qj 4qk 4ql 4qm 4qn 4qo 4qp 4qq 4qr 4qs 4qt 4qu 4qv 4qw 4qx 4qy 4qz 4ra 4rb 4rc 4rd 4re 4rf 4rg 4rh 4ri 4rj 4rk 4rl 4rm 4rn 4ro 4rp 4rq 4rr 4rs 4rt 4ru 4rv 4rw 4rx 4ry 4rz 4sa 4sb 4sc 4sd 4se 4sf 4sg 4sh 4si 4sj 4sk 4sl 4sm 4sn 4so 4sp 4sq 4sr 4ss 4st 4su 4sv 4sw 4sx 4sy 4sz 4ta 4tb 4tc 4td 4te 4tf 4tg 4th 4ti 4tj 4tk 4tl 4tm 4tn 4to 4tp 4tq 4tr 4ts 4tt 4tu 4tv 4tw 4tx 4ty 4tz 4ua 4ub 4uc 4ud 4ue 4uf 4ug 4uh 4ui 4uj 4uk 4ul 4um 4un 4uo 4up 4uq 4ur 4us 4ut 4uu 4uv 4uw 4ux 4uy 4uz 4va 4vb 4vc 4vd 4ve 4vf 4vg 4vh 4vi 4vj 4vk 4vl 4vm 4vn 4vo 4vp 4vq 4vr 4vs 4vt 4vu 4vv 4vw 4vx 4vy 4vz 4wa 4wb 4wc 4wd 4we 4wf 4wg 4wh 4wi 4wj 4wk 4wl 4wm 4wn 4wo 4wp 4wq 4wr 4ws 4wt 4wu 4wv 4ww 4wx 4wy 4wz 4xa 4xb 4xc 4xd 4xe 4xf 4xg 4xh 4xi 4xj 4xk 4xl 4xm 4xn 4xo 4xp 4xq 4xr 4xs 4xt 4xu 4xv 4xw 4xx 4xy 4xz 4ya 4yb 4yc 4yd 4ye 4yf 4yg 4yh 4yi 4yj 4yk 4yl 4ym 4yn 4yo 4yp 4yq 4yr 4ys 4yt 4yu 4yv 4yw 4yx 4yy 4yz 4za 4zb 4zc 4zd 4ze 4zf 4zg 4zh 4zi 4zj 4zk 4zl 4zm 4zn 4zo 4zp 4zq 4zr 4zs 4zt 4zu 4zv 4zw 4zx 4zy 4zz

[illegible]

ከላይኛው ምዕራባዊ የግንባታ ስራ ጋር በተያያዘ የሚከተሉት ስራዎች ይከናወናሉ፡

104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 700 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756 757 758 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 850 851 852 853 854 855 856 857 858 859 860 861 862 863 864 865 866 867 868 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 876 877 878 879 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 888 889 890 891 892 893 894 895 896 897 898 899 900 901 902 903 904 905 906 907 908 909 910 911 912 913 914 915 916 917 918 919 920 921 922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936 937 938 939 940 941 942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 960 961 962 963 964 965 966 967 968 969 970 971 972 973 974 975 976 977 978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 987 988 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 1000



A2- Radio Announcement Samples

**Cover Letter of Radio Announcement
(Pond Inlet)**

March 23, 2009

Public Service Announcement – Radio

Pond Inlet

Good Day,

The Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) will be visiting Pond Inlet on March 29-31, 2009 and we would greatly appreciate your assistance in helping us make this visit a success.

We would ask that you make the following announcement three times daily starting March 23 and run it until March 31. Once in the morning, lunchtime, and evening would be excellent.

If you have any questions, please call Ryan Barry at NIRB, 1-866-233-3033. We look forward to seeing you soon!

Thank You!

Ryan Barry

Nunavut Impact Review Board

Appendix A –Public Meeting Notice Materials

Radio Announcement (English)

The Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) is holding Public Meetings to discuss the review of **Baffinland Iron Mines Corp.’s Mary River project**, in accordance with Part 5 of Article 12 of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement. These meetings also constitute initial steps in the Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC) and NIRB’s public review of the transportation corridor proposed by this project, in accordance with Section 3.5.12 of the North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan.

The NIRB invites everyone to attend and learn more about:

- WHAT IS NIRB?
- WHAT IS THE **MARY RIVER** PROJECT?
- WHAT IS THE SCOPE OF THE PROJECT?
- HOW CAN YOU PARTICIPATE IN THE REVIEW PROCESSES?

The NIRB will be hosting these meetings at the Community Hall at the following times:

- March 29: Open house from 6 pm to 9pm
- March 30: Public Scoping Meetings from 1pm to 4:30pm, and 6pm to 9pm
- March 31: Public Scoping Meetings from 1pm to 4:30pm, and 6pm to 9pm

Coffee and tea will be provided and door prizes will be given away!

Appendix A –Public Meeting Notice Materials

Radio Announcement (Inuktitut)

March 23, 2009

ᐆᐃᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ - ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ

Pond Inlet

ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ,

ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ Pond Inlet ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ
March 29-31, 2009 ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ
ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ.

ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ
ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ March 23 ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ
March 31. ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ, ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ
ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ, ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ.

ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ, ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ/Ryan
Barry-ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ, 1-866-233-3033.
ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ!

ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ!

ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ/Ryan Barry

ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ ᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕ

A3- News Paper Advertisement Samples

Newspaper Advertisement (English)



NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETINGS

The Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) is holding Public Meetings to discuss the Review of Baffinland Iron Mines Corp.'s Mary River project, in accordance with Part 5 of Article 12 of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NLCA). These meetings also constitute initial steps in the Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC) and NIRB's public review of the transportation corridor proposed by this project, in accordance with Section 3.5.12 of the North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan.

The NIRB invites all interested parties to come out and learn more about:

- What is the NIRB?
- What is the Mary River project?
- What is the SCOPE of the Project?
- How can YOU participate in the Review processes?

A good opportunity to ask questions and give input!

Refreshments to be served and door prizes to be won.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

Pond Inlet, Community Hall
March 29, 30 & 31

Arctic Bay, Inujuuaq School
April 1, 2 & 3

Resolute Bay, Qarmartalik School
April 4, 5 & 6

Grise Fiord, Ummimak School
April 7, 8 & 9

Meeting times to be announced on local radio.
Additional Public meetings to be announced soon!

Nunavut Impact Review Board
PO Box 1360, Cambridge Bay, NU X0B 0C0
Fax: 1-867-983-2594
Email: info@nirb.ca
Phone: 1-866-233-3033

Appendix B: Meeting Notes from NIRB Public Scoping Meetings**Pond Inlet Meeting Notes****DATE****TIME**

March 29, 2009

6:00-9:00 pm

March 30, 2009

1:00-4:00 pm, 6:00-9:00 pm

March 31, 2009

1:00-4:00 pm, 6:00-9:00 pm

Total attendance

260

Each session attendance: Minimum: 32, Maximum: 87

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- The Mary River Project is big and close to the community. Impacts from the project will be significant, in particular on both land and marine wildlife which people rely on, and hunters in Pond Inlet and Igloolik share the wildlife resources in project areas. The company does not have a clear understanding of wildlife, the importance of wildlife to people, especially Elders who rely on hunting.
- If the Project has an impact on caribou, seals, marine mammals etc, it will impact traditional activities, and lifestyles.
- Concerns over noise from helicopters and other air traffic, ground traffic, and blasting operations from exploration activities have affected wildlife in the past. This impact from noise has been verified from the Nanisivik mine experience.
- The impacts on wildlife from Milne Inlet Tote Road and heavy traffic. The railway will have an even more serious impact on the wildlife.
- Caribou related issues:
 - Caribou population is declining since the Project in Mary River began and will be further impacted by the Project's development.
 - Caribou are being impacted and are changing migration routes, and this change has been confirmed by other communities.
 - Because of noise from ongoing project activities since exploration started in 2004, hunters now must go farther to hunt, that means they have to spend more on gas.
 - Noise also disturbed local hunters as caribou are scared away from the noise.
 - Caribou are not as available now as they used to be, nor are the caribou skins, which means that the residents must rely upon other fabrics for clothes.
 - There is no caribou where they are working near Mary River area.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Will community get help and support considering the low numbers of caribou available?
- Noise impact on caribou from blasting, drilling and construction.



Photo 1: Public discussing the Mary River project in Pond Inlet

- Question on caribou studies and monitoring programs such as: past/traditional caribou distributions; results of such studies; the current status; the personnel and responsible organizations. Types of caribou research activities, surveys regarding caribou population in Mary River project area etc.
- How long will it take to assess impact on caribou from mine development and associated railway?
- Ore crushing and related dust settlement on the vegetation will have a resulting impact on wildlife.
- Milne Inlet is habitat to a variety of wildlife, whales, narwhals, seals, fish and the Project's potential impacts on them is a concern.
- Wildlife will be unavailable in the Project area due to its development.
- Marine shipping will have impacts on marine mammals.
- Wildlife is rich in the shipping route.
- Seal and other marine animals are impacted by the noise from ships.
- Marine mammal survey should use a bigger plan, using helicopters is a very hard method to count animals.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Will the caribou and polar bear collaring programs and surveys be continued?
- Narwhales and seals in Steensby Inlet would be scared away by ships.
- If the marine habitat is polluted or otherwise impacted, how long it will take to identify these impacts?
- Sea mammals are not used to noise from shipping when ice is present – are there any measures (i.e. silencer) proposed to minimize the noise from ships?
- Migratory birds (geese) have changed their migration routes in the Mary River Project area; hunters didn't find geese last year at where they used to be.
- Ships from Nanisivik and the Nickel mine near Rankin Inlet caused a decline in the number of seals in that area, and make it more difficult for hunting.
- Will shipping occur in open water season?
- There should not be any shipping activities in winter in Milne Inlet, especially between mid-March to mid-July because seals have their pups and whales will be calving.
- There have been more ships in Milne Inlet and it has affected marine wildlife. Marine mammals (seals) have decreased in numbers since the Project started and the ship traffic in Milne Inlet increased.
- There are shallow areas in Foxe Basin along the shipping route, and there is a sunken ship in Foxe Basin.
- It was told that Milne Inlet is too narrow for big ships and therefore Steensby Inlet was chosen
- Exchange of ballast water may introduce exotic organisms which then may impact the marine environment.
- What shipping would occur at Milne Inlet and Steensby Inlet?
- Shipping start time.
- Why it is proposed to ship from Steensby Inlet?
- Why not use the existing Milne Inlet road?
- Consider shipping out of Nanisivik, there is a traditional trail between Mary River and Nanisivik passing through an ice cap.
- Alternative port site for Steensby Inlet (east coast of Baffin Island, Clyde River) taking into account caribou migration routes.
- Eastern alternatives for railway - how NIRB will decide on alternative routes?
- Concerns regarding shipping malfunctions.
- To many communities, the Mary River area is a sacred site.
- Concerns over the Project's impacts on traditional travel between communities which is important, how will this travel be affected?
- Will archaeological sites be protected? There are many in the area including tent rings, Inuksuks, etc.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Archaeological and cultural sites at lakes and river systems include Inuksuks which are used to mark hunting and fishing areas and these should be protected
- Inuksuks have different meanings and indications depend on the locations, shapes and orientations.
- NTI and RIA are responsible for community benefits. Are Baffinland and the QIA discussing the IIBA, and if so, what issues would be covered by the IIBA? What is the status? Communities should be informed in this regard.
- Baffinland and the QIA announced an MOU, the first step toward the IIBA, and Pond Inlet and Igloolik were included for business and contract.
- IIBA was never put in place in Nanisivik. Happy to see the NIRB including this in the review of the Mary River Project.
- What percentage of Inuit will work at the Project?
- What benefits will the people of Pond Inlet and other communities get benefits from the Project if it is approved? What will be the royalty rate for each person, and what kinds of benefits can hunters get through the IIBA?
- Will the company (Baffinland) improve or build the Pond Inlet runway, or a community freezer? Will Baffinland help with providing fuel for hunters?
- Questions on the transport assistance, contract and schedule plan for workers from communities.
- Suggestions regarding possible assistance for hunters:
 - Some employers provided funding for hunters who worked at mines in the past.
 - Hunting equipment is getting very expensive.
 - People continue go hunting in winter and in the summer; will the company provide fuel to hunters? Is there any plan to do so?
 - Hunters should be given benefits if the Project proceeds even if they don't work at the mine.
 - Hunters should get assistance from the company, such as providing gas, rescue help etc.
 - Company should build sheds to assist hunters' travel.
 - Hunters should get compensation due to the Project's impact on wildlife and associated hunting.
- What types of contracts and business opportunities will arise from the Project?
- Concerns regarding communication between the company, communities, and the community members.
- Benefit, compensation and welfare available for accidental injuries on the job.
- Social well-being for workers who don't work for a certain period of time (lay-offs).
- Questions regarding the transportation, contracts, and schedule plan for Inuit workers.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Baffinland’s baseline study started in 2004, and a 3 years study has been completed in 2 years.
- One of the lakes close to Mary Rive is a commercial fishing spot for Igloodik; any spill can flow to other areas via river systems. Will cross-contamination occur in the lakes?
- Dust concerns from ore crushing.
- Acid rock drainage and metal leaching prevention measures.
- Concerns over drinking water quality at camp.
- Are there cases of fish bearing lakes that have been contaminated?
- Concerns for the impact on fresh water and ice quality in Mary River (locals call it as Buttocks Lake) from existing sewage lagoons.
- With the implementation of sewage treatment systems at mine camps, will any sewage be discharged into nearby rivers?
- Will a waste water treatment plant be in place when project in full operation? Is there any contamination from existing sewage lagoons?
- What happens with sewage that overflows after treatment at the sewage plant?
- How do other communities feel about the Project?
- How long has the project been going on? Can the proposed shipping be changed?
- Does the NIRB use Traditional Knowledge studies in their review?
- Concerns regarding the National Park (Simirlik National Park) include: Impacts on tourism, lack of communication with the Parks, and impacts to land uses which ultimately impact tourism due to impact on the wilderness which the tourists come to experience.
- Concerns regarding the increased population and increased needs on water supply and waste water treatment at mine site, and associated impacts on hunters.
- Comments on the smells of sewage and spilled fuel at the Mary River site.
- Contaminated snow drifts finally melt into the rivers, along with surface runoffs from roads. This will cause impacts on fish when they enter the river system.
- Mary River iron ore deposits are said to be very valuable (the third biggest iron mine in the world), so how much royalty can be allocated to communities? If nothing, then the community would not support the Project.
- Questions regarding the drilling program:
 - How long has the drilling program been going on?
 - What are the effects of drilling on water quality?
 - Does drilling have impacts on vegetation?
 - How many drill holes does the Project have?
 - Have any new minerals been found through the bulk sampling program?

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Drilling water and additives may affect wildlife when they enter the water system.



Photo 2: Meeting notes in Pond Inlet

- How many inspections has Baffinland had so far?
- What kind of baseline data exists regarding contaminant loading of PCBs or other chemicals in fish used by community near the Project area?
- Fuel spills have happened at project sites, so more efficient communication should be in place to notify the community. The community has previously received this kind of information indirectly from the CBC.
- Have spills occurred in the past and were they cleaned up?
- Communication regarding marooned ship in Milne Inlet over winter.
- How much fuel and chemicals are stored on site?
- Community members don't like the fuel bladders used on Mary River project sites due to concern of leakage.
- Community workers who are employed with the Project should be notified of their work schedule.
- More employment should be given to each community and proper training should be available. Does the company have employment training plans?
- Heavy equipment training should begin when mine construction commences.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- What percentage of Inuit employment is anticipated for the Project?
- Transportation corridor is very large, are there direct impacts related to low level flights?
- The Mary River area has been historically used as a hunting ground. Have there been any Traditional Knowledge studies done involving Inuit? Is there any wildlife Traditional Knowledge collected? Will more of these kinds of studies proceed?
- Will the information collected by IQ groups be shared with communities? Concern over the possibility that some major point will be missed if IQ studies are accomplished sooner, and mine development begins later.
- Country food is healthier than store bought food, and the related concerns with a decrease in the availability of country foods due to mine development combined with increased living costs.
- Potential impacts on traditional land use activities.
- After mine closure, the buildings should be given to communities, and when the roads are abandoned, the bridges should be left for hunters.
- When the mine closes, concerns regarding the impacts to communities which rely on it for employment and other benefits.
- Shipping should use previously established routes, and be far away from shorelines.
- Concerns related to ice breaking shipping and impacts to marine mammals (such as walrus) – they can become trapped in thick ice, and therefore communities should be compensated for ice breaking.
- Will the company design and build any crossing structures for hunters traveling over the railway, and if so, how many such railway crossings might be built?
- Compensation should be given for mine related accidental death and injury.
- Workplace disciplines regarding on-site alcohol abuse and other impacts to mine workers health.
- Concerns over the potential expansion of mine life, will it be reviewed if mine life is expanded beyond the estimated 21 years?
- Wind blowing of fine ore along railway and Steensby Inlet ore facility over the mine life – are there any studies to this regard (fine ore management)?
- Will CEAA be involved in this process?
- Scientific research is necessary when deciding whether the Project should proceed.
- When will the company be able to pay off its debt?
- Who are the responsible agencies for spills and reporting, and what is the mechanism of communication with the communities in such an event?
- Any tank farms should be located in appropriate areas.
- Have roads associated with the Project been approved?

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Site maintenance over the whole lifespan of the mine.
- NIRB should not approve this project.
- The community is glad to have a chance to express their concerns in the NIRB's public meetings.
- Will the NIRB be visiting communities for more meetings in the future?
- How does the NIRB deal with comments it receives regarding the Project?
- Questions on NPC and Land Use Planning:
 - What is the Nunavut Planning Commission?
 - What do they do?
 - How will they be involved in this review process?
 - Why is the NPC absent from the meeting when discussing a joint process between them and the NIRB?
 - What land use plans exist in Nunavut?
 - How is the railroad involved in land use planning?

Arctic Bay Meeting Notes

DATE	TIME
April 2, 2009	1:00-4:30pm, 6:00-9:00 pm
April 3, 2009	9:00-12:00, 1:00-4:00 pm,
Total attendance	191
Each session attendance: Minimum: 37, Maximum: 59	

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- Concerns regarding noise from and the potential for ore to fall down as it relates to conveyor belt operation.
- Ore management and laydown areas.
- How is the conveyor belt connected to ships?
- Concerns regarding wind blowing ore fines during loading from stockpiles at the sea port to ships.
- What alternatives exist for conveyor transport of iron from dock stockpile to ships?
- What information exists regarding wildlife casualties on railways in other regions?
- Wildlife migration routes can change as a result of various factors such as vegetation loss – consideration should be given to the fact that the proposed railway route cuts across the area where rich vegetation exists.
- The proposed railway will cause caribou to change their original feeding grounds and move farther away from Project areas.
- While it seems that Baffinland has decided to build the mine, wildlife is still important; as is human health, considering impacts from mine development.
- Concerns regarding potential caribou casualties on the railway due to collision with trains.
- Concern regarding the prompt information update from Baffinland.
- Concerns for wastes resulting from previous exploration activities, have the same concerns for the Mary River Project.
- Alternative to the proposed railway which goes along east coast, taking into account that there is a variety of wildlife in the Steensby Inlet area.
- Caribou in Arctic Bay area were not impacted by the Nanisivik mine, but recently they disappeared from the region as a result of natural alterations to their habitat.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Will Inuit involvement in the Mary River Project include participation on committees or management boards as was the case with the Nanisivik mine?
- Steensby Inlet is a traditional caribou hunting ground, with some Igloolik community members using the area as long ago as the 1940s.



Photo 3: Elder discussing caribou issues in Arctic Bay

- Waste and garbage were abandoned in Milne Inlet by early exploration projects. Nanisivik also used a few kinds of chemicals such as lime, and therefore the same concerns were raised regarding the usage of chemicals in the Mary River Project and resulting site clean up during mine closure and reclamation.
- What type of minerals will be mined at the Mary River Project?
- Baffinland should assist hunters with their hunting activities by providing transportation to hunting grounds if the Mary River Project proceeds, provided that the proposed railway passes through migration routes of caribou. The community would like to know whether this recommendation will be put into action by Baffinland.
- Concern for impacts to wildlife and human health from noise caused by aircraft, railway, shipping, and port operations. Will these impacts will be monitored and studied from now to the end of mine life?
- More Inuit, especially hunters, be involved in caribou surveys given that they have extensive wildlife knowledge.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Concerns were regarding the proposed mine life of 21 years, communities had heard that the mine would operate for between 90 and 100 years.
- Ice breaking activities associated with the Mary River Project, were likened to those which occurred with the Nanisivik mine and had affected marine mammals (such as walrus). During ice breaking shipping, marine mammals were chased away by ice breakers.
- Concerns for sustainability of renewable resources for future generations, such as wildlife and country food given the impacts on wildlife from railway and shipping.
- Will Baffinland continue the IQ group this year?
- Concerns for Inuit involvement and IIBA negotiations.
- Concerns regarding year round shipping for the Mary River Project, as Nanisivik used very large ships at a rate of 20 trips per year by seasonal operation.
- Concerns for accidents (such as derailment), malfunctions, and mitigation measures related to railway operations, especially considering its high travel speed.
- Concerns regarding detailed shipping routes and bathymetric survey results which provided that there are shallow waters in the proximity of Steensby Inlet.
- Closure and reclamation security interest should be allocated to communities.
- The concerns for consistency regarding agreement implementation; namely that the signed agreements shall be not changed if and when the ownership of the mine is transferred to another company. The communities were consulted during the Nanisivik mine development stage and an agreement was signed. However, this agreement was not continuously implemented after the mine changed ownership.
- Concerns related to impacts on caribou from the Mary River Project development. The community will continue to pursue benefits and wildlife compensation
- Input from the communities should be considered in all planning and contingency plans.
- Concerns regarding the progress of negotiations including royalty, taxes, and the IIBA. Other communities have received royalties from mine development to the tune of \$15,000 per adult and \$6000 per child.
- Concerns for impacts on marine mammals due to under water blasting and dredging in the Steensby Inlet area.
- Caribou have previously migrated to Arctic Bay from East to West, and now they might migrate to the East or South. They migrate North in fall and back South in spring. Concerns also related to impacts on caribou populations from railway operation, as the Mary River area is a very important caribou calving ground.
- Community should be consulted regarding other proposed projects as well.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Percentage of Inuit employed at the Mary River Project, and what mechanisms will be in place for recruiting Inuit employees.
- Concerns regarding impacts on wildlife migration changes (migratory birds and fish) due to mine operation and shipping.
- Hamlet and HTO should fully attend this public meeting.
- Concerns regarding impacts to and deterioration of environmental quality due to mining development.
- Concerns regarding IIBA between QIA and Baffinland, MOU and IIBA negotiation as well as land leases.
- Will DFO authorize Baffinland to carry out ocean floor blasting?
- DFO used to conduct bathymetry, fish, and seismic surveys down to the Inlet here when Nanisivik was in operation. It was not heard at that time how much impact the noise had had on wildlife. Is this true?
- There were positive impacts from the Nanisivik mine, as the community benefited from the mine in regards to income.
- Concerns and comments raised by the community should be taken into consideration by Baffinland. The issues include:
 - Declining wildlife/caribou populations.
 - Movement of animals farther away from community.
 - Potential decline of seal population as happened when the Nanisivik mine was in operation.
 - Importance of traditional food.
 - Concern regarding the timeline of the NIRB review process.
- Concern regarding Inuit employment and associated competition between Inuit and southerners in the labour force.
- Concern regarding impact on wildlife at Steensby Inlet as there are a variety of wildlife resources at or near Steensby Inlet including terrestrial mammals and marine mammals.
- Concern for wildlife protection while balancing benefits from the Mary River Project.
- Elders raised concerns regarding impacts on wildlife.
- Concerns regarding Baffinland's community work group, which should include members with more knowledge of lands and wildlife.
- Alternatives for Steensby Inlet port site and railway alignment considering its intensive operation – more consultation should be done in the potentially affected communities. More studies should be conducted regarding the alternatives to the proposed railway transportation corridor.
- Country foods are getting more difficult to get, and costs of living (including hunting costs) are increasing.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Concerns over how the NIRB will consider the comments and Traditional Knowledge collected from community meetings in its review process.
- Concerns regarding impacts on wildlife from railway and shipping activities. Communities like Igloolik and Hall Beach share their hunting.
- Concerns regarding the potential for the railway to block wildlife migration routes which run from East to West.
- The Nanisivik mine did not benefit community except employment.
- Questions regarding project components:
 - Equipment transport by the Milne Inlet Tote Road and railway.
 - Scale and type of Steensby Inlet deep sea port.
 - Daily operation rate of train and ships.
 - Railway tunnels.
- Questions on the sequence/logical relation between NIRB Review process and IIBA finalization.
- Mixed feeling from community regarding the positive and negative impacts from the Mary River Project:
 - Positive aspects: employment and increased opportunities for young generations, big deposit and associated benefit.
 - Negative aspects: impacts on the environment, human health, and social issues.
- Has any study been conducted regarding noise level, noise impacts, and the magnitude from railway and air traffic.
- Has Baffinland provided transportation for community members to other communities such as Resolute and Grise Fiord.
- Concerns regarding any signed agreement between QIA and Baffinland.
- Concerns regarding potential ship capsizing or submersion and related accidents such as fuel spills into the ocean.
- Concern for fatal accidents and associated compensation in mine operation as had happened in Nanisivik mine.
- How can the ongoing activities (road building, suppliers transport) be moving forward when the NIRB review is not complete?
- Concerns regarding potential impacts of hazardous weather conditions on the operation of the railway.
- Baffinland has told the community the mine would operate for more than 90-100 years.
- Concerns that alcohol will be coming to the community.
- Impact on marine mammals from shipping, specifically the impact on seals layers/dens during spring season, which would significantly affect the survival of seal cubs.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Concern regarding compensations for marine shipping accidents.
- Noise impact on marine mammals from shipping, especially on seals.
- Impacts on wildlife from the construction and operation of roads and associated water crossings.
- It is preferable to build the railway on flatter areas rather than constructing tunnels.
- Concerns for ski-doo crossing facilities over the proposed railway that could be used for hunting, and also concern for the safety of hunters given the high traffic and high speed of trains on the railway.
- Information sharing regarding photographic illustration of railway alignment.
- Concerns regarding archaeological site protection in the Mary River Project areas.
- Questions on the Project proposal:
 - Who is Baffinland?
 - Size of deposits and Project area?
 - Total costs of and investment in the Project?
 - Total footprint?
 - Benefit per person?
 - IIBA negotiation progress.
- Community liaison office is closed, what is the situation?
- Could the NIRB only approve the mine for a short time period (5 years) in order to see how caribou are impacted by the railway?
- Who makes up the Baffinland working group, and what about the progress of the working group?
- Is the range of exploration activities limited to the Mary River area is the Project taking place in the whole North Baffin Region?
- The numbers of drilling holes in the Mary River area.
- Air traffic volume, low level flights, they almost resulted in accident/collision with hunters on the ground using ATVs in the summer, therefore a minimum altitude should be maintained when low level flights are carried out.
- Update of caribou study/survey.
- There are large amounts of fuel stored at the Mary River area and we heard there have been fuel spills, did they fix the situation that caused the spill?
- The exploration activities at Mary River have benefited the community.
- A caribou study team in the community conducted by GN using helicopter did not inform all the community members of the study. Experienced hunters should be on the board involving the study as they have extensive wildlife knowledge.
- The presentation itself would be more effective at facilitating understanding if given in the North Baffin dialect.

Resolute Meeting Notes

DATE	TIME
April 4, 2009	1:00-4:30 pm, 6:30-9:00 pm
April 5 2009	3:00-6:00 pm
Total attendance	69
Each session attendance: Minimum: 15, Maximum: 27	

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- Community members hunt caribou in the Project area with other communities like Pond Inlet. Will the community receive compensation for impacts to hunting?
- Will wildlife which has been impacted by the Project and migrated to other areas as a result, return to the Project areas after mine closure?
- Alternatives to the proposed railway and deep sea port.
- As DFO is very reluctant to approve applications for seafood harvesting (crabs and shrimps), and beach facility constructions, would DFO approve the underwater blasting?
- Government receives taxes and income, but individuals do not. Therefore the interest from these taxes should be considered as the mine development may impact the communities' food sources, and ultimately their life would be affected by the Project.
- As the Project is located within caribou calving grounds, are there any caribou studies in the Project areas?
- Ballast water management in Steensby Inlet (the Canadian Ballast water control and management regulations).
- Barrels and oils were left on hunting grounds and are now being cleaned up by DEW line cleanup project.
- Caribou in Steensby Inlet will be impacted by the Project.
- Communities are happy to have been consulted for the Project development; however, the community did not receive benefits from past mine development in the North Baffin region.
- Community is grateful for the work done by the QIA.
- Community members have hunted in the Mary River area since before the year 2000.
- Concern for other communities potentially impacted by the Mary River Project.
- Concerns for other deposits except deposit #1, public should beware of the future development.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Concerns regarding other communities' comments on the Project
- Concerns regarding shipping around Resolute.
- A shipping route with deeper waters should be chosen; some of the proposed shipping areas in Foxe Basin are shallow.
- Concerns regarding the impact of year round shipping to on-ice dog team travel.
- Concerns regarding the impacts on terrestrial wildlife by railway and to marine mammals from shipping.
- Concerns regarding waste and wastewater disposal.
- Concerns regarding the potential disposal of waste oils and greases in the Mary River area given that there would be lot of vehicles which would generate a large amount of waste oils. Polaris mine had poor performance in this regard. Waste oil was just dumped in barrels or burned.
- Concerns that wildlife will be impacted by diseases associated with mine development.
- Concerns related to current progress between the QIA and Baffinland regarding IIBA negotiation with respect to the mine development. Has a compensation agreement (IIBA) been signed?
- The QIA and Baffinland have agreed to a deal, and the company has spent lots money, so can the project be stopped? It seems like it is going ahead without this review process.
- Concerns related to wildlife compensation by Baffinland. Community Land and Resources Committee (CLARC) members should be informed when the information is available.
- How will the NIRB protect the wildlife and marine mammals and traveling among communities?
- How will the benefits (IIBA) from the Project be implemented for the community? Based on past experience, the community did not get benefits from mine development as it should have.
- The NIRB should seriously consider marine wildlife and impacts to marine mammals from marine shipping and impacts on surrounding communities from like Igloodik.
- Impact on wildlife from mine development is not as serious as people believe. From past mine experience, the marine mammals were still in mine areas, but when researchers deployed radio collars or tags, they would disappear from where they were caught, which was misunderstood to be a negative result of mining activities. Wildlife is not extinct, they just move to other places.
- Community members are interested to see photos of ships.
- Nanisivik should be considered as a deep sea port alternative to the proposed Steensby Inlet sea port.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Polaris did benefit local communities, but a big mess (rust barrels) was left after closure and reclamation. Now the DEW mediation projects are cleaning the mess up, but people have similar concerns with the Mary River Project.
- Pan Arctic Oil and Gas Exploration and their associated activities had impacts on Resolute even though the impacts may have disappeared.
- Performance bonds and security should be in place prior to Project development.
- Potential damages and impacts to landforms.



Photo 4: Public Scoping meeting in Resolute

- Potential impacts to marine mammals and possible mortality of wildlife due to under water blasting.
- Potential impacts to terrestrial and marine mammals from the Project.
- Communities can benefit from the Project development.
- Protection of archaeological sites in project areas is important.
- The public needs more time to ask questions and to express their comments.
- How will the NIRB deal with the conflicts between Hamlet and HTA (different options regarding the Project)?
- Will the shipping associated with the Mary River Project follow Canadian laws?
- What will be the timing of marine shipping operations, and how will it impact marine mammals?

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- What types of ships are proposed to be used for ice breaking? Are they double hulled vessel? There is concern regarding potential for oil leakage into water.
- What amendment would the NIRB and the NPC make to the NBRLUP? How would the NBRLUP be amended? Who will be involved? Has the amendment been made already?
- Questions on benefits, compensation, and royalties resulting from the Mary River Project.
- Railway will impact Inuit hunting ground and hunting activities in project areas – will there be any compensation in this regard?
- Relationship between ongoing activities in Mary River Project areas conducted by Baffinland, and the NIRBs review process.
- Resolute hopes to be informed and updated throughout the NIRBs review process.
- Resolute is far away from the Mary River Project; however it is still involved with the Project in one way or another. In the 1960's and 1970's it was involved with the polar gas exploration in the high Arctic, and those oil and gas resources still have the potential to be developed.
- Resolute plays an important role for Canada's sovereignty in the Arctic, and the community is grateful for being consulted by the NIRB. Residents of Resolute have suffered hardship and impacts from oil and gas exploration after being relocated.
- The shipping route is very close to Igloolik, Hall Beach, Cape Dorset, Coral Harbour, and Kimmirut; those communities should be included in the Public Hearing.
- Keep the railway after mine closure. There is the potential to extend the railway to Iqaluit. Whether there is a bridge to be built which connects to the mainland of Igloolik and then possibly down to Montreal.
- Concerns regarding the life of the Mary River Project.
- What are the facilities to be used to treat soils polluted by spills at the Project?
- How will government agencies and organizations be involved in the NIRBs review process? Will the NIRB do studies or will DFO or WWF?
- The impact on all waters (marine waters and fresh waters) should be assessed by the NIRB carefully.
- The community can get benefits from the Mary River Project, such as the employment percentage, business, and contact opportunities.
- The researching activities conducted by the scientists are more harmful to wildlife health than the mining industry, in the cases where radio collars and tags are put on animals. For example a polar bear was caught and was very sick when researchers put a radio on it.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- The Tote Road used to be a caribou hunting route used by the nearby communities. Has any research been done along the Tote Road and railway to identify whether there are any calving grounds in the Project area?
- Have relevant studies regarding noise impact on wildlife from railway and seaport been done?
- Have any new energy resources other than fossil fuels been considered, such as solar panels and wind turbines to replace the fossil fuels which would reduce greenhouse gases to provide heat for buildings?
- Has Baffinland seriously considered the community concerns, and do they plan to start the Project?
- Is snow taken into consideration? Hunters use snow when they are on the land.
- Will job training be conducted in the communities?
- Wildlife is not extinct, they change their migrating route, and no blame should be laid on development conducted by government and companies.
- The community is happy to be consulted. Before, the lands belonged to government, but now as a land claim agreement is in place, residents have a chance to protect their lands from pollution in Nunavut. The community is still pleased to see the NIRB come to listen to the communities' concerns.

Grise Fiord Meeting Notes

DATE	TIME
April 6, 2009	6:00-9:00 pm
April 7, 2009	1:00-4:30 pm, 7:00-9:30 pm
April 8, 2009	1:00-4:00 pm, 7:00-9:00 pm
Total attendance	86
Each session attendance: Minimum: 10, Maximum: 21	

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- Grise Fiord hunting ground extends South to Devon Island, and rarely stretches further to Lancaster Sound. It does not go to Borden Peninsula, but mostly covers the northern area of Grise Fiord.
- NIRB community consultation is too late, as it seems that the Mary River Project would start very soon based on original the staging and preconstruction plan.
- Concerns for the proposed mine life of 20 years as it is not practical.
- Comments that Nunavut did not benefit from past mine developments.
- Concerns regarding Inuit traditional way of life and wildlife taking account the mine development and climate change. Specifically the caribou population decreasing due to increased shipping as a results of climate change and mine development in the north.
- Does Baffinland have any mitigation plans to minimize impacts form mine?
- Concern for benefit from the Project for the region.
- Concerns for impacts on wildlife from contamination and pollution related to the Project.
- NBRLUP is a community based Land Use Plan, and consultations among five communities were conducted during draft stage. All governments should listen and consider the community concerns. Traditional travel routes are in the Mary River project area. When the former Lancaster Sound Land Use Plan was developing, lots of consultation works were done including:
 - Visiting communities and hunters
 - Traditional hunting sites
 - Environment Canada and Transport Canada involvement
- The railway should go east if possible to avoid having an adverse impact on marine mammals.
- Baffinland did not consider the concerns from communities for the Project.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Concerns over staking activities on Devon Island (without consulting with communities) which impact the environment.
- Concern for DFOs fairness given that DFO is very strict to approve the community facilities such as docks. How will it approve the Mary River project?
- Alternative routes for the proposed railway and sea port should be considered, as the proposed railway route is located on a caribou migration route, and the proposed shipping route in Foxe Basin will impact a variety of marine wildlife.
- The northern shipping route is better than the proposed Steensby Inlet route, because the ships will be very opposed by the people in Igloolik and the south, it will mean ships stay more in the open water of Lancaster Sound and down Davis Strait and farther away from the icy portions. The Igloolik area of Foxe Basin and near Cape Dorset is very shallow and could be dangerous for ships going through. The residents in Foxe Basin already experience impacts to their harvests because of ships. Also have concerns for shipping accidents, related spills, safety measures, and associated contingency plan prior to implementation of the Project.
- Concern that back-up facilities are not shown in the drawing. The north needs safety mechanisms in place and residents worry about their land, air, and water in the future.
- Concerns regarding shipping accidents, malfunctions, and disaster scenarios in remote ice area. Even though it may not be an oil accident like Exxon, still have concerns regarding the preparedness of environment protection, and emergency reaction mechanisms. It would be better to change the proposed shipping route to the one in Baffin Bay which is already used by marine traffic.
- The people of Foxe Basin would be greatly impacted so the railway should be moved closer to Pond Inlet. When high volume of shipping is proposed, especially considering icebreaking, there is a great potential for emergency situations to arise. The Baffin Bay route is used much less now so it would be better to move the shipping to Pond Inlet. There will be too much impact in Foxe Basin from that much shipping.
- Baffinland should consult with local communities so that appropriate plans and designs are in place to carry out the Project.
- Does Baffinland have other projects in other regions (related mine experience), and are there any beneficiary shareholders associated with the Project.
- Is there a Land Use Plan in the South Baffin Region? Is shipping within the land use planning region?
- Why is Baffinland using conveyors instead of loaders to transport iron ore? Dust will have health impacts to humans and wildlife, as carvers always suffer from dust.
- The location of proposed landfill at Mary River site is too close to water, this concern comes from the practice of dumping grounds in community.
- Why will ammonia nitrate will be used in the Project?

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Will there be potential for hunters to use the railway and trains after mine closure, or must hunters pay Baffinland if they want to use them?
- What type of rail gauge (wide or narrow) is proposed with the Project?
- Using desalinated sea water as potable water raises human health concerns, and associated question of why would the company use desalinated water instead of fresh water from nearby lakes?
- Questions on the Project components
 - Shipping route to Milne Inlet is in the ice-free zone all year?
 - The frequency of shipping operation?
 - How long has the Tote road been in operation?
 - Who will operate the shipping, Baffinland or another company?
 - Use for iron?
 - Locomotive performance in Arctic region?
 - Production rate of iron ore?
 - Total waste rock to be generated by the Project?
 - Iron ore processing methods?
 - Worker numbers at Steensby Inlet?
 - Type of workers based at the mine?
 - Fuel shipping rate?
 - Number of fuel tanks, site storage capacity at the Project at Steensby inlet and Mary River site?
 - Mine lifespan?
 - What kind of planes will be used?
 - Will ice on railway cause problems?
 - How long will construction of the Project take?
 - The distance from land to island in Steensby Inlet?
 - Is there a doctor on site?
- Residents hope for more airline operation in the high arctic which will benefit the local residents.
- Will Baffinland make an agreement with the communities regarding compensation for travel and hunting equipment loss as a result of ice breaking?



Photo 5: Public Scoping meeting in Grise Fiord

- How many members on the NIRB? How are members appointed? Why does NIRB have no members from the high Arctic?
- Is it possible that the IIBA can cover certain items, in which the communities can use Baffinland's shipping to bring in goods or whereby communities could share the cost with Baffinland?
- Concerns regarding information the community received in only a 2 day meeting regarding the Project.
- Concerns regarding mine closure and reclamation, as the mining companies did not fully complete the mine site clean up as they committed to do in Nanisivik after closure.
- Concern regarding Inuit employment, as it was not protected in past mines. In Polaris, Inuit were hired at the beginning but after the mine was in operation, they hire more employees from Newfoundland and other southern areas.
- Concerns raised regarding mine site clean up and reclamation policy, given the past experience related to resources development by INAC in the north. The liberals spend \$250 million of tax payers money for mine reclamation in northern Canada, and original occupants suffered from the damaged environment, while shareholders got benefits. How have the policies changed in the past 10 years?
- What benefits can Grise Fiord get from the Project?
- What is the rationale for the NIRB's scoping meeting held in Grise Fiord?

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Concern regarding ice breaking, as sea ice in Foxe Basin is used by the nearby communities to facilitate travel.
- Can the community give their concerns regarding the shipping route to federal agencies through the NIRB? The community should have an opportunity to voice their concerns to authorizing agencies for the Project.
- Balance concerns (i.e. impacts to wildlife) and benefits for residents (i.e. employment).
- Concerns regarding increasing exploration and research projects on Ellesmere Island.
- Concern for the potential of the Project to impact various sea birds at Hall Beach, and waterfowl at the Steensby Inlet are.
- Is the NIRB is going to have scoping meetings in Repulse Bay and Northern Quebec?
- Concerns that the impacted communities by shipping route were not fully consulted, given that the Project has been planned, there would be lot of concern in those communities impacted by shipping activities.
- Will the NIRB's Board members come to visit the community prior to approval of the Project? Who are the Board Members? Where are they from? Why are there no members from the high Arctic?
- What kind of involvement did the communities of Pond Inlet, Hall Beach and others have, and what concerns did they raise?
- It is wise that Baffinland consults all communities impacted by the Steensby Inlet shipping route.
- If the railway could be extended to Iqaluit, it would minimize the impact on marine mammals.
- The community is very pleased to have the NIRB consult with us. It would be better if the NIRB had a certain committee to represent the interests of Pond Inlet, Arctic Bay, and the high Arctic region.
- Freight costs in the high Arctic are very expensive; is there a possibility that Baffinland share shipping and thereby cut down the living costs of local residents? Is it possible to discuss this in the IIBA?
- How will people be able to go to work at the mine – can the community get a new airstrip? Even though it is small community and far away from the Project, it still would like to participate like other communities if the community can benefit from the Project. Besides, residents travel to the Project area by boat and ski-doo. The community needs to provide their kids with opportunities like everyone else in the bigger areas.
- Like other communities, concerns exist regarding social and community well-being, as increased cash flow in the community and associated increase in drugs and alcohol will change the life of younger generations. Is there some sort of promotion against such substance abuse geared towards young people?

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Can the community provide country food for the Inuit workers on the Project sites? Their diet is important and they will need country food. In addition, there are a few meat plants in the territory, and this would benefit local business.
- An airline stopped their route from here to Pond Inlet. Is there a possibility to reconnect Grise Fiord with Pond Inlet because residents have relatives and need easy access to other communities?
- Concerns for the Inuit workers' equality at the work place.
- The visit made by Baffinland was short and the information was extensive. We were overwhelmed. The community learned of the Project last December. The NIRB's meeting gives the community more information and some of this information is very new.

Igloolik Meeting Notes

DATE	TIME
April 16, 2009	6:30-9:30 pm
April 17, 2009	1:00-4:30 pm, 6:30-9:30 pm
April 18, 2009	10:00am-12:00 pm, 1:00-4:30pm
Total attendance	148
Each session attendance: Minimum: 20, Maximum: 39	

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- Based on the NLCA, how will the NPC and NIRB assess the impacts on marine water and surface water? What limits will be put on the assessment and can you provide any update in this regard?
- Difficulty reading the NIRB and NPC joint process.
- Clarification request regarding the definition of scoping - how do you identify individual environmental components which are interlinked?
- Lot of research has been completed in the past 10 years around the community (from James Bay to Iqaluit), a lot of valuable information has been collected. It seems that there is a lack of communication between governments and companies regarding the sharing of this information.
- Igloolik has voiced their opposition to the proposed shipping route.
- Are there any alternatives for the Steensby Inlet shipping route ?
- Concerns regarding on board sewage disposal and ballast water disposal.
- Misunderstandings occurred with interpretation when Baffinland had its community consultation and now also with the NIRB community scoping meetings.
- Clear information (the truth) regarding the Mary River project, including negative impacts of the Project, needs to be shared as community was previously not well informed about the Project.
- Impacts on land/waters from ongoing project activities and concerns for cumulative impacts when added to possible future project activities.
- A railway and shipping route are proposed for the Mary River project but the community did not have enough information when NIRB started its consultation in the community.
- Calcium used in Baffinland's exploration drilling program impacted the ponds nearby the drilling operations.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- It is not comfortable for the proposed railway, it maybe do not spend more if build the railway to Clyde River.
- The shipping route through Foxe Basin, via Coral Harbour and Hudson Strait is identified as the preferred route, which will have impact on walrus the local resident depend on as country food source. The potential for oil spills impacting on marine mammals is another concern.
- Igloolik has a population of more than 2000, so it is strange not so many people are attending the meeting today.
- The Mary River project will create jobs, but shipping will impact the life of the residents.
- Community residents have the right to protect their lands and waters.
- Whole marine ecosystem should be carefully evaluated as the shipping and the shipping route will affect the whole ecosystem, from sea birds (sea gulls) to marine mammals (seals, walrus and polar bears), even scavengers - the lifespan of wildlife will be affected.
- What was the rationale for choosing Steensby Inlet for the sea port rather than Pond Inlet, as Pond Inlet is closer to Mary River?
- An alternative shipping route located at Clyde River or Pond Inlet should be chosen, as the shipping would drive marine mammals away.
- It would be more acceptable if the shipping route is changed to Clyde River - hunters will be more supportive of the Project.
- A balanced consideration on all impacts would facilitate good decision making.
- Can the proposed shipping route can be rejected?
- What are the concerns from other communities?.
- Will NIRB consider the comments from the community?
- Whether or not the Igloolik HTA is concerned about the wildlife/walrus, this should be their top priority.
- Marine shipping may have significant impacts, may have subtle impact as it has never happened before. It might also have significant socio-economic impacts as well as biophysical impacts.
- Potential for cumulative impacts to wildlife; the meat will be not as good when animals have too much stress.
- What considerations for mitigation/minimization of impacts on wildlife have been offered?
- It was said that there are mines in Mexico that had run out of water... concerns exist for the same thing happening with the Mary River project.
- Where would ballast water be exchanged, at Steensby Inlet?
- What consideration has been taken into account regarding the impact on shellfish/marine creatures from shipping? Shellfish have been destroyed from shipping in the Great Lakes, and the arctic ecosystem is more fragile.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Old lessons have been learned from shipping during the operation of the mine at Nanisivik.
- Question about results after the mine closure.
- How is the ballast water taken on in Europe replaced? Where is it dumped?
- The airstrip at Steensby Inlet should not be extended as there are a lot of archaeological sites in the area. How would those sites be protected if the Project gets approved? An airstrip expansion in Igloolik was not allowed to disturb similar sites.
- Both Baffinland and governments conduct archaeological research in the Project areas. Where did the funding come from? Which one should be more reliable?
- How is iron ore separated from waste rock for Mary River Project? Some mines use water/chemicals to separate ore from waste rocks.
- Concerns regarding the cultural/values conflicts resulting from Mary River Project.
- Concerns regarding impacts from explosives/blasting on fish, as there are various fish in the lakes surrounding project area/rail alignment. How would these fish be protected from possible impacts?
- Was iron ore crushed during bulk sampling program?
- What is the quality of iron ore quality like for the Mary River project?
- How will oxidation of iron ore be controlled?
- How would dust from iron fines be controlled during iron ore transport? It would be a health concern for humans and wildlife.
- Concerns regarding drugs/alcohol being brought into the community by the project workers, based on experiences during the Nanisivik mine operation.
- Pond Inlet is closer to Mary River, so what was the rationale for choosing Steensby Inlet rather than Pond Inlet as a deep sea port for the Project?
- The project area is caribou hunting ground, whether or not Baffinland intends to allow hunting.
- The road alignment chosen by Baffinland should be trusted, as it is based on the scientific research. Will concerns regarding the ecosystem and wildlife protection be taken into the decision making?
- Have alternative methods of iron ore transport been considered by Baffinland, such as air lift by giant jets? Using the proposed large ships will be expensive, especially if wildlife protection is taken into account.
- Rangers use the Project area from May to June for their annual drill. how will the Project will affect this yearly military program?
- Have any studies been completed to assess the impacts from proposed roads leading to Steensby Inlet? Caribous can adapt to the change and migrate to other places, the important concern is the impact on marine mammals from the proposed shipping route.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- The Mary River Project should not cause concern given its short lifespan, as long as it benefits the economic development of Nunavut.
- There are old tent rings on the island where iron will be stockpiled and loaded on to ships... a similar one was found in the proximity of Igloolik airport, with grave sites also identified around the tent ring. This resulted in that airstrip expansion not being implemented. There might be grave/burial sites in the vicinity of the tent ring on the island, and those burial sites might belong to the same tribe or same era, therefore if construction activities are conducted on the island, it would be problematic.
- Request to clarify the size of the proposed ore carriers with visual images (photos) if available.
- How much ore would each ship hold, and what would the value of a full ship's load of iron ore be?
- The community appreciates NIRB's consideration of the comments from the community. Lots of exploration have been approved and conducted in Nunavut, and it is very expensive to identify deposits for mine development... does that mean NIRB has an obligation to allow identified deposits to be developed into mines with only a few people benefiting from it?
- Public should be well informed about the Project proposal.
- What are the objectives of NIRB's public consultation?
- Pond Inlet/Arctic Bay, and other communities all have their hunting grounds, every community is different.
- Will the public still be able to access the traditional and current hunting grounds in the Mary River area once mine is in operation?
- What amount of fuel is will be carried on the ships? What mitigation measures /contingency plans would be put in place to ensure safe shipping and protect the marine environment and wildlife from fuel spills?
- To put the ship size into perspective, one ore carrier would have a capacity of approximately 270,000 half-ton pickup trucks.
- Community is very concerned about the shipping route in Steensby Inlet, as it could potentially impact marine mammals and hunting through accidents, spills, and leaks.
- Scientific research has shown that shallow waters exist in Steensby Inlet. Open water shipping is not a big concern, but ice breaking shipping will be quite different. The wildlife will be impacted from this to marine shipping. What procedures and guidelines would be followed if the Project is approved?
- Tourists come up in the spring season and their close up photography activities have disturbed wildlife... they have moved away from communities and hunters have to go farther for hunting. 12 trips/month shipping will definitely have adverse impacts on wildlife migration, especially the walrus.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- It is said around 3000 jobs will be created from Mary River Project, but most people in the community have an education level lower than Grade 10, so what are the chances for those people to get job opportunities from the Project?
- The iron ore deposit will be mined for 21 years, and after that; there will be no more benefits for the community.
- Community has no way to ensure the concerns of the community and individuals are well presented by QIA when it negotiates with Baffinland. There should be a mechanism in place to guarantee community's voice is heard and addressed.
- There are around 4000 archaeological sites/tent rings in the Project areas. How can they be protected?
- Foxe Basin is important marine wildlife habitat for a variety of marine wildlife.
- Studies of impact scenarios of the Project on wildlife, and Mitigation measures to protect wildlife as the Project areas are caribou migration and calving grounds.
- Potential exists for dramatic environmental changes and there is uncertainty related to environmental change due to mine operation in 21 years given that the train runs twice every day. How can the impacts on the environment be assessed without understanding how the environment changes within 21 years?
- Baffinland has a hidden agenda with its materialistic nature; there is need for more representations from all 13 communities.
- Commitments must be made to the community by Baffinland.
- Safety concerns related to train operation, specifically train derailments.
- People's dependence on wildlife must be taken into account.
- There is travel between Igloolik and Clyde River year round, and the Project is located midway between the communities. The mine will create jobs but will change diets and lifestyles.
- The Project will benefit the community and people, but will cause concerns beyond economic issues.
- There has never been a mine in the area, so it is not clear to understand potential impacts from it. But based on a view from air, impact could be seen, if proceeds, the project will impact wildlife, fresh water and fish/Arctic char, and environment.
- The Project will affect hunting/fishing, concern regarding inaccessibility of the project area for the community after it is in construction and operation.
- Concerns for the transfer of mine ownership to Chinese and Japanese companies.
- Comments on the letter from GN-DOE to NIRB when the Mary River Project was screened by the Board in 2008. All four questions in the commenting form were answered by "Yes":
 - Potential impacts on ecosystem
 - Potential impacts on social and economic aspect
 - Significant public concern

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- New technologies for which the impacts are unknown
- Concern regarding impacts on vegetation, as taking the vegetation in the arctic recovers very slowly if it is impacted. The old ATV hunting trails have had an impact on vegetation in the Project area. It's understandable that the railway will have significant impact on vegetation forever.
- The Mary River area is a caribou hunting ground, but caribou are moving away from the area. Also caribou are sensitive to scent - the Project will greatly impact caribou.
- Shipping operations will impact marine mammals given the big size of ships and the contaminants that come along with ships. Considering that there were only 6 ships coming to the community before, and the currently proposed shipping rate, shipping will drastically change level of impacts.
- As the mine site is close to rivers, the dust from the mine will impact fish habitat - what mitigation measures will be adopted to offset this impact?
- People in Baker Lake are talking about a uranium mine and the associated impacts... the Mary River project will be the same in terms of impacts.
- Concerns regarding wastes which come from Europe and possible dumping at sea ports in Steensby Inlet. Walrus will be impacted negatively due to shipping operations.
- Comment regarding past experience being on board of ships, and wastewater /sewage were just dumped into ocean. The proposed shipping would have the same way of dealing with wastewater/sewage. What guidelines would be in place to control waste dumping?
- Inuit do not know how Baffinland market their iron ore in Europe, but most Inuit hunters have wildlife knowledge. We want royalties as the Project will impact land/wildlife habitat.
- Country foods will be impacted and there are concerns for whether future generation can keep traditional lifestyles.
- Concern for the royalty and compensation from the Project.
- People did not support the proposed shipping route in Steensby Inlet as it would impact wildlife habitat as well as the future generations. This opinion was expressed during a previous consultation meeting held by Baffinland.
- The proposed shipping route will scare walrus herds away from the community, and the railway will also impact caribou and birds. Why has an alternative route to the east coast not been considered?
- Mine operation will contaminate lands and rivers.
- Security bonds for closure and reclamation should be in place prior to mine operation.
- The Project will impact the well-being of future generations, and our concerns should seriously be taken into consideration.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Concerns for invasion of foreign species (such as barnacles) coming along with ships.
- Is it possible that Baffinland can sue the government if they cannot develop the Mary River mine?
- Some residents favor the Mary River Project, however the benefit (money) from the Project can't stay forever. The impacts on the environment and wildlife would be big concern.
- Everyone should have opportunity to express his/her concerns.
- Concerns regarding the results after the shipping stops, can animals come back after that?
- Residents disagreed with researchers when they put radio collars on the polar bears, but peoples concern and opposition were not respected, the same concern for the Mary River Project and wonder if the concerns from community are not treated seriously regardless what concern they have.
- People don't want a shipping route in Steensby Inlet; it should be on the east coast.
- What contingency plan will be in place if the Project is approved as there will be spill in ocean? And what new technologies will be used to clean up spills?
- In a TV program, it said that the shipping route for the Project would not be our waters, but now it seems that it is proposed in our waters.
- From the experiences of other mines, the environment was monitored in Iqaluit by representatives from a few communities, and samples were also taken for analysis in Pangnirtung. Will there be similar monitoring for this project? DIAND was responsible for studies conducted for wildlife monitoring and mitigation at that time, will DIAND still be responsible for the monitoring of Mary River Project as well?
- Have any lessons been learned regarding impacts on wildlife and environment using perspectives from other regions that had open pit iron ore mines?
- Aquatic life would be disturbed by waste, noise and oil spills from the shipping, particularly when one considers that the water body in Foxe Basin is not so large,
- Concerns whether the generosity of the Inuit is taken advantage of by foreigners.
- What kind of equipment and procedures would be utilized for clean up of the oils/chemical spills? Because they are distinctive in nature, the clean up method should be different.
- Is there new technology that can be used to clean up oil/fuel spills?
- There have been some studies completed including bathymetry for the Project, public have the following concerns:
 - Cooperation between different organizations,
 - Update if taking account climate change
 - Update of information to public

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- There is a problem with some of the translations in the presentation: the translation of air pollutants, and inconsistency of place names.
- Oil/chemical spills in the ocean from shipping will impact aquatic life and ultimately impact the country food.
- Will the air quality be monitored all the time?
- Concerns regarding the mine dewatering and discharge management.
- Concerns regarding wildlife habitat: Fox dens were occupied by quarry pit in community, what will be the fox and wolf dens in the Project area?
- Concerns regarding the water contamination from mine activities, and mine method of dewatering. As Inuit rely on country foods which are eaten raw, the contaminated water will affect the country food and affect human health. How will the public be noticed when such contamination occurs, who should be responsible for the notice for public, and how will the public know country food is contaminated?
- Concerns regarding foreign species invasion, pollution spreading via local contamination in the water system.
- Is there water/chemical usage in iron ore processing?
- Concerns related to lagoons and tailing ponds in the mining industry - Nanisivik had leakage from a tailings facility. What procedure would be in place in this kind of situation (spill, leakage accidents)?
- What kind of compensation and standards exist for water/land contamination from the Project.
- Pollution even from emissions will pollute the whole ecosystem, Do people have the right to ask the Project to shut down after it is in operation? Are you working for Baffinland?
- RIAs manage the lands but Inuit lands are owned by all beneficiaries.
- Delivery water has added chloride and fluoride, but Inuit are used to fresh water without any additives. Ice is also a fresh water source and therefore should be protected.
- Concerns for employment on the project site. some Inuit got jobs which are not related to their training. They got specific training in the South through GN programs, but when they worked on the Project site, they were only offered labour jobs.
- Women's council in NWT has procedures and mechanisms to help promote their skills and equality in work place, wish Nunavut had similar mechanisms or organizations to serve women in career development and skills training.
- Some Inuit workers have certificates and when they worked at the Mary River project, they also got training; they should get the positions that they trained for rather than being offered low level work (labour work).
- CBC news said there would be a 4 million dollar fund for training of Nunavut beneficiaries, is it true?

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Community supports the open pit mine, but opposes the railway and shipping route.



Photo 6: Public Scoping meeting in Igloolik

- Concerns for what benefit and welfare the community can get from the Project.
- Concerns regarding work opportunities and competition among different communities surrounding the Project.
- Suggest NIRB continue to inform the public in other communities which have the same concerns as Igloolik does, and get public opinions whether they support or oppose the Project.
- Community is grateful to be better informed about the project and ready for next step of participation in the EA process - Previously the public was not as informed as now regarding project development.

Hall Beach Meeting Notes

DATE	TIME
April 19, 2009	6:30-9:30 pm (Open House)
April 20, 2009	1:00-4:30 pm, 6:30-9:30 pm
April 21, 2009	1:00-4:30pm, 6:30-9:30 pm
Total attendance	105
Each session attendance: Minimum: 10, Maximum: 29	

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- Concerns over the impacts of caribou migration across the rail line; caribou migrate from south to north along Steensby Inlet, and back to the south again in Fall, both ways they have to cross the rail line
- Caribou cycle is around 30 years due to slow vegetation recovery - there were not caribou in Arctic Bay years ago, and they have been back around after 30 years.
- Translation mistakes on page 19 of the presentation.
- Is there any other processing after the crushing of iron ore; is it the same process that was used in Nanisivik?
- How is iron ore separated from waste rock?
- What were the results of the bulk sampling project conducted last year?
- The community is in support of the Project, and hope NIRB supports the Mary River Project.
- Mine impacts on the environment and wildlife can be mitigated as long as proper measures and manage met are put in place.
- Mining company is willing to listen to concerns from community; therefore we don't worry too much.
- Time changes, the climate is changing, and life can't go back to the past, so it is better to look forward.
- The Project can create jobs for future generations.
- What is the byproduct of the desalination process?
- Based on the past experience of community resupply ships, walrus will not be scared away after they get used to ships, then they might not avoid the ships any more, which might cause casualties. Therefore Inuit hunters should be on the first ship to monitor the walrus when the project starts operations.
- Some youth in the community have certificates, but they could not get jobs with the Mary River Project. At the same time, after Baffinland cut off jobs, more

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

Inuit lost jobs than their southern counterparts; the ratio of Inuit to southerners is smaller than last year when there were more than 300 people working at the bulk sampling program.



Photo 7: Youth participants at the Public Scoping meeting in Hall Beach

- Railway is a concern for caribou migration, but the real concern is the impact from rail traffic on caribou migration, as both migrations to north in spring and back to south in fall have to cross the rail line, which could cause caribou mortality from running into the trains.
- Safety issues related to rail traffic collision with caribou.
- Concerns regarding compensation for accidents and injuries at mine site. Family was scared when airplane crash occurred at the project.
- Concerns over benefits for youth.
- Bowhead whales move back north in June, and July is the most active season for hunting of walrus, fishing and geese. Mid- August is the best time to hunt caribou, as the hide is the best for clothing.
- Grizzly bear came to the west peninsula DEW line site last year, which was the first time grizzly bears were seen so far north.
- Last winter the freeze-up time was a month later than usual, and there was no temperature below -40 for the whole winter. Also, a large area of open water existed through the whole winter.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- The estimation for summer ice-free time in the arctic ocean has decreased dramatically, from 6 year at 2 years ago to 2 years now, Climate changing is a gradual process but when it occur, it just happen sudenly.
- Concerns for impacts on caribou migration from railway operation.
- Community supports the Project.
- Concerns regarding compensation for accidents and injuries at mine site.

Coral Harbour Meeting Notes

DATE	TIME
April 22, 2009	6:30-9:30 pm
April 23, 2009	1:00-4:30 pm, 6:30-9:30 pm
Total attendance	55
Each session attendance: Minimum: 12, Maximum: 29	

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- Polar bear studies have been ongoing for more than 25 years, how will the results be incorporated into NIRB's review process? Will any new studies be carried out? If so, how would the new studies be combined with the existing studies?
- What impact is expected on polar bears from the Project?
- Why isn't the railway planned to run northward with the existing road?
- How many board members does the NIRB have, and how many of those members are Inuit?
- Concerns regarding potential spills from shipping, will they be considered?
- World economy is declining, how will Baffinland get finances to develop the Project, and what benefits could Nunavut get from the Project? When project begins making a profit, how Baffinland will use the profit?
- There have been shipping activities in the North Baffin region, yet the company proposes the shipping route through Foxe Basin. Did Baffinland change the shipping route to the south after they consulted some communities in North Baffin region?
- Because the proposed shipping route passes through an area with a variety of marine mammals, there would be negative impact on marine wildlife, including noise impacts. The community disagrees with the shipping route.
- Given that the Project will operate for more than 20 years, and Foxe Basin is a polar bear feeding/calving area, the shipping route will impact polar bears significantly.
- How many ships would be used each year?
- Numerous marine mammals live in Foxe Basin year round including seals, walrus, bowhead whales, and the Coral Harbour area is a mating/calving area. Concerns regarding noise impacts from shipping, as even cruise ships scared seal away from the shipping route; the ore ships will have a more dramatic impact.
- Due to food chain connections, the impacts on seal and walrus will ultimately impact polar bears, which is already on risk list.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Historically Nanisivik had mine operation, and also the Northwest passage is going to be used for shipping, so why isn't it proposed to continue to use existing shipping routes? Why propose a new route which will disturb a significant breeding/hunting ground?
- Because the current in the Coral Harbour area is very strong, any accidental spill will spread quickly to surrounding areas.
- Residents in Coral Harbour should get certain compensation prior to project operation.
- Residents in Coral Harbour rely on marine mammals such as walrus and seals; therefore they will be negatively impacted by the Project.
- Has consideration been given to incorporating new technologies into the design of the ships that will be used, to minimize the noise level and reduce impact to marine mammals?
- Will there be an environmental person on board the ship to monitor any accidental spills/dumping into the ocean?
- Who is responsible for cleaning up spills and associated damage to the environment?



Photo 8: Public Scoping meeting in Coral Harbour

- Concerns for Inuit involvement in the project implementation, and whether these concerns will be considered seriously.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Project should change the shipping route as it pass through areas where seals, walrus and polar bear reproduce.
- Concerns for compensation and royalties being owed due to potential impactz to marine wildlife which community residents rely on.
- Government should reconsider the Project's proposed shipping route as it passes an area with abundant wildlife. An alternative shipping route in Davis Strait would have less impact on Nunavut's marine wildlife.
- What was the rationale of choosing Steensby inlet as a shipping port? If you consider the cost per unit of iron ore to Steensby Inlet and Nanisivik respectively, and if consider the railway operation cost to entire project investment, then the proposed route might turn out not the best one..
- There is sea ice in the Igloolik and Hall Beach area, and even choosing Steensby Inlet for the seaport, the company still has to use ice breakers. Why didn't the company choose North Baffin for the shipping route which would have less impact to marine wildlife?
- Residents welcome NIRB giving presentation to the community.
- The proposed shipping route will impact wildlife, particularly the marine mammals which elders rely on will move to other areas, therefore the community of Coral Harbour should get royalties from the Project.
- What is the time line of NIRB's Review process? And the time frame for Baffinland to build the Project.
- Concerns related to human rights in the work place, it has been heard from Baker Lake that some Inuit workers are not allowed to speak their mother language on-site.
- Opposed to the Project based on concerns for future generations, given that shipping route would impact marine wildlife and chase them away from regional hunting area.
- Were aircraft considered instead of trains/ships to transport iron to market?
- Which parties (NTI, QIA and KIA) will be involved in NIRB's Pre-Hearing Conference and Final Hearing meetings?
- Have other alternative means instead of ships been considered for transporting the iron ore products?
- There are lakes in the Mary River area. There are lots of chars that migrate to the ocean, and the bridge and railway constitute barriers for fish migration. Have studies been done on the fish resources in the area, and what has Baffinland considered in this regard?
- The residents in Pond Inlet dislike the shipping route in their waters; it seems that Steensby Inlet shipping route is a shortcut and probably less expensive, but there are strong currents in Foxe Basin. How will the safety issues related to shipping operations be addressed? What research and studies have been done by Baffinland on shipping safety in Foxe Basin?

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- What are the reasons for not proposing shipping norther to Pond Inlet, is it because Pond Inlet opposed it?
- What is the distance from major project components at Mary River to Pond Inlet?
- Have any new alternative energy sources such as windmills, solar panels and tide energy been considered for the Project?
- Have other alternatives to the proposed railway, such as one passing through mountains by tunnels been considered. Those routes would have fewer impacts on the environment and wildlife and could serve other businesses in the region. Such as tunneling could connect to Clyde River, Pangnirtung and Iqaluit. It might be good to connect Pangnirtung as they have a fish plant.
- What are some of the concerns from other communities regarding the shipping route?
- What was the rationale for choosing Steensby Inlet as the sea port, is that because it is a shortcut? What kinds of studies have been done on the ground condition?
- Have wildlife passes been considered to allow for crossing the railway?
- What to know the Wildlife information in Mary River.
- Shipping route should be on the east coast of Baffin Island through Davis Strait. The community (elders and kids) favor country food over store-bought food, residents support the Project but oppose the shipping route because of the concerns for impacts on wildlife and hunting from the shipping route.
- The shipping route would pass through an area which has been used as hunting grounds; if the Project proceeds, what compensation would be given to communities?
- What compensation requests have been made by communities in other regions (North Baffin, North Quebec)?
- What kinds of new facilities can Baffinland provide to communities impacted by the Project?.
- Concern regarding the potential impacts on the environment from spills, due to strong currents and shallow water in Foxe Basin. In 1950's, a ship sunk in Foxe Basin and has never been reclaimed - for big ships, navigating Hudson Strait is not an easy task. If this happens again, the impact on the environment would be disastrous.
- Mining is welcomes in Nunavut, but residents live on wildlife. If the Project goes ahead, it will move marine mammals to other areas.
- Severe concern regarding shipping route due to the abundance of wildlife in Foxe Basin.
- Concerns for wildlife, as belugas have been declining in Rankin Inlet due to high volume of marine traffic, the same concern for Mary River Project.
- Has there been consultation with a polar bear biologist regarding potential impacts on polar bears?
- Are there other mineral exploration projects near the Mary River project?

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Other than iron ore ships, are there any other ships that would be used for the Project?
- Some residents strongly oppose the shipping route.
- Would other mineral companies use Steensby Inlet as sea port? If not, then perhaps other companies might use one sea port between Pond and Clyde River instead of one at Steensby Inlet. There have been ships in the area since the 60's and we've seen tremendous impacts associated with this shipping since then.
- Concerns regarding shipping of other dangerous good such as chemicals.
- Shipping route would definitely impact wildlife, and would ultimately impact communities along the shipping route.
- Concerns for benefit that other impacted communities outside of QIA territory could get. Baffin region will have IIBA, as it involved land, but Coral Harbour will be impacted by the shipping by waters/oceans not by land, what benefit Coral Harbour will get if the Project proceeds given that shipping route will definitely impact marine mammal's migration routes.
- Unlike diamond companies which are usually profitable, there are concerns regarding how Baffinland will get the required funding to build the Project.
- Why haven't the communities in the Kivalliq Region been consulted with regarding the shipping route, while QIA and Baffinland have talked for a few years?
- What talks have occurred between QIA and KIA?
- If the Project proceeds, Coral Harbour should be put on a priority list for compensation and IIBA negotiation.
- Noise impacts to marine mammals are very significant, particularly for seals, as they are very sensitive to noise. Therefore, the community opposes the shipping route; if there is no choice, and then suggests shipping only in summer.
- Will NIRB come back to the community again before making a decision?
- Does DFO conduct migration studies in Hudson Strait?
- Concerns regarding who will represent Coral Harbour for benefits negotiations.
- How will the concerns related to traditional knowledge be weighted in NIRB's review process, compared to scientific issues?
- Repulse Bay should be included in NIRB's consultation efforts.
- What are the reasons for why the shipping route was proposed in Steensby Inlet?
- How will Baffinland cooperate with communities in Northern Quebec and Labrador for the Mary River project? Before submitting the proposal, they consulted with North Baffin communities, but they should have consulted with us as well, as shipping will impact our hunting and diet. Coral Harbour should get royalties, as should Cape Dorset, due to impact on marine mammals from big ice breakers.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Concerns regarding emergencies during the winter shipping season. When emergencies occurs, who (navy, rangers, Coast Guard) will they look to for help?
- Concerns regarding the attendance in other communities: how will NIRB make a decision (scoping in all the issues) if the turnouts were not high?
- Community is happy being consulted for the review of the Project due to the NLCA, before Inuit were treated like dogs without a name, just a number tag. We have raised our concerns on behalf of our children. This shipping would definitely negatively impact our waters. But more needs to be discussed.
- Again, we are against this shipping route like other communities and thank you for the opportunity to speak about our concerns.
- Quote from a comment:
 - Surgery- a doctor will not interfere with a body's natural working unless absolutely necessary, he will do his utmost to try every other solution before invading the interior.
 - Perhaps providential or planned by nature that the heart of Eastern arctic has precious metals, precious sources which can be easily air lifted out to protect the life that has occupied and used this location for 1000's years.
 - Would it be accurate to say Baffinland will be obligated to use a route outside the Foxe Basin if all the Inuit communities of Foxe Basin are consistent in saying “NO”? We believe traffic of this quantity and frequency should be kept on the eastern side of Baffin Island. The reasons are not good enough to cause distress to the point of forever ending life as it has be known for 1000's of years.
 - Pond Inlet is directly affected, but they said no to this traffic because of their narwhal population, etc. and they were listened to. How much more should we be listened to? We are not directly affected yet. We have more wildlife or a greater variety of wildlife in jeopardy. We feel responsible to protect the very essence of our survival, our food and our livelihood.

Cape Dorset Meeting Notes

DATE

April 25, 2009

Total attendance

Each session attendance: Minimum: 19, Maximum: 24

TIME

1:00-4:30 pm 6:30-9:30 pm

43

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- What is the current status of the Project? Has mine operation and shipping started already? What is the numbers of shipping transits?
- There are shallow waters between Hall Beach and Cape Dorset, these should be considered in planning.
- There are strong currents, and big ice packs associated with strong currents around Cape Dorset which should be well understood.
- There are big walrus herds and other marine mammals nearby, concerns regarding the impact on these walrus and other marine mammals.
- Project will benefit some Inuit - but there are concerns related to marine mammals, which local residents rely on. Marine mammals are major sources of country foods, therefore residents of Cape Dorset should get compensation/royalties from the Project because the shipping route will have significant impacts on marine mammals, hunting grounds as well as the well being of future generations.
- Community has no port facilities. as a type of compensation, maybe Baffinland would build this facility and other facilities supporting hunting activities.
- Cape Dorset would like to be involved in the NIRB's review process.
- What is the distance of the shipping route to Cape Dorset? It is too close and should be farther away from the community.
- Motorboats have impacts on the marine mammals, for example, walrus used to be abundant on the island at the east side of Cape Dorset, now they moved to the islands on the west side of the community due to the noise disturbance from motorboats.
- Concerns for the studies related to impact on marine mammals, regarding how marine mammals would be impacted by shipping and noise.
- Concerns regarding impact on hunting activities and associated traditional lifestyle. Baffinland should work with Cape Dorset hunters to learn about their hunting grounds in all seasons.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Foxe Basin is very important as a marine mammal migration corridor, for many mammals including seals, beluga etc. and therefore there are concerns about the impacts on marine mammals. They go west to Foxe Basin in summer and back to Hudson Strait for winter.
- Concerns regarding involvement of Cape Dorset in NIRB review process. Lots of promises have been made in the past but were broken. There are concerns about whether the NLCA would be followed properly and the commitments followed by the company.
- Concerns about whether the concerns/comments of the community will be considered seriously.
- Concerns regarding dumping the contaminated water into the ocean, as this did happen in Coral Harbour in the past by an ice breaker.
- Marine mammals will be impacted by proposed shipping as it is too close to Cape Dorset.
- Who will be responsible for the well being of future generations, and loss of traditional lifestyle?
- Will local residents get training prior to working at the mine or must they be professionals prior to being hired, as they are not well educated.
- Has an alternative route on the other side of Baffin Island been considered?
- Will Inuit be hired? And if so, what will the requirements and qualifications are?



Photo 9: Public Scoping meeting in Cape Dorset

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Marine mammals migrate in spring, and there are concerns over potential impacts on the marine mammals from shipping and noise. The current migration will be changed and hunting will have to be farther away than it is now, and some mammals will not come back again.
- Have studies/research been completed in respect of potential impacts on marine mammals?
- Land, water and ice will be all impacted, and shipping will change everything.
- Icebreakers create tremendous noise, and seals are very sensitive to noise, which would chase the seal away
- Better planning should be done to protect the future well being prior to operation.
- Concerns regarding socio-economic impacts from the Project, such as jobs, incomes, whether the residents in Cape Dorset would get jobs from the project.
- Question on whether ballast/balance water will be filled in empty ships back from Europe.
- Will NIRB come to Cape Dorset and answer their questions? These questions are serious and the Project would impact our waters.
- Maybe the soap stone project should have a review like this, as it will open a big pit.
- Mercury spills have occurred in Quebec Rivers, and same concern exists related to the Mary River project.
- Concerns whether there will be a contingency plan in place before the shipping is put into operation, as there is thick ice in Cape Dorset and Igloodik.
- Concerns of air pollution resulting from fuel consumption by all machinery, as it would spread globally and will get into the water, marine mammals and food chain. Also marine habitat, sea birds and migratory birds will be impacted as they come to Cape Dorset annually (i.e. ducks and geese).
- The project is approaching fast, and residents in Cape Dorset should benefit from the Project, so we hope the environment assessment goes faster.
- Questions of the results of wildlife studies ongoing here,
- Residents in Cape Dorset should also get jobs as those in surrounding communities. Will there be direct flights from Cape Dorset to Mary River?
- Concerns over the housing shortage in community, which is a big problem but GN responds slowly.
- Questions about the scale of Mary River project and job opportunities from the Project.
- Concern regarding procedures for dumping waste water when ships approaching Canadian waters from Europe.
- Migratory birds and Arctic char are a part of the diet of residents, and will also be impacted by the shipping.

Kimmirut Meeting Notes

DATE	TIME
April 26, 2009	1:00-6:00 pm
Total attendance	38

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- Where is NIRB's office located? Is this the only office for all of Nunavut?
- Question for the NIRB's meeting in other communities; when will NIRB hold meetings again in the community?
- The Project will impact marine mammals as well as land mammals. Concerns on the marine mammals and marine habitat protection if an ice breaker accident occurs.
- The community does not have enough information about the Project regarding the shipping route. The community would like to have a better understanding of this project as it is a serious matter.
- Public was not well informed of the NIRB meeting, even though NIRB notified all communities 25 days prior to the meetings, and the flyer was distributed by email to HTOs and Hamlets, and they were on the notice board but not so many people were aware of them.
- Community relies on the marine mammals which will be impacted; marine mammal habitat and migration will be impacted by shipping.
- Under the NLCA, Inuit rights are protected.
- Community will be impacted by the Project as a result of shipping effects on marine life and habitat. Why is the ship route not proposed to go through Baffin Bay?
- What is the quality of iron ore at Mary River?
- Concerns for the impact on the residents who live in areas where the Project is proposed, and about how the railway will affect land mammals such as caribou.
- Have any studies been done on shipping impacts on marine mammals?
- The shipping route passes through traditional hunting grounds, where residents hunt whales in the winter season. The impacts would be significant, taking into account the long term mine life.
- Concern regarding the immediate commencement of the Project, as it was understood by the community that Baffinland and QIA had signed some agreement. In this regard, the community prefers to slow down the assessment process so that the public who are interested in the Project can have a chance to gain a better understanding before it is approved.



Photo 10: Public Scoping meeting in Kimmirut

- Careful and balanced consideration should be given to the impact when the Project gets approved.
- Community doesn't want to lose the traditional lifestyle which will be threatened by the proposed shipping route.
- Concerns whether ice condition has been studied, as the ice is very thick and the ship will have to have enough ice breaking capacity.
- Concerns regarding the compensation due to relocation of marine mammals from shipping operations.
- Concerns for country food availability for future generation after the shipping commence.
- Where there any Inuit involved in the shipping studies? The community would see the results prior to the approval of the Project.
- Concerns for the studies of the shipping route, and other alternative shipping routes such as through Baffin Bay. Is it too late to evaluate another shipping route?
- Concerns regarding the MOU, as it have been misinterpreted as the approval from QIA for the Project.
- Concerns regarding the spills/contamination from shipping and high cost of any clean up if it had to occur.
- Impact on human health (lifespan) due to food chain take up, as a result of contamination of country food by shipping.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- If the Project is approved, another shipping route should be used rather than the one currently proposed as it has potential to impact on the community.
- Concerns for the setup of this meeting, as people are only getting the information today. Taking into account the number of slides in the presentation and short stay, we would ask more questions when you come next time.
- Is Baffinland is an Inuit-owned company?
- Have there been any minerals found in Kimmirut area?
- Is there currently any shipping going on in a mine in Raglan (in QC)? It has negatively impacted fish habitat.
- Are any Inuit involved in the shipping studies and what are the outcomes?
- Concerns regarding ballast water from Europe and related Canadian regulations.
- Concerns related to the food chain in Foxe Basin - invertebrates would be impacted, and so then would the marine mammals.
- What are the potential job opportunities from the project for all Inuit (include Kimmirut)?
- Concerns over shipping safety with consideration of shallow waters close to Hall Beach and Coral Harbour.
- Foxe Basin is the habitat and migration routes of walrus, beluga whales, seal and polar bears. Concerns over noise impacts on marine environment - marine shipping will impact the whole region.
- Alternative shipping route should be considered by building the sea port on the east side of Baffin Island.
- Concerns related to ballast water impacts on invertebrates and walrus, even though it might be changed 200 miles beyond Canadian waters. There will be ballast water coming into the sea port area, and it would impact the whole ecosystem.
- Ice breaking would contribute to global warming as it decreases the reflection of light and enhances the global warming trend.
- Garbage has been found at shore areas from shipping activities; will garbage be generated from the proposed shipping and dumped in water?
- The community is pleased to hear NIRB's presentation, though the meeting time is too short. The community hopes they are given sufficient information before the public meetings, which will promote the public participation.
- It is fine for ships to anchor in front of the community, but the key point is to protect the marine environment and mammals. Also they can detect contaminants miles away, if water is contaminated by ships, they will relocate to other places.
- Marine environment and marine wildlife must be protected as the residents depend on the harp seals other several types of seals in south Baffin. They will be scared away by the shipping route. It will affect the food chain.

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- Compensation is needed for accidental spills and pollution that damage wildlife and their habitat.
- Concerns regarding where complaints should go if impacts are observed from the ships.
- Polar bear is not at risk according to local knowledge. They live on the ice pack, feeding on marine mammals, and will be impacted by the Project.
- Community appreciates the NIRB's consultation prior to the approval of the Project.
- Would explosives be used if the ice is too thick to break through with the ships?
- Concerns about drug/alcohol control at the project site.
- Concerns for burial site protection in project areas.
- Public meetings like the one NIRB held in Kimmirut have never seen before. Will the same presentation be made for NIRB Board members?

Clyde River Meeting Notes

DATE

May 6, 2009

TIME

1:00-4:30 pm

Total attendance

78

Each session attendance: Minimum: 1, Maximum: 55

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- Is traditional knowledge considered in the NIRB's review process? It should be used in the Project design.
- The Mary River Project is a huge project, and there are concerns over the following issues:
 - The Project will impact variety of environmental factors
 - Railway will definitely impact wildlife, in particular caribou
 - The shipping route should be changed to another area, the proposed shipping route will impact Igloodik and Hall Beach
 - The residents will also be affected by the Project



Photo 11: Public Scoping meeting in Clyde River

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

- A lot of materials/fuels are already on site even if the Project is not approved at the end of the Review process.
- Concerns over whether drugs and alcohol will be prohibited on the mine site.
- Will drug testing be conducted on site in the future? This is not convenient for those without such habits.
- What recreational amenities are available at mine site?
- Is there any other alternative site that can be considered by Baffinland to locate the port?
- Will NIRB's Board members come to the community in future?
- Question on how site will be cleaned up after mine closure, due to concerns over the waste dumping on the Project site.
- The Mary River Project is located on an earthquake zone.
- Question on the preparedness for major spills, and what response plan will be in place?
- Will the Federal Government help to carry out installation of a permanent weather station?

Appendix B –Meeting Notes

Iqaluit Meeting Notes

DATE	TIME
May 9, 2009,	1:00-3:30 pm, 6:00-8:00 pm
May 10, 2009	1:00-3:00
Total attendance	8
Each session attendance: Minimum: 3, Maximum: 5	

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

The public sessions in Iqaluit were very poorly attended and resulted in no new public comments, concerns or questions. Meetings were ended earlier than planned owing to this poor attendance.

Appendix C- NIRB PowerPoint Presentation

Appendix C: NIRB PowerPoint Presentation

The complete NIRB PowerPoint presentation (in English and Inuktitut) is available on the NIRB ftp site by using the following link:

[HTTP://FTP.NIRB.CA/REVIEWS/CURRENT_REVIEWS/08MN053-BAFFINLAND_MARY_RIVER/2-REVIEW/03-SCOPING & GUIDELINES/SCOPING/SCOPING REPORT/](http://ftp.nirb.ca/reviews/current_reviews/08MN053-BAFFINLAND_MARY_RIVER/2-REVIEW/03-SCOPING_%26_GUIDELINES/SCOPING/SCOPING%20REPORT/)

Appendix D- NIRB Public Scoping Meeting Sign-In Sheets

Appendix D: NIRB Public Scoping Meeting Sign-In Sheets

The complete meeting attending Sign-In Sheets in eleven Nunavut communities are available on the NIRB ftp site by using the following link:

[HTTP://FTP.NIRB.CA/REVIEWS/CURRENT_REVIEWS/08MN053-BAFFINLAND_MARY_RIVER/2-REVIEW/03-SCOPING & GUIDELINES/SCOPING/SCOPING REPORT/](http://ftp.nirb.ca/reviews/current_reviews/08MN053-BAFFINLAND_MARY_RIVER/2-REVIEW/03-SCOPING_%26_GUIDELINES/SCOPING/SCOPING%20REPORT/)