



Public Information Meetings SUMMARY REPORT

Created as part of the NIRB's Review of
Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation's
Mary River Project
(NIRB File No.: 08MN053)



June-July 2011

Nunavut Impact Review Board

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Outline of the Mary River Project	1
1.2	Brief File History	2
1.3	Objectives of NIRB Review Process	3
2.0	NIRB PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETINGS	5
2.1	Overview of Public Information Meetings	5
2.2	Setup of NIRB Public Information Meetings	5
2.3	Meeting Materials	6
2.4	Agenda and Venues of Public Information Meetings	7
2.5	Advertisements	7
3.0	SUMMARY OF IDENTIFIED ISSUES	8
3.1	Mary River Project	9
3.1.1	Mary River Mine Site	9
3.1.2	Steensby Inlet Port	9
3.1.3	Milne Inlet Port	10
3.1.4	Marine Shipping	10
3.1.5	Railway	10
3.1.6	Milne Tote Road	10
3.1.7	Project Closure, Reclamation and Monitoring	11
3.2	Ecosystem	11
3.2.1	Terrestrial Wildlife and Habitat	11
3.2.2	Caribou	12
3.2.3	Other Terrestrial Species	12
3.2.4	Vegetation	12
3.2.5	Marine Wildlife and Habitat	13
3.2.6	Terrestrial Landforms	13

Public Information Meetings Summary Report

3.2.7	Freshwater Habitat and Freshwater Quality	13
3.2.8	Air Quality	14
3.2.9	Noise and Vibrations	14
3.2.10	Human Health	14
3.2.11	Climate	15
3.3	Socio-Economic Environment	15
3.3.1	Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement (IIBA)	15
3.3.2	Economics	16
3.3.3	Training and Employment	16
3.3.4	Community and Individual Well-being	17
3.3.5	Land and Ice Use and Inuit Harvesting	17
3.3.6	Cultural and Heritage Site	18
3.4	NIRB Review Process	18
3.4.1	NIRB Process and Related Coordination/Cooperation	18
3.4.2	Other Issues (including QIA and Baffinland)	19

TABLE OF PHOTOS

Photo 1: <i>Public discussing the Project in Igloolik (photo provided by Rosanne D'Orazio, INAC)</i>	29
Photo 2: <i>An elder commenting on Mary River project</i>	32
Photo 3: <i>A community member questioning wildlife issues in Coral Harbor</i>	34
Photo 4: <i>Audience listening to the NIRB PowerPoint Presentation</i>	37
Photo 5: <i>Public Information Meetings in Kimmirut</i>	39
Photo 6: <i>Public Information Meeting in Clyde River</i>	42
Photo 7: <i>Public Information Meeting in Pond Inlet</i>	45
Photo 8: <i>Public Information Meeting in Arctic Bay</i>	49
Photo 9: <i>Public Information Meetings in Resolute</i>	50
Photo 10: <i>Public Information meeting in Grise Fiord</i>	52

APPENDICES

Appendix A - NIRB Public Meetings Sign-In Sheets.....	21
Appendix B – NIRB Public Information Meetings PowerPoint Presentation	22
Appendix C – Public Meeting Notice Material	23
Appendix D – Meeting Notes from NIRB Public Information Meetings	28

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) would like to thank all those who participated in the recent public meetings held throughout communities in the Qikiqtani and Kivalliq regions of Nunavut, as part of the NIRB's Review of Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation's Mary River project proposal. These meetings were an important component of the NIRB's ongoing public awareness program and served to provide the public with follow-up to the previous scoping meetings held by the Board in 2009. The meetings were successful owing to the active participation of local organizations and community members and the assistance received from Hamlet offices, Hunters and Trappers' Organizations, the Qikiqtani Inuit Association, the Kivalliq Inuit Association and of course the community members themselves.

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, approximately 160 kilometres (km) south of Pond Inlet, 155 km north of Igloolik and 1,000 km northwest of Iqaluit. This project would involve the construction, operation, closure, and reclamation of a 21 million tonne-per-annum open pit iron ore mine. High-grade iron ore would be mined and processed using conventional crushing and screening methods. A railway system would transport the ore approximately 149 km from the mine site to an all-season deep-water port and ship loading facility at Steensby Inlet, where the ore will be loaded onto ore carriers for overseas shipment through Foxe Basin and Hudson Strait. Year round shipping would be undertaken with a fleet of cape-sized ore carriers with the capacity to break ice, while additional non-ice breaking ore carriers and conventional ships would be used during the open water season.

The Proponent proposes the following major phases for the Project (as per Baffinland's January 2011 Draft Environmental Impact Statement):

- 1) **Construction phase:** 4 years
- 2) **Operation phase:** 21 years
- 3) **Closure and reclamation phase:** 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 in the Mary River area;
- 2) Railway transportation of iron ore from Mary River mine site to the Steensby Inlet all-season sea port;
- 3) Open water shipping into Milne Inlet, through Eclipse Sound and Pond Inlet, via Davis Strait and Baffin Bay from southern Canada;
- 4) Transportation of supplies and materials from Milne Inlet, via the Milne Inlet Tote Road, to the Mary River mine site;
- 5) Operation of an all-season sea port in Steensby Inlet;
- 6) Year round shipping (including ice breaking) of iron ore from the Steensby Inlet port through Foxe Basin and Hudson Strait to southern Canada and Europe;
- 7) Air transportation; and
- 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/02-REVIEWS/ACTIVE%20REVIEWS/08MN053-BAFFINLAND%20MARY%20RIVER/2-REVIEW/>

1.2 Brief File History

On March 20, 2008 Baffinland submitted the Mary River project proposal to the NIRB, the Nunavut Water Board (NWB) and the Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC). On April 30, 2008 the NIRB received a positive conformity determination for the Project from the NPC 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 to address the prospective transportation corridor proposed by the Project's railway component.

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 report to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development (AAND – at the time called 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 Review of the Mary River Project.

Between March and May of 2009, the NIRB facilitated public scoping meetings, open houses and other presentations in communities identified to be potentially affected by this Project or by any potential amendment to the NPRLUP as part of its Review of the Mary River Project. On November 16, 2009 the NIRB issued Guidelines to the Proponent for the development of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). In September, 2010 Baffinland expressed its intention to include a new alternative means of carrying out the Project, the "Road Haulage Option" into its Draft EIS for the Review. Upon consideration of this request and soliciting comments from parties, the NIRB issued an addendum to its Guidelines for Baffinland's use in preparing its EIS on November 24, 2010.

On January 21, 2011 Baffinland submitted its Draft EIS (DEIS) for the Mary River project to the NIRB. Following an internal conformity assessment of the submission with the EIS Guidelines and associated addendum with the assistance from the NPC for the requirements relating to the proposed transportation corridor for the Project, the NIRB accepted the submission as a DEIS and commenced the technical review period on February 15, 2011. The DEIS was distributed to the public and interested parties with an invitation to submit their Information Requests (IRs) to the NIRB for consideration. On March 24, 2011, following receipt of IRs, the NIRB forwarded the requests to Baffinland and other interested parties for responses to the IRs.

Baffinland submitted its complete IR Response package to the NIRB on or before April 26, 2011 and, in a letter on May 5, 2011, clarified its intentions for addressing outstanding IRs and the removal of the “Road Haulage Option” alternative from consideration in the NIRB’s Review process. On May 10, 2011 the NIRB requested responsible authorities and interested parties provide their comments or concerns regarding the adequacy of the IR responses provided by Baffinland to date. In particular, parties were asked to comment on the degree to which their respective IRs had been satisfied and any other outstanding issues which might significantly hamper the fulfillment of parties’ respective mandates should the technical review period commence.

Prior to commencing the 60 day public comment period and scheduling a Technical Meeting and Pre-Hearing Conference (PHC) for this Review, on May 30, 2011 the NIRB requested that Baffinland provide a supplemental information package to address changes to the Draft EIS due to the removal of the “Road Haulage Option” alternative from consideration. This submission was to include a revised project description and references to the page volumes, sections, and page numbers where the revised information supplemented sections of the current Draft EIS. On July 5, 2011 the NIRB received the requested submission from Baffinland and, commenced the 60 day public comment period for this Review.

1.3 Objectives of NIRB Review Process

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

- Assess the ecosystemic and socio-economic impacts of proposed project;
- Gauge and define the extent of impacts the proposed project 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.

Public Information Meetings Summary Report

The NIRB, as part of the Review process, will be conducting a detailed technical review of the DEIS for the proposed Mary River project with the intent of analyzing the completeness and quality of the information presented by Baffinland. A technical review of the DEIS consists of the development of technical review comments by interested parties, such as, territorial and federal government departments, regional Inuit associations, and members of the public. The technical review comments will include the following:

- Determination of whether Parties agree/disagree with the conclusions in the DEIS regarding the alternatives assessment, environmental impacts, proposed mitigation, significance of impacts, and monitoring measures – and reasons to support the determination;
- Determination of whether or not conclusions in the DEIS are supported by the analysis – and reasons to support the determination;
- Determination of whether appropriate methodology was utilized in the DEIS to develop conclusions – and reasons to support the determination, along with any proposed alternative methodologies which may be more appropriate (if applicable);
- Assessment of the quality and presentation of the information in the DEIS; and
- Any comments regarding additional information which would be useful in assessing impacts – and reasons to support any comments made.

As part of its ongoing public awareness program, the NIRB hosted public information meetings throughout the communities identified as being potentially affected by the proposed Mary River project or by any potential amendment to the NPRLUP as part of the Review of Project. These community meetings were facilitated by NIRB staff with the intent of meeting the following objectives:

- Provide an overview of NIRB's environmental impact assessment process;
- Promote awareness of the review process for the Mary River project proposal;
- Provide follow-up to previous NIRB scoping meetings by discussing the information presented in the DEIS for the Project; and
- Encourage effective public participation in this ongoing Review.

Through the public information meetings, the NIRB collected and categorized comments, concerns, and traditional and local knowledge from members of the potentially affected

communities on the Project and assessment conclusions as presented in Baffinland's DEIS. Issues raised at the public information meetings, in combination with the input from other interested parties regarding Baffinland's DEIS, will contribute to the NIRB's technical review and remaining steps in the Review for the proposed Mary River project.

2.0 NIRB PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETINGS

2.1 Overview of Public Information Meetings

The NIRB conducted public information meetings in eleven communities identified by the Board as being potentially impacted by the proposed Mary River Project or by any potential amendment to the NPRLUP as part of the Review of Project. The public information meetings began on April 9, 2011 and were concluded on May 9, 2011 through two trips to the South Baffin region and North Baffin region. The meetings were held over two nights in each community. In addition to the NIRB staff, representatives of the following agencies were also in attendance at several or all of the meetings as observers:

- Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation (BIMC): Mr. Greg Missal and Mr. Qavavaug Issuqangituk
- Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC): Ms. Rosanne D'Orazio and Ms. Amy Chen
- The Nunavut Water Board (NWB): Mr. Sean Joseph
- The Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC): Mr. Bobby Suluk
- The Qikiqtani Inuit Association (QIA): Mr. Solomon Awa

2.2 Setup of NIRB Public Information Meetings

The information meetings were open to all members of the public with snacks and refreshments provided, and door prizes raffled. At each meeting, all attendees were asked to sign in when they came in the door (see Appendix A). To facilitate a better understanding of the Project, as well as the conclusions presented in Baffinland's DEIS and the NIRB's Review process, the NIRB gave a PowerPoint at each of the public information meetings. This provided an overview of the NIRB's environmental assessment process, the project proposal and the major conclusions within the DEIS (Appendix B). The NIRB presentations were delivered in English, with simultaneous interpretation in Inuktitut. Additionally, the presentation was divided into sessions each night which enabled attendees an opportunity to ask questions and to voice their concerns. The public was encouraged to comment on the proposed Project, potential environmental impacts, conclusions presented within the DEIS, and any concerns related to the Project. Both

written and verbal comments were accepted at these public scoping meetings, with verbal comments being recorded by the NIRB staff members, representatives from other agencies and the Proponent.

In each community, the NIRB also presented diagrams which outlined the NIRB-NPC joint review process and NIRB-NWB coordinated process for the Review of the proposed Mary River project. The Proponent provided full-sized maps of major components of the Project, including the Mary River mine site, the Milne Inlet and Steensby Ports, the Milne Tote Road, and the Railway.

When possible the public information meetings included an open house session with NIRB staff members, as well as with the Proponent and representatives from other agencies. This gave attendees an opportunity to discuss in an informal setting the NIRB's Review process, the baseline information and impact assessments presented in the DEIS. In order to assist the public to better understand the DEIS, NIRB staff brought the complete 10-volume DEIS document for the public to review at the open house session and information meetings. An automated PowerPoint presentation accompanied the open house session, which highlighted the NIRB's mandate and environmental assessment process.

In each community, certain questions or concerns were raised that were previously brought up during the public scoping meetings held in 2009. In each case, the NIRB staff explained how the concerns were recorded in the NIRB Public Scoping Meeting Report, where the corresponding directions had been given to the Proponent through the EIS Guidelines, and ultimately where the concerns were addressed within the DEIS document. This approach appeared to lead to a greater understanding of, and appreciation for, how the NIRB makes use of public comments and feedback through the Review process.

2.3 Meeting Materials

At each public meeting, the following materials were provided:

- NIRB's Power Point presentation (in English and Inuktitut)
- NIRB EIS Guidelines for Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation's Mary River Project (in English)
- NIRB Public Scoping Meetings Summary Reports (in English and Inuktitut)
- NIRB Guides 1 through 8 (in English)

Public Information Meetings Summary Report

- Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (in English)
- NIRB-NPC-NWB Process Diagrams (in English and Inuktitut)
- NPC North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan (in English and Inuktitut)
- NIRB Environment Assessment Brochure (in English)
- NIRB's 2010 Annual Report (in English and Inuktitut)
- Baffinland's DEIS for the proposed Mary River Project (in English)
- Executive Summary, Baffinland's DEIS for the proposed Mary River Project (in English and Inuktitut)
- Sign-In Sheets
- Comment Forms (in English and Inuktitut)

2.4 Agenda and Venues of Public Information Meetings

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

Round Number	Community	Date
Round 1	Igloolik	April 10
	Hall Beach	April 11 & 12
	Coral Harbour	April 13 & 14
	Cape Dorset	April 15 & 16
	Kimmirut	April 17 & 18
	Iqaluit	April 19 & 20
Round 2	Clyde River	April 30
	Pond Inlet	May 1 & 2
	Arctic Bay	May 3 & 4
	Resolute	May 5 & 6
	Grise Fiord	May 8

2.5 Advertisements

Public notification is an essential tool used to engage the public in effective consultation. The NIRB utilized a number of notification methods to advertise the public information meetings held in the Baffin Region. Please refer to Appendix B – NIRB Public Information Meetings PowerPoint presentation. For a sample of all advertisements distributed by the NIRB please see

Appendix C.

Radio

Public service announcements in English and Inuktitut were provided to each radio station one week prior to the meetings.

Flyers

Prior to the NIRB visiting each community, local community members were requested to assist with placement of flyers around town, announcing the NIRB meetings in English and Inuktitut. Additionally, flyer placements were verified once staff arrived in each community. Additional posters were placed in key business and community locations if they were not present (i.e. Co-Op store, Northern store, Hamlet offices).

Newspaper

Newspaper advertisements in both English and Inuktitut were printed in the *Nunatsiaq News* newspapers two weeks prior to the start of the NIRB meetings.

Other

Upon arrival in each community, the NIRB staff visited briefly with local organizations to promote attendance at the workshop, including the Hunters' and Trappers' Organizations, Hamlet offices, schools and others where available.

3.0 SUMMARY OF IDENTIFIED ISSUES

The issues raised at the NIRB's public information meetings were similar to those previously expressed by community members during the NIRB public scoping meetings in 2009. During the public information meetings, it appeared that the public had a better understanding of the NIRB Review process and the Project being proposed; however, it is noted that community members expressed concerns regarding not being aware of public consultations conducted by the Proponent and/or consultants and any baseline studies carried out in Project region.

The following is a summary of the key issues and concerns raised both verbally and in writing at the information meetings covering topics ranging from valued-ecosystem components (VECs), valued socio-economic components (VSECs), the NIRB review process and other related issues

to the Project. These comments will aid in the identification of items that need to be addressed or considered throughout the environmental review process, and should be considered by the Proponent in its ongoing consultation with communities. For a more detailed summary of comments and concerns expressed by each community visited, please refer to Appendix D.

3.1 Mary River Project

The Proponent's DEIS for the Mary River project outlines key components of the project, including the Mary River mine site, Steensby Inlet, Milne Inlet Ports, marine shipping, railway, Milne Tote Road, project closure, project reclamation, and project monitoring. Many community members expressed their support for the proposed Mary River Project; however, many emphasized concerns about the project and the impact it could have on certain environmental aspects. These concerns were raised in the previous public scoping meetings, and were addressed by Baffinland in their DEIS.

3.1.1 Mary River Mine Site

Concerns were raised by the members of the public about the potential negative impacts of the proposed open-pit mining activities on the landscape and on their traditional way of life.

Issues raised included questions about the size of the deposit, and the footprint of the proposed open-pit; concerns regarding the impact of proposed mining activities on existing camping grounds in the area; the potential negative impacts on the pristine and *beautiful* landscape and how the Proponent intends to conduct responsible mining activities including regular removal of debris from the mine site. Potential impacts from extending the mine life were also raised during the meetings. Other questions brought up were related to airstrip use, fuel distribution around site, spill contingency response, etc.

3.1.2 Steensby Inlet Port

The location of the shipping port in Steensby Inlet was of major concern to community members, especially to those with traditional hunting grounds in the Steensby Inlet area. Concerns about the negative impacts of the proposed port and shipping activities on marine wildlife populations in the area, and, on their ability to pursue their traditional ways of life were brought up.

The major issue raised during the public information meetings focused on the rationale provided by the Proponent in still choosing Steensby Inlet as a seaport given that public had previously

expressed significant concerns regarding the potential impacts of a port development and associated year round shipping activities on many marine species, in particular seals and walrus populations in the Steensby Inlet area.

3.1.3 Milne Inlet Port

The Proponent's decision to remove the proposed shipping of iron ore from the mine site via Milne Inlet from their project proposal was generally welcomed by community members in north Baffin Region. However, similar concerns were expressed about the potential negative impacts of developing the port, and the potential risks to marine environments in the Milne Inlet area from the proposed shipment of supplies.

3.1.4 Marine Shipping

The proposed shipping routes through Hudson Strait and the Foxe Basin were still expressed to be of major concern. The potential adverse impacts of shipping, in particular ice-breaking, on marine wildlife and marine wildlife habitat were raised by several community members as was previously brought up in the 2009 scoping meetings. A number of marine species were identified to be either of significant importance to Inuit culture, or of major nutrient sources for local diet, or both. There were also concerns regarding impacts to the entire marine ecosystem from catastrophic fuel spills or from chronic noise impacts as a result of the proposed year round shipping activities in the region. A number of participants also had concerns with Baffinland's conclusions in the DEIS particularly regarding the no significant impacts on VECs on the marine environment. Community members along the proposed shipping route also pointed out certain baseline information presented in maps regarding the distribution of some marine species, such as walrus, were not accurate or complete based on local knowledge of the area.

3.1.5 Railway

Many community members agreed with Baffinland's conclusions in the DEIS that the railway was a key component of the project, but had concerns with the routing and the design of the railway, as well as the potential negative impacts of the railway operation on terrestrial wildlife. Specifically, impacts to caribou and to hunting activities across the railway corridor.

3.1.6 Milne Tote Road

Concerns raised on the proposed Milne Tote Road were very similar with the concerns raised during the NIRB public scoping meetings in 2009; including, truck-wildlife collisions, dust emissions and air quality, as well as potential barriers to traditional land use activities.

3.1.7 Project Closure, Reclamation and Monitoring

Concerns related to project closure, reclamation and post-project monitoring included the duration of the proposed mining activities and the planned closure dates; how the Proponent plans to deal with the open pit after conclusion of mining activities and any post-project monitoring, and financial security for post-project reclamation work prior to the issuance of any permits.

3.2 Ecosystem

The potential negative impacts of developing and operating the Mary River project were of concern to most community members. Possible irreparable damage to land, wildlife, and other components of the environment were raised as concerns. It was emphasized that there is a need for project components to be designed and operated in a way that minimizes impacts on the environment. Also, the cumulative effects of several ongoing mining-related activities on wildlife resources in the region were raised.

3.2.1 Terrestrial Wildlife and Habitat

A common theme in questions and comments raised was the potential impacts of the proposed project, especially the Mary River mine site, the railway and the Milne Tote road, on terrestrial wildlife and habitat. Some concerns were directly related to Baffinland's assessment of choosing caribou as the only indicator for terrestrial wildlife and habitat, and disagreeing with the conclusions in the DEIS regarding the statement of no significant impacts to terrestrial wildlife and habitat, in particular to caribou from the proposed project activities. Community members expressed concerns for the development of more comprehensive monitoring programs for terrestrial wildlife and habitat by Baffinland if the Project is approved.

Summary of the issues raised regarding terrestrial wildlife and habitat included:

- A need for regulatory authorities to conduct a thorough review of Baffinland's proposed mitigation and monitoring measures for the proposed mining project.
- Whether enough studies have been conducted on impacts of mining activities in the region, the types of baseline research conducted by Baffinland and how they came to their conclusions.
- How the proposed project will impact terrestrial species biodiversity and the need for the development of strategies to address this.

- Disagreement with the conclusions within the DEIS regarding that statement of no significant impacts on terrestrial wildlife and habitat, in particular to caribou from the proposed project activities.
- How caribou was chosen as the only VEC indicator for terrestrial wildlife species, provided that many species of smaller terrestrial mammals play important roles in a healthy ecosystem.
- The perceived lack of understanding by the Proponent and by regulators of how Inuit, wildlife and the environment are connected.

3.2.2 Caribou

The main concerns brought up with respect to caribou included:

- The recent trend of declining caribou populations in the Baffin region.
- The present impacts of mineral exploration and related flight activities on caribou herds.
- Potential impacts of the proposed Mary River project on traditional caribou migration routes between southern and northern Baffin.
- The proposed mining activities' impacts on traditional hunting grounds in the Mary River area.
- There is a need for the inclusion of Inuit in any proposed wildlife monitoring teams.

3.2.3 Other Terrestrial Species

Concerns were raised regarding potential impacts of the proposed Mary River project on other terrestrial wildlife species. Major issues discussed included:

- Why potential impacts of the proposed project on lemmings and on land predators such as foxes were not included in the studies presented in the DEIS.
- More thorough baseline studies of ducks, Canada geese and other migratory birds is required to aid in assessing the potential impacts of the project.
- Why the baseline studies focused on caribou and not on other terrestrial species.

3.2.4 Vegetation

General concerns were expressed by community members about vegetation that would be destroyed based on the footprint of the proposed Project. The link between natural vegetation and healthy wildlife populations was also emphasised. Community members had concerns about the potential impact of the development of mining infrastructure on natural vegetation including lichen which is a major food source for caribou.

3.2.5 Marine Wildlife and Habitat

Members of the public in communities located along the proposed shipping routes through Foxe Basin and through Davis Strait expressed concerns about potential project impacts to marine wildlife and marine wildlife habitat, which they rely upon as a food source. Potential impacts of shipping on pack-ice and other marine wildlife habitat was emphasized. Many participants had issues with Baffinland's conclusions that residual impacts of the Project on marine wildlife will not be significant. Members suggested preferred timing of proposed shipping activities and the importance of rigorous marine wildlife monitoring programs, including having Inuit wildlife monitors on board shipping vessels.

The following are a summary of the concerns raised:

- Emphasized the inclusion of traditional knowledge in baseline studies of marine wildlife.
- Potential impacts of shipping activities on walrus herds and walrus calving grounds.
- The risk of strong marine currents in the Foxe Basin area transporting accidental oil spills to sensitive marine habitats such as narwhal, seal and walrus.
- The accuracy of wildlife distribution studies conducted by Baffinland.
- The timing of proposed shipping activities and how it will impact life cycles of marine mammals including the seasonal whelping of seals.
- The risk of collapsing marine mammal populations, a main dietary source for Inuit.
- Uncertainty regarding how marine wildlife will respond to year-round shipping in sensitive marine environments such as Foxe Basin and Steensby Inlet.
- Witnessed harassment of belugas and other marine wildlife by staff of companies conducting mining exploration activities.

3.2.6 Terrestrial Landforms

General concerns were expressed about the scale of the proposed mining activities and the potential negative impacts on natural landforms including hills, valleys, permafrost and permafrost-influenced features.

3.2.7 Freshwater Habitat and Freshwater Quality

Impacts of the proposed Project on freshwater habitat including streams, rivers and lakes were

expressed. The need for engineering controls to mitigate release of run-off from the Project into sensitive water bodies was emphasized.

A summary of the concerns raised include the following:

- Measures need to be put in place to prevent storm-water pond breaches and resultant contamination of surrounding water bodies.
- Potential contamination of sensitive water bodies, particularly lakes containing land-locked char, from mining activities.
- Impact of dust generated from construction and operation of the project sites on surrounding natural freshwater bodies.
- The risk of salt used in exploration drilling activities entering surrounding water bodies.

3.2.8 Air Quality

Members of the public were interested in knowing how the Proponent intends to mitigate potential negative impacts on air quality from dust generated at the mine site and during the transport of the iron ore via the railway. Concerns about fossil fuel-based emissions from mine trucks and other combustion equipment were also expressed.

3.2.9 Noise and Vibrations

How the Proponent plans to mitigate the impact of noise generated from the proposed activities on the environment was discussed. Specifically, concerns were expressed about how marine mammals will react to noise from shipping vessels, and how terrestrial animals including caribou and migratory birds will react to noise generated from the proposed blasting activities at the Mary River mine site. The need for monitoring programs to assess the impacts of project-generated noise on marine and terrestrial wildlife was strongly recommended.

3.2.10 Human Health

Potential impacts of project-related activities on human health were a concern for many members of the public. Impacts of fugitive dust and metal contamination on their food sources including wildlife and vegetation were stressed. There was consensus for the need for development and implementation of comprehensive monitoring programs to address these concerns.

3.2.11 Climate

The main issues raised with respect to the region's climate was as to whether Baffinland factored potential effects of climate change into project component designs, and how the regions harsh climate will affect proposed project activities including construction and operation phases.

3.3 Socio-Economic Environment

While most community members expressed support for the Project, a number of concerns regarding the benefits of the Project and the potential impacts to the social and economic environments were raised. The following sections summarize these concerns and comments.

3.3.1 Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement (IIBA)

The main concerns which were raised regarding potential project benefits to Inuit, with respect to on-going negotiations between the regional Inuit association and Baffinland included:

- Concerns over the progress of IIBA negotiations and the current status. The need for regular community updates of these negotiations was stressed.
- The type of benefits potentially affected communities could expect from the project.
- Benefits for youth.
- Percentage of Inuit workers in the whole labour force of the proposed mine and measures that need to be put in place to encourage Inuit involvement in the project such as heavy equipment training.
- Communities to benefit from the project if it were to proceed.
- Question whether Baffinland plans to invest in community based infrastructure and/or support community initiatives such as health and recreation facilities.
- The IIBA should focus on developing primary and secondary education programs in the affected communities.
- The types of assistance Baffinland plans to provide to local hunters when they travel and hunt (e.g., fuel, sheds, and transport tools) especially considering the potential diversions that may result from the development of mining infrastructure – especially the railway.
- Hunters should be given benefits if the Project proceeds—even if they do not work on the mine site—as wildlife and harvesting will be impacted by the Project.
- Possibility of royalty and compensation payments due to the impact on wildlife by the Project.
- Contract and business opportunities; the need for local Inuit companies to gain access to contracts.

- Concern over whether the proposed IIBA will actually benefit the communities, referring to the former Nanisivik and Polaris Mines, where no benefits were received by the communities.
- Question whether benefits will really compensate for loss of wildlife and wildlife habitat; and the need to establish a comprehensive benefits plan, especially as country foods become scarce and residents begin to rely more heavily on relatively more expensive grocery foods.

3.3.2 Economics

The general consensus among community members was that the Project will benefit local people by providing job opportunities and increasing income; however concerns were raised on how the Project may change Inuit lifestyles and unravel the social fabric of the affected communities.

Some concerns raised include:

- Concerns related to the effects of the temporary closure and final closure of the mine on communities.
- Concerns regarding employment opportunities and competition for project contracts among the communities surrounding the Project area and firms in southern Canada.
- Concerns about potential impacts of the proposed mine on staff retention in communities, especially at the municipality level.
- There is a need to train potential Inuit workers at the mine about money management and family budgeting.

3.3.3 Training and Employment

The following concerns were raised with respect to potential training and employment:

- Suggested that heavy equipment training should start when mine construction commences, not when the mine is in operation.
- Concerns about job opportunities and preferential hiring. Inuit getting the necessary training from technical programs or courses for specific jobs, but receiving lower-paying jobs on their return to the project site, and having less opportunities than those from the south.
- Fairness in the treatment of Inuit workers at the mine site.
- The gap between mine employment opportunities and the reality of an under educated local workforce, and possible solutions.
- Planned job allocations among different communities.

- Job training from government programmes for women.
- Baffinland should involve students in summer programs and job training.
- There is a need to strengthen programs in educational institutions in the region to meet future demand for skilled workers.
- There is a need for cultural orientation programs for all staff once the mine is established to provide employees with local information and help avoid any misguided generalizations.
- The Proponent's reasoning for not including some communities in the North Baffin on the points-of-hire list.

3.3.4 Community and Individual Well-being

The following concerns were recorded with respect to community and individual well-being:

- The need for a balanced consideration when evaluating the benefits of the Project and the impacts on wildlife and the environment.
- 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.
- Concerns about food security.
- Impacts of drugs and alcohol brought into communities from the Project's workers, and also drug and alcohol abuse at the Project site itself.
- Cultural conflict between Inuit workers and southerners at the work place.
- 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.
- Impacts on the marine mammals in Foxe Basin and Baffin Bay will change the future lifestyle of Inuit.
- The need to minimize any negative social impacts associated with mine workers transiting through communities.
- The need for the establishment of specialized programs for youth delinquents.
- The need to implement measures that mitigate the negative impacts of frequent family separations due to work schedules at the mine site.

3.3.5 Land and Ice Use and Inuit Harvesting

Community members had concerns about the potential negative impacts of the proposed Mary River mine development on traditional terrestrial and marine hunting grounds and, hence, on the way of life of Inuit. There was consensus that the Proponent needs to establish mitigation

measures to limit any potential stresses to Inuit traditional activities from the Project. Also, community members voiced the need for adequate compensation for any losses as a result of the Project.

3.3.6 Cultural and Heritage Site

The need to preserve any archaeological sites including traditional camping and burial sites, sod houses, tent rings and inukshuks in the Mary River and Steensby Inlet areas was raised by community members.

3.4 NIRB Review Process

The general opinion expressed among community members seemed to be that the NIRB's review process for the Mary River project was effective for addressing their concerns about the proposed project however, community members can find it challenging to participate effectively in the NIRB review process. For example, the technical ability of and resources available to community members and organizations, including the Hamlets and HTOs, for the purpose of assessing the Proponent's DEIS document, is limited. In addition, it was noted during the meetings that the timelines established by the NIRB for various commenting periods are difficult for the Hamlets and HTOs to meet due to lack of resources, the complex nature of the information provided within the DEIS and the volume of information contained within the document. There is a need for continued public consultation to educate potentially-affected communities about the project and to provide more meaningful engagement opportunities.

3.4.1 NIRB Process and Related Coordination/Cooperation

The following are some comments raised with respect to the NIRB's review of Baffinland's Mary River project and related matters:

- There is a need for the NIRB to undertake a thorough review of Baffinland's mitigation and monitoring plans.
- Will any required project monitoring programs include both environmental and socio-economic impacts?
- The NIRB, during post environmental assessment monitoring, will need to gauge Inuit employee retention and reasons why Inuit employees may not successfully complete their work rotations.
- How is the coordinated and joint review processes involving NIRB, NPC, and NWB structured and what are the reasons for this coordinated/joint review?

- There is a need for the NIRB and other regulatory agencies to protect Nunavut beneficiaries from project related disasters.
- There is a need for financial support to the HTOs and Hamlets to build capacity to review the DEIS document.
- How could a change in the proposed duration of mining activities affect the review process?
- Communities have questions about conclusions of “non-significant impact” to VECs as summarized in the DEIS, in particular residual impacts on marine mammals.
- Question whether the NIRB has provided communities with enough time to assimilate the information in the DEIS and make informed judgements about the project.
- There is a need for NIRB staff to pay regular visits to the mine site to monitor impacts of the project.
- At what stages will the Board Members be participating in the process?
- What is the timing and duration of any post-project certificate monitoring?
- Would the NIRB approve any request from Baffinland to renew its mining licence beyond the currently proposed 21 years?
- How will the Proponent’s predictions and conclusions, as contained in the DEIS, be assessed by NIRB?
- There is a need for the NIRB to maintain its independence throughout the review process.

3.4.2 Other Issues (including QIA and Baffinland)

Other issues that came up during the community information sessions included:

- There is a need for the Proponent to conduct further consultation with affected communities on the Project.
- There is a need for Hamlets and the QIA to provide more information about the project to community members.
- More community members are needed at the public sessions to raise their concerns.
- Question whether all relevant government agencies will undertake independent assessment of the Proponent’s conclusions presented in the DEIS.
- There is a need for the establishment of committees in each community focused on Baffinland’s Mary River Project.
- Preference for the Proponent to have liaison offices in all affected communities.

Public Information Meetings Summary Report

- Question whether all previous public consultations conducted by Baffinland and concerns raised by the public were included in the DEIS.
- Question regarding the current ownership status of the company and the role played by the former owners of the proposed Mary River Mine.
- Question whether current prospectors in Nunavut are regulated.
- Is Baffinland currently undertaking exploration work without approved permits?
- Support for some community initiatives including funding for HTOs to conduct independent research.
- Question whether QIA and Baffinland intend to meet with Elders in communities as part of the IIBA negotiations since these Elders are familiar with the environment.
- There is a need to involve local inspectors to ensure that things are done appropriately.

Appendix A - NIRB Public Meetings Sign-In Sheets

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

<http://ftp.nirb.ca/02-REVIEWS/ACTIVE%20REVIEWS/08MN053-BAFFINLAND%20MARY%20RIVER/2-REVIEW/04-COMMUNITY%20CONSULTATIONS/02-PUBLIC%20INFORMATION%20MEETINGS%20IN%20NU/>


Appendix B – NIRB Public Information Meetings 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/02-REVIEWS/ACTIVE%20REVIEWS/08MN053-BAFFINLAND%20MARY%20RIVER/2-REVIEW/04-COMMUNITY%20CONSULTATIONS/02-PUBLIC%20INFORMATION%20MEETINGS%20IN%20NU/>

Appendix C – Public Meeting Notice Material

Appendix C1-Public Meeting Flyer (English)



THE NUNAVUT IMPACT REVIEW BOARD

PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETINGS

The **Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB)** will be holding Public Information Meetings related to **Baffinland Iron Mine Corporation's Mary River Project Proposal** and NIRB's Environmental Assessment Process. The NIRB invites everyone to attend and learn more about:

- NIRB's environmental impact assessment process
- Update on NIRB's review process for the Mary River project proposal
- Conclusions in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
- How to participate effectively in the environmental assessment process

THIS IS YOUR CHANCE TO PARTICIPATE AND PROVIDE INPUT!

COMMUNITY	MEETING VENUE	DATE	TIME
IGLOOLIK	<u>COMMUNITY HALL</u>	APRIL 09	6:00-9:00 PM
		APRIL 10	1:30-5:00 PM
HALL BEACH	<u>ARNAQJUAQ SCHOOL GYM</u>	APRIL 11	6:30-9:30 PM
		APRIL 12	1:30-5:00 PM, 6:30-9:30 PM
CORAL HARBOUR	<u>COMMUNITY HALL</u>	APRIL 13	6:30-9:30 PM
		APRIL 14	1:30-5:00PM, 6:30-9:30:PM
CAPE DORSET	<u>COMMUNITY HALL</u>	APRIL 15	6:30-9:30 PM
		APRIL 16	1:30-5:00 PM, 6:30-9:30 PM
KIMMIRUT	<u>COMMUNITY HALL</u>	APRIL 17	1:30-5:00 PM
		APRIL 18	1:30-5:00 PM, 6:30-9:30 PM
IQALUIT	<u>PARISH HALL</u>	APRIL 19	6:30-9:30 PM
		APRIL 20	1:30-5:00 PM, 6:30-9:30 PM

Meeting dates and time are subject to changes due to weather conditions, will be announced on Local Radio!

Coffee, tea and refreshments will be provided and
Door prizes will be given away!

CONTACT US:
 Box 1360 Cambridge Bay, NU X0B 0C0
 Phone toll-free: 1 (866) 233-3033, direct:1(867) 983-4606
 Email: lw@nirb.ca

Appendix C2- Radio Announcement Samples

Cover Letter of Radio Announcement

(Iqaluit)

Public Service Announcement – Radio

Good Day,

The Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) will be visiting Iqaluit on April 19th and 20th, 2011 and we would greatly appreciate your assistance in making our visit a success.

We would ask that you make the following announcement in English and Inuktitut three times daily on April 12th and 19th, 2011. Once in the morning, lunchtime, and evening would be excellent.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to call. We look forward to seeing you soon!

Thank You

Kofi Boa-Antwi

cc Li Wan

Nunavut Impact Review Board

Announcement:

The Nunavut Impact Review Board (or NIRB for short) will be holding Public Information Meetings here in Iqaluit to discuss Baffinland Iron Mine Corporation's **Mary River Project Proposal** and the NIRB's Environmental Assessment Process.

Members of the public are invited to attend and learn more about:

- NIRB's environmental impact assessment process
- Update on NIRB's review process for the Mary River project proposal
- Conclusions in the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment (DEIS)
- How to participate effectively in the environmental assessment process


The NIRB will be giving presentations at the Iqaluit Parish Hall on Tuesday, April 19th from 6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. and on Wednesday, April 20th from 1:30 p.m. to 5 p.m. and from 6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.

Snacks and refreshments will be provided!

Please note that meeting dates and times are subject to changes due to weather conditions.

If you have any questions, please call Li Wan at 1-866-233-3033.

AppendixC3- Newspaper Advertisement in Nunatsiaq News (English)



The Nunavut Impact Review Board

Public Information Meetings

The Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) will be holding Public Information Meetings related to Baffinland Iron Mine Corporation's Mary River Project Proposal and NIRB's Environmental Assessment Process. The NIRB invites everyone to attend and learn more about:

- NIRB's environmental impact assessment process
- Update on NIRB's review process for the Mary River project proposal
- Conclusions in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
- How to participate effectively in the environmental assessment process

This is your chance to participate and provide input!

Igloolik
Community Hall, April 9, 10
Hall Beach
Arnaqjuag School, April 11, 12
Coral Harbour
Community Hall, April 13, 14
Cape Dorset
Community Hall, April 15, 16
Kimmirut
Community Hall, April 17, 18
Iqaluit
Parish Hall, April 19, 20
Clyde River
Community Hall, April 29, 30
Pond Inlet
Community Hall, May 1, 2
Arctic Bay
Community Hall, May 3, 4
Resolute
Salluviniq Gym, May 5, 6
Grise Fiord
Ummimak School, May 7, 8

Meeting dates are subject to changes due to weather conditions, and meeting times will be announced on Local Radio!

Coffee, tea and refreshments will be provided.

Door prizes will be given away!

27

[illegible]

Appendix D – Meeting Notes from NIRB Public Information Meetings

Igloolik Meeting Notes

DATE

April 10, 2011

TIME

1:30-5:00 pm

Total attendance: 33

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- The Proponent, at earlier consultations, stated that the project would involve only Steensby Port and not Milne Port for ore shipping, and that the Milne Tote Road option won't be necessary." Why is it proposing using Milne Inlet as a port site to ship out iron ore products now?
- I've been against mining in these parts because of potential impacts on wildlife. My attitude has changed as my children and grandchildren need jobs. We, however, have to review the impacts and mitigation measures carefully.
- We've been treated unfairly by Baffinland. As a member of the Hamlet Council, we were surprised by the proponents preferred route for sea transport. We would prefer Milne Inlet but the Proponent says Steensby is preferred as it's cheaper; walrus calves in Steensby. We need monetary compensation if we lose our wildlife.
- We worried about the Steensby Port option. We would prefer Milne Inlet to be used; NIRB have to perform a thorough review to safeguard our children's future. We prefer Milne is used as the heavy duty port. We also worry about impacts on caribou population.
- The shipping route through Steensby will not only impact wildlife but everything in the marine environment. Everyone in Igloolik does not want this route. We are worried about the walruses etc. We've voiced our concerns regarding this option but they don't seem to be concerned. This route is used by marine mammals and we feel the Steensby marine transport option would cause significant negative impacts.
- Is the 4-year construction time set by Acelor-Mittal or Baffinland?
- The Proponent's DEIS is very huge; how does NIRB staff feel about this? The QIA mentioned in the IRs, after the DEIS was issued, that not enough IQ was used; walrus calving was not well documented in the DEIS. Also, we only had two weeks to review this DEIS and we feel it's not enough.
- I'm concerned about wildlife impact when they release ballast water in our region i.e. impacts of invasive species.

Appendix D – Meeting Notes from NIRB Public Information Meetings

- We don't feel we've been properly consulted by the proponent. We do not feel we have details about the project. The Hamlet and the QIA have had only a few presentations to us on this project. I think there should be more time provided to the public for comments. We have not been adequately informed by Hamlet and QIA about this project. I'm worried about impacts on vegetation including lichen.
- We have not had any updates about the project from the proponent. I wish that more community members attend sessions like this one to voice their concerns. Many of us present have conflicts of interest as potential contractors if the project goes ahead.



Photo 1: Public discussing the Project in Igloolik (photo provided by Rosanne D'Orazio, INAC)

- We've not heard much about Clyde River, but this community will also be impacted. I'll like to see job opportunities for our future generations.
- There was not much on archaeological resources in the assessed VECs as Deposit 1 is in a known archaeological zone. Potential impacts on predators and lemmings were not addressed in the presentation on the DEIS.
- Some sections of the Foxe Basin are shallow. We want to know what bathymetric studies or dredging would be done to make the ships not run aground.
- Who should we call at NIRB if we want to comment in Inuktitut?

- I'm against the mine. There will be permanent impacts to wildlife, land and environment. The transportation via sea will impact marine environment. The prospect of jobs makes it look good but how much formal education would a person need to work at the mine. We don't have many educational institutions; will there be good jobs for people who apply? If there are contract opportunities how will we compete with other businesses? They say there will be no significant impacts to wildlife. We've elders who are familiar with wildlife and we don't want to see impacts to our traditional hunting grounds. The ships moving back and forth will impact our livelihood including our ability to successfully hunt marine mammals. The caribou population has declined in recent years and has been confirmed by a biologist recently. We will also need emergency response infrastructure to prevent catastrophes. Why won't the Proponent consider using the proposed navy port in Nanisivik instead?
- The Inuktitut version of the power point presentation on the Proponent's analysis in the DEIS creates the impression that the marine mammals are not important.
- Inuktitut terms will have to be looked at due to dialect differences. Also, will government agencies undertake independent assessment of the proponent's studies?
- If they say there'll be no impact from the project, that's their opinion; but our elders and hunters know otherwise. The mining activity and shipping route will disturb wildlife. We know for a fact that walruses tend to flee when disturbed.
- Other animals were not included in the DEIS, for example, lemmings, birds, weasels, wolves, ducks, Canada geese, sea gulls and other year-round animals.
- How will verbal IQ knowledge be incorporated into DEIS since most traditional knowledge is in the form of stories?
- I'm concerned about tailings from the mine and how this could impact rivers, streams and lakes which are important sources of fish including lake trout and Arctic char. We have the best food source in that area and we want to keep it that way.
- We are thankful to NIRB for representing us. We never had these opportunities previously. We are also aware of the presence of other iron ore deposits in the area. We know that NIRB will be back in the communities again.
- The DEIS, those large volumes, I believe our elders have more knowledge than is contained in these thick volumes. We have to think of our future generations. There are things that have to do with the regulatory regime but you have to include the traditional knowledge in the NIRB process.

Hall Beach Meeting Notes

DATE

TIME

April 11, 2011

6:30-9:30 pm

April 12, 2011

1:30-5:00 pm and 6:30-9:00 pm

Total attendance

70

Each session attendance: Maximum 33, Minimum: 14

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- Will the Proponent be shipping iron ore from Steensby Inlet?
- The people who matter are not here. Back in the day, there were tracks of caribou in the region. Now there are no tracks due to the exploration and flight activities which scared away the caribou. The proposed shipping route in Foxe Basin will drive walruses away. In Pond Inlet, seals and whales are being scared away just by the few ships that come in every summer. When a Proponent decides to do something it seems very difficult to change and our comments and concerns don't really influence anything. This was the way it was with Nanisivik in Arctic Bay. I'm originally from Pond Inlet but had to travel long distance just to hunt. Who is going to compensate me for the long distance travelled?
- What kinds of support or benefits to Inuit are available if the project is to go ahead?
- I will like to train the people in Hall Beach for the potential mine and would like the Proponent to help me acquire heavy equipment to commence heavy equipment training for community members to prepare them for employment at the Mary River Mine.
- I really know the project area. In 1963 there were a number of studies done. It was noted that Milne Inlet is calving grounds for whales. I recall in 2005 Baffinland were, after consultation, considering using facilities other than Milne Inlet to avoid calving grounds identified in that area.
- I'm from Pond Inlet but familiar with the Steensby Inlet area. I went hunting recently but got lost as I couldn't find any caribou. I remember before exploration commenced there was an abundance of caribou. Once Baffinland exploration activities commenced, including aircraft flights, the calving grounds of caribou were affected. We love marine mammals including seals, walruses etc. We are concerned about sustainability of our wildlife. Baffinland's aircrafts fly every day, disturbing wildlife.
- The presentation missed some items. Baffinland is aware of two lakes with land-locked char near their project. I hear they dump non-hazardous waste into these lakes. My concern is that these land-locked fish were not mentioned in your presentation. When Baffinland first came we were earning money but now no more. It looks like they were

bribing us so we favour the project. Local people are willing, if opportunities exist, to make money.

- In northern Quebec, communities get royalties from mining activities. Can we in Nunavut get royalties too?
- I do know that we cannot stop the process of the intention to open the mine but we want the environment to be safeguarded. I haven't heard much from QIA; we don't seem to have a representative. We want to make sure that things are done properly regarding the proposed mine development.
- The QIA are our representatives regarding royalties but I'm concerned as to whether they can represent us effectively. I worry about seaweeds, vegetation contamination for dust. I do support the project only if we will receive royalties.



Photo 2: An elder commenting on Mary River project

- Is Baffinland still having problems with the road between the mine site and Milne Inlet?
- When we were children, community members could hear people exploring in the Mary River area while they went camping. Caribou have disappeared with exploration but I believe they return once they become habituated. We want benefits from the project. My concern is with Steensby Inlet where the railroad will be. I'll have no concerns if there were no accidents. I'm a 63 year old elder. We need committees in the community focused on Baffinland's Mary River Project.

Appendix D – Meeting Notes from NIRB Public Information Meetings

- I'm not too concerned about the land animals. I've seen road construction and they were not too concerned except when harassed. I'm more concerned about marine mammals. The marine currents will transport spills to sensitive marine habitats. So I support the project as long as potential marine spills are prevented.
- If we were against the project there would have been many more of us here. I don't mind if the project goes ahead as long as wildlife are not disturbed. Since my childhood, caribou numbers have fluctuated and I know they'll continue to fluctuate in the future.
- Is there the possibility for Baffinland to set up an office in Hall Beach?

Coral Harbour Meeting Notes

DATE

TIME

April 13, 2011

6:30-9:30 pm

April 14, 2011

1:30-5:00 pm and 3:00-6:00 pm

Total attendance: 30

Each session attendance: Maximum: 21, Minimum: 4

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- Why do Baffinland build seaports at Steensby Inlet and Milne Inlet?
- I wonder what the people on Pond Inlet and Igloolik think about the shipping route especially as it will be very close to their hunting areas.
- I'm not in favour of all-year shipping because of the high cost of living.
- People want to know a bit more about the shipping routes from Pond Inlet or Milne Inlet.
- I have concerns about marine life and also, will the company be liable for any wildlife destroyed as a result of their activities?
- We feel we are getting nothing out of it so why should we care.
- I have experience with mining. We know it's not a green operation, but I want to know if you'll be on top of it if there's any contamination in conducting this operation.



Photo 3: A community member questioning wildlife issues in Coral Harbor

- They should consider a port in Pangnirtung or Iqaluit. Their planned rail could be from the mine to a port in Pangnirtung or Iqaluit. The company will not care for the land like we do. We will only get some benefits that won't compensate for our loss of wildlife. Groceries are getting really expensive and our only respite is in our wildlife.
- It's difficult to stress just how much we rely on the land. We find it very difficult to afford groceries as they are extremely expensive.
- The Company is planning a railway; it sounds like a massive undertaking. How are communities close to this project reacting to this?
- I'm certain the proponent will endeavour to protect the environment. When the mine opens, there will be a lot of people applying for work. Meadowbank Mine has provided employment for communities in the Kivalliq region.
- What are the potential impacts to wildlife?

Cape Dorset Meeting Notes

DATE

April 14, 2011

TIME

1:30-5:00 pm and 6:30-9:45 pm

Total attendance: 73

Each session attendance: Maximum: 50, Minimum: 23

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- You said you are a member of the NIRB staff but are you a neutral group or in support of Baffinland?
- You stated in your presentation that the minister has the final say as to whether the project proceeds or not, please explain.
- We need to get all information about the proposed project from NIRB and Baffinland as this is important to the community.
- We would like the proponent to bring some samples of iron ore to future presentations.
- What happens after the NIRB project certificate is issued? We must ensure that monitoring is undertaken after the environmental review process.
- We would like Baffinland to come to the community for face to face consultation.
- QIA and NTI are getting all the royalties with nothing coming to us the people.
- Are you going to be coming back in the future for consultation?
- Will there be snowmobile crossings along the railway?
- Are there any caribou crossings along the railway?
- How much help are we going to get from QIA?
- I'm not against this project however it will have significant impacts on us and our wildlife. They know there'll be impacts but they still want to go ahead. The proposed shipping route was of concern to NWB when they visited but we haven't heard anything since. The project is over a 21 year period so there will likely be impacts. We may lose caribou, migratory birds etc.
- How large is the deposit; the larger the deposit, the longer the project life.
- Have there been studies on wildlife distribution? When we hunt we ensure not to disturb the animals e.g. when one walrus sights a human it signals to the whole herd and they all move away. I'm concerned that the ships will result in marine life leaving the area. Have there been studies on impacts of sound to marine life especially from ships?



Photo 4: Audience listening to the NIRB PowerPoint Presentation

- Were all previous consultations by Baffinland included in the DEIS?
- Have there been studies on effects of shipping on walruses and other marine mammals?
- It's been 3 years since NIRB commenced the review of this proposal but many communities in this region are yet to be informed about this project. These communities have concerns as well but have no venue to hear them. NIRB should look at other methods of information dissemination.
- Will the proponent be doing more work after 21 years (will mine be continued after 21 years proposed mine life)?
- We know that, like politicians, proponents make a lot of promises but we the people are sceptical. We want to know the reaction or response time to potential spills or accidents.

Kimmirut Meeting Notes

DATE

TIME

April 17, 2011

1:30-5:00 pm

April 18, 2011

1:30-4:30 pm, 6:30-8:30 pm

Total attendance: 45

Each session attendance: Maximum: 22, Minimum: 9

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- Will transportation through Steensby be year round?
- The impact of the project will be on marine mammals especially walruses, seals and whales. I would like to see Inuit monitors hired from local communities. We want Inuit on the ships to monitor marine mammals during shipping activities especially as there are concerns of marine mammals being scared off by noise from ships.
- We wonder why the Steensby shipping route is not straight but seems to have twists and turns. There are presently ships travelling along the Hudson Strait, and we want to know why the proposed shipping route is not further out from our community.
- Baffinland indicated that they consulted with Cape Dorset and Kimmirut before route selection but that's not the case as we told Baffinland that they should place the route further away from land to prevent impact to marine mammals.
- Is NIRB here to give information or to gather concerns as to how to improve this project?
- We have concerns regarding marine mammals. We know they are assessing the shipping routes. We want to be informed of days ships will be passing through and we want protection of our marine mammals. The ships may scare the marine mammals further away from our area. The marine mammals are our main dietary source. We don't know whether marine mammals will disappear when ships pass through and we hope this fact will be part of your review.
- Has the original company been sold and if so, who are the current owners?
- We want to know how the proponent intends to reduce noise pollution in the marine environment from shipping.



Photo 5: Public Information Meetings in Kimmirut

- Baffinland have been here two or three times already and I've personally visited the mine site. You say Inuit concerns have been included in the planning of the project but I don't see many of our concerns addressed in the DEIS. Right now, the two companies that own Baffinland have stated that they will put mitigation measures in place if accidents occur. We've heard they are going to be using large ships and we know that nothing is indestructible. We live off the land and rely on wildlife. I don't know whether we will see animals move or become extinct but we expect some benefits if that happens. QIA and Baffinland should come to an agreement if our livelihood is impacted.
- All assessments have concluded that impacts will be non-significant. How did they come to those conclusions when no ships have moved in yet? We feel the shipping route is too close to our land. Also, we want the company to treat ballast water from Europe before dumping in our waters to prevent invasive species impacts.

Iqaluit Meeting Notes

DATE

TIME

April 19, 2011

1:30-5:00 pm

April 20, 2011

1:30-5:00 pm

Total attendance: 24

Each session attendance: Maximum: 16, Minimum: 8

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- The Baffinland DEIS is comprehensive and the project will impact goods, services and jobs. I do take issue with the prediction that job creation equals wellbeing as this is too simplistic. It must be realised that people employed at mines suffer from separation, and their families bear stresses from the separation when members are on mine site. Hence we would suggest that facilities such as addiction clinics be supported in our communities. It is important for families to be able to have video-conferencing with employees at the mine site during shift. There are technologies available for this. It aids a better adjusted employee and is good for both employees and Baffinland. Also, Baffinland may need to provide families with money management programs to deal with new found wealth resulting from employment on the mine.
- As Iqaluit is a gateway city for the mine, we want to ensure that policies are put in place to regulate mine staff that transit through our city to prevent anti-social issues. Our local businesses would also like some advanced planning and would need to know what Baffinland's needs are so they can prepare for contract opportunities.
- Other IIBAs put emphasis on primary and secondary education and not just post-secondary education. We want the current IIBA to include not just training in trades but also elementary education.
- We worry about potential impacts of the mine on our staff retention in the City of Iqaluit and other Hamlets, particularly heavy duty operators. Hence, we need measures put in place to train more local people to help retain staff. Also, a community committee of local people is necessary to create for public interest in the project.
- Considering the size of this project and the significant injection of cash predicted there is potential for this project to unravel the social fabric in communities in the Baffin region.
- Does project monitoring include both environmental and socio-economic impacts?

Appendix D – Meeting Notes from NIRB Public Information Meetings

- How do we incorporate our elders input in economic development in the high arctic and address impacts of proposed mining activity on social stressors?
- Is there potential for a new community to be developed as a consequence of the mine?
- There is the need to train local community members to prepare for employment at the proposed mine site.
- Cultural orientation will be relevant once mine is established to provide employees with relevant local information and debunk some misguided generalisations.
- The NIRB, during post project certificate monitoring, may need to gauge the success of Inuit employee retention and reasons why Inuit employees may not successfully complete their work rotations. It is important for the mine to be Inuit-friendly. The proponent should realise that Inuit people are not only suitable for low-skilled jobs.
- There is a need for specialised program for youth delinquents.

Clyde River Meeting Notes

DATE

April 30, 2011

TIME

2:50-6:30 pm

Total attendance: 36

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- Who are the current owners of Baffinland?
- There are a number of prospectors in Nunavut, who is controlling their activities?
- How come Baffinland is undertaking exploration without an approved mining licence?
- Where is QIA in all this, as they are responsible for IIBA negotiations?
- I wish Nunavut beneficiaries are protected against project related disasters.



Photo 6: Public Information Meeting in Clyde River

- If there is an encounter between company employees and a polar bear who will be responsible?

Appendix D – Meeting Notes from NIRB Public Information Meetings

- Baffinland need to discuss with Inuit-owned companies about contract opportunities.
- What about royalties?
- Regarding having plans in place, are there plans for human communities?
- What part of the review are we undertaking presently?

Pond Inlet Meeting Notes

DATE

TIME

May 1, 2011

1:30-5:00 pm

May 2, 2011

2:30-5:30 pm and 6:30-10:00 pm

Total attendance: 102

Each session attendance: Maximum: 51, Minimum: 21

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- Community did not get funding to facilitate retain necessary technical resources to review the DEIS, who should we apply for the interviewers funding in the review process.
- What type of wildlife research was conducted by Baffinland and how did they come to their conclusions? We want support for some community initiatives including funding of HTO to undertake research.
- We need compensation as the HTO members will be impacted from the project. We get one-time assistance but we need continuous assistance. To hunt caribou, now I need to go to Hall Beach.
- Is it possible for the HTO and Hamlet to get funding from INAC to review the 5000 page document?
- Why are we not given enough time to review the DEIS?
- We have concerns about the length of the project and how it would affect the review process. Will discovery of new deposits change the project mine life, and if so then maybe NIRB's current review is premature.
- I'm pleased that the shipping route through Pond Inlet had been dropped off.
- There seems to be misunderstanding about the Mary River Project. A lot of Pond Inlet residents have concerns about some information missing in the DEIS. Many predictions of no impacts to wildlife from the project are not true as wildlife is presently impacted. So the prediction of non-significance is incorrect.
- In volume 8 of the document, there was information missing. Its states that there'll be no impact on seals etc. but I want more information on potential impacts on marine mammals. I want seals and narwhals to be studied further so we can get more information. Also the Hamlet and HTO need more time to respond to the DEIS.
- I don't think the community has been given enough time to go through the DEIS.

Appendix D – Meeting Notes from NIRB Public Information Meetings

- We know potential impacts from iron ore shipping. Dust from trucks are dispersed during ore transport and this could affect lakes and other water bodies.
- When we talk about Baffinland, we need to really assess impacts as Inuit have a perception that Milne Inlet biodiversity will be impacted. We need to look at strategies to protect our wildlife. We suspect that equipment previously installed by Baffinland in the marine environment was emitting noise to drive away marine mammals; again, it is the perception problem.
- Wildlife has already been impacted by airplanes and ships, and more ships will cause further impacts down the road.
- I heard Baffinland is planning all-year shipping. The seals begin whelping at certain time of the year. Hence, year-round shipping especially around March to April will impact seal whelping in Steensby Inlet area.



Photo 7: Public Information Meeting in Pond Inlet

- In 2009-2010 the Hamlet raised concerns about fish in Milne Inlet and the fish off the small Island in Milne Inlet. I haven't heard the reasoning for Baffinland's statements of no impacts to wildlife. With respect to fish, some rivers flowing into Milne Inlet will be impacted. Caribou also migrate between Iqaluit and our area, and if Baffinland states that there will be no impacts on caribou, then that's wrong as there'll be impacts.

Appendix D – Meeting Notes from NIRB Public Information Meetings

- We've heard that there'll be no significant impact to wildlife etc. We have to go far distances to hunt for caribou and yet Baffinland continues to tell us there'll be no significant impacts but that's false. We have suspicions about Baffinland. This project needs to be reviewed thoroughly. We want someone from NIRB to visit the mine site without the company of Baffinland staff. Also we want more time to review the DEIS.
- Hunters have witnessed impacts to marine wildlife from seasonal supply shipping so how much more impact will there be from all-year shipping?
- Impacts of noise and light pollution from the mine development should be addressed.
- I've witnessed Baffinland oil spill from barrels while transporting via helicopters to drill sites.
- I've witnessed harassment of belugas by Baffinland staff in a helicopter near Steensby Inlet. Steensby Inlet is calving and feeding grounds for beluga.
- We want some the NIRB board members to attend these meetings.
- We prefer the meetings to be held in the winter as most people leave for camps in spring.
- When Baffinland commenced exploration, they said they'll be buying food from our Coop and will be hiring and contracting locally. After one year, Baffinland reneged on all their agreements and started conducting business with outsiders in breach of the 5-year agreement with Coop. We are therefore disappointed and worry they'll renege on other new promises. I heard that the mayor of Iqaluit supports it because of job opportunities, as did the mayor of Rankin Inlet. Ottawa will be a point of hire so we locals will lack access to jobs. Every spring, caribou migrate to the Arctic Bay and then migrate south along the path of the railway. Hence, we do not support the railway even though we hear Igloodik is o.k. with it. Prior to the IIBA, Baffinland would have to apologise for their previous breaches.
- What happened to the five-year agreement to release equipment from the projects exploration when it complete?
- Baffinland stated that once the Tote Road was completed they could use it for air transport. They keep breaking promises which creates trust issues. We are also worried about salt from drilling entering water bodies.
- While conducting bulk sampling, the trucked ore via the Tote Road released dust and was definitely impacting areas. They should have had better dust suppression methods. I've been involved in iron ore exploration since the 1960s. The ore has to be extracted by blasting but we know that we could hear the blasting 50 miles away from the mine site.

These areas are used by caribou, and we hunters know where our resources are. The caribou have moved to Igloolik, hence, we need to go long distance to hunt. We need noise mitigation put in place for mining activities. Also, they had equipment under water for their studies that scared away the marine wildlife. We want this to be the best possible mine with low impacts. We know we will want this project because of jobs. We will be all guessing at the eventual consequences of mining, but this is our land.

- The HTO and Hamlet are disadvantaged regarding this project as they do not have the capacity to review the document unlike NIRB and Baffinland.
- Regarding terrestrial wildlife and habitat, there is an archaeological site, a very ancient migratory route for caribou, and impact on these and whales are said in the DEIS to not be significant. We know that whales have their young in Milne Inlet from June to September. Since Baffinland started using the Milne Inlet area, the whales and seals are no longer in the area, and once ships leave the seals return. The DEIS seems to have been written by someone who has not lived here.
- Will there be storage areas at Steensby Port for iron ore? We are worried that metals from the iron ore could impact wildlife through the food chain.
- How long will be the project monitoring?
- Mary River is my camping spot so I'll be uprooted.
- Mary River used to have a lot of wildlife species but now they are disappearing and it is no coincidence. It is obvious that they should compensate us for all the wildlife lost as we rely on this for food. We are frustrated that we are not being believed when we say that our wildlife is impacted.
- Pond Inlet needs more support and assistance to review this project. There must be someone on NIRB who is from Pond Inlet.

Arctic Bay Meeting Notes

DATE	TIME
May 3, 2011	6:30-9:50 pm
May 4, 2011	1:30-5:30 pm and 6:30-9:30 pm
Total attendance	81

Each session attendance: Maximum: 61, Minimum: 9

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- It seems all their conclusions were that nothing was significant. Considering that the project will be year-round it is surprising that Baffinland suggests that there will be no significant negative impact. We expect a bit more honesty. 21 million tons is a lot of mining and non-significance is a hard sell.
- After 21 years of operation will NIRB renew the permit?
- Before project go-ahead there will be people prepared to open businesses. Now if another company purchases Baffinland we believe Baffinland should support these contractors for continuity.
- Baffinland's DEIS concludes that there will be no significant impacts to ring seals, bowheads and other marine mammals but I'm sure there'll be impacts to marine mammals from shipping e.g. they may be caught in propellers. We have different lifestyles from the southerners. We have no farms and live off the land. Everything is so expensive now.
- I'll like to inform NIRB about the impacts, and that NIRB have been very helpful. When I was on the NWB, there were companies that applied for licences and we informed the public as well. Which parties will be meeting to discuss the water licences?
- We've been informed about the involvement of QIA in the Mary River Review. Will QIA and Baffinland be meeting with elders in our community? These elders are familiar with the environment.
- Is the Mary River Mine different from Nanisivik Mine?
- Will the trucks and railcars be covered? Also some jets dump fuel during operations and I wonder if that will occur with Baffinland.
- Regarding employment, we were able to get benefits from Nanisivik and I wonder if Baffinland will assist in shipping supplies to communities.



Photo 8: Public Information Meeting in Arctic Bay

- When will the mine open?
- Will there be training for heavy equipment operation for community members?
- Who are the current owners of Baffinland and who exactly is Acelor Mittal?
- The shipping route through Lancaster Sound and Eclipse Sound by Nanisivik was hunting areas for marine mammals. We want to know whether Kimmirut and Cape Dorset are concerned about impacts of shipping as we have experiences with this from previous mines in our area. Arctic Bay is considered to be a supporter of the project but we want to know how other communities feel about it.
- People in Igloolik and Hall Beach are worried about impacts on walruses. These communities send us walrus meat. Also caribou calving grounds will be impacted. We presently have to go to Repulse Bay to hunt caribou. Professionals in this room are making money but we value our wildlife. Groceries are very expensive; I believe it was on TV recently. These bills are very stressful to us. We are not interested in the Mary River project as only a few people will gain employment there. This project will impact our way of life. I don't eat store bought food rather I rely on wildlife.

Appendix D – Meeting Notes from NIRB Public Information Meetings

- The Mary River area is very pristine and beautiful and I will like to see it stay pristine. There are community clean-ups here and I will like Baffinland to conduct regular clean-up at the mine site.

Resolute Meeting Notes

DATE

May 5, 2011

May 6, 2011

Total attendance: 33

TIME

6:30-9:30 pm

1:30-5:00 pm and 6:30-9:30 pm

Each session attendance: Maximum: 18, Minimum: 5

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- Why is Baffinland not considering Resolute as a point of hire?
- I'm in disagreement with the company's conclusions on all VECs especially with respect to their non-significance determination.
- How many airstrips will be developed and what type of planes will they be using on site?
- How will the fuel be distributed around the project site?



Photo 9: Public Information Meetings in Resolute

Appendix D – Meeting Notes from NIRB Public Information Meetings

- Will there be fugitive dust from the ore mining activities?
- How will the company's predictions be assessed by NIRB?
- If there are significant impacts, are we going to get compensation?
- There may be a need for local inspectors to ensure things are done appropriately.
- We rely on the environment in Resolute Bay; we rely on our wildlife hence any negative impact will be very damaging as humans, wildlife and environment are connected. We need to be very cautious.

Grise Fiord Meeting Notes

DATE

May 8, 2011

TIME

1:30-4:30 pm

Total attendance

11

Comments, Concerns and Questions:

- The mine site is far but could still have both positive and negative impacts on us. It looks like there are contradictory conclusions regarding whether there will be impacts. It is good that NIRB, as an independent institution, will undertake an unbiased review of Baffinland's conclusions. If there are jobs, we want to be included and not be shut out as was the case with the Nanisivik Mine. After all, our environment will be impacted as well. We want job opportunities to be posted in this community. Also, the company needs to reassess the DEIS with respect to cultural wellbeing as a subject of note. We need a thorough assessment of cultural impacts and not just as an afterthought.



Photo 10: Public Information meeting in Grise Fiord

- The presentation states that the mine life is 21 years yet we read in newspapers that it is a 100 year project.
- Does the project include contingency plans for shipping activities in the Baffin waters?

Appendix D- NIRB Public Scoping Meetings Sign-In Sheets

- The assessment of impact on terrestrial wildlife focused exclusively on caribou for significance assessment but they should have included other terrestrial animal including lemmings, every species plays a role in a healthy ecosystem.
- I'll like to thank NIRB for coming this far north. Even though we are some distance from the project, there is potential for impacts and I hope measures are put in place to reduce impacts.
- Baffinland should involve students in summer programs and job training.