

ANNEX D: QIA Final Submission to NWB

QIA Mary River Project Review Committee Comments

- i. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment (381 Pages)**
- ii. Comments on the Final Environmental Impact Assessment (82 Pages)**

APPENDIX A: Reference Materials

For QIA, Appendix A represents an important component in the Project review process; Inuit involvement. While there is no set formula for how to achieve high levels of Inuit involvement the approach taken by QIA was to establish local review committees in potentially impacted communities. The members of QIA's review committees are listed below:

QIA Environmental Assessment and Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement Committee Members

Name	Community	Position
Caleb Sangoyah	Pond Inlet	HTO Member
James Atagootak	Pond Inlet	Hamlet Member
Pilipuusi Paneak	Pond Inlet	QIA Board Member
Jayko Alooooloo	Pond Inlet	Member at Large
Mathaisie Qaunaq	Pond Inlet	Member at Large
Cornelius Nutarak	Pond Inlet	Member at Large
David Qamaniq	Pond Inlet	IIBA Member
Solomon Mikki	Igloolik	HTO Member
Zacharias Kunuk	Igloolik	Hamlet Member
David Ingaut	Igloolik	QIA Board Member Designate
Loui Uttak	Igloolik	Member at Large
Elisapee Quasa	Igloolik	Member at Large
Marie Airut	Igloolik	Member at Large
Paul Quassa	Igloolik	IIBA Member
Abraham Qamaniq	Hall Beach	HTO Member
Jopie Kaernerck	Hall Beach	Hamlet Member
Jaypeetee Audlakia	Hall Beach	QIA Board Member
Alice Saqqina	Hall Beach	Member at Large
Deborah Qanatsiaq	Hall Beach	Member at Large
Solomon Qanatsiaq	Hall Beach	Member at Large
Koonoo Oyukuluk	Arctic Bay	HTO Member
Olayuk Naqitarvik	Arctic Bay	Hamlet Member
Levi Barbabas	Arctic Bay	QIA Board Member
David Kalluk	Arctic Bay	Member at Large
Leah Kalluk	Arctic Bay	Member at Large
Leah Koonark	Arctic Bay	Member at Large
Josie Enuaraq	Clyde River	HTO Member
Noah Kautuq	Clyde River	Hamlet Member
James Qillaq	Clyde River	QIA Board Member
Jayko Apak	Clyde River	Member at Large
Igah Hainnu	Clyde River	Member at Large
Ootoova Audlakiak	Clyde River	Member at Large
Simia Suvega	Cape Dorset	HTO Member
Qimmeataaq Nungusuituq	Cape Dorset	Hamlet Member
Olayou Akesuk	Cape Dorset	QIA Board Member
Atsiaq Alasuaq	Cape Dorset	Member at Large
Ejetsiak Peter	Cape Dorset	Member at Large
Nitani Peter	Cape Dorset	Member at Large
Josephie Padluq	Kimmirut	HTO Member
Maliktoo Lyta	Kimmirut	Hamlet Member
Mikidjuk Kolola	Kimmirut	QIA Board Member
Miki Lyta	Kimmirut	Member at Large
Mialiralaa Judea	Kimmirut	Member at Large
Aibilee Kolola	Kimmirut	Member at Large

The Terms of Reference describing the membership, responsibility and function of these Committees has previously been shared with NIRB and other review parties. QIA has undertaken significant efforts to involve Inuit in the review process. As a result of these efforts, QIA can confidently state that there are gaps in how Inuit in potentially impacted communities are involved in the Project planning and Project review process. These gaps relate to the roles of all parties; the Proponent, reviewers, the Nunavut Impact Review Board and QIA. Although the potential impacts of the proposed Project are far reaching, involving as many as eight communities within the Qikiqtaaluk, this in itself is not a justifiable reason for limiting Inuit involvement. Certainly there are real barriers to initiating and maintaining Inuit involvement, however it is important to balance those barriers against the respective roles and efforts of each party.

One such barrier is the DEIS itself. As a lengthy technical document, written almost exclusively in English, reviewing the DEIS at the community level was not possible. Under the direction of QIA, the Proponent undertook to develop DEIS Summary Packages to facilitate community review of the main components of the DEIS. The complete DEIS Summary Package is included at the end of Appendix A. It is important to note that not all communities undertook to review the entire package. QIA's Committees in Hall Beach, Igloolik and Pond Inlet were given the entire package, where as other communities were given packages specific to potential impacts (i.e. Kimmirut and Cape Dorset did not review terrestrial impacts etc.).

As the minutes presented will demonstrate in many instances the bulk of QIA's effort was spent on explaining the Project to Committee members and communities at large. QIA's role in the environmental and regulatory review process is not to explain the Project. QIA's role is to review the Project and apply such efforts to the review process itself. For QIA, as a Designated Inuit Organization, reviewing the DEIS is not an armchair exercise. Involving Inuit to the degree QIA has achieved has taken considerable planning and investment. Ensuring that the perspectives of Inuit are applied to the review process adds additional dimensions to the QIA submission. It is fair to say that many discussions held with QIA beneficiaries highlighted the degree to which communication between the Proponent and Inuit has not been extensive or consistent throughout the Project development phase. For potential Project advancement to be successful, communication between the Proponent and Inuit will need to evolve into regular and more extended forms. Simply put, Inuit are not asking to be involved, they expect to be involved. As an initial means of addressing this topic, QIA is requesting that the Proponent use the contents of Appendix A as a guide for future community discussions. Furthermore, as stated in Appendix C, QIA is requesting that the Proponent demonstrate how the comments and concerns presented have been addressed.

A review of the materials contained in Appendix A will demonstrate QIA has focused its efforts primarily on project impacts, for which there are two main reasons; timing and circumstance. The NIRB process necessitates reviewing a large amount of material in short time periods for the purpose of providing detailed representations relative to a project proposal. The focus on project impacts, as opposed to benefits, also relates to the fact that negotiations related to the Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement are on-going. It is QIA intention to begin active discussions with communities on project benefits in the intervening time between this technical submission and the Proponent's submission of an FEIS.

Finally, in reading this document it is important to understand that this Appendix contains documents referenced in QIA's Technical Review of the Mary River Project DEIS. It is a compilation of notes from QIA consultations with communities, Community Project Review Committee activities, and multi-party meetings regarding the proposed Project in which QIA participated. Also listed are important events directly related to QIA's review for which there is no written record.

The contents of this Appendix have been presented to enhance the public record during the DEIS technical review period so that they may be considered and referenced by interested parties.

Meeting participants are listed in each document, however the attribution of specific comments to individuals has been removed in order to preserve anonymity.

It is possible that additional meeting minutes may continue to be received by QIA right up until the deadline for producing Technical Comments. As such, QIA may (prior to the Technical Meetings), provide an updated list of additional matters that the communities would want to see presented and assessed by the Proponent in the FEIS. QIA has altered NIRB as to these logistics. It is not anticipated that additional minutes, if received, would in any way alter QIA's technical comments to NIRB.

Mary River Project Review Committee Meetings	
Iglulik (Igloolik)	6
Ref I-0505: Igloolik Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (May 5)	6
Ref I-0516: Igloolik Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (May 16)	7
Ref I-0518: Igloolik Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (May 18)	8
Ref I-0527: Igloolik Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (May 27)	10
Ref I-0617: Igloolik BIMC Consultation – Meeting Notes (June 17)	11
Ref I-0704: Igloolik Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (July 4)	14
Ref I-0705: Hall Beach/Igloolik BIMC Consultation – Meeting Notes (July 5)	16
Ref I-0711: Igloolik Site Tour – QIA Notes (July 11)	30
Ref I-0915 Igloolik Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (September 15-21)	33
Ikpiarjuk (Arctic Bay)	36
Ref AB-0609: Arctic Bay Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (June 9)	36
Ref AB-0709a: Arctic Bay Site Tour – QIA Notes (July 9)	39
Ref AB-0709b: Arctic Bay Site Tour – Committee Notes (July 9)	41
Ref AB-0728: Arctic Bay Mary River Project Review Committee – Meeting Minutes (July 28)	44
Kangiqtugaapik (Clyde River)	47
Ref CR-0530: Clyde River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (May 30)	47
Ref CR-0610: Clyde River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (June 10)	49
Ref CR-0613: Clyde River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (June 13)	51
Ref CR-0818: Clyde River Project Committee – Local Radio Show (August 18)	52
Ref CR-0823: Clyde River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (August 23)	53
Ref CR-0921: Clyde River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (September 21)	54
Kimmirut	56
Ref K-0616: Kimmirut Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (June 16)	56
Ref K-0727: Kimmirut Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (July 27)	58
Kinngait (Cape Dorset)	60
Ref CD-0000: Cape Dorset Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (no date)	60
Mittimatalik (Pond Inlet)	62
Ref PI-0502: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (May 2)	62
Ref PI-0530: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (May 30)	63
Ref PI-0623: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (June 23)	66
Ref PI-0708a: Pond Inlet Site Tour – Committee Notes (July 8)	69
Ref PI-0708b: Pond Inlet Site Tour – QIA Notes (July 8)	70
Ref PI-0717: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (July 17)	72
Ref PI-0803: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (August 3)	75
Ref PI-0808: Pond Inlet Project Committee – QIA Workshop Summary (August 8-12)	78
Ref PI-0825: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (August 25)	93
Ref PI-0912: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (September 12)	95
Ref PI-0913: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (September 13)	99
Ref PI-0914: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (September 14)	102
Ref PI-0915: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (September 15)	106
Ref PI-0922: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Notes (September 22)	109
Sanirajak (Hall Beach)	111
Ref HB-0517: Hall Beach/Igloolik BIMC Consultation – Meeting Minutes (May 17)	111
Ref HB-0527: Hall Beach Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (May 27)	112
Ref HB-0531: Hall Beach Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (May 31)	113
Ref HB-0614: Hall Beach Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (June 14)	116
Ref HB-0704: Hall Beach Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (July 4)	118
Ref HB-0726: Hall Beach Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (July 26)	120
Ref HB-0727: Hall Beach Site Tour – QIA Notes (July 27)	123
Ref HB-0803a: Hall Beach Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (August 3)	125

Ref HB-0803b: Hall Beach Project Committee and CLARC – Meeting Minutes (August 3)	127
Ref HB-0912: Hall Beach Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (September 12)	129
Ref HB-0913: Hall Beach Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (September 13)	139
Ref HB-0927: Hall Beach Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (September 27)	144
QIA COMMUNITY CONSULTATION NOTES	148
Ref QIA-0713a: Pond Inlet Consultation on Caribou and Terrestrial Impacts – QIA Notes (July 13-14)	148
Ref QIA-0713b: Pond Inlet Consultation on Caribou and Terrestrial Impacts – Meeting Minutes (July 13-14)	152
Ref QIA-0714a: Hall Beach/Igloolik Consultation on Marine Mammals and Shipping – QIA Notes (July 14-15)	160
Ref QIA-0714b: Cape Dorset Consultation on Marine Mammals and Shipping – QIA Notes (July 14-15)	171
Ref QIA-0808: QIA Mary River Project Workshop Summary (August 8-12)	176
INTERESTED PARTY MEETING NOTES	193
Ref RA-0705: Common Concerns – Shipping Impact and Marine Mammals (July 5 & 13)	193
Ref RA-0712: Interagency/BIMC Workshop – Discussion and Action Items (July 12-14)	196
OTHER MEETINGS AND EVENTS	205
DEIS SUMMARY PACKAGE	

MARY RIVER PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETINGS

IGLULIK (IGLOOLIK)

Ref I-0505: Igloolik Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (May 5)

Igloolik Mary River Project Committee Meeting Minutes
Community Liaison Officer Office
May 5, 2011. @10:00 a.m.

Present from members:

David Irgaut, Solomon Mikki, Zacharias Kunuk

Present from Staff:

Sidonie Ungalaq, Community Liaison Officer

1. Selection for Mary River Project Committees:

Appointed member from Hamlet – Zacharias Kunuk
Appointed member from HTO – Solomon Mikki
Appointed member from CLARC – David Irgaut

Appointed members from the members above

Louise Uttak – public
Marie Airut – public
Elisapi Quassa - public

2. Adjournment:

Adjourn of May 5, 2011 Baffinland Committee members meeting @ 11:30

Ref I-0516: Igloolik Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (May 16)

**Igloolik Mary River Project Committee Meeting Minutes
Community Liaison Officer Office
May 16, 2011. @1:00 p.m.**

Present from members:

Zacharias Kunuk – Hamlet, Solomon Mikki – HTO, David Irgaut – CLARC
Louise Uttak – public, Marie Airut – public, Elisapee Quassa - public

Present from Staff:

Sidonie Ungalaq - Community Liaison Officer
Solomon Awa - QIA

1. Selecting for Mary River Project Committees Chairperson and second chairperson:

Through nominations and a vote, Solomon Mikki will be Chairperson and Zacharias Kunuk will be Vice Chair for the Mary River Project Committee.

2. Tulaktarvik.

The port in Mary River was discussed and members talked about their concerns for tomorrow's meeting with the Baffinland people at HTO building. They gathered questions and answers for the meeting.

3. Teleconferencing:

Members had a one-hour teleconferencing with the southern people from Winnipeg, Montreal, and Ottawa.

4. Adjournment:

Adjourn of May 16, 2011 Mary River Committee meeting @ 5:00 p.m.

Ref I-0518: Igloodik Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (May 18)

**Igloodik Mary River Project Committee Meeting Minutes
Community Liaison Officer Office
May 18, 2011. @1:00 p.m.**

Present from members:

Solomon Mikki – Chair, Zacharias Kunuk – Vice Chair, David Inngaut – CLARC
Louise Uttak, Marie Airut, Elisapee Quassa.

Present from Staff:

Sidonie Ungalaq - Community Liaison Officer
Solomon Awa - QIA
Steven Bathory – QIA
Cheryl Wray - QIA

1. Review of Baffinland and HTO public meeting.

Discussion on BIM Project and Shipping:

- We are not in agreement with the port site location. We have been saying this for years now but nobody is hearing us.
- The translation of information or presentations that are provided to us by the Company are just translated and not interpreted so it is difficult for us to understand the concepts.
- Why can't the company use tunneling equipment instead of blasting for the tunnels on Cockburn Lake. This would lessen the impact on the fish in that lake.
- We are concerned about our opportunities to develop a commercial fisheries industry in Igloodik from the Steensby Inlet and Cockburn Lake areas if this Project goes ahead.
- What will the water quality be like from the mining, railway and shipping activities. It will change our water and our health.
- We need to have real discussion with the company on compensation for this Project.
- The impacts to the walrus will be huge and we eat the walrus. How will the walrus be impacted and how will the company minimize those impacts.
- The elders know that the youth need work but we can't sacrifice our environment for this.

The Mary River Project Committee had their say and thinks that the Committee's should go on, as long as when Baffinland are working at the Mary River site.

2. Next face-to-face meeting

May 27, 2011 @ 1:00 p.m.

3. Adjournment:

Adjourn of May 16, 2011 Mary River Committee meeting @ 5:00 p.m.

Ref I-0527: Igloolik Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (May 27)

**Igloolik Mary River Project Committee Meeting Minutes
May 27, 2011. @1:00 p.m, Community Liaison Officer Office**

Present from members:

Solomon Mikki – Chair, Zacharias Kunuk – Vice, David Irngaut – member, Louise Uttak – member, Marie Airut – member, Elisapee Quassa - member

Present from Staff:

Sidonie Ungalaq - Community Liaison Officer
Solomon Awa – teleconference in Iqaluit

- 1. Opening prayer:**
An opening prayer was conducted at 1:15 p.m.
- 2. Review of Agenda:**
Members approved the agenda.
- 3. Port-site follow-up meeting with BIMC.**
Some of the Committee members would like to plan with staff before the BIMC arrives here to Igloolik.
- 4. Develop a list of community members who are from Steensby Inlet.**
One of the committee members will go on the radio and ask the public to call here if they lived in Steensby Inlet. The names will be collected and forwarded to the Iqaluit office.
- 5. Workshop dates-August 8-12.**
Two members were nominated and selected to attend a workshop on August 8-12.
- 6. Present the idea of the Coordination Team going with committee members to attend to Nuvuiit and Steensby Inlet.**
Two members were selected to go on the Mary River site tour.
- 7. Update on the establishment of other committees.**
A QIA representative will start to travel to the affected communities on May 29, 2011 and will get back to us with information.
- 8. Next face-to-face-meeting:**
Open.
- 9. Adjournment:**
Adjourn of May 27, 2011 Mary River Committee meeting @ 4:00 p.m.

Ref I-0617: Igloolik BIMC Consultation – Meeting Notes (June 17)

**BIMC Meeting with Igloolik Mary River Project Committee and QIA
June 17, 2010, 4:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
By Teleconference**

PRESENT:

QIKIQTANI INUIT ASSOCIATION:

Mr. Solomon Awa		QIA EIS Team
Mr. Stephen Bathory	-	QIA EIS Team
Mrs. Elisapee Quassa	-	Igloolik Committee Representative
Ms. Marie Airut	-	Igloolik Committee Representative

BAFFINLAND:

Mr. Matthew Pickard	-	Director, EHS and Sustainability
Mr. Nick Arnatsiaq		Community Liaison Officer, Igloolik

CONSULTANT to BIMC:

Mr. Richard Cook	Environmental Consultant, Knight Piésold Ltd.
------------------	---

The meeting was held mostly in English, with some translation by Mr. Nick Arnatsiaq. These meeting notes were recorded by Mr. Richard Cook.

Following introductions regarding who was on the call, BIMC started by stating that Baffinland is looking for clarity on the concerns of Igloolik with respect to the proposed Steensby port, and how the company can best prepare for the proposed trip to Igloolik the first week of July.

QIA – The community still needs more information on how the Steensby port was proposed. Igloolik are still looking at the Nuvuiit site and want to understand how it is possible, and if not then why not. They want to look at the maps – is there too much permafrost between the Steensby and Nuvuiit site? They are still thinking about the Nuvuiit site. There was a miscommunication between Baffinland and the elder’s committee.

BIMC – How did Baffinland’s previous meeting with the committee go?

QIA – The previous meeting was more like an information session, not a discussion. Time was limited and there wasn’t enough chance for a real discussion.

BIMC – We want to understand the best format to engage the community.

QIA – A full-day discussion with the Igloolik committed members with no rush, plus an open house. The date might need to be changed from July 5-6 to July 8-9 though.

A discussion followed that July 9 is Nunavut Day, and it was agreed that there would need to be follow-up to confirm the date of the meeting.

QIA – We were looking to generate a list of families to visit the Steensby site – do we have the list?

BIMC – We need to know the approximate number of people to start planning the logistics of such a visit.

BIMC – The chair is out of the community – will follow up with this person when he returns to the community.

QIA – The best guess is about 20 people.

QIA – Has a field study of the Nuvuiit site been done, or can it be done?

BIMC – A desktop study of a railway alignment to the Nuvuiit site was completed by the railway engineer – this was presented during the previous meeting the company held in Igloodik.

QIA – OK. We would like the railway engineer to attend the meeting.

BIMC – Not sure if this will be possible, but we will see if she is available.

BIMC – What is the main concern about locating the port at Steensby Inlet?

QIA – There are three main concerns. First is seal pupping on landfast ice. Second is that the railway goes along the Cockburn Lake which has been identified as a commercial fishery. Third is that during summer marine mammals including walrus, beluga and bowhead go into Steensby Inlet.

BIMC – QIA's letter asked for a full impact assessment on all options for rail and port, but the concern in Igloodik seems to focus on Steensby and Nuvuiit, is that right?

Committee – Yes, the main concern is Steensby, Cockburn Lake fisheries, and blasting alongside the lake for the tunnels.

BIMC – Can we look at comparing the effects of Steensby versus Nuvuiit?

Committee – A very good question to ask. We'd like to have a discussion comparing the impact on the two places.

QIA – Baffinland is going to Igloodik to work on the Nuvuiit site, but it is important that the other port sites be addressed. There is still a lot of pressure from the communities on the other port sites, so they can't be excluded.

Committee – The main issue on the Igloodik side is Steensby and Nuvuiit. The other sites – we haven't heard from the other communities. If the other communities raise concern on the other sites it would need to be looked at.

BIMC – Thanks, very helpful to understand.

Committee – If Baffinland can bring a huge map to Igloolik?

BIMC – Yes, we'll have maps and IQ information prepared and will bring with us.

Committee – It is unfortunate that most of the committee are not available right now due to other commitments like Rangers and being out on the ice for the last couple of weeks of ice.

BIMC – We'll communicate regarding dates. BIMC can work on the meeting location, refreshments, translators, etc. We'll need at least two translators.

QIA – Can I suggest an interpreter from Hall Beach?

BIMC – Is it [name of interpreter]?

QIA – Yes.

BIMC – We agree, it would be good to have the interpreter there. BIMC can coordinate to make arrangements to have the interpreter there, if he is available.

QIA – Likely one of us will be there.

QIA – The Hall Beach committee can come? They would like to attend.

BIMC – Oh, I didn't know. That would be fine if we can coordinate.

Meeting adjourned 5:00 p.m.

Ref I-0704: Igloolik Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (July 4)

**Igloolik Mary River Project Committee Meeting Minutes
July 4, 2011. @7:00 p.m.**

Written by Solomon Awa

Present from members:

Solomon Mikki
Zacharias Kunuk
David Irngaut
Elisapee Quassa

Present from Staff:

Solomon Awa - QIA

- 1. Opening prayer**
Open meeting with a prayer.

- 2. Mary River site tour**

There will be a site tour on July 11, 2011 and everyone is invited to attend. Baffinland will be arriving in Iqaluit in the morning. We will fly to Mary River and take a site tour at Mary River and possibly to Steensby Inlet port site.

- 3. Selection of casual employee.**

There were three applicants from the public to be as a casual employment during the holiday of QIA CLO until August 18, 2011.
A member was chosen to be as casual until the permanent CLO returns to office, starting tomorrow for the Baffinland visit to Igloolik.

- 4. Baffinland visit to Igloolik**

Baffinland is arriving to Igloolik and we will bring Hall Beach Mary River Project Committee members to talk about Steensby Inlet port site.

- 5: Possible questions to Baffinland**

There will be a tunnel made using the explosives; is it possible to reduce the amount of discharge during the construction at the long lake to protect the fish and its habitat.

Baffinland mentioned that they can move the fish elsewhere during the construction where can they find that big of a lake to hold that many fish. They would request to Baffinland that it be done only in summertime when the fish are down in the ocean. There is approximately 100,000 lbs of commercial fishing quota around the Steensby Inlet area

The ballast water will be discharged at Steensby Inlet that is taken from the middle of Atlantic ocean. Would that cause impact to the area of Steensby Inlet mixing the salt water to the area where there is not so much salt water? How much impact will that be?

All that shipping route will see impact when ships come and go every day and a half especially during the winter. More seals will move away, more walrus will move away there will be less activities for the wildlife.

Terrestrial mammals will be impacted by the train, its habitat and there should be more consideration to reduce the dust spreading from the ore.

6. People who have been living in or around Steensby Inlet.

Igloolik Mary River Project Committee members would like to request from Baffinland that those people who were living in or around Steensby Inlet should be taken to the site for the final view. There are at least 40 people who might be interested to go to Steensby Inlet to see what is being planned for the shipping port site.

7. Adjournment:

Adjourn of July 4, 2011 Mary River Committee meeting @ 9:00 p.m.

ᐃᓚᓗᓕᓕᓐ ᐅᑲᑲᐤ: ᐵᑲᓕᓐᓗᓕᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓐᓗᑲᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ

Baffinland: ᓄᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓕᓐᓗᑲᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐅᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ

ᐃᓚᓗᓕᓕᓐ ᐅᑲᑲᐤ: ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ, ᐃᑲᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓐᓗᑲᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ

Baffinland: ᐅᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ

Slightly warmer water sink in water - ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ

ᐃᓚᓗᓕᓕᓐ ᐅᑲᑲᐤ: ᐃᓗᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ

Baffinland: ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ

ᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ: ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ

Baffinland: ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ

Baffinland: ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ

ᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ: ᐃᓗᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ

- 1. ᓗᓕ
- 2. ᓐᓗᓕᓐ
- 3. ᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ
- 4. ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ
- 5. ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐ
- 6. ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐ
- 7. ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐ
- 8. ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐ
- 9. ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐ/ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ
- 10. ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐ
- 11. ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐ
- 12. ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐ
- 13. ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐ
- 14. ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐ

ᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ: ᐃᓗᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ

ᐃᓚᓗᓕᓕᓐ ᐅᑲᑲᐤ: ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ ᐃᓗᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐᓗᓕᓐ

Δηλώνω με ικανοποίηση και ευγνωμοσύνη την ολοκλήρωση της λειτουργίας μου στην εταιρεία. Ευχαριστώ όλους τους συναδέλφους και τους προϊστάμενους για την καλή συνεργασία και την υποστήριξη. Thank you for closure!

Διευθυντής: Δρ. Δημήτρης Παπαδόπουλος

Ref I-0711: Igloodik Site Tour – QIA Notes (July 11)

11 July 2011

Igloodik Mary River Project Committee – Mary River Site Tour

Notes prepared by Cheryl Wray and Solomon Awa

Participants:

- Erik Madsen – BIM
- Joanasie Naulaq - BIM
- Cheryl Wray – QIA
- Solomon Awa – QIA
- Solomon Mikki – Committee Chair/HTO
- David Irngaut – Committee Member/CLARC
- Louis Utak – Committee Member
- Zacharias Kunuk – Committee Member/Hamlet of Igloodik
- Marie Airut – Committee Member at Large/Women’s Group
- Elisapee Quassa – Committee Member at Large

The group departed for Mary River at 9 am. En route, the plane flew over the Alternate Route (described as Nuvuiit Peninsula in Section 12, Page 142, Volume 3 of the DEIS). However the plane was unable to fly the entire route due to weather. The topography in this area is very hilly. The group arrived in Mary River and received a brief Site Orientation and orientation to Project. An elder led a prayer.

Points discussed during overview to the Project were:

- The massive scale of the Project.
- There are some people who view the Project either positively or negatively.
- It would be beneficial for some people on this Committee to visit Diavik and Voisey’s Bay to see how a large scale mine (Diavik) and shipping operations work (Voisey’s Bay).
- Under the NLCA, pre-development staging is acceptable. BIM would like to conduct this at Steensby, Mary River and Milne Inlet to prepare for construction. NIRB has allocated half a day to discuss this during the technical hearings.
- Fuel bladders will be removed from Milne Inlet and replaced by a 5 million liter tank. During construction, 40 million liters of fuel will be stored at Milne Inlet.
- Mary River’s airstrip will be expanded during pre-staging (2012) to 6000 feet to allow for a 737 jet.
- Steensby will include heavy equipment, a floating camp and fuel stores during 2012.
- There are 8-9 other deposits besides Deposit 1, so this project is a game changer for Nunavut. It will be a multi-generational mine.
- The IIBA/MOU is actively being negotiated and benefits include training, employment and business opportunities.
- The tote road has been removed from the mining operations plan, and this change required the submission of an Addendum to the DEIS reflecting the resulting differences in impact assessment.

- BIM is aware that Igloodik has concerns with the Steensby Port site so a map has been included with the alternate routes. The Company would like to fly those routes with this Committee. BIM realizes that decisions cannot be made here, but open discussion is required.
- The group was asked if they wanted to see Milne Inlet, and they agreed.
- Milne Inlet, Mary River and Steensby Inlet maps were reviewed.

Questions included:

1. Committee: Will the orientation/safety programs be translated and conducted in Inuktitut?
 - BIM: No, but they should be and this is something that that BIM has to work towards.
2. Committee: How safe is it to fly in a helicopter?
 - BIM: A safety briefing is conducted by the pilots and the helicopters will not fly unless it is safe to do so.

A tour of the proposed railway was conducted utilizing 3 helicopters. The helicopters flew the entire route, port location and Steensby Islands where ore will be potentially stored. The flight back to Mary River was direct (shortest flight line) using a flight path north of the rail route. Questions asked:

3. Committee: Is the rail route on bird breeding grounds?
 - QIA: As there are ponds and lakes along the route, there will be some nesting birds, but the area is not classified as an important nesting area by BIM.

Enroute back to camp, the helicopters flew over Deposit 1 and looked at the soapstone quarry. Question asked:

4. Committee: Will communities have access to soapstone quarry?
 - BIM: Yes – it is within the IIBA.

The group landed at Mary River and had lunch. After lunch, a tour was conducted up the road to Deposit 1, where members collected a piece of ore to take back with them.

The group boarded the plane to Milne Inlet. Committee members were encouraged to ask questions about what they have observed so far. Questions asked:

5. Committee: Will community members be allowed to hunt at camp?
 - BIM: Community members who are at camp to work will not be allowed to hunt or fish. If they are here on their time off, then yes they can hunt and fish.
6. Committee: Why can't they hunt or fish? Community members may be hungry for their country food.
 - BIM: It is an environmental and safety policy at all large exploration, construction or mining camps. It will be an item within the IIBA for the company to provide country food at camps.
7. Committee: Can the community members bring their own country food if they want?
 - BIM: Yes.

8. Committee: I know that the company will be unlikely to use the Nuvuiit alternate route due to it being very hilly; I know that it can't be used. But the Community of Igloodik does not want the Port at Steensby. They need to see the second alternate route with their own eyes. Did the Company representative see the 30 walrus on the ice?
 - BIM: Yes we are going to attempt to fly the second alternate route if weather permits. No, I did not see the walrus.

Committee: Thank you for the opportunity to see the proposed sites as we have never done this before.

BIM: This is how the Company would like to operate and work in the future.

The groups conducted a brief ground tour of Milne Inlet. Iron ore stockpiles were observed as well as the bladder fuel farm that will be decommissioned.

The second alternate route was flown en route back to Igloodik (Rowley River route).

The Committee returned to Igloodik at approximately 8pm.

Ref I-0915 Igloolik Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (September 15-21)

**Igloolik Mary River Project Committee Meeting Minutes
September 15, 16, 20, 21, 2011**

Member attended

Zach Kunuk	September 15, 16,20 2011
Solomon Mikki	September 15,16,20,21 2011
David Irngaut	September 15,16,20,21 2011
Louis Utak	September 15,16,20,21 2011
Elisapee Quassa	September 15,16,20,21 2011
Marie Airut	September 15,16,20,21 2011
Sidonie Ungalaq	Staff

Agenda:

Discussion on Sections of DEIS
Predevelopment Works
Letter for schedule

Discussion on section 3 of DEIS

Part 3a-Climate Change

- We would like to see the train that is going to carry the Iron Ore to have a cover.

Part 3b-Land forms, Soils and Permafrost

- We would like to see the train go through the thicker soils for safety purposes, since there is climate change it would be safer to travel.

Discussion on section 4 of DEIS

Part 4a-Marine Habitat and Biota

- The train that is going to carry the Iron Ore to the port should have cover that way it have less impact on all animals.

Part 4b-Marine Mammals

- If BIMC keep try and go to Steensby Inlet for port site the impact will be much larger, but if they will go to Nuvuiit the impact will be much smaller.

Part 4c-Marine Water and Sediment Quality

- Here we have questions about impacts we would like to get back on this.

Part 4d-Migratory Birds and Habitat

- The birds that live in Mary River are more then there are, birds that eat meat are in over 20's and birds that eat vegetation are in more than 10.

Part 4e-Sea Ice

- Igloodik Mary River Committee did not have much to say on Sea Ice

Discussion on Section 6 of DEIS

Part 1- Population and Demographics

- Concerning life Do you think it be best for the employees to come home and go back to work and not have Mary River as a community?

Part 2-Education and Training

- It can be best if we can have training in Igloodik for Heavy Equipment Operators that way they would have more students.

Part 3 – Livelihood and Employment:

- Do not agree with the statement where traditional knowledge is not transferred
- Rotational work will have an impact on family dynamics – partners, children, grandchildren.
- Baffinland should investigate homes on site so people can go home every evening.
- BIMC and QIA has to work more closely together, we need to look on this more closely.

Country food:

- Would not prepare the traditional way and cooks would prepare the country food the southern way.

Education and Training:

- Conduct training in communities instead of sending people south for programs.
- Training of Inuit Supervisors – set up a plan
- Training of Environmental/Wildlife/Marine Inspectors.

Royalties:

- At a certain age (18 or 21) people within the communities would receive a royalty cheque such as bands in the south that have industrial activity on their lands. This could reduce the rates of suicide if people knew that they were going to receive money.
- The Inuit in the impacted region will not see the “real” money as the government will use the funding for the entire territory.
- The most impacted communities should get the most royalties – the money should not be spread around and benefit the 7 impacted communities.

4- Human Health and Well-being

- We need to look at this tab more closely and not in a rush it.

5- Economic Development and Self-reliance.

- We would like to look at this again.

6 – Community Infrastructure and Public Service

- Mitigation measure for a reduction in public service in the communities is the setup of a training program for hamlet workers.

7-Contracting and business

- Economic Development Officers for the Hamlet should have a partnership with a business person with Baffinland to determine what opportunities exist for service within the communities.
- Support QC and QL with employment for contracts and projects on site.
- Support a Fisheries Plant for Igloolik.

8-Cultural Resources

- Do not agree with the statement “sacred” as all the land to Inuit is sacred and burial sites are not found as there are no burial sites. Inuit were left on surface and not buried – no wonder you didn’t find burial sites. Only after Christianity did burial start.
- People who were born in that area should be buried there – that is Inuit Culture.

9-Resources and Land use

- Concern – caribou crossings – can we build the rail above the known caribou trails.
- Inuit do not want road kill – they don’t want to eat caribou that have been hit and killed by the rail.
- Question: How will we travel during the summer with the ship traffic in Steensby? Are we trying to beat the ship traffic?
- Igloolik does not agree that there will be no impacts to marine life.
- They want the port south as they will not be able to travel the Steensby.

10-Culture Well-being

- Every fiscal can BIMC give more money to QIA for this tap # 10?
- We would like to have QIA give money to Inulariit Society for they teach proper speaking in Inuktitut and teaches traditional skills.

11-Benefits, Royalty and Taxation

- For the most affected communities on their waters and land they would like to see written estimates of royalties.

12-Government and Leadership

- Who will be governing throughout the year?

13-Substance Abuse

- Let it be like this for now and when we have to change it we can change it

14-Archeological sites and land use

- Since there is archeology up in Steensby Inlet we would like to see the ship going to Nuvuiit.

IKPIARJUK (ARCTIC BAY)

Ref AB-0609: Arctic Bay Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (June 9)

**Mary River Project Committee
Meeting held at the HTO office in Arctic Bay
June 9, 2011 @ 7 p.m.**

Present:

- Solomon Awa - Project Coordinator
- Levi Barnabas – QIA Representative for Arctic Bay
- Koonoo Oyukuluk – HTO Representative
- Olayuk Naqitarvik – Hamlet Representative
- Leah Koonark – Women Representative
- David Kalluk – Member at Large
- Leah Kalluk – Member at Large
- Niore Iqalukjuak – QIA CLO

Opening Prayer @ 7:24 pm

Review of Agenda and Introductions

Moved and seconded to approve the agenda as presented.

The Meeting Procedure and Terms of Reference were read. Committees from Hall Beach, Igloolik, Clyde River, Pond Inlet, Kimmirut, Cape Dorset, and finally Arctic Bay have already been formed.

Q: Can we have a copy of the Knight Peisold research of the wildlife and archeological sites made available for all to see?

A: Will try to get that material.

Q: When does the committee meet and how often?

A: It all depends on when materials need review.

Q: Will the Committee meet when required?

A: Yes.

Q: Will Committees meet alternately?

A: Yes, Committees will meet alternately even if it is a teleconference.

C: A member said that he wishes to be involved; he felt that they were not included when they had the workshop in Mary River, it seemed like they were sent home when the issue of the route was about to be discussed.

C: Another member feels that all Committees should be included. He feels that Arctic Bay Committee may be of assistance as they have dealt with an ice breaking mining ship in the past

and he also feels that all of the Committees should each have a representative when dealing with the environment.

Q: Why are the number of years the mine will be opened declining? When they first announced it, they had said it would be open for a hundred years and how it's down to 21 years. Also why will the Committee only be in function during the start of the mining process; the Committee should run throughout the mining process.

A: Each of the deposits have a certain number of years in which they will be worked on. Deposit 1 has a projected life of 21 years, the other deposits will be worked on in the future. This Committee is set to be in function only in the beginning, however maybe there will be other committees that will look after it once the Mine is up and running.

C: Regarding the changes going on with the mine, the changes that are happening; the plans that Baffinland had should remain the same even though ArcelorMittal has purchased Baffinland. There should be new appointments once the terms are up.

C: The Committee wants to see the Knight Peisold reports or researches in the meetings.

Appointment of Chairperson

Nominations and seconds by various members. D. Kalluk is appointed to the Chairperson position.

Appointment of Vice-Chairperson

Nominations and seconds by various members. O. Naqitarvik is voted to the position of Vice Chairperson.

It was explained that there are eight QIA employees that will be the support group for the Mary River Project Committees. He also explained that they will be going to Communities to assist the Committees in during the process.

Q: Are Repulse Bay and Salliq are part of the process?

A: Perhaps they should be but since they are not a part of QIA then he figured that maybe QIA should write a letter to the appropriate Inuit Organizations within their area to see if they have any concerns.

Two members of the Committee were appointed to attend the workshop to be held from August 8, 2011 to August 12, 2011 in Iqaluit.

There will be a tour of Mary River by Baffinland to be held on July 9, 2011. A taxi is to be arranged by CLO to pick up the group to be taken to the airport.

Igloolik Concerns

It was explained that Igloolik had concerns regarding the docking area for the ship and that Baffinland does not wish to move the docking area. However, People of Igloolik wish to change the docking area from Ikpikiturjuaq to Nuvuiit. The Committees of Pond Inlet, Clyde River and

Hall Beach have all supported Igloodik's request. The Arctic Bay Mary River Project Committee moved to support Igloodik's request as well.

A member stated that if BaffinLand does not wish to change the docking area then the ships would have to pick up ore from Ikpikiturjuaq once every two weeks. Ikpikiturjuaq is the route of char, it is also calving ground for caribou and also geese and other birds lay eggs in the Ikpikiturjuaq area. There are caribou and the waters in that area are calving grounds for walrus.

Another member would like to have a teleconference every now and then, as that would give the Committee a chance to find out how the other Committees are dealing with issues.

A QIA representative will be in Pond Inlet on July 15, 2011 and they will be talking about caribou, Arctic Bay can join in on the teleconference at that time.

Moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

Ref AB-0709a: Arctic Bay Site Tour – QIA Notes (July 9)

9 July 2011

Arctic Bay Mary River Project Review Committee – Mary River Site Tour

Notes prepared by Cheryl Wray and Solomon Awa

Participants:

- Erik Madsen – BIM
- Cheryl Wray – QIA
- Solomon Awa – QIA
- Niore Iqalukjuak – Committee Member/Mayor of Arctic Bay
- David Kalluk – Committee Member
- Olayuk Naqitarvik – Committee Member
- Koonoo Oyukuluk – Committee Member
- Leah Kalluk – Committee Member
- Leah Koonark – Committee Member
- Levi Barnabas – Committee Member

The group departed for Mary River at 8:30 am. A brief Site Orientation and orientation to the Project were conducted. An elder led a prayer.

Points discussed during the overview to the Project were:

- The massive scale of the Project.
- There are some people who view the Project either positively or negatively.
- It would be beneficial for some people on the Mary River Project Committee to visit Diavik and Voisey's Bay projects to see how a large scale mine (Diavik) and Shipping Operations work (Voisey's Bay).
- Under the NLCA, pre-development staging is acceptable. BIM would like to conduct this at Steensby, Mary River and Milne Inlet to prepare for construction. NIRB has allocated half a day to discuss this during the technical hearings.
- Bladders will be removed from Milne Inlet and replaced by a 5 million liter tank. During construction, 40 million liters of fuel will be stored at Milne Inlet.
- There will be a floating barge at Milne and approximately 15 ships sailing to Milne for construction.
- Mary River's airstrip will be expanded during pre-staging (2012) to 6000 feet to allow for a 737 jet.
- Steensby will include heavy equipment, a floating camp and fuel storage during 2012.
- There are 8-9 other deposits besides Deposit 1, so this project is a game changer for Nunavut. It will be a multi-generational mine.
- The IIBA/MOU is actively being negotiated and benefits include training, employment and business opportunities.

- The tote road was recently removed from the mining operations plan, and this change required BIM to write an Addendum to the DEIS that includes the resulting changes to the assessment of impacts.

Questions asked included:

1. Committee: Are all of the ore deposits of high grade material?
 - BIM: We will need to conduct additional delineation drilling to map the ore bodies to determine its grade.
2. Committee: I haven't seen any plans for hydro – is this in the plans?
 - BIM: The mining of the first deposit will be conducted using diesel-generated power. An environmental assessment to permit hydro power. Over all it is better to use hydro but initially diesel will need to be used.
3. Committee: We have concerns with the blasting along Cockburn Lake for the tunnels. We would like to see where these tunnels will be.
 - BIM: DFO ensures that no harm to fish will occur through their permits. BIM will have some of the best engineers building this rail properly.

A tour was conducted of the Mary River site as well as Deposit 1. Questions asked:

4. Committee: Where is the soapstone quarry?
 - BIM: The location was shown on the map across Mary River.
5. Committee: Where is the location of the railway? Is it in the Mary River Valley?
 - BIM: Not right in the valley but near it.

An aerial tour (via plane) was conducted of the potential rail route and Steensby Port, pointing out the tunnel locations. The group then flew to Milne Inlet following the tote road. A tour of Milne Inlet was conducted. Questions asked;

6. Committee: When will jobs start?
 - BIM: Some work will start with the construction of the fuel tank at Milne Inlet. During pre-development staging, there will be a window of time for training opportunities.
7. Committee: Can we partner with NAC to develop training programs?
 - BIM: Yes that is what we need to do. For example – carpenter's helper courses within the communities. The IIBA will address training and working partnerships.
8. Committee: Will we be allowed to come and hunt on the mine site?
 - BIM: The DEIS clearly states that access would be given in terms of accommodations and fuel.

The Committee returned to Arctic Bay at approximately 7 pm.

Ref AB-0709b: Arctic Bay Site Tour – Committee Notes (July 9)

**Mary River Project Committee
Mary River Tour
July 9, 2011**

On Tour were:

- Levi Barnabas – QIA Representative for Arctic Bay
- Koonoo Oyukuluk – HTO Representative
- Olayuk Naqitarvik – Hamlet Representative
- Leah Koonark – Women Representative
- David Kalluk – Member at Large
- Leah Kalluk – Member at Large
- Niore Iqalukjuak – QIA CLO

All went to the airport at 8 a.m. and were picked up from the Arctic Bay Airport by Baffinland's Summit Air.



Once we departed Arctic Bay, we flew over Milne Inlet and went to Mary River base camp.



We had a tour of the camp site and were driven to the top of Deposit 1.



This photo is on the top of deposit 1. Back Row alone from Left to Right: Levi Barnabas, Baffinland Employee, Cheryl Wrey and Koonoo Oyukuluk. Middle Row from Left to right: David Kalluk, Olayuk Naqitarvik, Solomon Awa and Leah Koonark. Alone in the front is: Leah Kalluk. We were given an airplane ride from Mary River along the planned railway route all the way to Steensby Inlet.



Then we flew to Milne Inlet and landed there.



And then we flew home at 6 p.m.



Ref AB-0728: Arctic Bay Mary River Project Review Committee – Meeting Minutes (July 28)

**Arctic Bay Mary River Project Committee
Teleconference held at the HTO office in Arctic Bay
July 28, 2011 @ 2 p.m.**

Present:

- David Kalluk – Chair Person
- Olayuk Naqitarvik – Vice Chair Person
- Koonoo Oyukuluk – HTO Representative
- Leah Koonark – Women Representative
- Levi Barnabas – QIA Representative for Arctic Bay
- Leah Kalluk – Member at Large
- Niore Iqalukjuak – QIA CLO

Also Present via Telephone:

- Solomon Awa - Project Coordinator

Re: Summary of the Mary River IIBA

Opening Prayer said by **D. Kalluk** @ 2:24 pm

A Summary of Mary River IIBA was read.

Comments or questions to Item 1:

Q: Is the shipping route being tested?

A: Yes the route is being tested.

Q: The MOU for the IIBA was signed and was in use from 2009 to 2011 and this MOU ended in May 2011, so my question is, what is the status of the negotiations and what are in the contents and what are the dates for this MOU?

A: This will be one of the issues to ask during the workshop.

Comments or questions to Item 2:

Q: This is in regards to Education? Where and when will this take place?

A: It can start now either through Mary River or through Nunavut Arctic College.

Q: Who will fund them? Baffinland or Nunavut Arctic College?

A: This will be another question to ask at the workshop.

Q: Baffinland must have an agreement with the Nunavut Government regarding education and what is the status with the agreement?

A: Yes there is an agreement for Deposit 1 but they will have to do up other MOU's with the other deposits, this question will also have to be asked at the workshop when they start dealing with IIBA.

Q: Asked about learning on the job – Is it open now and where do they apply?

A: Yes this is available and should be discussed at the workshop.

Comments or questions to Item 3:

Q: If any Inuk wishes to have a contract and does not have a business, can they do so without a business?

A: Inuit would have to submit to any of the contracts made available by Baffinland and then Baffinland would have to consider who they wish to award the contract to.

Q: QIA, QC and QL have a contract with Baffinland but Inuit up here aren't being really used, has this issue been looked into?

A: This issue can be asked during the workshop.

Q: In regards to Country food if Baffinland were to start purchasing Country food, the Co-op's and Local HTO's can look after the food within their Communities, who would be a good contact for this?

A: To my understanding, QIA seems to want to look after this issue. Currently, it is a matter of a health issue but people employed by Baffinland can be sent or can take over Country food with them when they go to Mary River.

Q: This is in regards to low flying of aircraft, if this continues animals will be impacted. He also wonders if the flights that go from Mary River to the other Communities can be utilized by bringing in Country food from the other Communities.

A: This issue can be brought up at the workshop.

Questions or comments to Item 4

Q: In regards to financial participation, would the Mary River Project Committee be getting funds?

A: Funds go directly to QIA and then QIA decides how it uses the funds.

Q: In the MOU, there is also a line that states that Elders get funds and also trading of Country food, is this still in the agreement?

A: Yes, I believe that is still in the agreement.

Q: In regards to Crown Land and Inuit Owned Land, would Inuit still get funds from Crown Land?

A: QIA gets funds because Baffinland is leasing from Inuit Owned lands.

Q: When we had Nanisivik, they had indicated a target level of Inuit Employment of 60% and this was never met by the Company. It would be good if Baffinland does not have any of this seeing as I'm sure they would not meet any of the targets that they make.

A: This will be another issue that would need to be brought up at the workshop.

C: In regards to the Community Initiatives funds, the other Inuit Organizations in Northern Quebec have purchased vehicles and are using them to help their beneficiaries. They also get a

share of the dividends but yet we do not get that here. This issue would be a very good if it was implemented here in the Qikiqtani Region.

Q: This is in regards to the Environmental issues that have Communities concerned in regards to the docking facility that is planned to be built in Steensby Inlet. Will Baffinland continue to build the docking facilities even when Inuit oppose the building of that dock?

A: We will meet about this and discuss it at the workshop.

Q: 10 people took the drilling course in Igloolik and it makes me wonder if any of the people that took that course are working.

A: We can ask Baffinland regarding this issue.

Q: In regards to working conditions, will there be counselors available for Employees made available in Mary River? And will Baffinland ask for counselors to be flown in when required?

A: Baffinland mentioned it and we have to request for it through the IIBA.

C: Some of the Mary River Project Committee members do have certification in this field and could be utilized.

The next teleconference should be on August 2, 2011 at 3 p.m.

Adjournment at 3:42 p.m.

KANGIQTUGAAPIK (CLYDE RIVER)

Ref CR-0530: Clyde River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (May 30)

Clyde River Baffinland Committee

Special Meeting

May 30th, 2011

<u>Present:</u>	Solomon Awa	QIA Rep;
	Noah Kautuq	Member
	Jayko Apak	Member
	Igah Hainnu	Member
	Ootoovah Audlakiak	Member
	George Iqalukjuak	CLO/Sec
<u>Absent:</u>	James Qillaq	Member
	Josie Enuaraq	Member

(1) Opening Prayer: The meeting started at 10:14 am with a prayer.

(2) Review of Agenda: Accepted as it is.

(3) Terms of Reference & Meeting Procedures: QIA representative read and explained the roles and responsibilities of the committee and mentioned that the committees will be in existence until the agreement is signed in about 2 years. He talked about the honorarium and also mentioned that as long as 3 members are present, the committee meetings can proceed. A total of 6 members are required in the committee. Question was raised if honorarium could be direct deposit to the bank.

(4) Selection of Chairperson & Vice-Chairperson: The committee agreed to discuss the issue once two of the members are back in the community.

(5) QIA Technical Team: Different sectors of support at QIA, eg; Environmental, Wildlife, Land, Fish and Birds. Support team are available.

(6) Up-Coming Workshop: There is a proposed workshop on August 8-12. The workshop would assist to better understand what other communities concerns are and get ideas on how the other committees function in their hometown. Two members and the CLO would travel to the meeting. Members agreed to elect 2 people once the missing members are back in town.

(7) Mary River Site Tour: Site visits will occur sometime in June and members from communities will likely take turns in traveling to the site.

(8) Information from Igloolik meetings: Issues with wildlife and sea mammals have been a concern to the people of Igloolik along with the proposed railroad. Wildlife migration routes will be affected and the people are concerned with the safety of animals. But, overall, the community is keen to the proposed mine as long as the safety concerns are met.

(9) Adjournment: The committee agreed to meet again on June 3, 2011 at 7:00 pm. The meeting adjourned at 11:35am.

Ref CR-0610: Clyde River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (June 10)

Clyde River Baffinland Committee

Regular Meeting

June 10, 2011

<u>Present:</u>	Noah Kautuq	Member
	Ootoovah Audlakiak	Member
	James Qillaq	Member
	Josie Enuaraq	Member
	Jayko Apak	Member
	Solomon Awa	QIA Rep; /via telephone
	George Iqalukjuak	CLO/Sec

<u>Absent:</u>	Igah Hainnu	Member
----------------	-------------	--------

- (1) Opening Prayer: The meeting started at 10:21am with a prayer.
- (2) Approval of Agenda: Accepted as it is by all members.
- (3) Terms of Reference: The role and responsibilities of the committee was explained. There are 7 communities involved including; Arctic Bay, Pond Inlet, Clyde River, Igloolik, Hall Beach, Cape Dorset and Kimmirut. It was also mentioned that all community members will have a conference meeting sometime to give an idea what the concerns are in their communities. All concerns on Mary River will be submitted through QIA and then to Baffinland.

Members mentioned about the unnecessary use of helicopters for minor work involved eg: transporting drilling pipes with land vehicles instead to preserve the noise reduction on the animals.

The chairperson's honorarium was also mentioned since she or he would be more involved with the community through communicating and being the informant.

Members felt that all committee members should have a chance to visit and see the mine to get a better idea on the surrounding issues of the mine. Hamlet or HTO committee representatives would have to select a new member whenever their term ends with the council.

- (4) Election of the Chairperson: Two members were nominated for the chairperson's position. The members cast ballots and Josie Enuaraq was elected to the position.
- (5) Election of the Vice-Chairperson: Two members were nominated for the Vice-Chairpersons position. Jayko Apak was elected as the vice-chairman.

- (6) QIA Technical Team: Mary River EA coordinator on the Baffinland Project to the committee. There is different support available within QIA on issues such as; land, water, birds and animals.

There was a mention about support needed to families whose spouses are employed at the mine since they will be out for some periods of time. QIA will look into this and see if a worker is needed.

- (7) Upcoming workshop: The proposed dates are from August 8-12 and 2 members and the CLO would attend. Two members to attend the meeting will be confirmed in the next meeting.

- (8) Site Visit: No formal date has been confirmed yet but it would probably be in July, August or September.

- (9) Concerns from Igloolik: Concerns about the proposed railroad route at Ipikituqjuaq has been a concern to the community since it will affect the animals, birds and sea mammals around the area. It's was also a concern for this community (Clyde River) since people travel through that same route from Clyde River to Igloolik by snowmobile. An overall concern from this community was that people don't mind if the mine does not open for the sake of the animals but would be willing to abide if the safety of wildlife concerns are met.

- (10) Date of Next Meeting: June 30, 2011

- (11) Adjournment. The meeting finished at 11:51 am.

Ref CR-0613: Clyde River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (June 13)

Clyde River Baffinland Committee

Special Meeting

June 13th, 2011

<u>Present:</u>	Josie Enuaraq	Chairman
	Noah Kautuq	Member
	Iqah Hainnu	Member
	James Qillaq	Member
	Ootoovah Audlakiak	Member
	George Iqalukjuak	CLO/Sec
<u>Absent:</u>	Jayko Apak	Vice-Chairman

- (1) Opening Prayer: The meeting started at 2:00pm with a prayer.
- (2) Appointment of Workshop Delegates: Since some members will be out this spring and summer, the committee appointed two delegates and one alternate along with the CLO to attend the workshop in August 2011.
- (3) Adjournment: The meeting finished at 2:20pm.

Ref CR-0818: Clyde River Project Committee – Local Radio Show (August 18)

Clyde River Baffinland Committee

Clyde River, Nunavut

Local Radio Show

August 18, 2011

Present:	Josie Enuaraq	Chairman
	Igah Hainnu	Member
	George Iqalukjuak	A/CLO

The radio show started at 7:00pm.

It was explained which communities attended the workshop in Iqaluit and the purpose of the workshop.

Statements were read regarding the request of support from Igloolik, Hall Beach and Pond Inlet about the location of the proposed port. Later, workshop participants explained the concerns from the most affected communities on the following:

- The proposed site of the port.
- Concerns of Fish, Water, Caribou, Sea-Mammals and the eco-system.
- Concerns of toxins and pollutants from blasting chemicals; on land, air and water.
- Ocean currents and ships.
- Training issues and proposed jobs at Mary River.

The show finished at 9:00pm.

Ref CR-0823: Clyde River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (August 23)

Clyde River Baffinland Committee

Clyde River, Nunavut

Special Meeting

August 23, 2011

<u>Present:</u>	Josie Enuaraq	Chairman
	Jayko Apak	Vice-Chairman
	Igah Hainnu	Member
	Ootoovah Audlakiak	Member
	Noah Kautuq	Member
	George Iqalukjuak	A/CLO

<u>Absent:</u>	James Qillaq	Member
----------------	--------------	--------

Opening Prayer: The meeting started at 7:08pm with a prayer.

Chairman's opening remarks: The Chairman requested the meeting to inform the committee on the purpose of the recent Iqaluit Workshop on the Baffinland Project. He continued with communities involved and concerns they had with the proposed mine. The following areas of concern were mentioned:

- Proposed ship docking port area.
- Animals, fish, sea mammals, birds that could be affected by the activities around the area.
- Concern of chemicals from blasting components on lakes, sea and air.
- Construction of the railroad.
- Training and employment issues with Baffinland.

Roles of Representatives: Hamlet and HTO representatives agreed to pass the concerns from affected communities to their council/committee.

The committee also planned to hold an open house in the future to show maps on the area of the proposed mine.

Adjournment: The meeting finished at 8:20pm.

Ref CR-0921: Clyde River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (September 21)

**Clyde River Mary River Project Committee
September 21, 2011
Clyde River**

Attendees:

Josie Enuaraq
James Qillaq
Manasie
George Ikalujuaq
Gary Ipeelie
Luusiusi Paneak
QIA Executive: Okalik Eegeesiak, George Qulaut, Philip Paneak, Larry Audlaliak
QIA Staff: David Joanasiq, Abe Qammaniq, Hannah Uniuqsaraq
Solomon Awa, Cheryl Wray

General Comments:

- The impacts to Inuit due to alcoholism and increased money will be there. We do not have qualified counselors to deal with this. How will BIMC assist us on this?
- We will need assistance in teaching about money management – will BIMC assist us with this?
- An elder should be involved in negotiations to ensure that knowledge of our lifestyle is not lost.
- The impacts to land will be great from this project as it is large. We are very concerned with this as it will impact the caribou and fresh water.
- We will need to ensure that if this project goes ahead, employment and training for our people are provided.
- We are very concerned with the ballast water and how it will impact and contaminate our waters.
- Are the Government caribou biologists involved with QIA and BIMC to ensure that our caribou are protected from impacts.
- Disturbance from dust will move a long way and impact vegetation and water.
- Why can't couples work together at the site? This would make it easier on marriages if they were allowed to be at camps together.
- People with criminal records will not be employed. We don't agree with this – people need to be given second chances. Also people who do not have an education – people need to be given opportunities.
- We need to know what the impacts are on wildlife and to determine if money is more important to us than wildlife. Clyde River is very concerned about caribou.
- Only a very few people will be employed by the company. Is this worth our land and wildlife? We need to decide this together.
- We feel that the Company keeps stating that this Project will go ahead before we fully support it.

- The impacts from the mine will not only be to the employees of the company but to all of us Inuit due to the impacts to the wildlife and water.
- It appears that only employees and businesses will benefit. How will the rest of us in the communities benefit?
- Employment is great but what about those that cannot work at site?

KIMMIRUT

Ref K-0616: Kimmirut Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (June 16)

Kimmirut Mary River Project Review Committee June 16, 2011

Attendees:

- Solomon Awa – QIA
- Mathew Akavak – QIA Lands Department
- Perry Ikkidluak – CLO, Kimmirut

Committee Members Present:

- Mikidjuk Kolola – CLARC representative
- Maliktoo Lyta – Municipality of Kimmirut representative
- Josephie Padluq – HTO representative
- Miki Lyta – Member at large
- Lilairalaa Judea – Member at large

1. Opening prayer at 5:30 pm.

Introduction.

2. Approval of agenda.
3. Mary River Project
Review of Mary River Project Committee Meeting Procedures and Terms of Reference

Q: Committee member asking would be per diems if we had to travel?

A: Use QIA per diem rates.

Q: Member asking about the term of office, if this Mary River Project Review Committee is to run more than three years?

A: The same person can sit on the Committee if they are appointed.

In the Terms of Reference #6 Committee Selection: Committee Members appointed by either of the organization do not necessarily have to sit in any of the Organizations, they can be appointed by them.

A: It states in #10 of the Terms of Reference the Committee Terms.

C: It is good to have Terms of Reference and committee procedures to have a better idea what we will be doing.

4. Appointing Chairperson

One of the Committee members is not here, but Committee agrees to select a Chairperson at this meeting. Nominations were made and a secret ballot vote is taken. Maliktoo Lyta is elected as Chairperson.

5. Appointing Vice Chairperson

Nominations were made and a secret ballot vote is taken. Mikidjuk Kolola is elected as Vice Chairperson.

6. QIA Technical team

Went over the various people on the Mary River Project Committee QIA team that will look after the Mary River Project.

7. QIA Workshop August 8-12.

The Committee selected by secret ballot two members to attend the workshop in Iqaluit, as well as the CLO.

The main topics will be how Mary River will run and the Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement.

8. Mary River Site Tour

North Baffin Communities will have a day tour early in July, and South Baffin communities will be sometime in July 24, 25, 26.

9. Igloolik Meeting Comments

Baffinland went to Igloolik to do a presentation on the Steensby port. Igloolik are stressing to have the port moved further down about 40 km. The reason being that they go fishing there, and there is a seal pup area. They use the area for harvesting a lot, and people use the route between Clyde River and Igloolik often.

Q: How can we support the people of Igloolik? They have concern about the proposed shipping route, they want the port moved further down. How can we help them, through NIRB?

A: We can show our support. Clyde River also stressed in Igloolik's concern and Hall Beach is also concerned. There are a lot of concerns, people across Nunavut get their Walrus meat from that Community. As we will have a workshop, we will further discuss this topic in that workshop.

Committee members also are concerned with Igloolik's concern about the shipping route.

Member: I had a question once on the shipping route to NIRB on who drew the lines on the shipping route? The answer I got was that Inuit wanted the proposed route where it is and here Kimmirut and Cape Dorset say the route is too close to our communities. I just wanted to comment on this.

QIA: Now that we have a Mary River Project Review Committee we will be discussing issues in later meetings. We will meet in the coming months to discuss on some topics, they are pretty much ready, they just have to be translated.

10. Meeting adjourned at 6:55 pm.

Ref K-0727: Kimmirut Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (July 27)

**Mary River Project Review Committee Meeting
Council Chambers, July 27, 2011**

Members present:

- Maliktoo Lyta – Chairperson
- Josephie Padluq – Member
- Mikidjuk Lyta – Member
- Aibilee Kolola – Member
- Mialiralaq Judea – Member
- Mathew Akavak-Q.I.A. on the phone
- Perry Ikkidluak-C.L.O.-Kimmirut

Absent: Mikidjuk Kolola-Chairperson

1. Meeting started at 1:10 p.m. with a prayer.
2. Summary of the Mary River IIBA
The Inuktitut translated version was read.
 - 2009 Memorandum of Understanding
 - Economic and Social provisions already negotiated.
 - Inuit Education and Training
 - Employment
 - Contracting and Subcontracting
 - Workplace Conditions
 - Support for Communities
 - Work still to be done
 - Financial Participation
 - Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit
 - Environment: Land, Water, and Wildlife
 - Work at Mary River 2011-2013
3. Questions and Information
The Committee went over parts of the translation that they did not understand:
 - Technical Aspects

If there are questions on these you can raise them or if you don't have questions right now, you can raise them at the Iqaluit for the workshop.

Question on # 3 Economic and Social Provisions Already Negotiated
e) Support for communities

Q. What does that mean?

A. Explaining that the meaning of 'support for communities' will be discussed further in the workshop.

If the ships start going back and forth, we will be affected in some way for sure, so if the IIBA can help us in some way, we have to think of ways to benefit.

Meeting adjourned 2:00 p.m.

KINNGAIT (CAPE DORSET)

Ref CD-0000: Cape Dorset Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (no date)

Kinngait Mary River Project Review Committee

Location: QIA Office @ 7:30pm

Attendees

Committee Members:

- Olayuk Akesuk, Community Rep./Minute Taker
- Adamie Nuna
- Atsiak Alasuak
- Nitanie Peter
- Ejesiak Peter
- Qimeatak Nungusuituk

QIA:

- Mathew Akavak, QIA Lands

Opening prayer: Atsiak Alasuak

Approval of agenda moved and seconded.

The committee went through the Terms and Reference and Meeting Procedures.

Q: It is my understanding that we will need approval from QIA to get some material translated as some can't read English or Inuktitut?

A: Yes all materials that need to be translated will have to go through QIA.

Q: When we have to extend our meeting do we have to go through a motion?

A: No, as indicated in the Meeting Procedures it clearly explains that under 3 hours we get \$125.00 and over three hour we get \$250.00 and if we break for lunch and go back to meeting it's an extension of the meeting.

Q: How many meetings a month are we allowed?

A: The committee will meet on as needed basis and if we decide to meet without QIA approval it's without pay.

Nominations for Chairperson and Vice Chair. Ejesiak Peter is elected as the Chairperson for Kinngait Mary River committee. Adamie Nuna is elected as the Vice Chairperson.

The item on the agenda for technical team is deferred to another meeting as there was no material on the item.

The selection of two people to go to workshop in Iqaluit was discussed. Two members and one alternate were selected to go.

Item 8 will be dealt with at tomorrow or Friday's meeting there is more information on the trip to Mary River as it does not say how many committee members can go.

The other issue is that Kingait needs a CLO ASAP as it is important that the committee have someone to go to on issues related to Mary River.

Meeting adjourned at 10:05 pm

MITTIMATALIK (POND INLET)

Ref PI-0502: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (May 2)

Mary River Project Review committee minutes

May 2, 2011, QIA office

Members Present:

Soloman Awa	QIA employee
David Qamaniq	QIA CLO
James Atagootak	Hamlet Council representative
Daniel Komangapik	Mittimatalik HTO representative

Members Absent

Philip Paneak	Chairperson
---------------	-------------

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 pm, and opened with a prayer.

2. Mary River Project Review Committee selection process

The Terms of Reference for the Mary River Project committee were explained.

3. Secret Ballot

The following people will sit on Pond Inlet Mary River Project review committee;

1. James Atagootak Hamlet council representative
2. Daniel Komangapik Mittimatalik Hunters and Trapper's Organization representative
3. Mathias Qaunaq member at large
4. Jayko Alooos member at large and
5. Cornelius Nutarak member at large and
6. Jesse Nutarak alternate member.

4. Adjournment

Thanks to all for coming. The meeting adjourned at 3:55pm

Ref PI-0530: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (May 30)

**Pond Inlet Mary River Project Review Committee
Meeting minutes at Qaggivik
May 30, 2011, 7:00pm**

Members Present:

Cornelius Nutarak	Member at Large
Daniel Komangapik	MHTO representative
James Atagootak	Hamlet council of Pond Inlet representative
Jayko Alooooloo	Member at Large
Jesse Nutarak	Pond Inlet CLARC representative
Mathais Qaunaq	Member at Large
Philip Paneak	QIA Board member Pond Inlet community representative/ Mary River Project IIBA Chief Negotiator/ Chairperson QIA Regional Lands committee
Solomon Awa	QIA Mary River Project Environmental/IIBA Review Coordinator
David Qajaakuttuk Qamaniq	QIA Community Liaison Officer/Mary River Project IIBA negotiator

1. Opening

QIA has set up Mary River Project Environmental/IIBA Review committees in several affected communities by the Mary River project and they are;

1. Arctic Bay
2. Cape Dorset
3. Clyde River
4. Hall Beach
5. Igloolik
6. Kimmirut
7. Pond Inlet

Everyone was welcomed to this newly created Mary River Project Environmental/IIBA Review committee.

2. Agenda

Opening
Review of agenda
Mary River project committees a) Terms of reference b) Meeting procedures
Selection of Chairperson
Selection of Vice Chairperson
QIA technical team
Workshop August 8-12, 11
Tour Mary River site
Information on Igloolik meetings
Other business (Was added on to the agenda)
Meeting adjournment

3. Mary River Project Committees

Gave a presentation on the following topics;

a) Terms of Reference

1. Introduction
2. Purpose
3. Responsibilities
 - 3.1 QIA support
 - 3.2 QIA Mary River Project Coordinator
 - 3.3 Community Liaison Officers
4. Committee Membership
5. Committee Selection
6. Compensation
7. Multi-Community Meeting
8. Public Communication
9. Committee Term
10. Committee Funding

b) Meeting Procedures

- 1.0 Committee membership
 - 1.1 Selection of Chairperson
 - 1.2 Responsibilities of the Chairperson
 - 1.3 Committee member Responsibilities
 - 1.4 Conflict of Interest
 - 1.5 Removal of a member
 - 1.6 Replacement of a member
 - 1.7 Notice of change in Committee Membership
- 3.0 Meetings
 - 3.1 Meeting Request
 - 3.2 Notice of a Meetings and Materials
 - 3.3 Meeting deadlines
 - 3.4 QIA Response to meeting extension
 - 3.5 Meeting Quorum
 - 3.6 Meeting Agenda and Materials
 - 3.7 Translated Materials
 - 3.8 Clarification of Questions
- 3.0 Records of Meetings
 - 3.1 Purpose of the meeting Notes or Minutes
 - 3.2 Meeting Notes or Minute Content
- 4.0 Travel

For more detailed information on the two topics please refer to the Mary River Project committee's Terms of Reference and Meeting Procedures prepared by QIA.

4. Section of Chairperson

Nominations and vote for Chairperson. Jesse Nutarak was acclaimed to the Pond Inlet Mary River Project Review committee.

5. Selection of Vice Chairperson

Nominations and vote for Vice Chairperson. Mathais Qaunaq was elected Vice Chairperson.

6. QIA technical team

There will be a technical team that will concentrate on:

- Sea water and Freshwater Lakes
- Ice
- Land Mammals
- Ungulates
- Caribou, Wolves, Weasels, Raptors, Ducks, Canada Geese

At Ikpikituajuk studies are being planned for the following sea mammals; Seals, Bearded seals, Walrus. As well as the following; Ducks, Canada geese.

Social Economics

Communities will be affected by the Mary River project, such as employment, and it will be harder to do traditional activities.

There is a QIA Mary River Project coordination team as well.

7. Workshop Aug. 8-12, 11 (Need to select 2 members from each of the committees

The Pond Inlet Mary River project committee agreed to meet again on June 15, 2011

8. Mary River Project tour

QIA will ask if a tour is possible at the Mary River, there will be roughly about 40 people if it goes ahead hopefully in August or something.

Member: Before freeze up?

QIA: Yes, hopefully this summer workshop and tour.

Member: We are from Pond Inlet, we selected the land and we will be the most affected, the area in question is our place we go hunting for our daily diet. All of the Mary River project committee members should attend.

9. Information from Igloolik meetings

Baffinland representatives met the people in Igloolik. Some people are not in favor of the project. When a question was about the project, some were in favor of the project. Elder wants his children, his children's children to benefit. The reason for that is that fact that we are dependent on money these days, we will need to come up with an IIBA that will benefit our children, the people of Igloolik want the company to study an alternative port to Nuvuiit, due to fact that Steensby area and the proposed shipping route is a place where seal pups are born.

10. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:10pm

Ref PI-0623: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (June 23)

**Pond Inlet Mary River Project Review Committee
Meeting minutes at QIA Office
June 23, 2011, 2:00pm**

Members Present

Jesse Nutarak	Chairperson
Mathias Qaunaq	Vice Chairperson
Daniel Komangapik	MHTO representative
Jayko Alooooloo	Member at Large
Philip Paneak	QIA Board member Pond Inlet community representative/ Mary River Project IIBA Chief Negotiator/ Chairperson QIA Regional Lands committee

Members Absent

Cornelius Nutarak	Member at Large (Without cause)
James Atagootak	Hamlet of Pond Inlet representative (Without cause)

QIA staff

David Qajaakuttuk Qamaniq	QIA Community Liaison Officer
Solomon Awa	QIA Mary River Project Environmental Review Coordinator

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 2:18 pm, and all were welcomed, including Solomon Awa, Environmental review coordinator for the Mary River project who was on the speaker phone attending the meeting.

2. Review of agenda

There were no additions or deletions.

3. Selection of two (2) Pond Inlet Mary River Project Review Committee Representatives that will attend the Mary River project review committee meeting workshop in Iqaluit

All of the Mary River project review committee members present voted in a secret ballot. Two committee members were selected to attend the meeting/workshop scheduled for August 8-12, 2011 in Iqaluit.

4. Mary River project Site tour

A day trip is planned to visit Mary River project sites for the affected communities, the visit is tentatively scheduled for July 8, 2011 for Pond Inlet Mary River project review committee members, July 9, 11 for Arctic Bay MRPR committee members, July 10, 11 for Clyde River MRPR committee, July 11 for Igloodik committee, and so on.

5. Possible Questions to bring to the workshop

- Noise,
- Land,

- Soil, all the way down to permafrost,
- Air quality,
- Global warming,
- Lakes, Rivers,
- Ocean, Ice,
- Sea mammals (sealife)
- And Social issues.

We might send out questionnaires to the affected communities or we might visit them.

Question: Will the project affect the lakes, rivers?

Last time during the 2008/09 bulk sample program Baffinland had to transport water to Milne Inlet because the river was unsafe to drink.

Economics/Social issues

Jobs will be created but Inuit traditional way of life will change forever such as going out camping, going out hunting, spring camping, visiting relatives in other adjacent communities by ski-doo, such as Igloodik and Hall Beach.

Social issues: there will be a lot of affects on family unit such as;

- Jobs,
- Being away from their family.

Pond Inlet residence may have experienced two weeks (2) in and two (2) weeks out rotation when some residents of Pond Inlet and Arctic Bay worked for Pan Arctic Oils Ltd. People who have worked for Pan Arctic in the past would know what it's like to work in rotational jobs.

Talk to the Mittimatalik Hunters and Trappers Organization or the general public and get input from them if you wish to do so, these are some of the things that need to be addressed, have a writing pad handy and write down any community concerns, hopefully after the workshop we will be able to visit the affected communities.

Member: Are the land animals and sea animals both included?

QIA: Yes, They have been included.

Member: Can the Chairperson? Or can a member of Pond Inlet Mary River project review committee go on the radio and collect community concerns?

QIA: Yes, the chair or the vice chair can be the spokespersons of the Mary River project review committee and they can collect community concerns. MRPC members can also participate as well, it is not limited to the Chair or Vice-chair that is why Mary River project review committees were set up in the first place. Yes, you have been given authority to do that.

Member: There was a mine near Arctic Bay, called Nanisivik. Arctic Bay delegates have already have experience in having a mine near their community, their input will be very helpful/useful.

QIA: For your information Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation representatives will be heading to Igloolik and are scheduled to hold public meetings to talk about the proposed port site. Igloolik residents want the proposed port site to be relocated to Nuvuiit, the community members want a full day meeting on this topic.

If any of the members want to make any comments or have any concerns on the proposed Ikpikituqjuaq port site, you can give your comments to QIA. Hall Beach is close to Igloolik we will have delegates from Hall Beach, we will not force anyone to attend, it will be only those who can be available.

Member: We might collect community concerns using the radio station?

Other comments:

Members of the QIA Executive, IIBA Negotiating Team, and Technical Team met face to face in Ottawa on June 6 & 7, 2011 to discuss QIA's financial participation. Another meeting is scheduled for July 5 & 6, 2011 in Montreal.

Chairperson asked for further comments, then informed the members that the agenda items have been completed he thanked MRPRC members those who attended the meeting.

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:58 pm

Ref PI-0708a: Pond Inlet Site Tour – Committee Notes (July 8)

**Pond Inlet Mary River Project Review Committee
Site Tour
July 8, 2011, 9:00am**

Members on site tour:

Jesse Nutarak	Chairperson
Mathais Qaunaq	Vice-Chairperson
Cornelius Nutarak	Member at Large
Caleb Sangoya	MHTO representative
James Atagootak	Hamlet council of Pond Inlet representative
Jayko Aooloo	Member at Large
David Qajaakuttuk Qamaniq	QIA CLO Pond Inlet
Solomon Awa	QIA Environmental review coordinator
Cheryl Wray	QIA Mary River project advisor
Erik Madsen	BIMC VP Sustainable Development, Health, Safety and Environment

QIA and BIMC representatives arrived on Summit Air on July 8, 2011 from Mary River to meet and pick up the Pond Inlet Mary project review committee members. Left Pond Inlet around 8:20am and arrived at Mary River around 9:15 am. We were met by Mary River Security Personnel and then went through security before we met at the briefing room.

After breakfast, Baffinland gave a Powerpoint presentation of the Mary River project Mine site plan pre-development works site layout, Milne Inlet Pre-development works site layout, proposed winter roads for pre-development work, railway lay out construction phase, Steensby Inlet pre-development works site layout and Steensby Inlet port layout. After the presentation everyone went to tour the crushed iron ore as well as the saw first hand a crusher. Then they went up to pit number 1 and they also saw other pits from the distance. After that tour the members had lunch break.

After the lunch break the members flew to Steensby Inlet following the proposed railroad track. They flew over Steensby Inlet and then headed back to Mary River flying over the Mary River Milne Inlet tote road. Once at Milne Inlet we had a coffee break and then took a mini tour of the camp, the crushed iron ore and the bladder farm. After that they all got on the plane and headed back to Pond Inlet and arrived around 6:00 pm.

Ref PI-0708b: Pond Inlet Site Tour – QIA Notes (July 8)

8 July 2011

Pond Inlet Mary River Project Committee – Tour of Mary River Site

Notes prepared by Cheryl Wray and Solomon Awa

Participants:

- Erik Madsen – BIM
- Cheryl Wray – QIA
- Solomon Awa – QIA
- David Qammaniq – QIA
- Jesse Nutarak – Committee Chair
- Jayko Alooos – Committee Vice- Chair/Member at Large
- Cornelius Nutarak – Committee Member at Large
- Mathaisie Qaunaq – Committee Member at Large
- James Atagotak – Committee Member/Hamlet
- Caleb Sangoya – Committee Member/HTO

Upon arrival at Mary River, the Company representative conducted an orientation and tour of the site up to Deposit 1. Maps for 2012 pre-staging, construction and operations were reviewed. Areas illustrated on the maps were Deposit 1, the rail line and Steensby Port as well as the fine and lump ore stockpiles at the Sheardown Lake location. The different deposits (1, 2, 3, 4 etc.) were identified. It was explained that the railway has to be built on bedrock and not on the marshier grounds.

Questions and concerns were:

1. Committee: Will there be blasting on Cockburn for tunnels?
 - BIM: Yes blasting will occur for tunnels. Regulatory requirements by DFO will need to be met.
2. Committee: What about the bladder farm at Milne Inlet? Are they going to decommission it?
 - BIM: The plan is to decommission it.
3. Committee: Will Inuit be able to access the soapstone quarry?
 - BIM: The IIBA addresses this.
4. Committee: How deep is Deposit 1?
 - BIM: I will have to look at the mine plan again to find out the exact depth.
5. Committee: Where does the sewage go?
 - BIM: Sewage is treated and pumped into ponds where testing and further treatment is done. Effluent is not discharge into the lake until water license requirements are met.
6. Committee: Can steel and inert waste be brought back south as opposed to being put in a landfill?

- BIM: The NWB license approves the burial of inert materials on site and it is economical to do this.
7. Committee: Does the water become acidic from iron ore dust?
- BIM: Aquatic effects and water license requirements outline testing that is required to detect any impacts from iron ore dust. There are plans to have a water collection system that will mitigate impacts.

The group flew by plane down the rail route, Cockburn Lake, the tunnel locations, and Steensby Port and ore storage areas on the islands and the ship docks.

Questions were:

8. Committee: What is the location of the floating accommodation complex at Steensby?
- The area was pointed out.
9. Committee: Would the bay of Steensby be used (ikpikiturjuaq)?
- BIM: No, except for an ice road.

The group flew along the tote road to Milne Inlet. The sea container crossings were observed. Questions and discussion points included:

10. Committee: Where is the drinking water location?
- The Committee was shown km32 lake where potable water is taken.
11. There is a concern about dust from the iron stockpiles at Milne. People have observed red on the snow from the iron ore piles in winter.
12. Committee: How much fuel will be at the site?
- BIM: 40 million L will be stored at Milne Inlet.
13. Committte: Will you try to keep dust down on the tote road?
- BIM: Yes this is a summer activity.
14. Committee: What form of reclamation will there be at the tank farm?
- BIM: Bioremediation will be conducted on site.
15. Committee: There was a discussion on training and building, for example, community freezers. Trainees were sent to a manufacturing plant, where they worked on actual trailers going to site and then were hired to install trailers. Such programs lead to full time employment once people complete their training.
16. Committee: A lot of people weren't employed as they didn't have basic training in WHMIS, first aid, and fire extinguishing.

The group looked at the location of the floating barge to offload equipment at Milne Inlet. Committee: A concern was raised about an instrument in the water that is disturbing marine wildlife. Community person stated that DFO had asked to have instrument returned so maybe it was placed there by DFO?

The Company representative explained the difference between a Class A and B water license and the monitoring that will be required.

Tour returned to Pond Inlet at 7pm.

Ref PI-0717: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (July 17)

**Pond Inlet Mary River Project Review Committee
Meeting minutes at QIA Office
July 27, 2011, 3:00pm**

Members Present

Jesse Nutarak	Chairperson
Caleb Sangoya	MHTO representative
Jayko Alooooloo	Member at Large
Cornelius Nutarak	Member at Large
James Atagootak	Hamlet of Pond Inlet representative
Philip Paneak	QIA Board member/IIBA chief negotiator

Members absent

Mathias Qaunaq	Vice Chairperson in Iqaluit
----------------	-----------------------------

Minutes Recorder

Norman Koonoo	Minutes recorder
---------------	------------------

Delegate

Mathew Akavak	QIA Lands Officer through tele-conference
---------------	---

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 pm. Introduces the members present and informs the members that the only item on the agenda is the Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement.

Member: requests clarification on the purpose of the meeting and agenda and ask for developments under provisions in the 2009 MOU and back ground and what progress has been made to date. Member wants a brief overview of the summary of the IIBA with specific concerns noted on 3 (e) support for communities.

QIA: provides some clarification.

Committee briefly reviews the IIBA information session and the summary of the Mary River IIBA.

QIA: welcomes any questions committee may have on the Summary

Member: asks about the driller training camp?

Member: also asked exactly how the IQ provisions will be implemented and used at the camp?

It is suggested that all questions be documented and brought by the delegates attending the workshops in August in Iqaluit.

Member: also asked if sale of country food will be allowed at the Mine site? For example if fish can be caught near site can be sold to Mine employees?

Member: also forwards his concerns regarding 3c) contracting and sub-contracting and requests clarification of the 100% participation by eligible Inuit firms and what constitutes a 100% Inuit firm?

Member: notes concerns on 3d) workplace conditions and raises his concerns on drug testing on site.

QIA: stated it is normal for mining companies to implement ZERO TOLERANCE policies regarding the use of DRUGS Because of the nature of the industry and wishes to put emphasis on 3e) support for communities and list that as first priority.

Member: touches on the issue of cross-cultural preparedness and discrimination based on race or sex; and asks why economic or compensation issues are not included in the IIBA; and the issue of artifacts and how to deal with the processes.

QIA: states the traditional uses are included under Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit.

Member: raises concern on the availability of soapstone on the site and what steps can be taken to facilitate the supply of soap stone to local carvers.

Member: raises his concerns about the possible population size of mine and wonders if services like church and RCMP policing will be required.

Member: Discusses the issue of the ZERO TOLERANCE POLICY ON DRUGS and feels that drug testing on site is too harsh. Also the fact that that Inuit might be targets, when it comes to racism. Someone from the south can actually plant drugs on someone without them knowing it. There was one incident at Mary River when a very good mechanic was fired because someone planted drugs in his personal belongs, this guy didn't even do drugs. Inuit should be given a second chance.

Member: asks if arrangements can be made to allow shipping and expediting services with barges for local retail stores or local individuals.

Member: forwards his questions on 3a) Inuit Education and Training and what progress has been made on this issue.

Remedial steps-What steps will be taken in the long term?

Member: Requires clarification on the INPK (The Fund) of the IIBA, Soap stone issues. The Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit provisions of the IIBA and puts emphasis on the HERITAGE ISSUES concerning ARTIFACTS and the need to inform and educate mine staff on proper regulations concerning the issue of traditional items.

Member: agrees with another member that some form of Religious Services, Counselling and support services is needed.

This committee feels that the issue of EXPEDITING SERVICES OR ARRANGEMENTS TO ALLOW FOR SHIPPING on empty vessels should be discussed and reviewed.

Member: requests clarification on 4a) FINACIAL PARTICIPATION.

Break at 4:45pm

Meeting resumes again at 4:58pm

Committee discusses issue of 3e) support for the communities and feels more money will be needed to fully implement the provisions required under 3e).

QIA: states that progress being made on item 4. There is work still to be done and notes that the Agreement In Principal has been signed and indicates that Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit is being reviewed and that Land, Water and Wildlife issues are being drafted.

Member: Negotiations under Article 26 of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement? Clarification needed on terms such as Designated Inuit Organizations and ROLES and RESPONSIBILITIES and who has AUTHORITY and what REQUIREMENTS ARE NEEDED in INTERAGENCY committees.

Meeting adjourned at 5:24 pm.

Ref PI-0803: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (August 3)

**Pond Inlet Mary River Project Review Committee
Tele-conference meeting minutes at QIA Office
August 3, 2011
3:00pm**

Members Present

Jesse Nutarak	Chairperson
Caleb Sangoya	MHTO representative
Jayko Aooloo	Member at Large
Cornelius Nutarak	Member at Large
James Atagootak	Hamlet of Pond Inlet representative
Mathias Qaunaq	Vice Chairperson

Minutes Recorder

Norman Koonoo	Minutes recorder
---------------	------------------

Solomon Awa	Mary River Environmental Review Coordinator in Iqaluit via teleconference.
-------------	--

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 3:13 pm to discuss QIA Mary River project workshop in Iqaluit.

A summary for the workshop to be held August 8-12, 2011 in Iqaluit was presented.

DRAFT AGENDA QIA MARY RIVER PROJECT WORKSHOP AUG. 8-12, 2011

It was explained what each topic will contain and the QIA roles.

Member: Request clarification on ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT and REGULATORY PROCESS.

Committee members raise QUESTION on TERRESTRIAL ENVIRONMENT-CARIBOU: Will hunters receive financial assistance due to forced relocation of caribou by the Mary River project?

Member mentions the issue of BALLAST WATER exchange and QIA explains the process and how it will be handled.

Committee members raise CONCERNS over BALLAST WATER and exchange at Steensby Inlet.

Discussions referred back to the workshop agenda and the Topics to be included. The committee suggested reviewing the agenda and adding any concerns the committee may have prior to the workshop.

Teleconference with QIA ends at 3:33pm break for 10 minutes resume meeting at 3:45pm.

REVIEW WORKSHOP AGENDA

Member raises CONCERN on SHIPPING TRAFFIC AND POSSIBLE EFFECTS ON NARWHALS and requests that this is added in the topic under Environmental Assessment and RECOMMENDS OUTSIDE MONITORING of SHIPPING TRAFFIC in the area.

Member agrees with monitoring and RECOMMENDS ONGOING MONITORING OF AFFECTED SPECIES such as SEALS and NARWHALS and how their populations will be impacted due to ship traffic, and that this be included under Environmental Assessment.

Also RECOMMENDS AERIAL SURVEYS AROUND THE AFFECTED areas and this be ongoing and compared to IQ (Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit).

Member further added CONCERNS over BALLAST WATER EXCHANGE, being opposed to any dumping of ballast water around traditional hunting grounds and SUGGESTED BALLAST WATER EXCHANGE FURTHER DOWN DAVIS STRAIT where currents can carry away ballast water.

MARINE ENVIRONMENT-STEENSBY AND MILNE INLET

Member pushes for SUPPORT for IGLOOLIK CONCERNS over STEENSBY INLET. Also mentions own CONCERNS over the proposed PORT in MILNE INLET and what construction materials will be used and how it will be used seasonally?

AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT-FISHERIES COMPESATION

Member SUGGESTED MONITORING also be done on FISH POPULATIONS in order to determine FISHERIES COMPENSATIONS.

Member states that \$30,000.00 is lost per person in regards to LOSS OF FISHING ACTIVITIES.

TERRESTRIAL ENVIRONMENT-CARIBOU-COMPENSATION

ISSUES raised over CARIBOU with current PROJECT OPERATIONS

FUTURE PROJECT MONITORING

Member RECOMMENDS ANIMAL MONITORING be included in this topic.

Member RECOMMENDS outside MONITORING on PROJECT SITE. MONITORING on ALL ASPECTS of the Mary River Project HIGHLY STRESSED BY THIS COMMITTEE.

PROJECT TIMELINES-PRE CONSTRUCTION

COMMUNITY CONSULTATIONS will be REQUIRED in this area and RECOMMENDS PROGRESS REPORTS to be provided to the communities.

DAY 3 PROJECT SOCIO-ECONOMICS

IIBA - ISSUE OF COMPENSATION FOR HUNTERS RAISED.

CONTRACTING AND EMPLOYMENT

Member emphasizes review of topic and states CONCERN over WHOLLY OWNED FIRMS (INUIT), INUIT BUSINESSES, INUIT BENEFITS and INUIT PARTICIPATION.

DAY 4 COMMUNITY WELLNESS FUND

Committee feels this is as a HIGH PRIORITY and REQUESTS THROUGH REVIEW AND DISCUSSIONS.

ISSUE OF PROJECT TRADE OFFS DISCUSSED

Pros and Cons weighed over possible developments and how it will affect the community in the long-term.

Member REQUESTS additions to include ON-THE-JOB TRAINING BE PROVIDED TO INUIT MINE EMPLOYEES

INUIT IMPACT BENEFITS AGREEMENT DRAFTING/A-I-P RATIFICATION

Member discusses IIBA RATIFICATION PROCEDURES and places emphasis on THOROUGH PRE-COMMUNITY CONSULTATIONS PRIOR TO IIBA RATIFICATIONS.

Member calls for 10 minutes break at 5:43pm meeting resumed again at 5:52pm

ISSUE OF NORTH BAFFIN AND SOUTH BAFFIN DISTRICT DISCUSSED

Committee feels this issue should be ADDED UNDER CLOSING COMMENTS in order to better FACILITATE PROVISIONS CONTAINED IIBA DISCUSSIONS.

Member agrees that the issue of NORTH AND SOUTH BAFFIN BOUNDARIES BE ESTABLISHED PRIOR to full OPERATION OF THE MINE PROJECT.

Member raises his CONCERNS over RAILROAD TRAFFIC and SAFETY. He wishes this be INCLUDED IN THE CLOSING COMMENTS at the WORKSHOP.

PROJECT NEXT STEPS COMMUNITY REPORTING

Member emphasizes a HIGH PRIORITY for COMMUNITY REPORTING to keep the AFFECTED COMMUNITIES INFORMED over ongoing developments within the Project.

Member REQUESTS PERMISSION from the COMMITTEE to make a PUBLIC RADIO ANNOUNCEMENT regarding the UPCOMING MRPRC WORKSHOP to be held in IQALUIT to inform the public about the COMMITTEE'S ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES concerning the Mary River Mine Project Review.

ISSUE OF ROYALTIES DISCUSSED AND WILL BE BROUGHT FORWARD TO WORKSHOP.

Meeting adjourned at 6:10 pm.

Ref PI-0808: Pond Inlet Project Committee – QIA Workshop Summary (August 8-12)

**QIA Mary River Project Workshop
August 8 – 12, 2011
Frobisher Inn, Iqaluit**

Attendees:

- Mary River Project Committee Representatives
- Community CLOs
- QIA Executive and staff
- QIA Environmental Assessment Coordination Team
- QIA Technical Team
- QIA IIBA Team

Day 1 QIA Mary River Project Workshop

Meeting starts at 1:10 p.m, and opens with a prayer.

Delegates introduce themselves

-A delegate of Arctic Bay, explains situation upon arrival into Iqaluit, citing that they had to wait at the airport for two hours without anyone meeting them at the airport.

-Another delegate introduces himself and explains there was no problem arriving to Iqaluit and QIA staff was at the airport to greet and welcome them.

-QIA presents the house keeping Announcements and schedule for the week (review of Agenda).

-QIA staff introduced for any concerns the delegates might have. Also explains how the meetings/workshop have been set up and who will give the presentation.

-Delegates are asked to take notes for review and summary.

-An outline of the purpose of the workshop is presented and explained to the delegates and what will be involved regarding info, updates, communication and interaction.

-Primary goal and purpose of workshop is for delegates to be fully informed and communicated about the Mary River Mine Project Review.

- A) Environmental assessment aspects discussed
- B) IIBA
- C) Land Lease Dec 2012 land lease in effect

QIA Roles/Structure

QIA Board, QIA executive, Executive. Director of Lands. Lands Dept.

Role and responsibility, explains each of the different teams.

- QIA: wishes to introduce the technical team - delegation is informed that the Technical team has already started with their meetings over the weekend, and have gathered a lot of information for the workshop.

- QIA: Coordinator introduces himself and explains the technical team's role during the workshop. Technical review delegations informed that we are in the Technical Review stage of the project and how the N.I.R.B. is involved with technical review process. Any question or concerns are encouraged.

- QIA: Explains how the workshops will be facilitated through the week and explains that seating arrangements will be shuffled in order to allow everyone to meet.

Marine environment – shipping route

- QIA Tech: Marine environment-shipping route, information gaps and sensitive areas. It is noted that the proposed Mary River mine project once completed and in operations will result in very large shipping traffic in north Baffin. Possible impacts on wildlife discussed in the proposed shipping routes and areas, pre-development and construction shipping traffic estimated at 15 ships per year.

- QIA Tech: impacts and effects on different species explained and how each aspect of development will affect hot spots prior to and during construction and development of the mine with its infrastructures and facilities.

-Delegation given opportunity to discuss topic at 2:15 for each table to discuss any concerns they may have regarding Marine environment-shipping routes.

Table, ARCTIC BAY

- Questions raised on shipping routes for monitoring purposes.

- Issues discussed on this topic wildlife, compensation and IIBA issues. Predicted impacts on wildlife species and monitoring will be handled.

- concerns on walrus population around Steensby Inlet discussed stating walrus population will be heavily impacted and different species habitat i.e. calving grounds, mating seasons will be impacted.

- Cape Dorset raises concerns regarding the close proximity of the proposed shipping through Cape Dorset, possible fuel spills issues discussed.

-Various concerns discussed by the different communities; contains specific concerns regarding the amount of shipping, traffic, shipping routes and possible impacts the routes may have on wildlife.

-Monitoring issues, who and what will be involved.

-Cape Dorset concerns re: the close proximity of shipping routes and their wish to move the route further from the community.

-Issues of Marine mammals discussed along the proposed shipping routes and how that will impact their populations.

-Proposed Steensby Inlet shipping route discussed and recommendations for an alternate route suggested by Igloodik delegation.

-Cape Dorset delegation indicates that although mention of traditional Inuit knowledge is brought up it is usually never integrated or implemented in any of the proposed action plans and notes climate change along with wind and current (water) directions have changed for Cape Dorset in the past few years.

-QIA President provides a brief summary of QIA roles and responsibilities. i.e. Mary River Mine Project and how QIA will be involved in the review process and thanks everyone for their participation in the workshop.

-QIA President acknowledges the effort of the negotiation and thanks them for their dedication and hard work.

-Marine Environment-Steensby and Milne Inlet

15 minute break at 4:42 pm . Meeting resumes at 5:03 pm

-Marine mammals - topics on different mammal species i.e. walrus discussed disturbances on sight, sound and smell noted.

-shipping routes along habitats for marine mammals raised i.e. walrus and ringed seal populations.

-possible impacts on narwhal species along Hudson strait and Fox Basin/Davis Strait raised and discussed.

-disturbances along migratory routes for marine mammals and mortality issues are significant concerns by the communities.

-Round Table discussions encouraged on Marine Mammal issues.

-Marine Environment- marine mammals issues raised by the table include food sources and food contamination, topics that may affect different mammal species.

-Ballast Waste Exchange- topic surrounding this issue brought up by this table

-Concerns raised around roundtable discussions include forms of compensation for animal harvesting loss, possible impacts on animals and safety issues.

-Questions also include winter time shipping routes and how that will affect hunters, development stage and noise levels that will be generated by the operation of the mine and how that will affect different animals species surrounding the development areas.

-Seasonal animal behavior to be considered i.e. calving grounds, mating seasons and migratory routes.

-Concerns also include, bowhead whales and how their migratory routes will be affected plus the issue concerning Polar Bears impacts on Bird species also have to be considered in the affected areas of development.

-Relocation of different animal species due to raised noise levels discussed.

-Comparisons of the Nanisivik Mine and animal populations referred and noted. It is stated that animals will invariably relocate to different areas and the timelines for those animals returning to the area explained.

-Dignitaries from Baffinland arrive to workshop at 6:00pm and are introduced to the delegation. QIA President welcomes and introduces everyone.

-Baffinland is pleased to see everyone participating in the workshop and introduces his colleagues to the delegation.

-Day 1 wraps up at 6:27pm.

Day 2 (Aug 9, 2011)

- Meeting opens at 8:46 am with a prayer.

- QIA introduces delegates, interpreters and explains some people will have to leave workshop for other duties and mentions the workshop agenda.

Ballast Water Exchange:

- QIA: Ballast water exchange explained and discussed. It is mentioned that an empty ship requires ballast water and is required to dump its ballast water prior to arriving into Nunavut. Process of ballast water exchange explained. Each ore ship will discharge 200,000 CM of ballast water, 102 ship trips per year.

-Roundtable discussions on ballast water exchange commences.

-Conditions and process of ballast water exchange discussed around table for Igloolik.

-Concerns raised include amount of ballast water being discharged.

-monitoring systems should be in place

-regular testing of sediment water recommended

-Monitoring of animal species around discharge area.

-Ballast Water Exchange, round table discussions. Policies and Procedures concerning the discharge of ballast water should be in compliance and properly monitored.

Roundtable discussions and concerns from other tables include:

-the need to test Canadian and foreign waters, clarification requested on points of discharge on Baffin Island area, comparisons and from other known discharge of ballast water studies required.

-Salinity and water temperature to be considered, how this will impact seabed species (major food source) for marine mammals.

-different water temperature, from different locations. Monitoring systems to be in place

-Concerns relating to possible containment of different microorganisms and bacteria in ballast water exchange discussed. The need for screening, or filters in discharging methods.

Quality of water concerns

-DFO involvement in monitoring of species will be required/recommended.

-Water currents and streams should be studied to get an idea where ballast water may end up in.

-Break at 10:15am until 10:30 am

-ballast water will affect water salinity, concerns on the food chain and effects currently unknown.

-Water temperatures currently unknown(winter)water may be heated to prevent freezing.

-coastal organisms, seabed spills are a high concern-MAJOR FOOD SOURCE

-Discussions about filtering- process may not include full filtering of smaller species

-Ship tracking issues discussed.

Aquatic Environment-Fisheries Compensation

-Environmental impact statements indicate predictable process

-sediment influence(seabed)not clear at this time, how much dust will accumulate in discharge areas.

-Baffinland has studies on sediment quality.

-Explosives concerns-it is not clear how much explosives will be used making it hard to determine how much metal will settle.

-Disturbances in mortality for different animal species discussed.

-Fisheries compensation-separate from IIBA-DFO requirement

-DFO guidelines/land ownership and access different sequence of habitat compensation. Programs are in place to monitor if compensation is working. Different types of compensation include obtaining or creating access to fisheries.

-Harbour development

-Water supply intake

Fisheries compensation

-Communities should monitor how compensation is processed.

-Round table discussions on topic of fisheries compensation/Aquatic Environment

Table 4 IGLOOLIK

-Quotas a high concern

-Fish habitat may be impacted- a high concern

-Monitoring habitat systems recommended during and after construction to determine fish populations.

-Amount of railway traffic is a high concern, recovery times for animal species prior to and during construction of railroad discussed.

11:30am-Baffinland dignitaries arrive to explain schedule of community tours and what will be involved.

-Employment and training initiatives.

-contact for Iqaliut/Baffinland introduces himself and explains his new job with Baffinland.

Baffinland will visit Igloolik and Pond Inlet for community consultations beginning today. Person responsible for training at Baffinland introduces himself and explains his job with Baffinland.

Break for lunch, resume meeting at 1:30pm

Aquatic Environment/Fisheries compensation

-Questions and comments regarding roundtable discussions concerns include

-water quality

-Fish habitat/food source

-Commercial fishing quotas

-Ballast water discharge

-explosive around lakes

-Recommendations include relocation of port in Steensby Inlet.

-Ecosystems, food chain concerns will there be preventative measures to protect lakes? How will fish populations be protected?

-Compensation issues; What will be involved?

-Amount of Railway traffic anticipated generation of vibrations may impact surrounding lakes and rivers.

-Potential loss of fish around surrounding lakes is a high concern for out coming communities.

-Clarification requested on fisheries compensation

-May not necessarily mean monetary compensation

-Types of compensation explanations required

-DFO roles and responsibilities RE: Compensation

-Monitoring issues remain a high concern and priority

-spill response materials to be made available

-Issues on possible relocation of fish habitats

-Possible re-routing of railway

-QIA: Gives a brief summary from a recent study done on fisheries habitats in the Nunavik Region and notes how successful projects have been in Fisheries.

-A community member provides a brief summary on studies relating to fisheries done around Igloodik.

Terrestrial Environment- Caribou

QIA: provides an explanation on caribou herds on Baffin Island. How the MRP will impact caribou populations.

-discussions to include, concerns on how caribou populations will be impacted, during the different stages in development and construction of railroad infrastructure.

-QIA: explains studies done on caribou populations and caribou monitoring

-Potential impacts to caribou populations.

-Roundtable discussions from 2:24 to 2:50

Our table discussions/concerns:

- Amount of railway traffic; these include Mortality rates/caribou around developed areas.
- Potential impacts around caribou migratory routes in a high concern
 - disruption of migratory routes
- expected increase to human populations has to be considered around outlying communities resulting in possible increased harvesting of caribou.
- caribou habitat/Potential impacts.
- issues on wildlife monitors discussed.

Ten minutes break at 2:50pm

- Length of the railway is a major concern
- Increased levels of populations in the mine will potentially impact caribou herds.
- Proposed railway location borders on migratory routes and should be considered.
- Mitigation measures by Baffinland include provisions for caribou crossings along migratory routes.
- Mitigation measures do not include calving grounds and some caribou habitat.
- Issues on the frequency of helicopters remain a high concern for potential impacts on caribou herds/populations.
- possible forced relocation of caribou grounds is an issue
- caribou populations and habitat have already been impacted, due to the construction of roads leading to Milne Inlet.
- the caribou have moved elsewhere and that calving grounds have already been disturbed resulting in the relocation of calving grounds.
- Migratory routes remain a high concern for all tables
- Food sources will definitely be impacted.
- Noise levels should also be considered
- Generation of dust falling on caribou food sources should be considered.
- Data from Nunavut on caribou Biologist on caribou research should be forwarded and made available to QIA.

-Concerns include recommendations not to disturb migratory routes.

Caribou behavior explained

-It is mentioned that Baffinland will have to put together a caribou monitoring system in place around developed areas.

Current project operations

- delegation informed of what infrastructure will be involved, what will be built around Milne camp

Infrastructure and Facilities include:

- Airstrip
- temporary docks
- fuel tank farms
- equipment materials on site
- a permanent dock/Milne Inlet
- roads; 120 km road from Milne to Mary River
- bridges
- quarries
- four proposed camps during construction of the Mine project.

Our table's concerns include:

- water quality around surrounding lakes
- recommendations to have the proposed camp in Steensby Inlet relocated
- remediation measures should be in place

Current operations (project) round table discussions continue with questions and concerns

- Railway cars should have proper containment cars to protect extra generation of dust.
- railway alignment/location other concerns include how harvesting quotas will be allowed to each surrounding community and who will be affected should animals be destroyed during the development and construction of the railway.
- Monitoring of different animal species remain a high concern before, during and after construction of the mine camps.
- Pond Inlet and Hall Beach supports Igloodik's opposition for construction at Steensby Inlet.
- Calving and mating seasons for caribou should be considered and development should be carried out accordingly to minimize potential impacts on caribou populations.
- Amount of ship traffic (iron ore ships)

-Total of 24 bridges have been identified and approximately up to 200 culverts along the roads.

-Closing comments and thanks to everyone for productive sessions and explains the remaining agenda.

Meeting wraps at 5:06 pm and start next day at 8:30 am

Day 3 (August 10, 2011)

Current project operations/ IIBA

NIRB review process; questions and comments

Explanation of pre-development staging

-company's proposal to construct mine within the next two years, proposed construction of mine camps presented to delegation.

-18 to 20 sealift (ship traffic) into Milne for the construction of the Milne port.

Questions/ comments

-300 to 400 million dollars to construct the mine camps.

- Arctic Bay supports Igloodik's position to relocate Steensby mine Camp.

-Potential impacts on Narwhales, seals and sea mammals is a major concern, due to the proposed shipping traffic during construction of the Milne port.

-QIA's participation in the NIRB review process is really important.

-Pre development and proposed construction of the mine camps discussed by this table.

-Projected timelines for construction of the mine camps, discussed.

-Communication and community constructions remain a high priority with QIA.

-Safety issues discussed-concerns over ammonia nitrate discussed

-round table discussions on project operations.

-Potential impacts to narwhale, seals, and sea mammals around Steensby Inlet is a major concern.

Afternoon sessions, meeting commences at 1:15 pm

Inuit Impact Benefit Agreement:

- Article 26 of the NLCA; QIA presents the overview of IIBA process and contents.
- Since 2006, QIA has held meetings with Baffinland on matters dealing with IIBA
- QIA provides an overview of IIBA process and explains the process.
- Negotiations with Baffinland are ongoing in terms of the IIBA process.
- Environmental Aspects discussed
- IIBA and Negotiation process defined, team members introduced.

Project Socio-economics

- Question posed to delegation- do you agree with the company's conclusions about the effects on your lives and communities?
 - Project impact statements provided in matters related to employment and financial participation.
 - It is expected that there will be 4,200 jobs available prior to operations.
 - 600 expected jobs at full operation.
 - Baffinland is stating that there will be minimal negative effects on the livelihood and employment of Inuit and suggests effects will be positive.
 - Environmental aspects and impacts Baffinland suggest impacts on the environment will be minimized.
 - 225 to 350 Million in revenue annually at full operation.
 - Establishment of funds for social programs, traditional concerns should be made available and accessible.
 - Round table discussions on topic of IIBA begin at 2:15 to 2:45 pm.
 - Training issues and employment issues discussed by table 3 Arctic Bay.
- Topics in this discussion include concerns relating to Socio-economics, education and training initiatives.
- Community wellness programs/ funds
 - Social aspects

- Possible increase use of drugs and alcohol
 - Impacts on harvesting activities
 - Provisions for soapstone accessibility
 - The need for chapel services/ clergy
- Clarification required on how the funds will be allocated and disbursement of funds for each affected communities.
- Igloodik urges outlying communities to support their opposition of the Steensby camp and their wish to move it further away from sensitive areas of wildlife habitat. Ask each review committees to provide supporting letters advising their position to move the Steensby camp.
- Community based monitoring system recommended.
- Socio-economic impact studies
 - community consultations
 - public services
 - skill levels
- Population Demographics; Human health and wellness issues
- Health and social provisions
 - Community based programs
- Positive and Negative effects of mine employment
- Zero tolerance policy on drugs and alcohol a major concern.
 - healing programs high recommendation
 - counselling services should be available
- Monitoring issues
- Issues of hunting and harvesting activities
- Archeology and cultural sites Baffinland recognizes the importance of site preservations
- Cultural wellbeing
- Baffinland has stated that impacts on traditional and cultural practices will be minimized and respected.
- Employment conditions
 - issues relating to discrimination
- Meeting adjourned at 5:15 pm.

Day 4 (Aug 11, 2011)

-Meeting opened at 8:43 with an opening prayer.

- Training
- Contracting
- IIBA
- Employment

-Baffinland and QIA support the use of the Inuktitut language in the workplace documentation will be available in Inuktitut.

-Publications and notices will also be available in Inuktitut.

-Training;

- Inuit benefits to be maximized
- 106 job classifications, 450 available jobs

-Subcontractors also required to hire Inuit workers as Baffinland

-One million dollars annually for training

-3 to 4 million for training Inuit

-Company is committed to adult training all job levels

-Employment- Inuit employment currently no limits at all job levels and Inuit employment practiced,

-Company is committed to hiring Inuit coordinators

-Contracting- target levels to maximize Inuit employment for the life of the mine.

- Provisions also include maximizing woman employment in the mine.

-Inuit firms have a substantial advantage over bidding 25%

-250,00 per year from company for business start up initiatives; Supportive

-Baffin Inuit firms will receive advantage over Nunavut wide Inuit firms.

-Open discussions at 9:20 for 10 minutes.

-Job benefits should be maximized to most affected communities

-Contracting- Inuit involvement should be encouraged.

-IIBA issues; Inuit participation in contracting should be increased.

- On the job training issues remain a high priority for Inuit
- Increased levels of woman employed encouraged for all job levels.
- Apprenticeship programs recommended.
- More senior level management positions required for Inuit.
- Timelines for monitoring of Inuit involvement in contracting 90 days in review of contracts to determine compliance with Inuit target levels.
- IIBA; Financial participations
- QIA as landowner of surface rights will receive royalties.
- IIBA; Financial participation
- Provisions for availability of Inuit country food at mine site
- Benefit/ Economics
 - Economic
 - Jobs
 - Training- Management
 - Apprenticeship
 - Education
 - Contracts
 - Financial stake
- Social/ Cultural
 - Community infrastructure
 - Inuktitut workplace
 - Community wellbeing
 - Some increased access to hunting areas
- Impacts
 - Social/ Cultural
 - Loss of hunting
 - Impact on traditional culture
 - Land
 - Communities
- Family problems with shift work
 - extra money
- Impacts/ Environment
 - Water quality-streams
 - oceans
 - Wildlife-sea mammals
 - fish

- food chain
 - Integrity of certain areas (ecosystems)
 - rail line
 - port site
- Catering contracts to mine camps to include provisions for country food
 - Environmental section still requires negotiations - IIBA negotiations
 - Agreement in principle expected by end of September.
 - Different types of contracts/contracting
 - sub-contracting
 - Increase in community infrastructure immediate benefits
 - QC is the business development arm of QIA with Qikiqtaaluk logistics expediting the distribution of jobs.
 - QC partnering with Kakivak Association with Qikiqtaaluk Environmental specializing in environmental clean-up, helping into hiring Inuit employees
 - Open discussions begin at 2:00 pm
 - project trade officers comparisons b/w impacts and benefits.
 - Our position remains to relocate, move the rail line and port from Steensby Inlet to Nuvuiit Point.
 - Compensation issues over loss of caribou
 - Deadline for submission of technical review comments by NIRB extended to Oct 5/2011
 - Education issues remain a major concern.
 - Community consultations should be regular and ongoing with all affected communities prior to any form of development in all aspects of the life of the mine to closure.
 - Igloodik's position to move the port location from Steensby Inlet to Nuvuiit remains unchanged- Igloodik feels the relocation of the port will be beneficial to the company in terms of operating costs and suggests receiving less, IIBA as a project trade off.
 - Monitoring issues in all aspects is a major concern around the communities.
 - Support and co-operation between all affected communities urged and supported
 - Break for ten minutes at 4:00 pm, resume at 4:10 pm
 - Meeting facilitator explains agenda wrapping

Ref PI-0825: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (August 25)

**Pond Inlet MRP Review Committee
Aug 25, 2011**

Present: Jesse Nutarak, Jayco Alooooloo, Mathias Qaunaq, Caleb Sangoya, James Atagootak, Kooneeliusie Nutarak and Norman Koonoo

Meeting begins at 3:17 pm. The meeting is called to order with an opening prayer.

Committee member explains there is no agenda, just to brief the committee regarding the Iqaluit MRP workshop. Also provides the committee with an information package containing a summary of the BIMC draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) for the Mary River project and briefly reviews the contents of the DEIS.

It is noted that the Iqaluit workshop meeting minutes are still being prepared and should be ready for next meeting.

Member: notes the lack of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ) knowledge in the DEIS and mentions how seasonal winds can impact development areas and caribou habitats, stating this issue should be considered by BIMC and he also notes the lack of data concerning ocean currents and streams surrounding affected areas.

Member: supports these concerns and recommends implementation of IQ knowledge where applicable to all aspects of mine development and operations.

Member: urges community support for the opposition of the Steensby port location.

Member: informs committee that NIRB has extend it's deadline for submissions for comments after receiving letters from Hamlets of Hall Beach, Igloolik and Pond Inlet.

Member: takes opportunity to briefly outline concerns relating to the location of the Steensby port by the Hamlet of Igloolik, stating Igloolik has full support from QIA.

Caribou Habitat

Member: states concern about the potential impacts to caribou and caribou habitat and urges the committee to forward a letter to ensure the community of Pond Inlet will receive proper compensation for loss of caribou surrounding Pond Inlet.

Member: suggests that North Baffin communities should work together and collectively agree to the opposition of the location of the proposed railway and to suggest alternative locations in less sensitive areas of animal habitat.

Member: summarize the concerns from the Iqaluit, MRP workshops outlining shipping routes, traffic, ballast water and frequency of ships to and from Milne Inlet.

Ten minutes break at 4:13 pm, resume meeting at 4:23 pm

Member: notes the observations by local hunters that animals have moved, due to noise levels around Lancaster Sound. He also states his concern regarding low-level flights around the mining camps and stresses strict compliance with policies and procedures.

Member: informs the committee regarding recommendations received from MRP workshop that allows provisions for community based monitoring surrounding the mine development, construction and operations.

Member: states his concerns strongly about a certain Baffinland employee noting that the employee never wants to hire Pond Inlet people.

Member: recommends studies be done on seals, seal populations and habitat before, during and after construction to assess the impacts on seal and sea mammals surrounding the proposed construction locations, stating observations by local hunters on the lack of animals around Milne Inlet.

Questions and concerns

Community-based monitoring is highly supported by Pond Inlet review committee.

Member: stresses the importance of forwarding all of our relevant concerns to BIMC in suggesting alternate locations for less sensitive areas despite the company's concerns on cost. It is acknowledged that affected communities and the land is more important to the Inuit and all preventative and mitigation measures be fully utilized to ensure maximum preservation of local animal habitat.

Member: strongly recommends that provisions under the IIBA be geared towards Pond Inlet as the closest community to the Mary River mine Project.

Member: requests committee members to review the BIMC DEIS information package for next meeting's discussions and comments.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm

Ref PI-0912: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (September 12)

**Pond Inlet Mary River Project Review Committee Meeting Minutes
September 12, 2011 at Qaggivik**

Members Present:

Jesse Nutarak	Chairperson /(minute recorder)
Mathias Qaunaq	V/chair, Member-at-Large
James Atagootak	Hamlet Rep
Jayko Alooooloo	Member-at-Large
Kooneelosie K. Nutarak	Member-at-Large
Philip Paneak	QIA Community Representative
Nathan Tigullaraq	A/Community Liaison Officer, QIA

Absent: Caleb Sangoya MHTO Rep

1. Opening of Meeting

The meeting commenced at 1:35pm with a prayer.

2. Consultant visit-QIA

-Purpose of visit

The Chairperson mentioned that we have to review the tap 6 of the DEIS document prepared by the QIA consultants on the socio-economics of the Baffinland proposal, prior to and after QIA's visit.

Travel and meeting plans for the consultants and QIA Board members will also be made available for our information and concurrence. The committee will meet again tonight once QIA arrives and again tomorrow morning at the Mikinnirsaq at 9:00am.

3. Activity report.

a. Community Based Monitoring

As a result of our previous meeting, we wrote to QIA Project coordinator, with copies to QIA Executive that our committee strongly recommends that the community based monitoring should be implemented as soon as possible. The hunters and beneficiaries with participation from QIA staff will have better autonomy in monitoring measures prior to the start up of the project and during the life of the mining in Mary River.

One of the heads of the consultant teams had mentioned that this is a good idea and that other community has enquire about the same measure, consultant team and QIA staff are now in the process of how this could be implemented.

b. Meeting with Igloolik MRP committee

During our previous meeting, the committee had concluded that they should meet with Igloolik MRP Committee, to get more information on the Steensby Inlet proposed port.

It is that Pond Inlet MRP Committee have supported Igloodik to use Nuvuiit as port as Steensby area is used more for hunting and fishing.

QIA had mentioned that they can/will try to accommodate our request after re-arranging travel plans and dates, and will get back to us as soon as they have found date and place

4. Preview of document-EIS

The tab 6 of the discussion document of DEIS deals with social economics of the proposed project in which our committee has number of concerns and will probably result in lengthy discussions. The Chair mentioned that he had contacted the Community Health Representative (CHR) of GN Health Centre to inquire about the increasing number of people being treated by the physicians as a result of alcohol and drug abuse since the start-up of the Mary River mining.

The CHR had mentioned that the number of people being treated had raised considerably and that there are number of minors who have been given alcohol had increased which may have connection with mine employees. The CHR had agreed to come to our meeting to answer questions from our committee and the consultant tomorrow morning.

1. Population and Demographics

Since the airlines will be travelling from Ottawa and Iqaluit to Mary River, this may not be a too much of a concern at this time, however since the north has the better air quality and environment than south there are a lot of southern people who are just waiting for opportunity to move north and this should be taken into consideration for a long-term impact. The Committee discussed the previous developments in the region and how it had impacted the quality of life within the community and added social problems that had come along with them.

Government devolutions will be experienced as the population grows and the mine will probably result in Government service personnel increase in the long-term.

Employees in the mine should be returned back to their respective community instead of going to bigger centres like Iqaluit for shopping. Since the start-up of Mary River, employees were allowed to go any place where they want to go and this practice had seen increased in drug and alcohol related accidents and social problems because when a mine employee finishes his/er shift they go to Iqaluit to shop for alcohol and drugs then go back to their community with supplies, this has created social problems. The Health centre has experienced increased social problem. We were ensured that this practice is no longer allowed, mine employees are now restricted to go any other place other than their respective community.

2. Education and Training

Summer students on summer employment do not need to be 18 years of age as it is a policy or known practice of the BIMC that they should have reached the age of 18 in order to work at the mine. Summer Students under the age of 18 should be given an opportunity to gain experience.

Past employees who had been dismissed due to drug and/or alcohol offences should be given a second opportunity at least after six months as any person can make changes in their lives.

There should always be a counselor or mentor on site for employees to have a place for counseling and be able to discuss employment issues that may be hindering their employment or social life at home.

Training-on-the-job should be carefully listed and kept for future reference that are not related to trades. The list of trainees and pool of certified workers should be adamantly used and kept, maintaining a list of employees certified on specific occupations can be used for future use.

The people of the community should be made aware of this set-up and participate voluntarily to ensure the list is kept safely and appropriately.

Long-term training should be sought in any component/or sector of the mine all the way to the end of the project as the types of trainings can be or are transferable.

3. Livelihood and Employment

The creation of new jobs and healthier live style will be welcomed and enjoyed, however, an employee may have funds to purchase gas, grub and other necessities for hunting, the environment especially in the rail road area, there'll be nothing to hunt as there will be people working on the mine. This scenario is the most saddening experience for any Inuit hunter.

Government of Nunavut, Arctic college should be involved in training and further education issues and they should be planning for this mine exploration now. The mine and the Arctic College

Caribou struck by a train will not be suitable for food as it may be damaged and the skin may not be suitable and spoiled for clothing and/mattress. BIM has and will enforce a policy that all foods will be required to be inspected, why are they willing to give a caribou meat that has been spoiled to Inuit? The meat may be already contaminated with dust from the train loads.

Foxe Basin do not have a Land use plan in place so it must be harder to minimize the potential impact from development such as vessel routes whereby the sea mammals are plentiful.

Hunters while hunting should have access to gas, grub and a bed in the mine area, IIBA issue?

Committee members agreed to adjourned and will continue tomorrow with the consultant with the QIA who will be coming in tonight.

5. Adjournment.

The meeting was declared adjourned at 5:35pm by the Chairperson.

Ref PI-0913: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (September 13)

Pond Inlet Mary River Project Committee - Meeting Minutes

September 13, 2011, Mikinnirsaq Parish Hall

Present:	Jesse Nutarak	Chairperson (minute recorder)
	Mathias Qaunaq	Vice Chairperson, member-at-large
	Jayko Alooooloo	Member-at-large
	Caleb Sangoya	MHTO Rep
	Kooneeliusie Nutarak	Member-at-large
	James Atagotak	Hamlet Council Rep.
	Nathan Tigullaraq	A/CLO

1. Opening of meeting

The meeting was opened by the Chairperson at 1:13pm, and a prayer was given.

2. Consultant Visit

Due to the mechanical problem of aircraft in Clyde River, QIA did not arrive last night but the representative suggested that we continue our review of the DEIS document today, and they will try to come in again today/tonight.

We have received information on the travel/visits schedule of the QIA consultants, MRP Committees, and the QIA Executive. The plan was read to the committee members.

3. Review of DEIS – continuation

Human Health and Well-being

This section should be a top priority as it relates to the wellbeing of all people working in the mine and its vicinity.

Families left by working parents will be impacted greatly, they will have no food and other essentials and may/will be affected by alcohol problems and drug abuse within the community.

How do we as people know or will know if the Government is actually spending the money for its purpose that has been allocated by and from the mine?

Monitoring – what would be the basis for monitoring - what and which impact(s) would be considered “serious”?

Iqaluit, the capital city of Nunavut will be most impacted on social issues as it will be the ‘hub’ for airlines, businesses and employees, how will the monitoring of social problems issues be dealt with in the capital? It is now known that whenever social issues arise in Iqaluit, the surrounding communities are affected such as alcohol bootleggers sell them to communities.

For leisure times and off-shift times employees can and will have access to gymnasium equipment and other entertainment equipment and should also be allowed to go hunting for small game; ie: ptarmigan, rabbit and foxes.

Railroad wagons should be covered when transporting raw material (crushed ore) to Steensby Inlet to minimize the separating of the dust and other contaminants and gases on the environment.

Loading dock and the conveyor belt should have covering shelter to prevent the dust, and other contaminant gases to escape to the environment and the seawater especially. From the Nanisivik Mine experience, ring, harp and bearded seals have been contaminated as the cods were feeding on the dust from the docking facility which the seals feed on. Seals were contaminated on their liver and kidneys, thus not suitable for food.

Employees' working clothes should also be carefully maintained in safe and contained rooms as they may spread dust and other invisible gases being transferred to their clothes and exposed body area. There is potential spread of contaminants if they do not clean-up before entering cafeteria and other camp living quarters.

Employees with families should be given an option to be able to move to the mine if they are planning to work at the mine for long period of time. If they were allowed the mine may be able to keep some employees consistently.

Are the funds, Community support funds, the ilagiiktunut Nunalinnilu Pivalliatjutsait kiinaujat fund, already being distributed and running? If so, Pond inlet should get its fair share of the fund in tackling the social problems arising from employees with the mine as we already are impacted.

The company should also ensure that the families being left while the parents are working be provided with essentials; ie: food, leisure time entertainment and self-help services (counselor).

The committee feels that they should adjourn for the day and continue with QIA tomorrow morning if the representative makes it to the community tonight.

The committee members complained that they need snacks and hi-liners for their next meeting to be available and hopefully meet in the place where there is a washroom.

Economic Development and Self-reliance

The word being used "minimize" 'the effects to the land or to harvesting....' In the short-term period it may be true, however, in the longer term, the employees working at the mine may be wealthier and have ability to purchase hunting equipment and supplies, but the area (Mary River area) will not be suitable for hunting as it will have railroad and people working with their humongous equipment. Plus there will be restrictions that the hunters may be abide by.

“...the Project will have a large effect on the entire territorial economy”, the question is how much will be directly enjoyed by the Pond Inlet people who had negotiated and picked Mary River area included in the NLCA. The question of “Inuit owned businesses” usually come to light when dealing with contracts as the non-Inuit spouses usually owned and operate the actual business, just using their Inuk spouse for their benefit.

The age requirement should not hinder youth when entering summer student jobs, at the age of 13, 14 and so forth, they should be given an opportunity to enter the labour force at the mine. It is known that when a youth is given a summer job that s/he have interest they usually pursue that career for long period of time.

Presently, hardly any businesses in Pond inlet have relations with BIMC, because most service contracts are awarded to Iqaluit business and other larger centres in Nunavut. Although, the company enjoy awarding contracts to whomever they wish, they should recognize and support businesses in Pond Inlet if they wish to do their mining in Mary River since Pond Inlet beneficiares are landowners.

The Committee feels that they should get more information on the IIBA negotiations and the protocol on dispensing funds to the beneficiares directly. There will be “substantial revenue will be paid to Inuit”, how will that be handled? By whom and would there be criteria or eligibility in order to access that funds.

Since the funds arising from the IIBA will be directed at the Baffin as a whole, the North Baffin should be given more then anybody else as they will be most impacted by the project. Although, the IIBA negotiation team has mentioned that they will try to get more benefits to the north Baffin, it may not work or there will be objections to the set-up, so the best scenario may be to split Baffin with North Baffin as separate entity as it is now set-up.

4. Meeting adjournment

The meeting was declared closed at 5:17pm and will start again tomorrow with Cheryl Wray, consultant from QIA.

Ref PI-0914: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (September 14)

Pond Inlet Mary River Project Committee Meeting Minutes
September 14, 2011 QIA Office

Present: Jesse Nutarak Chairperson (minute recorder)
Jayko Alooooloo Member-at-large
Caleb Sangoya MHTO Rep
Kooneeliusie Nutarak Member-at-large
James Atagotak Hamlet Council Rep.
Nathan Tigullaraq A/CLO
Philip Paneak QIA Director, IIBA Chief Negotiator

Absent: Mathias Qaunaq Vice chairperson (excused)

2. Opening of meeting

The meeting was opened by the Chairperson at 1:07pm with a prayer.

3. Current Updates

Consultant Travel – The QIA representative did not arrive due to the shortage of hotel rooms in the community, they had cancelled the trip and will be arriving next week, September 21 along with Executive Committee members tour.

3. Predevelopment – BIM proposed activities

This document outlines the proposed activities of BIM prior to the actual operation of the Mary River mine in which BIM is and/or will be seeking approval from the Nunavut Impact Review Board by end of the year (2011).

Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation has send document “Predevelopment Work, August 2011” for the committee to review. This document is a proposal they wanted to do separate from the DEIS as it is for the shipping of equipment to Milne Inlet, Steensby Inlet and Mary River prior to the actual exploration of mine. It is expected that the vessels will be travelling through Pond Inlet 18-20 times per year. It also includes plans to build port and other infrastructure in Milne Inlet and Steensby Inlet. This type of proposal has never been pursued by the Nunavut Impact Review Board up to this date and the company is saying that if this proposal is not approved, the IIBA items that had been negotiated and approved will be delayed until the actual operation begins, but the committee feels this is just a pressure tactic of the company.

The committee (PIMRP) feels that the proposal should not even be review until Pond inlet gets some funds for the impact that they already had felt since the beginning of the BIMC started and put their feet on our land.

4. MRP Schedule

As mentioned yesterday, the plans and schedule for the committee, QIA executive committee and the consultant has been send for the committee information and concurrence. The travel plan for Cheryl has been slightly changed due to the mechanical and weather, and also the deadline to submit our meeting minutes is 23 September, the Chairperson will do them as the recording secretary is not available for this week.

5. DEIS Section 6 review – continuation

Continuation from 5. Economic Development and Self-reliance

From the previous years since the start up of the mine, the local Hamlet had experienced a shortage of qualified heavy equipment operators for short of time but they usually returned to the usual operations for the municipal services. This short-term problem may be eliminated as the number of pool of qualified operators increase from the training either with the mine or elsewhere.

6. Community Infrastructure and Public Service

The Milne Inlet tote road should be build permanently even after the project as the people and hunters in particular will be able to use it as well as the docking facility.

Number of pool of heavy equipment operators should also be monitored at all times, in order for the community to be able to have qualified operators on hand for municipal services and for the capacity building measures for training requirements in the future.

Long term employees when being absent from home may result in experience of hunger by the youth and the children of employees, which in term will result in vandals and break/enter looking for food. Such infrastructures in the community may be the target of vandals, thus creating expensive and undesirable replacements.

The QIA wildlife biologist had mentioned that he will send us the maps of movement of caribou in the region but to no avail.

Communities should be given an opportunity to voice their preference on the docking facility other than Steensby Inlet and/or Milne Inlet as there are other potential areas within the Cambridge Sound vicinity (between Clyde River and Pond Inlet).

The committee feels that they need to meet with Igloolik MRP Committee face-to-face to discuss the Steensby Inlet port, although, the committee (PIMRPC) feels they (Igloolik MRP) have legitimate reason for NOT wanting the Steensby Inlet to be the port. This way both Committees can strategize and plan for better port that is acceptable to both communities, in which the BIMC may be able to support and pursue.

7. Contracting and Business Opportunities

In the previous years, the Toonoonik Sahoonek Co-op was awarded catering contract but before the year end, it was taken away from them and given to the Baffin Inuit organization

business (QC). This should not happened again as it degraded the integrity of the community.

Newly created businesses by Inuit should be supported and entertained by the BIMC because Inuit business are hindered by the bigger and more rich corporations and ventures with more experience, but this will encourage the Inuit businesses.

8. Cultural Resources

Since Inuit history is not or has limited history in print or paper media, the history of Inuit in the Baffin region are all over the Mary River area as this spot has been used and occupied by Inuit for thousands of years and are not written anywhere, so therefore all the archaeological sites should be protected.

The archaeological authorities (ie: Heritage Canada and Inuit Heritage Trust) should be adamant in preserving and safe keeping of the archaeological site and should be written and protected.

The Government of Nunavut should be vigorously protecting and preserving these sites and protect them from being exploited, since these are all Nunavut history and of the people.

9. Resources and Land Use

The caribou in the region has already been impacted and the company should do more to protect the migration of caribou.

“The risk for collisions along the railroad with caribou is minor.....” this statement is not true mainly because there has never been a railroad in the region, nobody knows if it will or not. There may be many caribou being struck by rail because the caribou do not live in farms and are not capable of reading signs.

The narwhal and other sea mammals have already been impacted in and around the Koluctoo Bay where the narwhal give birth and renew their skins and this area is feeding area for them for fish and summer season. There are hardly any more seals and narwhal since the project started and there are believed to devices underwater that scare off the sea mammals including fish in the region. At least there are 3 or 4 rivers with fish that had been impacted.

For potential business start up for resort or fishing camp sector it may no longer be of interest to them as it will be full of vessels going back and forth.

The hunters do not travel only on shorelines, they do travel all over ice but they may travel only on shoreline only if the central ice rough.

For the hunter, with all the infrastructures and people in the region it will not be ideal area for hunting. There will no longer be clean water and environment to be sustainable, both for human and wildlife.

All the rest of the comments and concerns have been discussed in previous meeting relating to Resources and Land Use.

The committee will start again tomorrow to finish off the section 6

Adjournment

The Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 5:56pm.

Ref PI-0915: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (September 15)

Pond Inlet Mary River Project Committee Meeting Minutes
September 15, 2011, QIA Office

Present:	Jesse Nutarak	Chairperson (minute recorder)
	Mathias Qaunaq	Vice chairperson
	Jayko Alooooloo	Member-at-large
	Caleb Sangoya	MHTO Rep
	Kooneeliusie Nutarak	Member-at-large
	James Atagotak	Hamlet Council Rep.
	Nathan Tigullaraq	A/CLO
	Norman Koonoo	Recording secretary

1. Opening of meeting
The meeting was brought to order by the Chairperson at 2:13pm and a prayer was given.
2. Continuation of review – Section 6

Part 9

Inuit should not be given spoiled meat of caribou if it has been exposed to raw material and transported unprotected.

Project will impact caribou migration and movement drastically in the area between Steensby and Mary River, will block caribou migrating to and from Milne Inlet and Borden Peninsula.

Caribou in south and north are different herd where southern caribou migrate in circle in southern part of Baffin.

IQ on caribou migration and movement of caribou should be recognized and used as tool to mitigate the migration potential problem. Inuit in each of the Baffin communities know the land and they know where the caribou migrates and calve, they should be contacted and use their knowledge instead of relying on classroom education and the date that was used ten years ago.

If the train struck a caribou, the operator should be treated as any car driver down south, penalized and convicted, thus losing their license to operate.

Company should pay more than \$10,000 for killing a caribou to respective HTO as the trophy hunters pay for them.

Will impact majority of habitat both on the land and sea.

Vessels will impact the sea mammals, Foxe Basin will definitely be impacted including all its habitat including plant and ecosystem.

Koluctoo Bay should also be protected as the area is used by narwhal for calving and renewing their skins although they have already been impacted just in 8 years.

When there is a development where there is a abundant of animals, the scientist use devises to scare off the habitat, this practice is a sad story for Inuit as they depend heavily on animals both from land and sea. Animals up here in the north do not live in farms they are wild.

Biologist say they know that narwhals do not eat during the summer season, this statement is absolute nonsense; they do feed on fish and renew their skins and blubber during the summer and they do it in Koluctoo bay area including Milne Inlet.

Ballast water if its large enough, they will transport foreign species to the region, this may not be good for the other animals in the region and it may have drastic change on the salinity and temperature of the sea water.

Since the start up of the project, narwhal has been going Tremblay Sound, this also has in turn make it harder for hunters and more expensive for buying gas and grub.

Walrus in the Foxe Basin have also changed their migrating route since the Bulk Sample in 2008, they have moved to further area from Igloodik.

Do the Government use the same type of devise in the Atlantic Ocean and other jurisdiction?

Steensby and Milne Inlet should be treated equally the same as they are impacted in same manner and quantity.

Commercial fishing will be impacted as it is expected that the lakes in the whole region will be contaminated on the long-term.

Monitoring programs and compensation schemes should be implemented as soon as possible before the "predevelopment work" has started or approved.

Why did they change the number vessel traffic from 3 to 20 per month, as they have said earlier.

Travellers and campers will need to be given a CB radio while they are in the region for their safety.

How are the railroads be equipped when a hunter wants to cross the railroad, would there be stop signs or button if they want to cross it and wait for the train? How would they be required to do it.

Railroad tracks, how would they be installed? Need clear visualization of the track. Crossing spots – how are they operated, what or how distance should the train be.

Shelters for the hunters and travelers in the region should be build in some areas for them to refuge if they should be stranded while waiting for the train or if there is an emergency.

An email came in asking for delegation – QIA is planning a meeting on Steensby Inlet port and needs a name. The committee delegated the Chairperson for October 1-3, 2011 in Igloolik.

Adjournment

The Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 5:20pm.

Ref PI-0922: Pond Inlet Project Committee – Meeting Notes (September 22)

**Pond Inlet Mary River Project Committee
September 22, 2011**

Attendees:

Jesse Nutarak
Jayko Allooloo
Caleb Sangoya
Mathias Qaunaq
James Atagootak
Norman Koonoo
QIA Executive
David Joanasiq, Abe Qammaniq, Hannah Uniuqsaraq

General Comments:

- Ever since the Mary River Project has started, the caribou's migratory and behavior have changed. Areas between Clyde River, Pond Inlet and Mary River are not seeing any caribou.
- The impacts from the project have started already due to the bulk sample.
- How will the railway impact the caribou? How will they move around the railway? Their migration will be disturbed. We have already been impacted by the activity at Mary River on our caribou.
- We need to carefully consider this project due to its impacts on our livelihood which are the animals.
- We want to support the Foxe Basin people and have to Port moved from Steensby Inlet. People travel back and forth between Clyde River and Igloolik so we need to support the Foxe Basin people.
- How will the crossings for caribou and snowmobiles be constructed?
- We will require additional fuel to travel now due to the project. How will we afford this, for those of us that do not want to work a rotational lifestyle.
- We have not heard about the plans on fisheries and their impacts at all from the Government agencies.
- We do not want the caribou carcasses from the company from the animals that are hit by vehicles and the trains. They are contaminated and we do not want road kill.
- The marine life has already been disturbed due to shipping. There are fewer narwhals now.
- The dust created from the project is going to have an impact on vegetation and water and we are concerned about this. How will they lessen this?
- How will the dust be monitored? If the animals are impacted from the dust then so will we as Inuit as we eat them.
- What are the impacts to birds from the contaminated vegetation from dust? How will we monitor that?
- Are we going to be able to speak Inuktitut at the site? We need to ensure that Inuktitut is not lost for those working at the sites.

- Socioeconomics are a major issue for us on site – we are going to see some major impacts in our communities. We need to ensure that the IIBA addresses us.
- Language should not be a barrier to gaining employment on site.
- The IIBA needs to ensure that employees also come from the communities.
- Steensby Inlet has been a char area for thousands of years – there is the possibility of commercial fisheries there – how will people be compensated for that.
- The icebreaking and shipping will have a major impact on marine mammals – we are very concerned about this.
- The port site is a major issue for all the communities on Baffin Island – we need to ensure that everyone is comfortable with the project before this goes ahead.

SANIRAJAK (HALL BEACH)

Ref HB-0517: Hall Beach/Igloolik BIMC Consultation – Meeting Minutes (May 17)

Igloolik and Hall Beach Mary River Project Committees Meeting with Baffinland Iron Mines May 17, 2011

Zach Kunuk	Solomon Qanatsiaq
Solomon Mikki	Abraham Qammaniq
David Irngaut	Jopie
Louis Utak	Lizzie Phillips-Qanatsiaq
Elisapee Quassa	Sidonie Ungalaq

Anne O'Toole, Oliver Curran, Tim Kean – BIMC
Caroline Fitzpatrick – Canarail
Bevan LaDrew – Sikumiut

Discussion on Port Site Location and disruption to Inuit traveling from ship traffic:

Comments from the Communities ONLY:

- We are concerned with the disruption to seal pupping and how it will impact the seal population in the spring and winter.
- How will you warn hunters and communities that shipping is happening?
- You will need to discuss with us the impacts and if there are benefits for us as the ice will be changed permanently.
- Skidoos were lost in and around Arctic Bay and Nanisivik due to the shipping – we are concerned that this will happen to us too.
- There will be a lot of safety issues for us as residents in the area due to constant shipping. How will we be safe when we are traveling in our areas.
- Additional fuel and food will be required if you disrupt our travel path.
- All animals will be impacted by the shipping – walrus, all species of seals, and birds.
- The shipping in the Foxe Basin area will be in the middle of the Rangers patrol areas – how will this impact the Rangers patrolling these areas?
- We have a concern about the impact that this Project will have on our opportunities to develop a commercial fisheries in the Cockburn Lake and Steensby Inlet Area. How will the IIBA address this?
- How will you address the impacts to marine birds from the shipping route?

5. Nominating for Vice Chairperson

Nominations and vote for Vice Chairperson.

Thanks to everyone and talks about the meeting a little more.

6. QIA support

Explanation of QIA Project Review Coordination team.

We are also going to use the NIRB so they can help us what we want. Hall Beach will be one of the affected places.

7. Workshop August 8-12 we have to vote 2 from the committee

Move to next meeting.

8. Site tour

We are going to ask the Mary River if we can all go see the site on a tour.

9. Igloolik meeting

Baffinland went to Igloolik to have a meeting and some of us had to go there to have a meeting. Also explained to the committee about the Igloolik meeting.

Member – asks the committee does Mary River committee have to go on?

Member – I have a concern on the routes, they are going to use the route every second day for 21 years. We are from Canada and if they say it cost too much for any other routes well I am going to fight for it.

Member – they are saying we will use less money if we use the road that is close to Pond Inlet, but also saying they will have to make holes of 2 mountains. Fishes die easily so they say they can move the fishes. They don't even worry about our animals. We will have to try and get them to use a different road, if not we will have to know that we have to try harder.

Member – we are in Canada and Amituq is a walrus raw making place (iqunaq) and for that we have to make sure they use a different route for ships. In Canada, farmers fight for their land like grape makers, and we have to fight for the walrus too. Since they have a 21-year life span they are not thinking of the cost of making the roads. They can use the other side and other side they have seen the ships more than us.

Member – this is the plan 9 ships split by 2 and every second day ships come in and out. And the ships are like 300m wide. And when you look at it we will never have a sea ice.

QIA – Igloodik agrees with the starting of Baffinland with the shares to the community. This will go on, if we work with them help them we are going to do a very good one. We have to plan with Baffinland.

Member – YES I agree with you. We also have to look at the left behind families that kids will have no dad, mom; and spouse is alone; will have mom, dad, spouse only for just a short period of time, we have to think of those left behind. They have to be compensated.

Member – yes families will be left behind.

9. other

Member – Will our QIA Director join us on meetings? He is the director and I like to see him in our regular meetings.

QIA – he will be notified that he has to join us every meeting.

10. Next meeting date

Next meeting date is June 14, 2011.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:48 pm.

Ref HB-0614: Hall Beach Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (June 14)

**Mary River Project Committee Meeting Minutes
 ጆንኦርኦትር ኮቢትቶር ኮቢትቶር**

**June 14, 2011
 ጳጉሙ 14, 2011**

Present

Solomon Qanatsiaq – Chair
 Abraham Qammaniq – Vice Chair
 Alice Saqina – Committee
 David Kanatsiak – CLARC member
 Deborah Qanatsiaq – Committee
 Jopie Kaernerck – Hamlet member
 Jaypeetee Audlakiak – QIA Director
 Lizzie Phillip-Qanatsiaq – CLO

ገገኛ
 ካረላ ጌዳብሳጅ - ልጎቻቸው
 ልዩላዩላ ጌዳብሳጅ - ልጎቻቸው ገገኛ
 ልዩላ ጌዳብሳጅ - ኮቢት
 ልዩላ ጌዳብሳጅ - ጆንኦርኦትር ኮቢት
 ገገኛ ጌዳብሳጅ - ኮቢት
 ልጎ ጌዳብሳጅ - ዘረገጅ
 ኮቢት ልዩላ ጌዳብሳጅ - ካብራር ጸሐፊ
 ልዩላ ጌዳብሳጅ - ጌታ ልዩላ ጌዳብሳጅ

1. Opening of the meeting

The meeting was called to order at 7:03pm, and opened with a prayer.

1. ኮቢት ገገኛ ጌዳብሳጅ

ኮቢት ገገኛ ኮቢት ገገኛ 7:03 ጋራቸው ገገኛ, ካረላ ጌዳብሳጅ ገገኛ ገገኛ.

2. Review of Agenda

Everyone approves the agenda.

2. ኮቢት ገገኛ ካብራር ገገኛ

ኮቢት ገገኛ ካብራር ገገኛ, ልዩላ ጌዳብሳጅ.

3. Workshop August 8, 12 we need two members from the Committee

A vote is held and two members are selected to go to the workshop in August.

3. ልዩላ ጌዳብሳጅ ገገኛ 8 12 ለዩላ ጌዳብሳጅ ኮቢት ገገኛ

ኮቢት ገገኛ ኮቢት ገገኛ

ልዩላ ጌዳብሳጅ - ገገኛ
 ገገኛ ጌዳብሳጅ - ገገኛ
 ካረላ ጌዳብሳጅ - ገገኛ
 ልዩላ ጌዳብሳጅ - ገገኛ
 ልዩላ ጌዳብሳጅ - ገገኛ
 ልጎ ጌዳብሳጅ - ገገኛ

ገገኛ
 ገገኛ - 2
 ካረላ - 6
 ልዩላ ጌዳብሳጅ - 4
 ልዩላ ጌዳብሳጅ - 0

Ref HB-0704: Hall Beach Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (July 4)

Mary River Project Committee Meeting Minutes
ᓄᓂᓕᓂᓐᓄᓐ ᓂᓀᓂᓐᓄᓐ ᓂᓀᓂᓐᓄᓐᓄᓐ

July 04, 2011
ᓴᓕᓂ 04, 2011

Present

Solomon Qanatsiaq – Chair
Abraham Qammaniq – Vice Chair
Alice Saq pina – Committee
David Kanatsiak – CLARC member
Deborah Qanatsiaq – Committee
Jopie Kaernerck – Hamlet member
Jaypeetee Audlakiak – QIA Director
Lizzie Phillip-Qanatsiaq – CLO

ᓂᓐᓂᓐ

ᓴᓕᓂ ᓂᓄᓕᓂᓐᓄᓐ - ᓂᓐᓂᓐᓄᓐᓄᓐ
ᓴᓕᓂᓐᓄᓐ ᓂᓄᓂᓐᓄᓐ - ᓂᓐᓂᓐᓄᓐᓄᓐ ᓂᓐᓂᓐ
ᓴᓕᓂ ᓂᓐᓂᓐ - ᓂᓀᓂᓐ
ᓂᓄᓂᓐᓄᓐ ᓂᓄᓕᓂᓐᓄᓐ - ᓄᓂᓕᓂᓐᓄᓐᓄᓐᓄᓐᓄᓐ
ᓂᓐᓂᓐ ᓂᓄᓕᓂᓐᓄᓐ - ᓂᓀᓂᓐ
ᓴᓂ ᓂᓄᓕᓂᓐ - ᓀᓂᓂᓐᓄᓐᓄᓐᓄᓐ
ᓂᓄᓂᓐᓄᓐ ᓂᓄᓂᓐᓄᓐ - ᓴᓂᓂᓐᓄᓐ ᓂᓄᓐᓄᓐᓄᓐ
ᓂᓐᓂ ᓂᓂᓐ - ᓂᓄᓕᓂᓐᓄᓐ ᓂᓄᓂᓐᓄᓐ

1. Opening of the meeting

Meeting opens at 5:30 pm.

1. ᓂᓀᓂᓐᓄᓐ ᓂᓄᓂᓐᓄᓐᓄᓐ

ᓂᓀᓂᓐᓄᓐ ᓂᓄᓂᓐᓄᓐ > 5:30 ᓂᓄᓐᓄᓐᓄᓐ

2. Review of Agenda

Everyone approved the agenda.

2. ᓂᓀᓂᓐᓄᓐ ᓂᓄᓂᓐᓄᓐᓄᓐ

ᓂᓄᓂᓐᓄᓐ ᓂᓀᓂᓐᓄᓐ ᓂᓄᓂᓐᓄᓐᓄᓐ, ᓂᓄᓐ ᓂᓄᓂᓐᓄᓐ.

3. Site tour

Site tour in Mary River is on July 25 and six members are going.

3. ᓄᓂᓂᓐ ᓄᓂᓂᓐᓄᓐ

ᓄᓂᓂᓐ ᓄᓂᓂᓐᓄᓐᓄᓐᓄᓐᓄᓐ ᓴᓕᓂ 25ᓄᓂᓐᓄᓐ ᓂᓄᓂᓐᓄᓐ ᓂᓄᓂᓐᓄᓐᓄᓐ ᓴᓕᓂ ᓂᓄᓕᓂᓐᓄᓐ, ᓂᓄᓂᓐᓄᓐ, ᓂᓄᓂᓐᓄᓐ ᓂᓄᓕᓂᓐᓄᓐ, ᓴᓂ ᓂᓄᓕᓂᓐ, ᓂᓄᓂᓐ ᓂᓄᓂᓐ ᓄᓂᓐᓄᓐᓄᓐᓄᓐ.

4. Igloodik meeting July 05 concerns

Member – If it’s going to be in Steensby, Clyde River, Igloodik, and Hall Beach will have to go way up to go Clyde River. Also they are making a tunnel and when they make a tunnel they will have to use the explosives and also have to make the sea deeper so the ship can go there. The animals will change. It is a spot for our seals. There is ice there that is why we are doing this. In the future they are going to have a hard time. Nowadays young hunters just leave without informing anyone. There will be an accident for sure on this one. If they say Steensby is only option will we have to stop the mining. There are 3 mountains of Iron ore. And we are giving them 2 choices, to go Nuvuiit and they don’t even want to look at it because it costs too much. In the future it’s going to be very big, and we tried even to lower the ships schedule, we are

trying to help each other. They have to see a letter saying we want the railroad to go Nuvuiit. In the south there are very big railroads. We want the railroad to go Nuvuiit instead, they have to check it. If you kill all the fish is Steensby what are you guys doing? This is Igloodik and Hall Beach food. We live for our animals and we are going to fight for it.

Member – We will have to try and change the railroad and if we can't change it we have to get rebate from them every year.

If they are going to use the explosive they sure will use money. And if they try and move the fish they will break 2 things. We sure will have to fight for this. We have to convince them to move to Nuvuiit, they have not started the Steensby. They don't want Nuvuiit because it is a large railroad and it would cost more and it is closer to the ship. This is just a first deposit that they want for 21 years and there is more. We have to move them no matter what for our future generations. Inuit are thinking right to move railroad to Nuvuiit we have to fight hard for our generations.

Member – we will work with Igloodik to convince them to move to Nuvuiit.

Member – we have to get them to check the Nuvuiit for our generations. When there is change to our animals, if there's going to be money set a side for us to use.

5. Adjournment

Meeting closed at 6:10 pm.

Ref HB-0726: Hall Beach Project Committee – Meeting Minutes (July 26)

**Mary River Project Committee Meeting Minutes
ᓄᓗᓯᓕᓚᓕᓱᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ ᓆᓕᓕᓱᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ ᓆᓕᓕᓱᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ**

**July 26, 2011
ᓴᓕᓗ 26, 2011**

Present

Solomon Qanatsiak – Chair
Abraham Qammaniq – Vice Chair
Alice Saqina – Committee
David Kanatsiak – CLARC member
Deborah Qanatsiak – Committee
Jopie Kaernerck – Hamlet member
Jaypeetee Audlakiak – QIA Director
Lizzie Phillip-Qanatsiak – CLO
Solomon Awa – QIA staff

ᐃᓕᓱᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ
ᓴᓕᓗᓯ ᓂᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ - ᓄᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ
ᓴᓗᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ ᓂᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ - ᓄᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ ᓄᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ
ᓴᓕᓱ ᓴᓂᓱᓄᓯ - ᓆᓕᓕᓱᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ
ᓕᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ ᓂᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ - ᓄᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ
ᓄᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ ᓂᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ - ᓄᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ
ᓴᓕᓗᓯ ᓂᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ - ᓄᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ
ᓴᓕᓗᓯ ᓂᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ - ᓄᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ
ᓴᓕᓗᓯ ᓂᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ - ᓄᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ
ᓴᓕᓗᓯ ᓂᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ - ᓄᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ
ᓴᓕᓗᓯ ᓂᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ

1. Opening of the meeting

The meeting was called to order at 7:06 pm, and opened with a prayer.

1. ᓆᓕᓕᓱᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ ᓄᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ

ᓴᓕᓗᓯ ᓂᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ ᓄᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ 7:03ᓴᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ, ᓴᓕᓗᓯ ᓂᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ ᓄᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ.

ᓴ. Introduction

We all call our names to make sure we are there.

2. ᓴᓴᓴᓴ

ᓴᓴᓴᓴ ᓴᓴᓴᓴ ᓄᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ ᓴᓴᓴᓴ ᓴᓴᓴᓴ ᓄᓄᓯᓂᓪᓗᓯ.

3. IIBA Summary for Baffin Communities Draft 2 June 24, 2011

- can they provide country food for the family left behind since the only hunter went to work?

- can they open up a little store for cig, pop, etc... since when I was in Bio and most of them wanted pop and cig there it would be great if there is a little store there.

- training on the job and training for mining, about 500 jobs, 106 different jobs, 1500 jobs for about 20 to 30 years, if they can get a promotion for what they are doing up to management it would be a good opportunity to further themselves. Example when they are working for 2 to 3 years, get further.

- contracting and get involved in community before it is starting and look for someone who can do the work instead of getting workers from the south. If Baffinland is going to plan alone, they

should work with the Community Economic Development Officer. And not wait start with this sooner.

- It was mentioned that they have told Arctic College what the jobs will be. They have to use the government and college.

- they should get a website

-IQ who is it for? For the Inuit or white people? We Inuit already know what it is and white people have to learn the IQ, they have to know what we Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit.

- If there is going to be IQ in ten years there it will be great, since they will not be working till they go to bed. There should be something that can give them time to do IQ like set up an open area for IQ since if they're just going to work there they will live like white people. At least a culture program.

- I have seen on TV Indian People are millionaires at the Labrador area. We can get more information from them since they have completed their mine and we can get more ideas what they did before.

- they will try and protect the land, and give us full story of what they are doing, and ask for people to join them . When the shipping starts. It says in the summary they are going to start and IIBA will be planning too. QIA will join the ship to see the sea that they will use. It would be nice if we can have a say on our concern and ask them to do this and that. Maybe in English it's monitoring, I think it's stated like that and that has to be included. It has to be in mitigation. We have to put more on the IIBA planning and we have to work hard for this.

- ship will go here without any loads for checking the sea that they will use and see the animals to check if it has no animals. It is a very good question. In 2005 Baffinland was collecting concerns and we have to have more concerns or DFO and DOE can give us an update on how much animals there are in that area.

- we don't get ships in winter time and when the ship starts its going to run whole year long even on winter time. They have to come here in wintertime and see for themselves.

- it say we can even stay at the Melville and get gas from them. Research and Development since they are going to keep looking for more and if they find more minerals than iron, like gold they will do a lot more. It's going to be like Nanisivik, families will be there. And alcohol and drugs will be involved, I know it says no drugs and alcohol but when they get home they will have money to spend and that has to be looked at too.

- I know we have to put more on what has to be listed and they will say we have social worker, RCMP, etc... but we have to look in to this too. QIA has a plan if they ever shut down QIA will do the cleaning. They want to start 15 years of delivering iron to Steensby. They want to start planning. We have told them and we are still going to and if you don't want our plan go ahead and stop since we did not tell you to take the iron. We have to keep trying to do what we want too. We have to keep reminding them that we did not invite them to get the iron.

– Igloodik has had training on drilling course, why did Hall Beach not have any drilling course. We don't want to be just labourers.

4. Site tour to Mary River

– we will pick you up 8:00 am

5. Adjournment

Meeting closed at 8:30

Ref HB-0727: Hall Beach Site Tour – QIA Notes (July 27)

27 July 2011

Hall Beach Mary River Project Committee – Mary River Site Tour

Notes prepared by Cheryl Wray and Solomon Awa

Participants:

- David McCann, Cliff Pilgrim, Kirk Keller – BIM
- Cheryl Wray – QIA
- Solomon Awa – QIA
- Jaypeetee Audlakiak – Committee Member
- Solomon Qanatsiaq – Committee Member
- Abraham Qammaniq – Committee Member
- Jopie Kaerneq – Committee Member
- Alice Saqpina – Committee Member
- Lizzie Philip-Qanatsiaq – Committee Member
- Luba Nungmalik – Committee Member/Manager of HTO

The group departed for Mary River at 8:30 am. En route, committee members toured the Alternate Route (Nuvuiit Peninsula), as described in Section 12, Page 142, Volume 3 of the DEIS. The topography in this area is very hilly. The plane flew approximately half the route and then went directly to Mary River due to time constraints. The group arrived in Mary River and received a brief Site Orientation and orientation to the Project. Points discussed during the overview of the Project were:

- The massive scale of the Project.
- Review of Milne Inlet – Infrastructure will include fuel storage and a floating barge. It will be used as a construction staging area and freight will be shipped to Milne Inlet and then trucked to Mary River.
- The existing fuel bladders will be removed from Milne Inlet and replaced by a 5 million liter tank. During construction, 40 million liters of fuel will be stored at Milne Inlet.
- Review of Mary River Infrastructure will include an open pit, waste rock storage, a crusher area where trains will be loaded, and a camp. The Project footprint was minimized in the design phase. Project activities include blasting, mining and a crushing operation. Water catchments may be required around the open pit and waste rock storage, although iron is inert. BIM doesn't expect to have to treat contact run off but if required, they are prepared to do so. Collection and settling ponds are part of the water management system if required.
- Overview of Steensby Inlet – Islands will be utilized as an ore stockpile area, including a dock for two ships. There will be a freight dock, airstrip, camps, sewage ponds, fuel storage, etc. at the port location.
- Overview of Milne Inlet, Mary River and Steensby Inlet maps were conducted.
- Review of preconstruction staging maps – The plan is to position camps during pre-staging activities and occupy them when construction begins.

Questions included:

1. Committee: Will ships come into Milne during the winter?
 - BIM: No.
2. Committee: Will ships from Milne go back empty?
 - BIM: Hazardous materials are hauled back on ships but this is not a lot of material.
3. Committee: Will ballast water be required from Milne Inlet?
 - BIM: I think so.
4. Committee: Are people staying in the pre-staging camps right now?
 - BIM: No, these camps have not arrived on site yet. These camps will not be occupied until 2013 and will be trailer camps like Milne Inlet.

A tour of Mary River and Deposit 1 was conducted using pick-up trucks. Areas shown to the group were fuel storage areas, sewage treatment plant, sewage ponds, lay down areas, iron ore stockpile and the crusher area from the bulk sample, and the proposed start of the railway and deposit. The soapstone quarry near Deposit 2 was also pointed out.

A tour of the proposed railway was conducted utilizing two helicopters. The helicopters flew the entire route showing tunnel locations, port location and Steensby Islands where ore will be potentially stored and a dock where ships will be loaded. The flight back to Mary River was direct (shortest flight line) using the flight path north of rail route. Question asked:

5. Committee: Will construction camps along the route be temporary?
 - QIA: Yes, they are temporary.

The group boarded the plane to Milne Inlet and flew along the tote road so that committee members could observe the road. On the ground, a brief tour of Milne Inlet was conducted. Iron ore stockpiles were observed as well as the bladder fuel farm that will be decommissioned. Committee members were encouraged to ask questions about what they have observed so far. Question included:

6. Committee: Will remaining ore be shipped out?
 - BIM: Yes.
- A committee member thanked BIM for the opportunity to see the proposed sites as they have never done this before. The member knows that their children need to live in modern society that includes making money and realizes that younger generations need work.
 - The BIM representative stated that the Company would like to hire from all North Baffin communities and if it were possible they would run the entire mine using employees from North Baffin as it makes logistical sense. The Company needs to work on training and employment opportunities.

The second alternate route (Rowley River, as described in Section 11 of the DEIS) was flown on the way back to Hall Beach.

The Committee returned to Hall Beach at approximately 8 pm.

Member – when the employees start, the families will be left behind and the employees will leave their hunting. We sure will lose a lot of hunters. And there will be a lot of changes.

Member – we will also have to open a little store that sells pop, cigarettes, etc... campers in sites really like that.

Member – when will it start?

Member – if we cannot get them to move the railroad we will have to try harder. And if they don't like what we want just tell them to leave. And we should get money from them every year for using our land.

Member – seems like they are not hearing us they are trying to plan.

Member – we can move them and its possible. We have to get a paper and lock that land, get it restricted and get help from QIA.

Member – a person who is going to work should go take a pee test before they go to work.

3. Adjournment

Meeting closed at 3:45

Member – When Baffinland started it said that locals from Hall Beach were going to work there too and when it first started a few people worked. And when the people who worked there tried to apply there to work again but no one hired them. There are no Hall Beach local people working there.

BIMC – once IIBA starts we are going to hire more local people, its in the agreement. We are just planning stage, once we started we are going to hire more of the local people from Hall Beach, Igloolik, Pond Inlet, and other communities that are affected.

Member - Did you guys get CLO?

BIMC – I am new to this and I am still trying to get CLO's from Clyde, Arctic Bay, and Hall Beach.

Member – Port, are you guys going to look at the port? We do not like the plan that is going to be a ship port.

BIMC – We just had a letter from Okalik, also from the Mayors from Hall Beach, Igloolik, and Pond Inlet. We have to talk about this.

Member – what would you do if your pigs were going to be impacted? That is my question what would you do if your food is going to be damaged? If Mary River mine starts its not stopping and they are going to be there for long. Also we don't get to hear anything, just last minute, you guys need a CLO. On new things when we start things we don't know each other we have to get to know each other. We don't want it to be at the port that you guys are planning and we can protest.

Member – If you guys start and the port is not good enough you guys will have to make another one. If we are working together work with the Inuit we can plan this well.

BIMC – what do you guys want to see in Hall Beach?

Member – We like to be notified more so we can know what you guys are doing. That way we can be part of it.

Member – when Baffinland started a few of our local people were working and when it stop no one from Hall Beach has worked. It's been two years and no one from Hall Beach. Why are we even accepting what you want when you guys are not even hiring locals from here for 2 years. We can just disapprove everything since you guys are not even helping our locals.

Meeting adjourned at 6:03 pm

QIA – Since Iron is so heavy the dust will just drop to the ground.

Member – The impact will be small but once its start it's going to run for 20 years non-stop and there is going to be a lot of dust and the containers will have no lids.

Member – I was in Foxe 3 this summer and when the trucker started driving there was a lot of dust even with no winds; 250 m away in this package is not true.

QIA – Mary River's land is not flat and when the snow melts the dust will just drain away and the iron dust will just drain away to the lakes where there is fish, and not just the iron dust all the other dust too. It will also rain and that will drain to the lakes and rivers.

Member – it will impact the great lake of Angijujualuk since that lake has river to Ikpikutjuk, Tariuja, and from there to Milne Inlet, to Arctic Bay Ocean, and to the Iqalugasukvik.

QIA – we have to save that Angijujualuk lake.

Member – we will have to agree on how often are they going to monitor the microscopic bugs.

Member – They just want to get approved without further information.

QIA – This was mentioned that it has too much mercury they don't have to eat it.

2. b Noise and Vibration

QIA – All the noise explosives, train, hunters, traveler, plane, etc.. how can we make less noise, I know for the train we cannot control the noise. Also the train will have no lid because its going to take time, more hours to do it. There are going to be 100 train cars.

2c. Caribou

Member – they are saying they can stop if they saw a lot of caribou and how many is a lot it might be few for them but to us it would be a lot since we don't have a lot of caribou. And if they say there are not enough and it will just cost them to stop. And once they started they have to keep going non-stop. We have to set how many for them to stop the train once they start we will not have a say stopping them.

Member – In Qikiqtaaluk tajuat (pack of caribou) they use the same track when they start walking, we can watch them all day up to two days. And once they stop for eat and start walking again you can even feel the vibration.

Member – Caribou are very sensitive (scared easily) when we have not much caribou. I am asking how many is a lot when we have not much caribou? I went to Agmaluqtu by Honda this summer and since we have helicopters all summer long we cannot even see the caribou there. So if you see how many caribou can you guys stop? Since the train is right on the tulit (caribou track).

Member – how long can you wait? How many hours can they wait? How long do they have patience if they are more ahead from the ships for a week worth of stocks it would take much income with the ship for unplanned stoppage.

QIA – They are saying about that they will use the fertilizer.

Member – Caribou can eat anything, at times they can eat lemming, fish and whatever when a lot are dying. One time when we were in Mary River one of the rabbits was eating right at the iron area. They will have to keep security around the iron sometimes they try and eat anything.

QIA – Question is can they put fences on the iron area and port at the where they collect iron like 10 miles from the workplace.

Member – If the animals are just going to eat from the iron area it is going to be dangerous, they will have to keep monitoring. This is for our future if we see something that has too much iron we will not want to eat it. We will have to teach our generations since animals is our food.

3a Climate Change

Member – When I was a young man our weather was really cold not like today. And there would be more ice on the ocean. There is a saying we will never see the winter in the future. Old ice are melting we don't see them as much and they don't rise from the bottom anymore due to climate change. Our animals will move to a colder place and for sure our animals will change. Since our ocean water will be warmer. And the ones with fur will have less fur in them.

QIA – Question – Is Mary River pollution is going to increase the climate change?

Member – when you are in south when its really hot you can see the wave of the hot air. Our land is never the same, at times we have lots of snow and at times we have less snow, we will have to keep an eye on this one.

3b Landforms, soils and permafrost.

Member – soil was studied and from the studies they are saying not much planting area and that in studies it says there is not much, not enough food for the animals. This is life in high arctic we live on what we have, we try and survive on what is there. And from the soil that is much under it is permafrost and it's not deep to dig it. And if they are going to dig deep they are going to impact it. If they are going to use the land to make the roads they will have to scrape it not dig it.

Member – I am going back to climate change when they do a study they use the pounce to check the pollution for green house emissions, since it will go to our air and how is it going to impact the permafrost I like to know how many inches permafrost is going to be less?

4a. Marine Habitat and Biota

QIA – how are they going to impact the marine habitat and biota, Ssteensby ports how is it going to be impacted since they are going to discharge the ballast water from supply vessels, and its going to change the ballast water overseas, and there will be 9 ships and they will be one and a half day apart and lineup, they will dump the ballast water right in Steensby. We are going to have different fish from overseas.

Member – microscopy bugs are different from our bugs and those will be dumped in our ocean.

Member – They will eat each other and its going everywhere here. And they will exchange ballast water in the natulas which is the most suruniqpaatauluni. And in imaviu qitiani and dump in New Found Land and the ballast water will be 200,000 cubic metres, total 21 million cubic metres.

Member – The ocean is different from our ocean we can call it ikiq, and this has been in all the comments the micro bugs and that is the only way they can get the money and it is kind a hard trying to figure this out to fix this.

QIA - And they are saying that they will have a clean water treating it but if they do they would kill our micro bugs, that is why they will have to dump the exchange ballast water not treating it. If they make an impact how are they going to replace it? They have kept saying they are going to give us money. This is in progress but how should they replace the marine.

Member – They are thinking of money. Through QIA we can make investment freezing meat for 25 years and show them, this is how you make our food different and then they can give us food money. This is our chance to make things happen.

Member – We cannot make a difference to ballast water, we will have to agree on something from each other. This has been in all the comments about the impact of our ocean.

Member – Ships propellers will make the water dam and it will kill all the micro bugs and it will make impact right away and the micro bugs will die right away and the ones who eat micro will eventually die due to lack of food. They might have more food but it will make an impact on our food like seal will have different fur from the impact. They will be something that we don't even think of will have an impact.

Member – In Canada when St. Lawrence River was first a main ship area they had fish now it has no fish and there are a lot of zebra mussels. We know when new marine species are new in the area their population increase fast. And that is scary. Since we live here we don't want them here. For sure they will make a big impact. And it's not even in this how they will make impact. And if they try cleaning it will be full from that. In Arctic Bay they have said that in Nanisivik seals liver was damage from the ships going back and forth. We have to use the information and protect our ocean I would want them to use a different path.

Member – whole year long that island has ducks now. It going to impact from the dust and ice that they are breaking, is the seal pups are going to be impact, that is why we are trying to move the port for the discharge of the ballast water to the ocean. If they move it there will be less impact and it will be safer too.

4b Marine Mammals

QIA – ringed seal, walrus, beluga whale, narwhal, bowhead whale. And polar bear. They don't mention bearded seal and harp seal.

Member – walrus food, clams, they will be impacted. Here are other walrus food kukiujait, and unigqlaanguat. They don't come up to breathe but they have gills so they breathe in the ocean. And they must eat from the micro bugs so they can live. What does unigqlaanguat eat? Also plants on the ocean like kuani, iquuti, qajailu. In studies it says there is not much mammals and since it's in that study we cannot even take it off. We had a general meeting and most of them did not even know that area and in Hall Beach they say it was like that at that time. But it has a lot of walrus if you go now you would see a lot of walrus in isuqtuq right to kangiqluujua. It always has walrus whole year long. And it has there own walrus and they taste better.

Member – our seals tasted like ugaqs but now they don't even taste like ugaq.

Member – beluga has their road and if they will follow the ships we will have beluga.

Member – studies that are in papers are not right. So it would be great if one of the Inuit is going to join the studies with the impact. We both like to know all the Impact Mary River and us Inuit. The Mary River will do the studies and it would be great if the local from the community do the study too. Both of them would know more.

Member – I think it would be great if QIA start this taking pictures. Since if I am at the camp and taking pictures I am not going to share my pictures with anyone else. If someone once to see they have to go to the camp and look at the land itself. If QIA has now picture of our land they can say this to the new mining company and say this is what we have and prove them that this is what the impact last mining did. We can show them how mining can impact us.

Member – That ocean has everything beluga, bearded seal, walrus. Those mammals food will be impacted and when they eat their food and we are going to eat them it will go to us.

4c Marine Water and Sediment Quality

Member – If the port is not deep enough they will use the explosions to make it deep. They will have to study it first to check what marine is in there. And to make sure our mammals food is not there.

Member – They are saying they are going to use the less noise for explosive, the one make bubbles, but that will still make an impact on our micro.

4d Migratory Birds and Habitat

Member – Within 25 years I still like to eat eggs our bird eggs. I like a fresh ones right from the ground. All of the birds will be impacted.

Member – There are lots of different kinds of eggs, it has a lot of ducks, geese, and imiquitailaqs. And there are few islands there. And beyond Nuvuit there are pitiulaa.

Member – We use to have a lot of imiqutailaq around here when Hondas are now driving everywhere around us there is nothing at all.

4e Sea Ice

QIA – my only question is stable ice and moving ice.

Member – I am going to say this moving ice never stops and in salliq and qaggiuja it has a really small space. When the ice form it is really rough. It stays there for a little bit but that area has one spot moving ice. In salliq ice breaks and stable ice. If they are going to be in Steensby they will some dangerous place for birthing seals. That area is a big seal birthing area. If they move they will be in a less moving ice.

Member – flow edge is not far. If the ship is going back and forth while it is forming ice. The ice will keep move away when the whole ice move away sooner. Our ice kept moving one time in December we had no ice when the ice move away. It will impact us when ship is going back and forth and the route the ship use will never form ice.

Member – Over there is a mainland and it effects the Steensby and there is open water that keeps opening and in majuqtuli there is an open water. There are two main moving ice there.

Member – All of it will be impacted. They never thought of the full time and spring time when they do their report or studies. On studies they say when it has ice or no ice. And marine are still there. They will have to say when the ice first forms in January. Those in between seasons are not in the studies and they don't see them too.

Member – the ship route will form ice and in wintertime we get blizzard and blowing snow. And when that ships route is water they will not know if it's water or ice and it will look like ice when it's blowing snow or blizzard so we will lose some of our hunters for sure Igloodik hunters. Sikimiut had 3 accidents and when it happen 3 times they finally put down signs and make the bridge. It will happen to us since the ship is really big. The ship width is really big.

Member – Our hunters do not know the ships' routes and they will have to teach them on safety on ship route. And Baffinland will have to help us on search and rescue when our hunters are lost in the ice. If the Baffinland says it cost too much to move the port they will have to help us with the lost hunters with money since money is the problem we need help if our hunter is lost in the ice.

Member – It is the most painful for human to lose a family when they leave for hunting and coming back. One of the elder was saying she wanted to tell us something but couldn't because when she start talking she is going to just roll over on the floor crying. It is the most painful when the hunter leaves for hunting and never come back. This will have to be plan well.

5a Freshwater Biota and Habitat

Member – I can make you see something birthing not on ocean water. When you hold so many shrimp schism they just birth right at your hand. They can even birth not in ocean.

Member - For lakes train rail will keep dropping dust and they say it will not much impact for little dust but it's going to keep going back and forth for 21 years and it's going to pile up and that is why they will have to monitor the lake and fish to make sure how much iron is in the lake or fishes.

Member – They will impact a lot of things and I don't want to see the fish flowing.

QIA – The fishes will definitely flow on the lakes.

QIA – I have a question, we have concern on this too and kept saying this. Iron dust will it kill the fish from too much iron on the ice will they die from not breathing due to too much iron on the lakes. They have gills and breathe from the water. One time I shot a 22 to the lake and few of them died from it and flow on the water.

6. Draft Environmental and Social Impact Statement for the Proposed Mary River Project.
All of this is talking about the Social and we are going to try and talk about this in 15 mins

Member – We are going to start right at the bottom and it says we will go up while we are working, and I can see for sure at the end 90% of Inuit will be working it says they will do a training on the job and Inuit will be going up. I like to know who is going to look after this? QIA will have to start thinking about this and talk about the social issues.

QIA – it says to work you have to be 18 and up. School kids from high school 10, 11, 12 they have jobs on summer time, and it says you have to be 18 to work. I think we can ask the arctic college if they can start the course on explosive, and other things that are not in Nunavut.

We can get the ones for air breaks and heavy equipment operators.

And for big company they have rules and don't care about the family. No drugs and alcohol what so ever. If people start this they can just hire someone else the work is more important than the person. That is why we have to address this because once it's start they will not care for people who takes drugs and alcohol since they can just hire someone else. They will have a lot of employees and when hamlet makes \$9.00 they will say \$18.00 so hamlet will lose a lot of employees. Look at Yellowknife it is exactly like Mary River it is now a government place. It started like Mary River just a mining place. It will be like this to Mary River it might even start a community have church, stores, in this booklet starting at 6 we can still go back to this and talk about this.

When QIA executive went to Mary River to meet about the change to the port they found out that there was not even a study on the Railroad that they been trying to use. That is why two from here has to go there on the 17, 18, 19 to talk about this.

Member – Does Baffinland want to argue with only one from the community? It would show that if we all go we are more concerned on the railroad, all of the community has concern. And we are not going to back off.

Member – Families will fall apart and there are going to be some issues and how are we going to make this better? There will have to be a social worker here for them to go to. No one will ever say when they work for so long and when they come back and say here is the money I have been working you can go get some. That will never happen. 2 weeks in 2 weeks out is ok but they will want to work longer and that will be an issue. They will eventually live like white people and separated families.

Member – Things are expensive and when we want things we tend to work more to get that thing.

Member – The family will have to know the consequences that the employee will work this much and go back and forth and when families are like that there are some family issue. And they will have to understand that there will be issues.

Member – Since it's going to be a no alcohol they're going to gamble using cards and some of them will go home broke.

Member – If it's going to be just a work place Inuit will live like white people and lose their culture.

Member – Social is not easy once you understand it, it is easier. We all can change, in Mary River there has to be an Inuk who will be inspecting the employee. Also for second chances that has to be in the book because that person is a bad person but can work really well. And all of us can change to a better person.

Member read the 6 Community Infrastructure and Public Service, 7 Contracting and Business Opportunities, 8 Cultural Resources, 9 Resources and Land use, and 10 Cultural Well-being.

Member – If Mary River is going to be just a work place they will live like white people.

Member – Just being a work place it's going to make a lot of money and for youth they will keep showing up they will bring only good things.

Member – Since we Inuit have no money by contracting we will lose a lot. And there would be an Inuk who can do this but since White people have more paper knowledge it will be white people.

Member – start reading the 11 Benefits, Royalty and Taxation, 12 Government and Leadership and Cumulative Effects Assessment

QIA – what did you notice?

Member – from the start they have mention that zero tolerance alcohol, and when it involves no seconded chances. We will have to represent them since we can change.

Member – The population of Baffinland Inuit will be not much and the impact for bad thing will be there. Mother, father will want to move to a bigger place and that this was not even thought of. Spouse and kids know that they are not coming back. And that will Impact big time they will

have a big family problem. Breaking up families. Does white people from Baffinland break up they don't greive? In Nunavut we are only about 30,000. If we want our grand kids and great grand kids to have a good life we have to work hard on this. I have separated with my spouse and it is really hard on life. Does business people don't think of these??

QIA – If IIBA is going to be taken from QIA this will not matter.

Member – Employee's family will have to be notified that they will live alone for a long time looking after kids and all. And the impact will be less if we do this.

Member – how can government plan for this and be part of it on training and social? Now a days there are a lot of mining going on. And looking at the impact are not going to be small. We now have to plan for this big time.

Member – hamlet employees are not saying if it's going to be a better pay I am going to move there.

Member – Training our Economic Development Officer should work on this. I think it's better if QIA looks after this, I think CLO can do this since our EDO is not doing anything. Or even if our GLO looks after this. We now have to plan for this

Member – In our community we now have to do some training I don't want to see just laborer who just pick up garbage.

Member – they are trying to get better things for our community. there are a lot of people who cannot speak English and my grand kids don't want to go to school now. my question is how can we improve this? How can we make this important? We should try and give the white people to learn Inuktitut.

Member – Here in Hall Beach Education is very low even graduates cannot even read in English. They get diploma saying they are graduate and yet they don't meet the qualification. I think our teachers are not doing a great job on this.

Member – it's both language they cannot even do Inuktitut I am an Inuktitut and I know they speak it very well they cannot even write and read. We have to teach them how to read now as a parent even the bibles at least if they learn something.

Member – Contract in English is not good too we Inuit don't know English and we are going to be left out because we cannot speak English or write. I so thought I can make 76,000.00 per year for the job was open I tried it but it was already taken. We Inuit don't read much and I did not know until the job was filled. So I lost that job over French men. We can now think about the employees who are going to work for so long. If it's not going to be a community and be just a work place my kids, grand kids right to my spouse will be impact. If it's possible it will be great for the full time employees if the family can go there. Me and Abraham has a spouse who is spoiled, and if we smile at someone there are going to jealous and some people are beyond this over time. And there are a lot of people who has a brain damage from smoking drugs. Our drug users get really mad at over little things and make it a big deal. And they think this is now life

and they don't even do it privately. And they just leave it because our ladies sometime want to be the only one to be looked at.

Member – Which way is it going to use less money, our government will do a lot of work. Since Baffinland is going to give them money for the impact. Is it going to be enough??? Since government will have a lot of over time. For Hall Beach and seven affected communities there is not enough money. We don't plan when we are going to argue as a family it just happen. Maybe if Mary River becomes a community they will use less money on our communities from medivac's, social worker, cops, etc....

Member – These will have to be planned all the things that will be impacts. When I get a lot of money while I am working, when I was working there I was not in a fight with family those will come up to the person.

Member – The things we do in our life are hard to do and some don't effect as much, but we get to have these meetings on this and when we do we talked about these and we add something that are not in studies and that is not even being thought of. We just have to keep telling them our concerns because it will make a difference to our generations. We thought of this we are from arctic but we can still make mistakes. We have to keep an eye on these who people never come to arctic sometimes try and make money when they are end of their work, we will have nothing no animals if they don't do it right. We are doing this to our generation to make sure they will have something.

QIA – Money will be divided to Government, NTI, and QIA and the money that goes to QIA will be for Inuit. Inuit will do whatever they want to do. QIA directors will make a motion for 7 affected communities, and much of the money will be used for social issues. And this has been issue the social worker in Mary River that might be a use for the money they gave us. And also for educational purposes like some of the communities don't have a lot, so it can be use for education. And for NTI it will be used for hunters, but what if we don't have any more food? How can they replace our food? Baffinland will not be looking after social stuff it is just going to be a work place.

Member – we are 7 communities that are going to be affected. Is the money that is going to be given to use going to be enough? We want more on hunting, we are going to have problems and we use these problems are not cheep. Is it going to be enough or is it going to be gone for the problems? Hunters will not hunt there and ladies won't sew there. I think we will use up all the money on impacts since we are 7 communities. The money going to us is going to be too small. The one that is going to be given to government is going to be too small we are going to use it up in 6 months we are going to use a lot of money on government. If they are going to give us money to the government it is too small. We are not going to fix their life.

Contract will have to be notified more in Inuktitut and keep it in Baffinland, Nunavut, Canada. We just heard that one of our Inuit lost the job over French. In Nunavut 30,000 people, we like to know who is going to be the first to know?

Member – we can still get more information on this by radio, and internet. We live in arctic and sometime we don't have enough information given out. How can we inform more information to our communities. When we don't have communication it is not good. How can we make our communications stronger by giving Nunavut more job? But we have a person from Igloodik who

is looking after Igloolik and Hall Beach and here we don't have radio that is active and we don't get the information that we need. We need a CLO for Baffinland in Hall Beach.

Member – In this booklet there is no health risk. When it hits the Nunavut it spreads right away and if the white man bring sickness it will spread the sickness. Potential effects, health studies is not here.

Member – 9 ships will bring something that is going to be from overseas. The question is are they going to have customs for entering Canada?

Member – This is news two people were in this ship. One said that in Pond Inlet they notice that there is not much animals around there and they notice that someone has put something on the ocean that something scares the animals and move away. And that is not good.

Member – DFO does not even know about this because they are doing it privately. And Baffinland says they don't know. But they found out it was Baffinlands. 2 years ago Pond Inlet hunter was with the Baffinland and they did not know who he was and showed them the thing that they put in the ocean. At the Milne Inlet. We from the arctic don't have equipment but from our Inuit knowledge we can find out what it is and we have to have concern about it.

Member – QIA and Baffinland need a new interpreter because ours has very good thoughts and we need him as an committee when he is interpreter he shut his mouth and do his job. I don't want to say when I am an elder and say we told you so. We know there is going to be a big impact.

Meeting adjorn at 9:30 pm

Mary River Project Committee Meeting Minutes
ᓄᓗᓖᓕᓴᓕᓖᓖᓐᓔᓐ ᑲᑲᑲᓖᓐᓕᓖᓐᓔᓐ ᑲᑲᑲᓖᓐᓔᓐᓖᓐᓕᓖᓐ

Sept 27,, 2011
ᓖᑲᑲᓐ 27, 2011

Present

Solomon Qanatsiaq – Chair	ᐅᐸᓖᓐᓔ
Abraham Qammaniq – Vice Chair	ᑲᓕᓕᓐ ᓖᑲᓐᓕᑲᑲᓐ - ᐅᑲᓖᓐᓔᓖᓐ
Alice Saqpina – Committee	ᐸᐅᓕᓕᓐᓔ ᓖᑲᓐᓔᓖᓐ - ᐅᑲᓖᓐᓔᓖᓐ ᐅᑲᓕᓔ
Deborah Qanatsiaq – Committee	ᐸᓕᓖᓐ ᓖᓖᓐᓐ - ᑲᑲᑲᓖᓐ
Jopie Kaernerker – Hamlet member	ᑲᑲᓖᓐ ᓖᑲᓐᓕᑲᓖᓐ - ᑲᑲᑲᓖᓐ
Jaypeetee Audlakiak – QIA Director	ᓖᑲᓐ ᓖᑲᓐᓔᓖᓐ - ᑲᑲᑲᓖᓐᓔᓖᓐᓔᓖᓐᓔᓖᓐ
Lizzie Phillip-Qanatsiaq – CLO	ᓖᓖᓖᓐ ᓐᓔᓖᓐ - ᓖᑲᓐᓕᑲᓖᓐ ᐅᑲᐅᑲᓐᓔᓖᓐ

Absent:

David Kanatsiak – CLARC member at other meeting	ᐅᐸᓖᓐᓔ: ᐸᐅᓖᓐ ᓖᑲᓐᓕᑲᓖᓐ - ᓄᓐᓔᓖᓐᓔᓖᓐᓔᓖᓐᓔᓖᓐᓔᓖᓐᓔᓖᓐ ᐸᓖᓖᓐ ᑲᑲᑲᓖᓐ
---	--

1. Opening of the meeting

The meeting was called to order @ 7:03pm, and opened with a prayer.

2. Sept 15, 2011 Executive Summary

Committee Member – started with the community tour he went on with the executive. And started reading the executive summary introduction, Regulatory and Engineering 1 to 4, Aquatic Environment (freshwater and marine) 1 to 3, Freshwater 1 to 2 , Marine 1 to 9, and Terrestrial Environment 1 to 12.

Member – while we are on Caribou, back then we use to walk around the ground to look for caribou and if caribou's can smell our tracks even if does not show. And with dogs same thing, if caribou was here dog can follow the tracks by smelling it. And in studies they did not do it like that. Dogs can track fresh tracks that caribou walked on. The dust will block the tracks for caribou.

Member – and when we have not much caribou around caribou get scared easily so it will be a big pack, also Pond Inlet are being block from this.

Member – Before we get a lot of Caribou we are going to be blocked from the railroad. We will have to get them advice to do more studies, we are not just saying because caribou is our food and the store bought are very expensive. We have to talk with them about the land. On fox 3 there was caribou but they never came here.

በኋላ - ወይንሊክሩ ለምሳሌ? የሌላውም አይደለም? ወይም በጋራ ሲባል ለምሳሌ ሌሊት
አይደለም - ወይንሊክሩ የደረሰው ወይም ሌላውም የሌላውም አይደለም ወይም ሌላውም
ይሆናል፡፡ ሌላውም የሌላውም ሌላውም ይሆናል ሌላውም የሌላውም አይደለም፡፡

በኋላ - ሌላውም የሌላውም ወይንሊክሩ ለምሳሌ ሌላውም የሌላውም አይደለም፡፡

3. ሌላውም የሌላውም አይደለም

ሌላውም ሌላውም 9:30 ሌላውም አይደለም

QIA COMMUNITY CONSULTATION NOTES

Ref QIA-0713a: Pond Inlet Consultation on Caribou and Terrestrial Impacts – QIA Notes (July 13-14)

13 and 14 July 2011
Pond Inlet, Nunavut

Pond Inlet Mary River Project Committee meeting with QIA Technical Advisor on the Terrestrial Environment

Summary notes by Kim Poole

Members present

13 July 2011 evening

- Jesse Nutarak Chairperson
- Mathias Qaunaq Vice Chairperson
- Cornelius Nutarak Member at Large
- Jayko Alooooloo Member at Large
- Caleb Sangoya HTO Representative
- Titus Arnakallak Interpreter/Translator
- Norman Koonoo Clerk Secretary
- Kim Poole QIA caribou biologist

14 July 2011 all day

- All of the above, and:
- James Atagootak Hamlet Representative
- Paniloo Sangoya Resident Elder

Following are general notes from the meeting. Detailed meeting minutes taken by Norman Koonoo follow (see Ref QIA-0713b).

Some main comments and points by topic:

Caribou distribution

- Caribou distribution is generally the same during the highs and lows of the cycle; caribou will come back to areas where they have been before;
- Caribou converge on the Milne Inlet area in the fall, but do not do so as much now because of the project;

- Caribou will be affected by the noise of the project (vehicles, aircraft and helicopters) and also smell and human footprints, and will leave the area; there was the suggestion that displacement will occur to at least a 2-5 mile radius;
- There are now fewer caribou in traditional areas since the project (exploration, development, and bulk sampling) has begun. There were lots of caribou in the Mary River area in the 1980s; these caribou have now moved somewhere else;
- Although caribou are often in elevated areas, they occur near lakes in the summer;
- An area ENE of A Lake (just beyond the edge of the caribou RSA) was identified as an area of caribou concentration;

Caribou calving

- Caribou calve in the mountains at higher elevation, likely to avoid mosquitoes and predators;
- Calving areas during the low in the cycle will be the same as areas used at higher densities;
- Mike Ferguson has done surveys in the past (likely referring to the mid-1990s surveys) that documented post-calving distribution in the mountains near Mary River;

Caribou migration

- Migration will be affected by the project, and has already changed as a result of project activities;
- The Steensby Inlet area has more migration through it (and thus more potential to be impacted) than the mine, Tote Road, and northern portion of the rail line areas;
- Migration is generally not mass migration (dispersal as I would define), but more back and forth regular migration;

Caribou use of islands in Steensby Inlet

- Igloodik/Hall Beach people will have more information;

Sensitivity to disturbance

- Caribou are more sensitive to disturbance and will run away more easily during low numbers than during high number;

Trains and rail bed

- There was concern whether the train would be able to stop in time if caribou are migrating through or are on the tracks;
- Blasting in the cliff area along Cockburn Lake will chase away the caribou;
- Caribou can travel in rugged conditions, but members worry about mortalities that could be caused by the trains (and also what would happen to the carcasses if mortalities did occur);
- There were differing opinions on whether the rail bed would make caribou turn back/deflect, or whether they would just cross over; there was consensus that the leader in a group had to cross over for the rest of the caribou to follow;

- Committee members preferred the thaw-sensitive rail bed design (wider more gentle slopes) compared with the regular ground rail bed (steeper, shorter slopes); I explained that most of the bed would be constructed of the regular bed (steeper slopes; large rock/boulder material), and only 10% of the bed would have “caribou-friendly” slopes (more gentle and with finer material top cover);

Impacts of dust

- There was general agreement that dust will impact the caribou (and likely migrating geese);
- Caribou have an oily spot on their feet in between the toes of their hooves that is sensitive to smell for locating food, therefore they may be able to detect and be influenced by snow with dust on it;
- Suggested that piles of ore need to be covered to minimize dust;

Wolves and carnivores

- Wolves may converge on the Mary River site because of the garbage and human waste;
- Carnivore numbers will decline with declines in caribou numbers;

Birds

- Birds of prey will be impacted the most among avian species because they are affected by the prey base;
- The mine should be accountable for damaging falcon nests (as would an individual if they tried to poach falcon eggs or destroy a falcon nest);
- Peregrines: could use close nests to the Project Development Areas (PDA) to monitor impacts;
- Concern over effects of potential oil spill on marine birds;
- Less concerned about terrestrial birds; small birds will adjust;

Fish

- Cockburn Lake has 3 species of fish, and the effects of blasting on this lake in particular were a concern;

Exotic species

- There was a worry that exotic species (rats were mentioned) would come in on ships and cargo;

Monitoring

- There was a call for continuing monitoring of caribou and other wildlife (including fish, marine mammals) as the mine begins, including construction;
- Pond Inlet wants to be directly involved in the monitoring, and liked the idea about a monitoring agency to oversee the project;
- No aerial surveys should be conducted for caribou monitoring, but there were no ideas of how monitoring could effectively occur;

- The Committee wanted a monitor on site at all times to, among other things, monitor that rules about aircraft flight heights and disturbance are followed; this monitor should be around when the rail road was being constructed as well;

Compensation

- There was frequent discussion that Pond Inlet, the community that will be most directly affected and impacted by the project, should receive annual compensation or royalties from the project, to for example make up for hunters having to travel further to get caribou;

Ref QIA-0713b: Pond Inlet Consultation on Caribou and Terrestrial Impacts – Meeting Minutes (July 13-14)

**Pond Inlet Mary River Project Review Committee
Meeting minutes at Parish Hall
July 13, 2011, 7:00pm**

Members Present

Jesse Nutarak	Chairperson
Mathias Qaunaq	Vice Chairperson
Caleb Sangoya	MHTO representative
Jayko Aooloo	Member at Large
Cornelius Nutarak	Member at Large

Members Absent

James Atagootak	Hamlet of Pond Inlet representative (Without cause)
-----------------	---

Minutes Recorder

Norman Koonoo	Clerk Secretary
---------------	-----------------

Delegate QIA Wildlife Biologist Consultant

Kim Poole

Interpreter/Translator

Titus Arnakallak

4. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 7:09 pm, and opened with a prayer. The Chairperson welcomed all members, the recorder, and the QIA delegate who is here to talk about the Mary River Project.

QIA Delegate: was at Mary River site last year. He wants to learn Pond Inlet's concerns and to ensure concerns are addressed. The purpose of the meeting is to gather information regarding caribou near Mary River.

Member: raises a concern about calving areas not being on the discussion paper?

QIA Delegate: acknowledges this and informs the member that information is available and the department is aware of the certain calving grounds. The Company is aware of calving areas and is concerned but they are not doing enough.

Member: is concerned this will impact caribou areas when there is development on their habitat. Specifically movement of dust will affect their habitat.

Member: Welcomes the delegate and wants clarification or proper introductions be made around the table to ensure everyone is aware who is attending and who they are representing.

QIA Delegate: is here to listen and gather any information in regards to Mary River Project.

Requests that the Hamlet of Pond Inlet representative attend the next meeting.

Member: raises concerns stating that they have not worked with Government of Nunavut.

QIA Delegate: acknowledged that it has been difficult to deal with the Government of Nunavut.

Member: indicates that there are now three committees concerned with the Mary River project, the GN, Baffinland (Pisiksiit working group) and this review committee and wants more co-operation between the committees to gather relevant information on caribou behavior and habitat.

Member: wants to ensure full community consultation and Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit to be more fully implemented since they have first hand knowledge of caribou areas.

QIA Delegate: QIA wishes to emphasize any problems that may arise further in the development process and ensure that concerns are addressed and assessed in the early stages.

QIA Delegate: informed the committee about the Milne Inlet road and the plans to utilize it for the four year construction stage of the proposed mine. The mine promises it will use the road less, once the mine is in operation and it will likely only be used in the winter to move extra-large cargo to and from the project site.

Member: wishes to try and change the railway line as it is directly in the caribou country and wants committee to look into this.

QIA Delegate: QIA also wants information on caribou in Steensby Inlet and how the Islands are used by caribou in the wintertime as ice breakers will be in the area.

Member: also notes that caribou migration routes have changed due to climate change and is concerned that the railway will impact migration routes.

QIA Delegate: differences in movements and migrations to be assessed on tomorrow's agenda.

Ten (10) minute break at 8:08 pm (translator breather)

Member: wants data from the Government of Nunavut concerning radio collars and tracking information and also requests elder representation.

QIA Delegate: QIA wants clarification on caribou population around North Baffin and any distinctions there may be in the herds.

Member: Discusses the different caribou herds and the difference in their populations, behavior and migration patterns.

Impacts of dust on caribou and the effects it may have on caribou health and population.

Member: raises concerns about radioactivity or toxic levels and the impact it may have nearby caribou.

Questions put forward to the committee regarding the spin offs/trade offs to having a mine in the area and how the committee feels about this. Is it worth losing or having the caribou moved further away?

Committee: agrees discussions are needed to ensure a smooth transition in the development of the mine.

Compensation issues will have to be addressed.

QIA Delegate: QIA wants information on whether caribou behavior is different if they have high or low levels in population?

Member: notes that there has already been a change in the caribou habitat since the development of the Mary River mine project has begun, and continues to change, and that caribou have moved to different locations.

Member: would also like to retrieve early reports concerning caribou location, migration and habitat, compare that information to current data.

Member: wishes to ensure this. It is felt that aerial surveys are insufficient for monitoring caribou and asks for alternate methods that could be less costly and more effective.

It is recommended that a letter be drafted to Hamlet council of Pond Inlet to include Hamlet council representation.

The meeting wrapped up at 8:59 pm. A request will be made for elder representation to in order to include Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit.

2. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:59 pm and will reconvene at 9:00 am July 14, 2011.

**Pond Inlet Mary River Project Review Committee
Meeting minutes at Parish Hall
July 14, 2011 9:00pm**

Members Present

Jesse Nutarak	Chairperson
Mathias Qaunaq	Vice Chairperson
Caleb Sangoya	MHTO representative
Jayko Alooooloo	Member at Large
Cornelius Nutarak	Member at Large
James Atagootak	Hamlet of Pond Inlet representative

Elder

Paniloo Sangoya

Minutes Recorder

Norman Koonoo Minutes recorder

Delegate QIA Wildlife Biologist Consultant

Kim Poole

Interpreter

Titus Arnakallak

5. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 9:25 am, and opened with a prayer. All attendees were welcomed. The Hamlet Council representative was introduced, as well as the resident Elder, who will provide us with Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit concerning caribou.

QIA Delegate: clarifies the purpose of the meeting and his position with QIA. He requests further input from the committee with more detailed information and presents a few topics for discussion.

Member: raises concerns about the lack of information being provided by the GN. It is noted that despite the committee's efforts there have been no meetings with the GN in matters dealing with caribou behavior.

It is acknowledged that there needs to be a better working relationship between the committee and the GN Biologist.

Elder notes that the Mary River area is a previous calving ground for caribou and states they generally calve in higher grounds.

Member: briefly discusses caribou behavior during different times of the year and how they follow the winds during different seasons.

QIA Delegate: requests clarification on caribou behavior and asks if changes have occurred upon the development of Mary River mine site?

It is believed that caribou have in fact started moving elsewhere since the creation of the Mary River project.

Member: agrees that the caribou have moved significantly since the start of the Mary River project.

Elder: confirms that wildlife species tend to move away from development especially when they are low in numbers. It is also believed that although some species will originally move back to their calving grounds, it is also understood that caribou will move away from development.

Members agree that caribou population levels have significantly reduced as recently as 2007/08 where major development of the mine has begun.

Break for ten (10) minutes at 10:00am.

There is no clear indication as to how the caribou will respond to dust movement in the area. Committee feels that a radius of at least 20-30 miles will be free from caribou.

It is also noted that seagulls in the area have moved and are now rarely seen around the proposed Mary River mine site.

Member asks about the caribou situation around Baker Lake Uranium mine? It is believed that caribou in that area have also started moving?

Concerns are also raised in regards to low level flying within the mine site and surrounding areas.

Member: replies to the inquiry concerning Baker Lake caribou herds. It is indicated that caribou have moved away from the mine site and are now seen more within the community.

Member insists on full compliance with regulatory processes by all parties concerned.

Size and scope of the Mine operations are raised and discussed.

Monitoring has to be discussed and applied more diligently.

Member: notes that impacts will certainly be felt not just concerning caribou but with other wildlife as well. There will be other impacts such as the local economy and the social well being of the community. It is generally understood that the community of Pond Inlet will have the highest impact from the project. Focus will be needed to address concerns raised by the committee regarding the protection of wildlife around Pond Inlet.

Elder: informs the committee of a recent meeting held between the Tununiq Sauniq Co-operative Ltd and Chamber of Mines and the T.S. co-op will publicly inform the community on the development of it's meetings.

Calving migration, disturbance, dust movement, the railroad.

Calving grounds, migration and movement differences.

Member: wishes to discuss calving grounds and states that any high ground can be used as calving grounds if caribou populate the areas.

It is also noted that caribou tend to move to higher grounds during the warmer mosquito season.

Question: how the wolf population may impact the caribou within the mine site and surrounding areas?

Member: implies that proper food storage will minimize interaction with wolves. Food waste disposal will have to be monitored and properly contained in order to prevent unwelcomed wolves or foxes.

It is indicated that since wolves prey on caribou that wolves will also disappear or move with the caribou.

Committee: also states that there has been a drop in other wildlife populations such as foxes, lemmings and Arctic hare.

Member: feels that wolves will follow the caribou and will move away from the development.

Lunch break 12:00pm

Meeting resumes again at 1:15pm

Proposed railroad concerns; known calving grounds near Mary River lake located on the higher grounds.

Tay Sound Area is a known calving ground or calves have been seen there. It is believed that calving grounds will move to isolated areas away from any human activities.

Location and route of the proposed railroad was presented to committee, explaining railway features that will include approximately ten percent (10%) for caribou crossings and where people, snowmobiles or ATVs can cross.

Member: raises concerns re: caribou on the railway track around slopes and alongside rock walls where there is potential for caribou to be run over by the trains.

Concerns are also raised that railroad tracks will hinder caribou in their migration routes.

Clarification provided on the design of the tracks.

Reference to Prudhoe Bay Alaska pipeline was brought forward and research has shown that the caribou generally avoid the pipeline and it has had an impact in their herds. It is argued that caribou have habituated while others think it isn't so. Will caribou in this area respond similarly?

Issues such as caribou carcasses found on railroad tracks need to be addressed and this committee can request full community consultation on measures regarding removal of caribou carcasses.

This committee is keenly aware of the effects the mine will have on caribou populations. Observations include the inevitable relocation of caribou and calving grounds due to human activities.

IIBA issues discussed and it is recommended that compensation issues will have to be addressed and looked at closely.

Break at 2:05pm for ten (10) minutes.

Migration and Movement of Caribou

Seasonal movements of caribou observed and put forward. It is generally understood that caribou's main movements are usually spring and fall.

When may caribou use Steensby Inlet and the islands around Steensby Inlet? According to Igloodik residents, caribou often use that area. More accurate information can be obtained from Igloodik as they know the area more. Steensby Inlet/Islands are used more by Igloodik and Hall Beach resident hunters. It is indicated that caribou often stay in the Island near Steensby Inlet.

It is known that caribou will cross channels on the ice.

Predictions on caribou movements cannot accurately be made due to human activities and we do not know how the caribou will react to infrastructure, such as railroad tracks.

Other wildlife around the proposed mine site: it is indicated that there has also been a reduction in Arctic Hare populations around the Mary River mine project.

This committee feels strongly about Pond Inlet's full community consultation and it is given high priority as Pond Inlet is closest to the proposed mine site.

Birds

Potential impacts on bird species discussed.

Peregrine Falcons known to be in the area. How does this committee feel about the bird situation around the Mary River Mine project?

It is acknowledged that Peregrine Falcons are frequently seen in that area and the committee feels studies will be needed to monitor their numbers.

Human activities at the Mine site will definitely affect all species of wildlife in the surrounding areas and may move nesting areas used by birds.

Cycles in animal population numbers and movements have to be considered as this also affects human populations concerning the availability of country food.

It is observed that some species of birds have disappeared from the proposed mine site and that some nesting areas have moved.

Development of the proposed mine site will definitely impact the bird species and will reduce the number in the different animal species around the proposed mine site.

It is generally understood that all animals tend to move away from developed and noisy areas.

Member: suggests studies and tests be done on fish in surrounding lakes and how their numbers will be impacted.

Member: states his concerns regarding migration routes of snow geese noting that they have to fly over Mary River and how this may affect their migration routes.

Member: raises the concern about the caribou food quality. Recommendations put forward to continue monitoring food quality.

Issues of contaminations stated to be low by the Company?

It is assumed that once caribou are affected by contamination, they will be skinnier and this may affect food quality.

Recommendation: to continue monitoring all animals species around the proposed mine site annually.

Issues concerning the rules and regulations around bird species and fines to be paid by the appropriate parties that breach them.

Concern surrounding IIBA negotiating team brought forward and explained to committee.

Monitoring issues should be done on annual basis and this advisory committee should be consulted at all times.

Collaboration between local agencies is needed to ensure compliance with rules and regulations and to ensure co-operation between all relevant parties.

Community consultations are a high priority through out the whole process.

Traditional and cultural issues will also have to be observed.

Member: requests a representative be included from this advisory committee for the IIBA negotiating team.

Minutes of this meeting requested to be done before the workshops are being held in Iqaluit on August 8-12, 2011.

Terms of Reference are provided to familiarize the committee on its roles and responsibilities.

The QIA delegate thanked the committee for their valued input and for the review process.

It is suggested that monitoring be kept a high priority in all areas of development concerning the Mary River Mine Project.

Member: urges strong committee participation in all future meetings and workshops covering the Mary River Mine Project.

Data comparison needed to be observed from early studies of before and after development to review the impacts on surrounding wildlife.

Collaboration between all local agencies will ensure full community consultation and community input be listed as high priority.

Aircraft arrivals from Mary River and rotational flight should be more readily available and recommendations will have to be forwarded to Baffinland to provide current flight schedules for incoming and outgoing employees of the mine.

Polar bear monitors' responsibilities will have to be revised as suggested by member.

Committee thanked the QIA delegate for coming in to assist with the meeting and to gather information. Meeting adjourned at 4:08 pm by Chairperson Jesse Nutarak.

Ref QIA-0714a: Hall Beach/Igloolik Consultation on Marine Mammals and Shipping – QIA Notes (July 14-15)

14 and 15 July 2011
Igloolik, Nunavut

Hall Beach and Igloolik Mary River Project Committees meeting with QIA Technical Advisor on the Aquatic Environment

Meeting notes by Jeff Higdon

Meetings between the two community committees and the QIA Technical Team advisor took place at the HTO office in Igloolik on 14 and 15 July 2011. There were eleven participants:

Name	Affiliation
Abraham Qamaniq ¹	Hall Beach committee
Jopie Kaernerck	Hall Beach committee
Alice Saqpina	Hall Beach committee
Solomon Qanatsiaq	Hall Beach committee
David Irngaut	Igloolik committee
Solomon Mikki	Igloolik committee
Loui Uttak	Igloolik committee
Elisapee Quasa	Igloolik committee
Marie Airut	Igloolik committee
Jeff Higdon	QIA Technical Advisor
Susan Qamaniq	QIA Community Liaison Officer (Igloolik)

¹ Also translated

This report summarizes the information discussed on a topic by topic basis. Some map work was also conducted (walrus haul-outs, whale movements, pressure ridges, etc.). The communities want to work with the company to ensure that the project provides maximum benefits with minimal impacts, but they feel the company is trying to push forward as fast as they can. Committee members understand the benefits for their children and grandchildren, in the form of economic opportunities, but also note that the project needs to respect the numerous cultural and environmental concerns.

The communities recognize the importance of lower trophic levels to the marine ecosystem and note it as a deficiency in the DEIS. This is a substantial concern, especially the benthic community around Steensby Inlet. Ballast water was also a significant point of discussion and a major concern. Community members also identified concerns about shipping impacts on marine mammals, particularly disturbance and noise impacts. The likelihood of ships using the western route is of interest, and people consider it likely that the ships will sometimes have to use that route because of the ice conditions, particularly old (multi-year) ice in eastern Foxe Basin. They expect ships to use this route at times even though the communities are against it. Compensation as a mitigation measure was noted on several occasions, related to impacts of wildlife resources (commercial char quotas, impacts on marine mammal migrations and hunter access, etc.).

The following sections list comments made by community committee members, by subject area (with some overlap).

Cooperation

We want to work with the company and other groups to make sure the project is done correctly, take our time and do it right. We need to work with them to achieve our goals and develop a good working relationship.

We feel we can work together to achieve results, to ensure that the project provides the most benefits with the least risks. We want benefits for our children and our grandchildren, and to reduce the impacts on the animals.

We can work together as long as they are not abusing or mistreating the animals.

Our descendents, when this project gets going, they won't be able to have any say in how this project goes, so we are concerned about the effects on the animals in the future. Right now we are able to live off the animals, and we want our descendents to have the same opportunity, to live off country food that is not contaminated.

The communities want to be involved in suggesting changes, making sure communications are effective, and ensuring that all bases are covered. Not everyone has the same opinions so it is important that we all work together.

Port site

From the very start the communities did not want Steensby Inlet used as the port, they wanted shipping to stay on the east side of Rowley Island and not use Steensby Inlet. If they go to Steensby, all the sea mammals are going to be affected, and all the bottom creatures and other animals. Moving it is better for the mammals, moving the port south would reduce mortality for seals and other mammals, things like direct collisions or crushing them with the ship

Steensby will be cheaper to start-up, but there will be more impact. Moving the port would cost more initially but would be better for our decedents and for the environment and animals. In the community our minds are made up – we do not want the port in Steensby Inlet. The Steensby port will affect everything, fish, marine mammals, the bottom creatures.

Cultural and archeological sites

There are a lot of Inuksuit over there [Baffin Island] that we want to ensure are not damaged, these are important to our heritage. Sustaining our culture and our language are very important. There are many important cultural sites, such as sod houses, we need to ensure there is no damage to our lands, our important cultural and archaeological sites

Freshwater Biota and Habitat

Char impacts

Fish are found in all the rivers along the coast, almost every river, that go back and forth to the saltwater. There are fish in the Nuvuiit area, but they are skinny. They are not healthy; the meat is pale and doesn't taste as good. The fish are not as important as the ones in Steensby. The commercial quotas are further north, there will be less impact on those fish if it goes further out towards Nuvuiit.

At the lakes where they are going to be doing some work installing the culverts, when they use explosives to make the tunnels, some fish will die. Baffinland said they will move the fish, but the fish go into all the little nooks and crannies and they will never be able to get them all.

Sea Ice

Variation in ice conditions

The ice conditions vary year to year, the amount of pressure ridges and crushed ice varies. The variation in ice conditions is going to affect the movement of the ship. They are not going to easily cut through this ice, it's not going to happen. They are going to have to detour, and impact Inuit travel, and there will need to be compensation for us.

Rangers have been travelling in eastern Foxe Basin for 25 years, to inspect the RADAR sites. It is hard to travel via snowmobile because of the pressure ridges, and this is not going to change. There is always multi-year, rough ice. The sites are inspected four times a year, via snow machine in the winter. Also there are high snow ridges in the channels because of the high winds, which have to be detoured around. It isn't only ice thickness, but also what's on top of the ice, impacting travel.

Ship tracks in the landfast and pack ice

When the ship is going through the landfast ice, in January, February, it's going to be freezing over. The pack ice south of the landfast ice is constantly moving and shifting.

When the ice is just starting to form, shipping isn't much of a concern. When there's solid ice later in the season, then it is a big concern (see examples below under *Impacts on sea ice travel*).

The moving (pack) ice is not a major concern, compared to the landfast ice. When they crush the landfast ice, it's apparent that it's not going to completely freeze over.

When the ship goes through the landfast ice will freeze a little, but snow over. The danger of this is that it's not solid, even if it looks okay.

With the current and the pack ice moving, it's probably just going to cover over right away. It never stops moving, the ship going through the moving ice, it's going to cover over right away. It's constantly in motion. In solid ice, the landfast ice, it's going to stay open, maybe a track, but the moving pack ice, when the ship goes through it's going to heal over right away. Arctic Bay people have said the pack ice is going to consolidate again

Shipping impacts on ice quality and persistence

The ship will delay formation of landfast ice early in the season because of the steady shipping, and in mid-winter when it's really cold it's going to freeze over in a day and a bit, in spring time the solid ice might come off quicker because you got a big cut right in there. It will affect the pupping grounds for seals.

Areas of ice along the ship tracks that are particularly important

There is agreement amongst everyone that the Steensby Inlet landfast ice is very important for many reasons, including hunting, wildlife, and travel.

Impacts on sea ice travel

When people find out that we will get benefits, gas and food, they might travel over there just to see things and get free items. This could be dangerous for opportunistic travelers who are not as experienced.

The Steensby port will slow down travel for people from Clyde River, and affect the Nunavut Quest. It will keep some travelers from coming this way.

One reason we want them to avoid Steensby Inlet is that there will be less disturbance to the travel routes. The ice comes off quicker to the south, and there are moving waters and current. The shipping will cause a problem for the Rangers, if they go the Steensby, the patrols will have to take a really long route. If they go to Steensby, we will lose access to those two RADAR sites.

Breaking the landfast ice in Steensby would make for a long detour. It is good that they will provide us with gas, but it is a long detour and there will be a lot of extra time needed.

People travel there for training and for cultural excursions, also hunting, fishing, and the Rangers. The safety aspects for travelers, the dangers involved, and compensation, are all important issues to be addressed. There will also need to be compensation for lost hunting equipment (e.g., snowmobile going through the ice).

When the caribou are higher in number, there will be many more people travelling over there.

Even during adverse weather conditions they will have the expertise and the equipment for the ship to travel. They will have to be putting up markers along the route. If I lose my snowmobile I will want compensation from Baffinland. This is equipment we need for hunting, and for maintaining our culture.

We have been going to meetings and talking to hunters in Labrador, they have to get ferried across, there will have to be a ferry. In Labrador, ice bridges were formed. We went to Mary River site and there were representatives from Labrador, along with the shipping company. In Labrador, three people died, so they eventually got around to making crossing points, and they have employees at specific crossing points. If they are going to proceed to go through Steensby, they will need to have something in place where people want to cross at specific spots, and have some people working along the ship route putting up clear markers that everyone can see, for safety. It can be dangerous, especially when there are blizzard conditions on the land and the ice gets snowed over right away. You cannot tell the difference sometimes, as someone could go

through, especially a younger person who is not accustomed to seeing all the different conditions. We have to make sure that these concerns are addressed and well-thought out.

It is going to be a real hindrance after a ship goes through, there's going to be a certain amount of time before you can safely cross over.

The ship will be coming through so often that the landfast ice will not be able to freeze over. Steensby has people that use it going to the North, and for people in the North coming to the south. It is hard to plan where you will be and when, no detailed travel plans because it is dependent on weather. Sometimes there are unexpected surprises, including adverse weather. These are dangers that will be affecting us, and we have to plan these out well, for a better and safer future for our descendents.

Some people still hunt walruses on the moving ice, on the west side of Foxe Basin, but not as much as before. When people had dog teams they hunted on the moving ice a lot more, not so much now that everyone has a snow machine.

Shipping routes and ice conditions

We know the proposed route well, it is different on the eastern side, the current is slower so there is usually more pack ice, there are some open areas but a lot of ice. There is more old pack ice over there compared to the western side, and it is clear right away that they will sometimes want to use the western side because it is easier. Alternate routes will need to be taken sometimes, they could take the route sometimes that we do not want them to take.

The yellow ice (multi-year ice) is harder, it is usually situated on the eastern side of Foxe Basin. Pack ice is prevalent around Koch and Rowley because of the channels that restrict the flow. There is a narrow spot where the pack ice bottlenecks. The ice around Rowley is not moving all the time, there is crushed up ice with large pressure ridges. There is old multi-year ice, it is really rough. We expect the company to take the western route without much hesitation if the conditions are bad on the east. This is a big concern.

We question whether the ships can go through the east side all the time, the company should hire an icebreaker to try the route, just try it once, do it and see how it works. They are basing a lot on theory, but actual conditions will make a difference. They will use the western route sometimes. There are also a lot of shallow areas on east side.

The ship is probably going to have to detour because of pressure ridges. If we move the port to the south there's going to be less crushing of the ice and less pressure ridges.

With pressure ridges, they are hard to travel though, impossible at times. I brought this up before, it will be an obstacle that they may not be able to go through all the time. But they keep saying they can travel through that. Also, the Nuvuiit area is closer to the floe edge and it comes off quicker than closer to the mainland. An icebreaker went through Foxe Basin waters, and they were iced in, they had to find a way to get out of there.

Marine Habitat and Biota

Lower trophic levels

When people are concerned about animals, they worry about the bigger ones, but overlook the small animals often. We have to be concerned about the smaller creatures too. They were doing work in Steensby Inlet on the bottom creatures last year, they were finding dead animals, which is a concern for us. We don't know who was doing the work. Even the shrimps were dead.

We have to be clear, concerning the ship, what kinds of animals could be impacted by the ships in the deeper waters. We would like to know more about those animals in the deeper waters. Foxe Basin in shallow, there are different creatures in the deep areas.

If the project affects the small seabed creatures, then the animals that feed on them will also be affected and they will have to move, say if there's an accident. How can we improve the plans for how they will operate? If the small animals, low on the food chain, get contaminated, that will affect all the other animals. What will happen to us, what will they do for us, if they [Baffinland] end up clearing off all the shrimp and cod, the smaller animals? That is why we are trying to plan this out, so these impacts won't happen.

Pond Inlet people say there are less shrimps and cod these days, compared to before, because of the seismic tests. The elders in Pond are concerned about shock waves from seismic activity.

Marine fish

There are also lots of cod there in Steensby, all different sizes.

Ballast water

We are really concerned with the ballast water being drained in this region. What kind of safety precautions are Baffinland taking to reduce these impacts?

There's fish, clams, lots of bottom dwellers in Steensby. There's lots of char, and the fish there are better, they are a delicacy for other regions. The Rankin fish plant says Baffin Island fish are the best, they are ones they like the best.

Before the ballast water is dumped they have to test it to make sure it is safe to pour. We have to be mindful of the food web impacts to the smaller animals. They have to make sure that the ballast water is decontaminated before they dump it out, to make sure there is no contamination from the different regions.

They could use a mesh or filters to see exactly what type of creatures are being introduced to this region. They can work to find ways to improve their operations. Can they do something to deter the introduction of new species?

It is not going to be a small ship; there will be a sizable amount of water for ballast. If DFO can say it is not going to be dangerous, then we could feel better about it. This is an important issue that will have to be discussed more, we will not forget about it. Even if they have procedures in place to reduce contaminants, with that amount of water there will still be a chance.

The ships will need cleansers, or filters, something for sediments and any foreign species. They need something to trap those animals.

Filters would be great, but I am in favour of treatment of some kind.

Ballast water would dissipate better at Nuvuiit area.

Marine Mammals

Ringed, bearded and harp seals

All committee members agree that bearded seals should be considered as a VEC.

Bearded seals are common in the Steensby Inlet area, when the ice is going (rotting away) they go to that area. There are also lots of fish, and the food for the fish. Bearded seals, seals, and walrus are all in that region (Steensby). There will still be an impact at Nuvuiit, but much less than at Steensby.

In the spring, there are also lots of bearded seals all along the floe edge, and the area west of Steensby Inlet is a calving ground for bearded seals and walrus.

Harp seals have always been in these waters, but recently in higher numbers. They are becoming more abundant; they used to be low in numbers. In the 1960s there were very few harp seals, recently there are many more harp seals, also narwhals. Harp seals are seen at the floe edge, they have seen them at the floe edge in winter. This past summer there were not as many harp seals.

The seals use Steensby Inlet as a calving ground. There are quite a few seals over there, anywhere over there [eastern Foxe Basin], they do congregate in those waters.

When the ship goes through, there are no seal holes.

Steensby Inlet has seals and bearded seals, last year there were no bearded seals there. We want to know if they are using sonic-emitters or other devices to repel the animals, like they are doing in Milne Inlet and the Pond Inlet area. Maybe they did that to Steensby port. Pond Inlet people found devices that they discovered themselves, they were not told that they were there. So that is a reason that people are suspicious about devices being used in Steensby area.

One reason we prefer Nuvuiit is because of the landfast ice in Steensby and the effects on seal pupping. Steensby will change the seals a lot of they go through the landfast ice, and not just seals but also fish and the bottom dwellers.

Locations of walrus calving and haul-out areas that may be disturbed by shipping

In the fall they are on the islands, in the walrus haul out in many places in the fall. All the islands around Manning are used by walrus in the fall, and South and North Ooglit are also used by walrus, and Tern Island, plus around the Barrow River – there are walrus all along the coast.

Walrus are hunted in Steensby Inlet sometimes, and bearded seals are in many of the same areas.

The tourist groups around Rowley Island, the camera groups, they scared off the walrus. The HTA banned walrus tourism and sport hunting for two years. After that the walrus came back in higher numbers, it was apparent that there were more walrus with less boat traffic. It's not only the big ships that will impact the walrus, it's also these groups, the tourist groups and hunting groups, when they get higher in numbers they scare them off. Walrus sport hunts are going to start again this year. The sport hunters are going after the bigger tusks, they are very picky so they want the big tusks. They end up going through more walrus, selecting the bigger ones. Coral Harbour has different herds of walrus now, they came from this region.

Cetaceans

Whales stay here for winter on occasion, but not often. A young bowhead was iced in last year, a couple years ago, we think it was unhealthy.

The bowheads go through Fury and Hecla Strait. They have started to show up a lot more in the more recent years. They don't seem to go to the east side of Foxe Basin very often, they are seen over there only once in a while.

The belugas go over there first [east side of Foxe Basin], in that area, in the spring. Compared to the western side of Foxe Basin, they go to the east side first. They come from Kimmirut and Cape Dorset, into the eastern side of the Basin. They move north of Koch Island, along the coast and into the inlets.

The male belugas come first; they are followed by the females and their calves

There are two groups of narwhals, different whales from the north and the south, near Repulse. Narwhals have recently been seen in Steensby Inlet. The narwhals swing by this way and go along the floe edge.

Those creatures like whales, they sometimes put themselves in danger when they follow the ships, and the ships will come every day.

Polar bears

Bears den on Koch Island, in the snowed in areas, also Bray Island. They make their dens on the lee side of the hills, in areas of deeper snow.

There are a lot more polar bears now, people are seeing them around Steensby Inlet. In the past when the numbers were lower, there were not many bears over there.

Noise, vibrations – species responses

Sea mammals get used to new things, noises, etc., so they're not as afraid. But when they get used to disturbances, they put themselves in danger. Some animals run extreme distances, others do not. Regarding walrus, some people say they don't scare very easy, other people say they will do a deep dive and go great distances in one dive.

Sound travels differently in water than in air, and travels further in the water. There are also the noises from the ice as the ship goes through

When people are hunting they are really careful to make no noise, when they are paddling for example, because the animals will pick up on it right away. No wonder people are concerned, because the noise, and the effects of the ice and the turbulence of the water, will scare away animals, probably from a fair distance away. In the fall, when the ship comes by Hall Beach, the whales they are a long ways away from it, but they definitely move away from the ship. There are definitely loud noises that come from the ship. The animals will move away from the ship, there will be disturbances from the ship, from the loud noises in the water.

People in Arctic Bay provided us with information on the icebreakers that used to go through, they already experienced the effects of shipping so they met with us. When they were hunting narwhals they tried to keep the noise down, not even hit the boat or anything to make noise or splashes, when they're going after the whales. The people of Arctic Bay told us, when the ship was going through their strait, through the ice, after that they were basically able to walk right up to the whales. With our point of view, their senses were already all shot, they have sensitive hearing and their senses are shot after the ship noise. We want more input from Arctic Bay, as they noticed effects from the icebreakers and a difference with the animals. Greenland people say it is easier to hunt narwhals coming back from north Baffin, because their hearing is not as good, from shipping noise.

We are concerned for walrus too, our walrus population, they also have acute hearing, when you're trying to get close to them on the ice, they hear and they look up, so they do have acute hearing, but when their hearing is basically shot, and they are bombarded with all this sound, it's going to have a negative impact. We don't want shipping in the western route because of the noise, we prefer the east side of Rowley for the route because there are less mammals. Impacts will still happen over there.

The shipping, it's going to be all around us. There's also Roche Bay trying to work. They are going to cut off the access to our waters. They might cut us off from the animals. The animals travel and go to different places, and the ships could cut them off.

Many animals have a sentry, especially walrus. In the wintertime, they pick things up right away. They seem to have sentries for the younger walruses, when animals are young they are active, just like people.

When I came to this region [Foxe Basin] it was around the time that they started to use motorized transportation. With motorized transportation becoming more available, the walruses were farther away every year. We have moved them out further, we now realize that. Walruses used to be a food staple and we hunted them a lot. Now these days, with the sport hunters and the tourism groups, there are more boats out looking for the walruses with the big tusks. They had a noticeable effect too, so we tried a 2-year ban on walrus tourism and sport hunting. Last year the walruses were a bit closer. There are now more walruses towards Southampton Island, in talking with people it seems that some migrated down there.

Different animals have varying degrees of awareness, some are not afraid of people, others are. They are different. As a hunter you observe the different behaviours of the animals, I have seen walruses run away from a boat with a 7 HP. It is difficult to predict how far they will run away. I

cannot say how far they will run, but some of them will definitely run away. Others will not run at all. Things are things we will have to look at, and look into.

We cannot compare the ways that different species will respond to the ships. We haven't seen how they will behave; we haven't been on the ship so we cannot say. We will have to ask people with experience on the ships. One of us will have to be on the ship, to observe. We want to be aboard of one of the ships to see how animals react.

The animals were closer in the old days when only sails were used for transportation. Now, with motorized transportation, they are still fairly close but a bit further away, except those that are not in as good shape. That has become apparent; some animals aren't as wild and even seem tame. Some of the animals that are close seem really tame, especially the young bearded seals, they are curious and also not as afraid some of the other sea mammals. A younger bearded seal, if I'm not going after it, it will come right up to me. And the same with polar bear, some polar bears are stubborn and you cannot scare them off. So protecting these animals is important, and they are going to have to find a way to do that. Animal behaviour is different, some are tame and curious, some are not. Some animals will run, and some are tame and curious

Migratory Birds and Habitat

There are many types of birds – seagulls, Arctic terns, many migratory species. We are also starting to get eider ducks that stay year-round now, also that other one [description – red legs, black, lay eggs under rocks: black guillemot]. Eiders staying year-round is something new that has been happening in recent years, they are overwintering in the polynyas.

There are eiders that nest on all the islands, they all have birds, lots and lots of ducks. We go to all the islands for egg picking.

Caribou

Right now the shipping it not going to have any impact on them [use of offshore islands], because we are in the low part of the caribou cycle. But the caribou will start to come back again. Before, when there were caribou, they were on all the smaller islands. I caught caribou on almost all of these small islands.

When they go out on to the islands they stay there [all year], they get really fat because of the good grazing and lack of predators. On Koch Island there are caribou, they stay there year-round. They go to these islands to avoid predators.

They swim to the islands close to the shore, and also cross on the ice.

Bray Island also has caribou. Caribou go through cycles, they are at a low point right now. We have fewer concerns with caribou, compared to the sea mammals. When I was growing up, I remember a time when there were hardly any caribou, just old antlers around. Then they came back, and now the numbers are low again. The caribou will wait for the plants to grow back, and then they'll come back. The proposed railroad route is a concern to some people, although it is not a concern to me. From what I've seen firsthand, when they are migrating, if the first animal

goes through then the herd will follow. Compared to other aspects of the project, caribou is not a major concern.

When caribou have a destination they will go there, no matter what. Even major rivers are not an obstacle to caribou when they want to go somewhere.

Caribou will also cross the strait across Steensby Inlet.

Ref QIA-0714b: Cape Dorset Consultation on Marine Mammals and Shipping – QIA Notes (July 14-15)

14 and 15 July 2011
Cape Dorset, Nunavut

Cape Dorset Mary River Project Committee meeting with QIA Technical Advisor on the Aquatic Environment

Meeting notes by Bruce Stewart

Participants:

Name	Affiliation
Ejetsiak Peter	Committee Chair, Member at Large
Adam Nuna	Committee vice-Chair, HTO Representative
Olayou Akesak	Committee Member, QIA Representative
Atsiaq Alasuaq	Committee Member, Member at Large
Qimmeataaq Nungusuituq	Committee Member, Hamlet Representative
Nitani Peter	Committee Member, Member at Large
Nina Manning-Toonoo	Translator
Mathew Akavak	QIA Lands Officer
Bruce Stewart	QIA Technical Advisor

These notes are not exhaustive; rather they reflect concerns expressed and information provided by the Committee on habitat conditions and use, and animal ecology and behavior. Some map work was also conducted.

General Comments

Committee members were aware that decisions made on the Mary River Iron Mine project would be very important for their children and grandchildren. They emphasized the importance of Elders passing on what they know and don't know to their descendants. The Committee members were especially concerned with what may happen to animals along the shipping route, particularly in areas where landfast ice is broken. The elders are uncertain how shipping may affect marine mammals.

Location of the Ship Track

Committee members were under the impression that the northern shipping track, between Mill Island and Cape Dorset, was no longer under consideration by Baffinland. They prefer the southern route between Salisbury and Nottingham Islands and strongly recommended that route, as it would avoid walrus along the coast near the community. They were also anxious about whether the shipping route preferred by Baffinland could be moved if it is found to affect animals.

Sea Ice

When ice that is two feet thick is broken by a ship it will re-freeze about 4" on a cold day. In late winter or early spring ice can be travelled on after it freezes overnight. It takes longer to refreeze in mid-winter. Thickness is greatest in March or sometimes April. Ice along the ship route will not return to its original thickness, and pans may build up beside the ship tracks.

Currents and winds will bring the pack ice together. The ice pans are always breaking. They are larger and thicker offshore than nearshore. The origin of the ice can be recognized: dirty ice comes from Foxe Basin and clean ice from eastern Hudson Strait.

Heavy concentrations of multi-year pack ice (*kabuka*) are uncommon in the Cape Dorset area but do occur. These conditions have occurred twice in the elder's lifetimes (ca. 75-85 y), once in 1958 and once earlier. The multi-year ice comes from the east and moves around Cape Dorchester before circulating back to the south. When these conditions occurred there were no marine mammals and people went hungry.

Climate change is a concern. There is not much landfast ice in the Cape Dorset area and what there is has been changing very quickly. It had not formed by Christmas last year. If studies of ice are to be conducted they must be done soon. A three-year study of sea ice was recommended.

Marine Mammals

Hunters are not aware of a major breeding area for marine mammals as marine mammals give birth all over.

Choice of VECs

All members of the Community Committee agreed that the bearded seal should have been included as a VEC. They recommended that research be conducted on the bearded seal, as they bask and breed on the sea ice and may be affected by shipping.

Walrus

Walrus are the main animals of concern in the Cape Dorset area, as other animals [whales?] are typically present only during the open water period. Walrus are very family-oriented and raise their young until they are ready to mate, although male and female walrus are not always found together. The Committee did not want these close knit families affected by shipping.

Walrus information in the BIMC summary is based on old information. The distribution of walrus in the Cape Dorset area has been changing. Walrus have left Sakpu, an area of year-round open water. They have moved back into the Markham Bay area where they are hauling out on eider islands. One elder said that there were few walrus in the Markham Bay area when he grew up there [ca. 60-80 yBP (years before present)], whereas now there are many. There are lots of clams near the walrus haulouts but the meat in these clams is now red, not white. Polar bears have also occupied these islands and are eating eider eggs. A survey this past year saw 11 bears in 8 days. Eiders and bearded seals have been eaten or chased away from the area.

Walrus are present around the islands in western Hudson Strait year-round. Channels between the islands are deep and have lots of ice; when ice is present the walrus stay closer to the coasts on thin ice near shallow areas. There are many walrus on Salisbury Island in summer and they haul out all along its shallow southwest coast. During polar bear surveys led by Vicki Sahanatien last summer, many walrus were seen on Mill, Salisbury, and Nottingham islands. A low shoal southeast of Salisbury Island, Trinitie Rock or Nujutuituq (sp.?), is particularly important and has many walrus year-round.

Walrus are constantly on the move, so they will be on the shipping route. They used to move from Nottingham and Salisbury islands up the west coast of Foxe Peninsula and then back east past Cape Dorset in the fall. Walrus on ice pans may be more likely to be affected by shipping than walrus at haulouts, as the haulouts are farther from the ship tracks. Walrus tend to bask on thicker ice. When they are basking on the ice the wind drives them eastward toward Markham Bay. Walrus also rest or sleep amongst the pack ice, sometimes hooking their tusks on the ice pans while they sleep. Vessels will not be aware of these walrus and the walrus may not be aware of the vessels. These animals can also use very small breathing holes so people may not be aware that they are present under the ice.

In the past not everyone had a winter supply of walrus meat, mostly those with Peterhead boats. Walrus were hunted as soon as they were seen but now there is less desire to hunt them. Hunters no longer harvest large numbers of walrus from Salisbury Island. They have not done so since the dog-slaughter in the late 1950s.

A major survey of walrus is needed--including a survey in the dead of winter, to establish the size of the population, which may be increasing.

Bearded Seals and Ringed Seals

Bearded seals are present in the moving ice year-round. They bask and breed on the pack ice and seldom maintain breathing holes. Like walrus they rest or sleep amongst the ice and can be difficult to detect.

There are few ringed seals in open water in the winter, possibly due to the presence of walrus. Seals were more in evidence before the use of motorized boats and snow machines.

Belugas

Committee members were uncertain whether ships would increase or reduce access to belugas. Hunters know the beluga migrations and expect them in spring and fall. Belugas enter the inlets more often than narwhals. Ships are currently visiting during the open water season but no effects on animals have been observed. Beluga whales are often seen when ships arrive, it is not known whether they are following the ships or being driven by them. Hunter access to belugas changes with the presence and location of killer whales; increasing ship traffic ships may have the same effect. Beluga will likely be affected at first by shipping but, as long as they are not being hurt, they will likely return.

Ice breaking may bring more belugas into the Cape Dorset area. If shipping increases when ice is present belugas will likely follow the ships to take advantage of the open water. Because ice in

the Cape Dorset area is constantly moving whales that follow the ship tracks are unlikely to become entrapped. Ships may also chase beluga along the ice edge in the spring, around Markham Bay and to the west.

Narwhals

Narwhal sightings are rare along coasts in the Cape Dorset area. During their lifetimes (ca. 75-85 y), one elder had only seen them there twice and another elder three times. All of these observations were associated with the presence of killer whales.

Committee members were uncertain whether ships would increase or reduce access to narwhals. They commented that narwhals seemed to get used to new things easier than other animals. Narwhals pass farther offshore than belugas, and are passing through the channels in western Hudson Strait in the spring when the purple saxifrage blooms. In the past narwhals were hunted in the moving ice at this time. If narwhals begin coming near the coast more frequently, then ships may be affecting their movements. The current quota of 10 narwhals is never filled but it might be if ships change narwhal movements.

Large whales

Bowhead whales may be susceptible to strikes by ships hulls or props as these whales do not dive deeply right away.

Killer whales have not been sighted recently in the Cape Dorset area. They are believed to avoid the area due to the presence of walrus. The most recent minke whale sighting was 6 years ago. Although one elder mentioned that he had seen many minke whales during his lifetime. He also described seeing a female sperm whale with a calf [i.e. toothed whales with a blow hole that blows the other direction]; and a humpback whale. These large whales are not common in western Hudson Strait.

Noise and Vibrations

Ship noise will definitely affect communication among marine mammals. But, it may have less effect on bears, which are not deterred by the sound of gunshots unless they see the hunter.

Committee members were not sure how close ships could approach walrus haulouts before scaring the walrus. They expected that the smell of the ships would affect the marine mammals, and that this effect might change seasonally with changes in the wind direction. Walrus that are disturbed from areas where food is abundant will eventually return.

Marine Birds

In the spring, murrelets are present throughout western Hudson Strait and many pass through the Cape Dorset area enroute west to their breeding colonies. There are large breeding colonies on Digges Island and the adjacent Quebec coast and near Ivujivik but none near Cape Dorset. Birds that pass through the Cape Dorset area are believed to breed in the Coasts Island area. During their fall swimming migration murre chicks and their male parents are found all over western Hudson Strait.

Many eiders, guillemots, geese, and other species also pass through the Cape Dorset area. Some king and common eiders remain year-round. This past year, when ice was late forming, there were more eiders overwintering than normal. Phalaropes are sometimes seen while traveling to Quebec by boat. Birds seem to be less abundant than in the recent past. It was speculated that they may be moving into southeastern Foxe Basin. A study was recommended to learn more about seasonal habitat use of the area by migratory birds.

Seasonal Travel and Harvesting

Hunters do not travel into the pack ice as much now as in the past. They used to hunt walrus, narwhals, and polar bears from the pack ice but now there are easier ways of harvesting these animals.

Hunters from Cape Dorset boat off the floe edge in January through March when north winds maintain open water. The farthest floe edge is about 30 miles from the community. When ice is present hunters stay within 1 to 2 km of the coast. They do not travel to the larger islands in western Hudson Strait when ice is present. In spring and summer (June, July) they travel by boat along the south Baffin coast, to Southampton Island, the islands in western Hudson Strait, and the Quebec coast (Salluit). Few people now travel to Cape Dorchester on the northwest coast of Foxe Peninsula except in the spring by land.

Shipping is not expected to affect winter travel because people are not travelling far offshore in the winter. However, when hunters are swept offshore in winter, elders advise them not to try and return to shore but to move farther offshore. This is because the pans nearshore are thin and will crumble and break, whereas the pans offshore are larger and thicker. Elders along the Quebec coast give the same advice. Ice breaking might alter these conditions and affect the validity of this advice.

The possibility that ships may produce a high wake in summer was mentioned.

Accidental Oil Spills

The Committee expressed strong concern that ship accidents might cause spills that affect the marine environment. They were concerned in particular that local birds might be affected by oil if a spill occurred, and that a spill might affect the organisms that birds and mammals eat. There are strong currents in the Cape Dorset area that may spread oil quickly if there is a major spill. They wanted communities along the shipping route to be provided with cleaning equipment and training in its operation so clean-up operations could begin immediately in the event of a spill. They did not want to have to wait for equipment to arrive from other areas, and wondered whom to contact if they find oiled birds.

Ref QIA-0808: QIA Mary River Project Workshop Summary (August 8-12)

**QIA Workshop on the Proposed Mary River Project
Summary of Workshop Discussions
Frobisher Inn, Iqaluit, August 8 to 12, 2011**

Participants:

- Mary River Project Review Committees (representing the communities of Arctic Bay, Cape Dorset, Clyde River, Hall Beach, Igloolik, Kimmirut and Pond Inlet)
- Community Liaison Officers
- Representatives from the City of Iqaluit
- QIA Executive Committee
- QIA Mary River Project Team
- QIA Mary River Technical Review Team
- QIA Mary River IIBA Negotiation Team

Purpose:

The purpose of the workshop was to inform and update participants on all aspects of the Project in regard to the Environmental Assessment (EA) technical review process as well as the Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement (IIBA) negotiation process. It is important that community representatives and the members of the QIA Executive Committee have a full understanding of the Project in order to pose questions, provide input, and discuss potential impacts, benefits and trade-offs.

QIA's Role in Project Development:

The organizational structure of QIA was presented. The QIA Executive reports to the QIA Board. The Executive Director reports to the Board and is responsible for carrying out directives issued by the Board.

In order to review the Mary River Project proposal, an EA Project Team was formed consisting of a Project Manager, a Project Advisor, a Project Coordinator and eight technical specialists (consultants). The team formed to negotiate the IIBA consists of a Project Leader/Facilitator, a Financial Advisor, a Chief Negotiator, and four support personnel. Both of these teams report to the Director of Lands and Executive Director at QIA.

Environmental Assessment and Regulatory Process:

An outline of the NIRB process was included in the workshop materials handed out to all participants. The process and significant dates were highlighted. The difference between the DEIS and FEIS was explained. Technical review comments on the DEIS are due to NIRB on October 5, 2011.

Agenda

The topics below were discussed over the course of the workshop.

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| August 8-9 | Marine Environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Shipping route, information gaps, and 'hot spots' (sensitive areas)• Impacts on Steensby and Milne Inlets• Ballast water |
| August 9-10 | Aquatic (Freshwater) Environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fisheries• Water and habitat quality
Terrestrial Environment <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Caribou
Project Operations <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Current operations• Future operations• Pre-construction staging |
| August 10-11 | Socio-economics <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Economic aspects (employment, training, business and contracting, economic development, community services, royalties)• Social and cultural aspects (wellbeing, culture and harvesting) |
| August 10-11 | IIBA <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contracting and employment• Financial participation• Community wellness• Land, water and wildlife |
| August 11 | Project Trade-offs |
| August 12 | Wrap up |

For each topic, technical experts presented the topic, explaining what has been proposed by Baffinland in the DEIS regarding the Project plans and the Company's assessment of impacts and benefits. In the case of the IIBA, the basic components and content of the IIBA were outlined. Each presentation was followed by a round-table discussion on the topic in groups, and a final discussion after all participants had reconvened. Plenary sessions were conducted in Inuktitut or English (based on the comfort of the speaker) with simultaneous translation. Round-table discussions were conducted in Inuktitut.

The following notes summarize the questions and comments that emerged from the discussions.

- Summaries of the DEIS have been prepared by Baffinland and QIA (in English and Inuktitut) so that the Project Review Committees and community members can discuss the Project more easily.
- The QIA technical team is using the best available information to review the DEIS and determine whether the information and predicted Project effects that Baffinland has presented are sufficient and reasonable.

Marine Environment

Topic	Questions Posed	Main Comments
Shipping route, Information gaps and hot spots	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the scale and regularity of shipping? • How will the shipping route be monitored? • Could other ships use the same track? • Will there be compensation for impacts to wildlife? • How will travel concerns be addressed in the areas near affected communities? • Will the shipping route affect bowhead whales that travel long distances? • Will the shipping route impact polar bears and their food supply? • What will be the effect on bird species? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shipping will be year-round, to and from Steensby Inlet; • A ship will pass every 43 hours; • The sensitivity of specific areas and marine mammals varies based on the season; • Shipping associated with pre-development is expected to be a minimum of 15 ships into each of Milne and Steensby ports; • Possible impacts include: sound, visual disturbance, mortality among marine mammals, and changes to habitat and migration patterns; • Cape Dorset is concerned about impacts to the walrus calving grounds; • Cape Dorset and Kimmirut want the shipping route to be further away from the communities; • There are strong concerns for Steensby shipping route and recommendations for an alternate route and port site.

Additional explanations and discussions:

- Although traditional knowledge is often collected, usually it is never integrated or implemented in any of the proposed action plans.
- Seasonal animal behavior has to be considered, i.e. calving grounds, mating seasons and migratory routes.
- There have been changes in climate along with wind and water current directions around Cape Dorset in the past few years.

Topic	Questions Posed	Main Comments
Impacts on Steensby and Milne Inlets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who will be responsible for mitigating long-term impacts? • Are there comparable projects elsewhere? • Is IQ knowledge applied or taken seriously when designing Project components or mitigation measures? • What are the seasonal impacts? • What will the impact be on sea ice and currents? • Will there be compensation for impacts to marine mammals in Steensby Inlet? (There is no way to avoid impact.) • Narwhal are sensitive to sound. How will the noise from the passage of frequent and year-round ships impact narwhal? • How will we even know how many marine mammals are affected by noise and disturbance? • How much study has been done on pollutants, dust and contaminants in this area? What are the impacts? • Has there been any consideration of impacts on kelp? 	<p>There is a high level of concern regarding impacts to marine mammals in Steensby Inlet and along the entire shipping route. More research should be carried out. Specific concerns discussed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loading and off-loading ships in Steensby Inlet and the impact these activities will have on marine life. • Impacts to seals and walrus, especially given that seals, bearded seals and walrus breed in the area in the springtime. • The effects of shipping on landfast ice, and the resulting consequences for marine mammals. • Disturbances along migratory routes for marine mammals and mortality issues. • Food sources for marine mammals and contamination. • Travel safety on ice during the winter, and in summer for people out in small boats. • Noise from helicopters as well as ships. • Compensation should be more than money for store bought-food. This diminishes harvesting and cultural activities; compensation should facilitate hunting (e.g. fuel, equipment).

Additional explanations and discussions:

- There was an overwhelming response regarding concerns about the impacts to marine life and Inuit for the port site location in Steensby Inlet. There was strong support from representatives of all communities to seek an alternative site.
- Invariably marine mammals will be disturbed by noise and activity and move away from the area. Normally they would return after a period of time (which varies by species). However, with ship passing approximately every day and a half, year-round, what will the impacts be? The scale and regularity of shipping is unprecedented.
- If Inuit are stranded on ice pans, the elders say the best response is to move to larger, safer pans further out. But if ships are passing, this could be more dangerous.
- Hunters won't know where to look for marine mammals if their distribution changes substantially.
- Inuit also need to take responsibility for their part in protecting the environment (e.g. garbage such as motors and plastic bags that harm or contaminate).

	Questions Posed	Main Comments
Ballast water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the difference between the dumped ballast water and Nunavut water? • How is the ballast water and iron ore stored in the ship? • How will possible contaminants be controlled? • How will ballast water be monitored? • What is the impact on marine mammals from the ballast water? • Will new species or invasive species be introduced into the area? • Will food-chain (lower trophic) species be affected? • What will be the impact of salinity (salt) levels or temperatures that differ from Nunavut waters? • How will all the possible impacts of ballast water be mitigated throughout the Project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about the amount of ballast water being discharged; • Marine mammals are a <i>major</i> food source; there is strong concern for any impacts from ballast water or spills. • There is a need for a study in the Foxe Basin and Hudson Strait to determine the effects on marine life. • There is a risk of invasive species being carried into Nunavut waters attached to the hulls of ships, and concern about the resulting impacts on sea mammals and lower trophic levels. • Concern about contamination from bacteria and microorganisms, and a need for screening or filters to be used in discharging methods. • Monitoring systems should be in place to monitor animal species, sediment, temperature, and salt water levels (salinity) around the discharge area. • A study should be done on invasive species as well as small organisms and the impact these may have on the food chain.

Additional explanations and discussions:

- Ships to carry ore will be coming in empty and therefore will be carrying a lot of ballast water. Approximately 200,000 cubic metres of water will be loaded on to ships in Rotterdam; some of this water will be exchanged en route in the mid-Atlantic. Ships will carry more water in winter than in summer.
- Invasive species may be carried in ballast water; also water from the mid-Atlantic will have a higher level of salinity (salt content) and different temperature. What will be the impact of each ship releasing this amount of ballast water into Steensby Inlet year-round?
- Salt causes rusting to occur at a faster rate.
- There are no regulations at the present time on how to test or treat ballast water, though there may be in future. The filtering process may not include full filtering of smaller species.
- DFO involvement in monitoring of species will be required/recommended.
- Ocean currents make it more difficult to predict impacts. Water currents and streams should be studied to get an idea where ballast water may end up.
- Ship tracking can be put in place to monitor the actual route that ships take.

Aquatic Environment

Topic	Questions Posed	Main Comments
Fisheries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will there be preventative measures to protect lakes? • How would the fish be moved? • Will the downstream fish be affected? • How will fish be monitored and how will the impacts be determined for compensation? • Who will do the monitoring? • How will sea bottom feeders be affected? (e.g. clams, shrimp) • What will be the impact of dust on the local lakes and streams? • What is habitat compensation (vs. monetary compensation)? What type of compensation would be made? • What impact will there be from the explosives on nearby fish stocks? • Will spill response materials be made available? • Is it possible to re-route the railway so that it does not affect the good fishing lakes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most fish harvest for Igloodik comes from this area. • The current commercial fish quota at Steensby Inlet is 40,000 pounds. Loss of quota is a concern. • The lake is close to the railway, and that is one reason why the port site should be moved, since it will result in some change to the rail route. • BIM said that they could move fish to another lake, but beneficiaries do not accept this mitigation, and don't believe it will work. • Nothing was mentioned about impacts to landlocked char or trout. • There is concern for the amount of dust that will be generated from the mining, railway and port site. • There is concern about the effects of chemicals generated from explosives; impacts are unclear; the amount of explosives that will be used is also unknown. • There is concern with what will happen during spring run-off, and the impact to water quality. • Entire communities would require monetary compensation. • Monitoring of fish and habitat should start before construction. • Communities should monitor habitat compensation process and outcomes. • If the fish are contaminated, people will get contaminated.

Additional explanations and discussions:

- Fisheries compensation under DFO is separate from compensation under the NLCA/IIBA.
- DFO guidelines apply due to crown land ownership, which require habitat compensation rather than monetary compensation (e.g., new habitat creation or enhancement, creating access to fisheries through harbour development, etc.). Programs are put in place to monitor if compensation is working.
- There are examples of successful habitat compensation projects in Nunavik where communities participated in the process of developing appropriate compensation, as well as fish studies conducted in Igloodik.
- Impacts to sediment resulting from road, mining, and rail are unclear.
- Vibrations from railway traffic may impact surrounding lakes and rivers.
- Fresh water is easier to sample and test than water in the marine environment.

Terrestrial Environment

Topic	Questions Posed	Main Comments
Caribou	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the mining site impact caribou migration? • What impact will the railway have on caribou crossing, and on general caribou movement and migration? • Is IQ being incorporated in considering impacts and solutions? • How long does it take for the train to stop? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is concern with the decline of country food and the increasing reliance of Inuit on expensive store-bought food. • It is important to work with the GN in regards to caribou management and research. Access to existing GN data is important. • Impacts to and forced relocation of calving grounds is a major concern. Mitigation measures do not consider calving grounds. Migratory routes should not be disturbed. • The length of the railway is a major concern. • The proposed railway borders migratory routes and this should be considered. • There is concern about increased human population in the area and the impact that increased hunting will have on caribou and caribou numbers, particularly because herd populations are at the low end of the cycle at present. • Caribou populations and calving grounds have already been impacted from the Tote Road construction. • Noise and dust levels should be considered. Food sources for caribou will be impacted. • There are issues related to the frequency of helicopters and actual and potential impacts to caribou remain of concern. • Calving and mating seasons for caribou should be considered and development should be carried out accordingly to minimize potential impacts on caribou populations. • Monitoring is required over the long-term in local and regional areas.

Additional explanations and discussions:

- If the leader of a group of caribou crosses the tracks, the rest will follow even if there is a train coming. Will the train stop?
- Mitigation measures by Baffinland include provisions for caribou crossings along migratory routes. There are 6 crossings over the length of the railway.

Project Operations

Topic	Questions Posed	Main Comments
Current operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the dust from Mary River affect the wildlife and caribou? • Has the water quality at Mary River been affected? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current footprint of project operations at Mary River, Milne and Steensby was outlined.

Topic	Questions Posed	Main Comments
Future operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will there be caps on the railcars to prevent dust release? • What will the depth and total footprint of the mine pit? • Will the water quality be affected? • Where will the bridges be and how long will they be? • What is being done for landfill closure? • Will animals be prevented from entering the pit and tunnels? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current footprint of project operations at Mary River, Milne and Steensby was outlined. • Communities wanted more information about the Nuvuiit Port site. • Concerns were expressed about wildlife being killed, and payment for any polar bear deaths. • Careful monitoring is important. • Communities do not want ships going into Steensby during the winter • Concerns were expressed about mine runoff contaminating lakes and rivers. • Concerns were raised over the safety of people and animals travelling on the ice after the ships have passed by, or going across the tracks. • Communities want the chance to negotiate for the infrastructure left by Baffinland (e.g. rail and road). • More snowmobile crossings were requested. • Railway cars should be covered to prevent additional dust release.

Additional explanations and discussions:

- Reinforcement that communities do not want the port site at Steensby Inlet.
- There will be a total of 24 bridges and up to 200 culverts along the railway.

Topic	Questions Posed	Main Comments
Project timelines, Pre-construction staging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do we have support for the Project if the port site is moved to Nuvuiit? • What effects will ammonium nitrate have on the environment and how will it be monitored? • Where will the skidoo crossings be, and how many will there be? • Can changes still be made to the project plans and designs? • Will the security amount be enough if the mine is approved? • Will the allocation of harvest quotas be affected by the Project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference was made to Nanasivik and the impacts it had on the ecosystem (animals left area, contaminants found in marine mammals; also travel concerns, skidoos lost) • There is concern about the use of ammonium nitrate. • It was expressed by some that the Project development should be based on what QIA/Inuit want and not dictated by Baffinland. • Concerns were expressed that everything seemed approved without community involvement, particularly the selection of the Steensby port site. • Monitoring of wildlife before, during and after construction of the mine camps remains an important requirement.

Additional explanations and discussions:

- Discussions centred around the Steensby port site and whether the site would be acceptable to QIA/Inuit and the preference of an alternate site, namely Nuvuiit.
- The position by the communities of Hall Beach and Igloolik was that the port should not be at Steensby was reiterated. Three other communities expressed their support.
- The position that the plans for the mine had been made with no significant Inuit consultation was made several times.
- The Company's proposal for pre-development includes the construction of mine camps; 18 to 20 sealifts (ships) into Milne Inlet for the construction of the Milne port. The cost is 300 to 400 million dollars to construct the mine camps.
- QIA's participation in the NIRB review at this stage is important; communication and consultations with the communities remains a high priority for QIA.

Socio-economics

Topic	Questions Posed	Main Comments
<p>Economic aspects (employment, training, contracting, economic development, community services, royalties)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If someone is fired for alcohol or drugs can they be hired back later? • Can couples working at the mine live together? • What is involved in the 'employment and family assistance program'? • How can we be more educated regarding mines? • Will there be support for Hamlets who lose workers? • How will the government and QIA decide how to spend the money? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It must be decided how the money going to governments will be spent. • Jobs are not always benefits. Families break apart. • People need to be able to learn from their mistakes. Even if they have a criminal record or get fired for drugs, they should have the opportunity to be hired back. They need help and should be able to learn from their mistakes. • Education must be a priority. Drop-outs are high. Youth need counseling. • Compensation is needed. Older people will not stop hunting. • Shift work affects the whole family schedule on a regular basis. • It is unrealistic that Inuit are going to do shift work for a 100 years. • Unilingual Inuktitut speakers should be able to work on site. • Many Inuit have unrecognized skills. They can work better than most people. • There should be a very strict policy for discrimination with real penalties. This is our homeland. Everyone else is a visitor. Just because the Company owns the mine they don't own the land. • When people make money they are no longer eligible for social housing. But there is nowhere to move. It will become a choice between a job and a house. We need to work with the GN to create some flexibility in the rules and with the housing corporation. • We have to educate our children to take the good jobs, otherwise they will go to southerners and this will create frustration and tension.

Topic	Questions Posed	Main Comments
Social and cultural aspects (wellbeing, culture and harvesting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If we can't hunt anymore, who are we as Inuit? • How will people who choose not to work at the mine be supported? • What is the community support fund? How does it work? Who will run it? • Is there a separate fund available for healing? • Will there be access to carving stone? • What about crews from the ships? They could smuggle drugs or come to the communities. • Will the snowmobile bridges across ship tracks work? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have to know what the effects on our land and animals will be. The animals have to be protected. • Things will never be the same. • We are not trying to stop the Project, but we need to understand what it will mean. We need to do good planning. • Communities want to participate in monitoring. This could create a different kind of employment for hunters; jobs that value their skills. • The use of IQ must be recognized and enforced. Hunters are not being consulted. • We know that there will be negative impacts in communities. We want to know how Baffinland, QIA, and the GN are planning. We want to hear from them. • People need to learn how to manage money. • Drug and alcohol counseling is needed. People need help. • We need healing centres and programs on site and in the community (whether or not the project goes ahead) to help people with problems. • Elders have to be involved. • There needs to be a communication plan to tell people when the ship is passing.

Additional explanations and discussions:

- Cultural change:
 - Education and training is important now. Our culture was destroyed by education, but now we need it so that we are not stuck unemployed.
 - Money should be put aside for traditional knowledge learning. There needs to be focused programming, not just compensation.
 - The language needs to be preserved.
 - Integrating laws into Inuit life and culture is difficult. It is an ongoing process, and should be discussed. Inuit weren't even allowed to vote until the 1960s.
 - Elders and middle-aged people are just learning about mines. Younger people also are not aware. We are gradually learning about mines.
 - Inuit will continue to hunt. We are not stopping even if the Company thinks that.
 - If all Inuit work at the mine our way of life will be lost. There are more jobs than there are Inuit.
- Mitigation measures:
 - The 6 crossings for snowmobiles are not enough. If there is a caribou on the other side, I don't want to drive all the way down to a crossing. The caribou will be gone. There

should be wooden crossings, each 500 m or so, to facilitate hunting. Hunters should decide how many crossings, not the company.

- We do not want to eat caribou that have been killed by the train.
 - We do not think it will be safe on the ice near the ship tracks. In the summertime, small boats may be in danger from the ships.
 - There needs to be cultural sensitivity training, and concessions for Inuit who are not familiar with the workplace. There will be prejudice against Inuit.
 - Revenues going to NTI should be used for swimming pools, recreation.
 - In preventing problems, family members should be included in mitigation.
 - There should be a community on site so people can go home at night and families can stay together. Nanisivik had a school.
 - Employees should be allowed to go home when there is a death in the family.
 - Country food should be available on site. We don't want country food cooked the southern way. The company should buy country food from the HTO.
 - Minimum age limit should be 16 not 18.
 - There should be co-op jobs for students (3 months in school, 3 months working).
 - Inuit employment statistics never seem to be filled. Money should be put aside for that purpose.
 - There should be internships and apprenticeships at the mine. Inuit need to be trained for career advancement.
 - The Company should work with schools to create incentives for education.
-
- Grade 12 students often are not proficient in either English or Inuktitut.
 - Pond Inlet, Igloodik and Hall Beach are the most impacted communities. There needs to be separate provisions for these communities.
 - The operation of the mine is decided only by money.
 - We do not want to make the same mistakes as at Nanisivik. Also, it would still be a community if Inuit had been involved in closure planning.
 - Sexually transmitted infections can be a problem.
 - There are problems with foreign workers and interactions with people in the community.

IIBA

The IIBA is still under negotiation and will not be signed until the Environmental Assessment process is completed. Currently an Agreement in Principle is being negotiated. This session was included to inform communities and explain the elements that are under discussion.

Topic	Questions Posed	Main Comments
Contracting and employment, Financial participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will QIA distribute the money it gets from the mine? • How will GN allocate money? We want to hear from the GN to know what they are planning. • What will be the best use for this money? • Will there be monitoring to ensure that policies and best practices will be implemented? • How will the IIBA be enforced? Will there be monetary penalties and if so who will receive them? • Will there be equal job opportunities for women? • What training opportunities are being offered in the near future? • Will there be training for jobs like helicopter and airplane pilots, ship captains? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General principle: maximize Inuit benefits at every possible point, and over time. • Targets for Inuit employment will be based on labour force availability, and set each year (i.e. Maximum Inuit Employment Goal—MIEG). Contractors are obliged to comply. • The most affected communities should receive priority for all benefit – training, financial, employment and contracting. • Makivik distributed money directly to communities [Raglan Mine]. QIA should do the same. • It must be ensured that BIM meets obligations for Inuit employment and contracting. There has to be monitoring for training and employment. • There is a special provision in the IIBA to encourage and support female employees. • The IIBA also needs to support hunters. Not everyone wants a job at the mine. • Training fund: training available for Inuit for any of the 400 to 450 jobs on site. Also, a management training program. Efforts will be made to offer training in Inuktitut. • A training partnership has been formed, consisting of BIM, QIA, the federal government, and training institutions (e.g., Kakivak). • Scholarships will be offered each year. • Other incentives for young people to stay in school should be developed so they can get the good jobs at the mine. • There must be recognition of skills and experience of Inuit without formal certification. • All contracts are open to Inuit and give advantage to Inuit firms. (Preference for letting contracts: Baffin Inuit firms, Nunavut Inuit firms, non-Inuit firms.) There will be a business development fund, and assistance offered for the contract bidding process. • Language use policy: signs and reading materials will be in Inuktitut and English. The use of Inuktitut on site is encouraged, as long

Topic	Questions Posed	Main Comments
		<p>as it does not impair safety; use of Inuktitut should increase over time. How the language policy works in practice needs to be monitored.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testing should be in offered in Inuktitut, and some people need oral tests. • Country food needs to be offered at work sites. • Managers need to understand Inuit culture. • A review committee will be established to meet annually and review compliance with obligations and commitments in the IIBA and to discuss any issues.

Additional explanations and discussions:

- The broad outline of financial participation in the IIBA was given. Details were not provided since negotiations are ongoing. This was intended for information purposes only and there was time allotted for further discussion.
- It is important to have Inuit working at all levels of employment. At Nanisivik there was only one Inuk in management.
- Hiring priority is given to the most affected communities.
- Participants commented on experiences from the Bulk Sample Program, and noted issues that will need to be improved. For example:
 - Currently signs are not translated. Inuktitut speaking was not allowed on the radio.
 - Contract offers need to be in both languages.
 - Nuna Logistics was hiring from Yellowknife and Edmonton, and not enough from Baffin region.
- We have to emphasize Inuit educational upgrading, apprenticeships and advancement.
- QL (hiring contractor) had to even out employment between communities and, therefore, sometimes qualified people applied from one community but didn't get jobs (e.g., polar bear monitors from Pond Inlet); this caused some tension between communities.
- There are issues with Inuit owned businesses and unfairness with NNI registration; companies create joint ventures and use family, friends or spouses to increase Inuit content. Contractors find ways to get around Inuit content rules. This issue has to be examined closely.
- Inuit are able and capable of employment.
- We need to be thinking about grade 7 and 8 students now, getting them to prepare to make sure they have the education and skills to get jobs. GN and the schools should cooperate with the company.
- It is important to find out why students quit school or why employees quit their jobs.
- We need to challenge the stereotype of women in the workforce (e.g., women can be heavy equipment operators).
- There should be assistance with childcare and other barriers to school attendance or employment.

Topic	Questions Posed	Main Comments
IIBA - Land, Water, and Wildlife Community Wellness Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will these programs and impacts be monitored? • Who will be responsible for implementing? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compensation has yet to be fully developed under the IIBA negotiation process • Monetary compensation will not balance / offset the value of impacts on land, wildlife and socio-economics. • There will be a community wellness fund established via the IIBA. It is supported by both QIA and BIMC. It can be accessed by communities to provide funding for local initiatives to deal with project effects (e.g., cultural programs, healing centres).

Project Trade-offs

The final portion of the workshop was set aside for an overall discussion of Project benefits, impacts and trade-offs, as listed below. Specific questions posed included: What are the biggest concerns?; and, What are points of disagreement with BIMC and any potential resolutions?

Topic	Benefits	Impacts
Project Trade-offs	<p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jobs • Training and education • Training – management, apprenticeships • Contracts • Financial stake <p>Social and cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community infrastructure • Inuktitut in the workplace • Community wellbeing • Some increased access to hunting areas • Soapstone deposits 	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water quality—freshwater, marine • Wildlife—sea mammals, fish, food chain • Integrity of certain areas (ecosystems) affected by: ballast release, shipping route, port sites • Railway • Port sites • Tote road • Ballast water • Archaeological sites <p>Social and cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of hunting • Impact on traditional culture—land, communities • Family problems—shift work, extra money

Discussions:

- The port site should be moved. We want the port moved to protect the animals and it shouldn't matter how much it will cost.
- The Company is doing all its calculations on 1 deposit and 20 years of mining. We all know there are more deposits and they will make a lot more money. The cost of moving the port gets smaller when you look at it this way.

- Inuit were and are not involved enough. If asked, the Inuit would have had a lot to say about the port site and railway. Kimmirut and Cape Dorset were only visited after the planning was done.
- Communications need to be improved. If no one shows up to a meeting, it doesn't mean than everything is okay.
- The Company is not considering what wildlife means to us. If we are not hunting, then who are we as a people? Is all the money in the world worth that?
- We are the ecosystem: everybody and all the animals and the environment.
- We are moving more toward a wage economy. We must now take care of the environment and communities.
- Shipping in Milne Inlet is also a concern; there are still a lot of ships coming in during the construction period and this will impact the environment and animals.
- Shipping and ballast water will impact harvest species and their food sources (lower trophic levels) and affect food security. There has to be a proper filtering system.
- Benthic organisms and micro-organisms need to be closely monitored. The terrestrial food chain (e.g., mosquitoes) should also be monitored.
- Even if the port is moved, no matter what mitigation is put in place, the wildlife will be impacted. There still needs to be compensation. The company says there will be little effect, but we don't know how much impact there will be. We don't know if it can be mitigated. We don't know how much it will cost to clean up.
- However, compensation cannot fully balance the impact.
- The impacts will be long-term. Therefore, there must be long-term benefits as well.
- It is critical to develop community-based monitoring. Inuit should do a lot of the monitoring, especially for wildlife and land.
- At Red Dog in Alaska, the hunters were affected because marine mammals moved away. We need to compare impacts and research studies.
- The Project is 'life changing'. There will be changes to Inuit livelihood; food sources, land, families. We need to better understand these effects and think about what compensation would work here.
- Jobs are not always a benefit. Jobs also create difficulties. There will be impacts such as relationship and family problems, drunkenness, fighting, domestic violence, and all the consequences. There has to be support for families in the community.
- There should be provisions in the community to help cultural integrity and retention (e.g., cultural centres).
- The cost of living will increase, and it is not certain how many will get jobs; there will be family hardship to those with low incomes.
- We need to know what jobs are available and the skills required for those jobs. Also we need information on the products and services that could be provided by contractors. We need this information so we can plan now for training and education.
- We need to encourage our children to take advantage of the jobs and take the money home. Otherwise people from the south will come and take the jobs.
- Inuit can give the company advice on many things, e.g. hydrology in the area so that contamination doesn't occur.

INTERESTED PARTY MEETING NOTES

Ref RA-0705: Common Concerns – Shipping Impact and Marine Mammals (July 5 & 13)

Mary River Project: Experts Meeting – Shipping Impact and Marine Mammals
5 July 2011 (Winnipeg) and 13 July 2011 (Iqaluit)

Meeting facilitated by the Northern Projects Management Office (NPMO)
Notes by Bruce Stewart, QIA Technical Advisor on the Aquatic Environment

Participants:

- Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)
- CWS
- DFO
- EC
- NPMO
- PC
- QIA

Common Concerns

Regulatory agencies (DFO, EC, PC, CWS, AANDC) and QIA identified a number of shared concerns related to the aquatic environment during their meetings in Winnipeg on 5 July 2011, and in Iqaluit on 13 July 2011. These concerns were then discussed with BIMC and are reflected in the respective meeting notes. They include:

Baseline Studies

- Information presented in the DEIS, including the sampling baseline, does not form a sound basis for marine impact prediction and future monitoring. There are important gaps in the information on seasonal distributions of species; population density, composition, and size; and habitat use. These gaps, which extend along the entire shipping routes, make impact predictions uncertain and any future environmental effects difficult to detect.

Transboundary Issues

- Baffinland restricted their DEIS to the Nunavut Settlement Area (NSA) in spite of impacts to marine habitats and biota outside the NSA, in particular Nunavik waters. Shipping impacts will not be restricted to the vicinity of the shipping tracks because many species of marine mammals and birds are migratory, and their populations are shared by other jurisdictions.

Impact Assessment

- The selection of marine VECs is not appropriate for impact prediction and future monitoring. Bearded seals should have been included as they live and breed in the pack ice, and are ecologically and culturally important. Anadromous Arctic Char are a useful VEC, but they are not a good indicator of marine impacts as they only spend a small part of the year at sea. To assess and monitor food chain effects, other marine VECs should be added, including a truly marine fish, benthic and pelagic invertebrates, and marine plants. Changes may be detected earlier in lower than higher trophic levels, and may provide important clues for understanding their cause, enabling earlier and more effective mitigation.
- Baffinland uses 10% and 20% thresholds to assess the magnitude of effects on marine species and habitats, respectively without adequate justification. Thresholds for impact assessment must be tailored to a particular species or parameter, with an ecologically appropriate timeframe.
- Risks associated with the release of large volumes of ballast water by incoming ore carriers have not been considered in the DEIS. Ballast water can introduce invasive species and may differ physically and chemically from the receiving water. Under the International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments incoming vessels will likely be required to convert from exchanging to treating ballast water in the next 5 to 10 years. The various methods of exchange and treatment, and sources of ballast water all present different, potentially significant risks that should be assessed. Monitoring and mitigation measures should also be presented for ballast water.
- Baffinland should use the more precautionary 50 kPa threshold for blasting under ice cover that was developed by DFO for the NWT and Nunavut.
- The effects assessment and mitigation measures specific to wildlife sensitivities (e.g., key life cycle stages, number of generations) are not fully described.
- Likelihood of long-term wildlife displacement due to cumulative disturbance and the impacts associated with displacement of wildlife from normally preferred habitat have not been assessed. Assumptions of habituation to disturbance are not well supported in the DEIS.
- Marine organisms will be subjected to noise from aircraft, shipping, and construction. More detailed information is needed to assess the significance of noise disturbance on their life histories.

Shipping Routes

- Possible variations in the ship routes are not fully described nor are their potential effects. Recent bathymetric studies have found portions of the nominal southern route to be too shallow for ore carriers; heavy sea ice may require seasonal deviations in other areas. Impacts to the marine ecosystem and people using it cannot be assessed until the proposed route is clarified.

- The potential effects along the full northern and southern shipping routes were not fully described. The large magnitude, regular frequency, and year-round nature of the proposed shipping are unprecedented in northern Canada. The impacts of shipping, particularly on the sea-ice regimes (e.g., floe edge, polynyas, freeze-up, break-up, pan size, pack ice dynamics) and consequent impacts on wildlife and on Inuit travel/safety, were not adequately dealt with in the DEIS.

Mitigation and Monitoring

- Adaptive management measures that would be feasible for mitigating vessel impacts from the Project are not fully described. Given the wide uncertainty in impact predictions, it is very important to understand what measures are available to mitigate unforeseen impacts and whether these measures offer realistic mitigation potential.
- The sensitivity of monitoring programs for identifying population level changes and their cause(s) was not adequately described in the DEIS. Many impact predictions are uncertain, so heavy reliance may be placed on adaptive management to mitigate unforeseen effects. Consequently it is very important to understand whether monitoring programs would be able to detect change before serious population-level effects occur.

Ref RA-0712: Interagency/BIMC Workshop – Discussion and Action Items (July 12-14)

**Interagency / BIMC Workshop on the Proposed Mary River Project
Record of Discussion and Action Items**

12 to 14 July 2011
Frobisher Inn, Iqaluit, Nunavut

The workshop sessions were facilitated by Matthew Pickard (BIM) and Stephen Williamson Bathory (QIA).

Action:

- It was agreed that a record of discussion and action items would be generated and circulated to the participants for approval and then transmitted to NIRB.
- BIM will issue a letter to NIRB describing the Information Request (IR) interagency information exchange process that has been underway over the past several weeks and expected outcomes.

Tuesday, June 12, 2011 – Caribou Session

Participants

Amy Shen	AANDC
Oliver Curran	BIM
Anne O’Toole	BIM
Matthew Pickard	BIM
Mike Settingington	BIM/EDI
Luc Fortin	CTA
Jean Daniel Blouin	GN/DOE
Dianne Lapierre	GN/ED&T
Marie Duchaine	GN/Executive
Manik Duggar	NPMO
Johann Pelage	NPMO
Andrew Maher	PC
John Olyslager	PC
Colin Saunders	Pond Inlet
Solomon Awa	QIA
Stephen Bathory	QIA
Michelle Boyle	QIA
Lorraine Brooke	QIA
Kim Poole	QIA
Bob St.Eloi	QIA
Cheryl Wray	QIA

The purpose of this session was to allow the regulatory agencies, QIA, community representatives and BIM to engage in an open discussion concerning the DEIS, the status of

Information Requests and other matters related to caribou and other terrestrial wildlife to support input into the Technical Review.

The regulatory agencies, QIA and the community representatives agreed to the following areas of overlap and common concern as priority topics for discussion with BIM:

- Will the railway act as a filter or barrier for caribou;
- Further discussion on the effects of dust;
- Effect on ecological integrity;
- Uncertainty of information provided, especially given that caribou are at the low end of a cycle;
- Possible use of islands by caribou in Steensby Inlet and influence of ice-breaking restricting movement;
- Calving distribution and vulnerability of cows and young calves;
- Terrestrial bird baseline and assessment adequacy;
- Monitoring and adaptive management.

All participants made it clear that they had not yet had the time to do a full review of the June 30, 2011 Addendum for the removal of the road haulage option and modifications to the effects assessments and predictions.

Calving

There was a discussion on the limitations of scientific information available on caribou and caribou habitat for the north Baffin region and islands in Steensby Inlet. There was agreement that BIM had made considerable effort had been put into collecting baseline IQ. The lack of information raises uncertainties about impact prediction, particularly for a recovering population. Both IQ and existing scientific information show that caribou calve in the region surrounding Milne Inlet. However, existing scientific information also suggests that the region can be defined as a disbursed or non-congregating calving area and therefore has the potential for heightened vulnerability. The DEIS did not propose any specific mitigation for the calving areas or during the calving and post-calving periods which led to a discussion about the importance of a comprehensive monitoring program designed around the ability to detect change.

Action:

- BIM will request that GN provide the parties with their most recent information on caribou.
- BIM will look further into the model used for determining suitable vegetation and will commit to what can be provided within existing timelines for the Technical Review and FEIS completion.
- BIM will determine if other information exists to support mitigation forecasting around vulnerabilities and sensitivities e.g. vegetation and recommend what can be done in the Technical Review timeline and further into the FEIS.

Railway as a Barrier or Filter

There was discussion and clarification of materials to be used to construct the rail bed and at planned caribou crossings. Only the crossings will be 'caribou friendly'. IQ was used to determine appropriate crossing areas. Otherwise the rail bed will be constructed with larger materials which could present a danger to caribou attempting to cross at those points. The effect of drifting snow as a potential barrier in the winter was also discussed.

Further it was noted that during the winter, it is very difficult to predict crossings and whether caribou will use the rail line as a trail during the winter. It will take a train approximately 14 minutes to cross a point and this will occur every 6 hours. It would take 2 km to stop a train traveling at 60 km/hr. Information from experiences with diamond mines in the western Arctic suggest that caribou will avoid disturbed areas. Community representatives noted that once leaders begin to cross, others will follow despite the danger.

Action:

- The potential effects of the railway will be built into the monitoring program.
- It is agreed that monitoring and mitigation plans need to be updated and become more robust as the project advances so that issues are not left to the end. Monitoring and mitigation sessions need to commence prior to potential impacts. QIA suggests a workshop after the technical review of the DEIS is complete to focus on monitoring. PC identifies that the management decisions need to be included for the threshold at which mitigation needs to begin.

Islands in Steensby Inlet

A discussion took place regarding sea ice as important caribou habitat. Given that solid, land fast ice does not refreeze, the winter shipping route could present a barrier to movement of caribou in Steensby Inlet.

Action:

- BIM will reassess harvest data and include the islands and sea ice as habitat in the FEIS. Will also draw on more recent information from the GN on Peary Caribou.

Dust

The discussion centered on (a) defining an appropriate zone of influence and (b) iron concentrate and potential health effects to caribou and other wildlife. It was also noted in this instance, that if caribou choose to avoid areas where food sources are effected by dust (taste, smell), this will have an effect for Inuit harvesters. Also if animals are displaced to less optimal habitat this may have an effect on the overall health of the population.

Action:

- BIM will re-run the air quality model for the FEIS drawing recent information generated from work done at the Diavik mine.
- BIM will conduct the same analysis for the tote road to generate baseline information.

- BIM and QIA experts will continue discussion on significance determination.
- BIM will collect more data on iron content prior to construction as a baseline and for the purposes of monitoring.
- BIM will conduct lichen sampling and metals analysis of vegetation for the project area will be addressed through development of more detailed monitoring plans.

Monitoring

There was a discussion on the benefits of a comprehensive monitoring program that meets the needs of all the parties being designed collaboratively prior to the completion of the FEIS. The monitoring and management plans should at a minimum identify what needs to be monitored and how, identify thresholds for intervention and describe the responsibilities of all parties.

Action:

- It was agreed that a small core group be mandated, after the Technical Review, to work on an enhanced monitoring program, including thresholds for intervention.

Terrestrial Birds

There was a discussion and agreement that the baseline information for terrestrial birds did not provide sufficient information to be useful for impact prediction. The DEIS was therefore descriptive in nature.

Action:

- BIM will continue data collection and review and analyse the existing database of information, particularly for raptors and endangered species.
- BIM will use plot data to calculate rough densities by habitat type. Raptor team on site in 2011 will clean data and confirm nest sites. EC is requesting revisions to bird baseline.

Wednesday, June 13, 2011 - Marine Mammals Session

Participants

Rosanne D’Orazio	AANDC
Oliver Curran	BIM
Bevin LeDrew	BIM
Val Moulton	BIM
Anne O’Toole	BIM
Matthew Pickard	BIM
Siu-Ling Han	CWS
Derek Moggy	DFO
Georgina Wiliston	DFO
Allison Dunn	EC
Jean Daniel Blouin	GN/DOE
Dianne Lapierre	GN/ED&T
Marie Duchaine	GN/Executive
Manik Duggar	NPMO
Johann Pelage	NPMO
John Olyslager	PC
Colin Saunders	Pond Inlet
Solomon Awa	QIA
Stephen Bathory	QIA
Michelle Boyle	QIA
Lorraine Brooke	QIA
Jeff Higdon	QIA
Kim Poole	QIA
Bruce Stewart	QIA
Cheryl Wray	QIA

The session began with a review of meetings concerning marine mammals on July 5 and 6, 2011 in Winnipeg. The July 5th meeting was between the regulatory agencies and QIA which produced a list of common concerns. The July 6th meeting included BIM and focused on reviewing and advancing DFO’s IRs. The record with action items from these meetings will be submitted as part of the records for those meetings.

The purpose of this session was to continue building the relationship between BIM and the ‘review community’. The regulatory agencies, QIA and the community representatives reaffirmed the following areas of overlap and common concern:

- Adequacy of sampling baseline for impact prediction and monitoring (data to enable prediction of effects of their significance);
- Baseline information and DEIS restricted to the NSA;
- Use of 10% and 20% thresholds to assess the magnitude of effects on marine species and habitats, respectively without adequate justification;
- Possible variations in ship route and potential effects not fully described in the DEIS;

- Effects assessment and mitigation measures specific to wildlife sensitivities not fully described in the DEIS;
- Aircraft noise and significance of aircraft disturbance;
- Impact of project on sea ice regimes and consequent impact on wildlife and Inuit travel/harvesting;
- Likelihood and resulting impacts of species displacement on wildlife populations and Inuit harvesting;
- Ballast water concerns around species introduction, water exchange and treatment;
- Use the 50kPa threshold for blasting under ice cover as a precautionary measure;
- Further exploration of possible adaptive management measures that would be feasible for mitigating vessel impacts;
- Appropriateness of VEC selection for impact prediction and monitoring.

Again all participants made it clear that they had not yet had the time to do a full review of the June 30, 2011 Addendum for the removal of the road haulage option and modifications to the effects assessments and predictions.

From the above list, the following topics were identified as priorities for discussion with BIM:

- Shipping route sensitivity analysis – information gaps, bathymetry, sea ice data and geographic area;
- Adequacy of assessment of Milne Inlet shipping route for the 5-year staging and construction period;
- Baseline information related to lower trophic levels in the marine environment;
- Adaptive management, evolution of project design and seasonal closures.

Shipping Route Sensitivity Analysis

There was discussion on the treatment of sea ice in the DEIS and the lack of differentiation from a habitat perspective. There was further discussion on working with a 30-year standard for sea ice data series. Other topics of discussion included gap analysis, identification of hot spots, ballast water effects, salinity, bathymetry, ship operations and risks of accidents as well as cumulative effects, zone of influence for wake effects particularly for sea birds, ship design and ice breaking efficiency and appropriate geographic coverage for sensitivity analysis. It was concluded that more work on sensitivity analysis was needed which would provide all parties with a needed tool for future adaptive management.

Action:

- BIM will collect more ice data from CIS and consider ways to analyse over an extended (30-year) period and over a larger geographic area.
- BIM will collect new bathymetry data in the early fall of 2011.
- BIM will provide the parties with an approach for analysing sea ice habitat from a species perspective.
- BIM will calculate the potential zone of influence for wake effects.

- BIM will provide the parties with more information on ship specifications (understanding that design is in progress and may not be completed for the FEIS).
- BIM will ask FEDNAV if chemicals are used for de-icing and provide the response.
- BIM will make the calculation of number of vessel days in Arctic waters during construction and operation and estimate theoretical discharge volumes of oil/lubricants, emissions and noise levels.

Shipping in Milne Inlet

BIM reviewed the shipping plans for Year 0 (pre-construction) and Years 1-4 (construction) and other operations at the Milne Inlet base. Afterwards, one ship every 5 years will operate to transport materials too large for the railway. All shipping will be in the open water season using free market vessels. It was noted by Parks Canada that plans to establish a National Marine Conservation Area in Lancaster Sound requires that agencies apply a higher standard of care to the region.

Action:

- BIM will provide additional information in the FEIS on ship safety criteria (criteria required by Arcelor).

Adequacy of Baseline Information

The discussion built on the results of the meetings in Winnipeg, with an added focus on how to work to create a baseline for the lower trophic levels, address gaps and move into adaptive management. The use of Arctic char as a key indicator for marine species was challenged and the lack of information on benthos as a key link in the food chain and effects on marine mammals was also discussed. There was also concern raised by all of the reviewing parties about the lack of scientific data available generally on the marine environment for the project area. There was also discussion about lack of information in the DEIS on impact prediction methodology and uncertainties around determination of significance.

Action:

- BIM will consolidate and cross reference all IRs that overlap with DFO's IRs that relate to the adequacy of baseline information.
- BIM will clarify how they will be addressing specific data gaps.

Note: The parties at the July 5th and 6th meetings in Winnipeg agreed to follow up meetings relevant to this topic. DFO will take the lead to organize a small group of experts to look at what could be done to fill the gap in understanding and the effect on impact assessment. Transport Canada will organize an internal federal agency meeting on ballast water. INAC will organize an interagency meeting on closure, reclamation and management plans.

Adaptive Management

The reviewing parties all agreed that focused attention is required now to begin building a community-based monitoring program with feedback to management and thresholds for intervention. Given the challenges related to uncertainty, sensitivity to detect change, attribution and scale, a collaborative process drawing on the expertise of all parties is warranted. It was also noted that this topic is relevant to the IIBA that is currently under development. All parties agreed to the importance of continuing to collaborate and provide input into the development of a monitoring program.

Thursday July 14, 2011 – Socio- Economic Session

Participants

Rosanne D’Orazio	AANDC
Seth Reinhart	AANDC
Doug Brubacher	BIM
Oliver Curran	BIM
Anne O’Toole	BIM
Matthew Pickard	BIM
Dianne Lapierre	GN/ED&T
Chris Down	GN/Executive
Chris Fraser	GN/Finance
Natalie Strijak	GN/Health
Paul Quassa	Igloodik
Manik Duggar	NPMO
Colin Saunders	Pond Inlet
Solomon Awa	QIA
Stephen Bathory	QIA
Michelle Boyle	QIA
Lorraine Brooke	QIA
Cheryl Wray	QIA

The session began with a note that QIA did not review the economic models used in calculating effects on the territorial economy, or the technical adequacy of archaeological and Inuit knowledge studies, or human health aspects related to accidents and contamination.

It was agreed that the focus of the session would be on project monitoring and IR responses. It was also agreed that in terms of potential impacts of the project on Inuit, it would be prudent to link the previous days’ discussions on VECs and how they impact on Inuit. Further it was agreed that monitoring of socio-economic impacts will require collaboration among several government agencies, QIA, communities and BIM, each having specific responsibilities in this area. A common goal is to have the monitoring program and management plans well enough advanced for inclusion in the FEIS. Further it was understood that elements of the IIBA could also factor in a monitoring structure.

Community representatives noted specific concerns about impact prediction in the areas of wildlife and associated effects on Inuit harvesting, food security and proactive efforts to assist Inuit in receiving employment and money management. They also stated that the communities

would want to know as soon as possible the details of monitoring and management plans to gain a comfort level that preventative measures will be in place. Further the community representatives raised the issue of GN redirecting new revenues generated by the project into programs and infrastructure to assist the affected communities to mitigate impacts.

There was discussion on the methodology used to determine significance of impacts even in the absence of more detailed baseline information. Suggestions included working with data from similar projects elsewhere in northern Canada or the world.

The GN took the lead on a discussion concerning impacts on the territorial economy. Several questions were raised including transparency of the economic models used, limited analysis at the regional or community level, scale of the project warranting further discussion which cannot be limited by data restrictions, and leakage of benefits/profits out of Nunavut. BIM also stated a commitment to negotiate a Development Partnership Agreement (DPA) but could not say how or when.

Outstanding IRs from GN, QIA and INAC were reviewed. Responses will be integrated by BIM into their response spreadsheet. Of particular note was the discussion on the interaction of effects and uncertainties across VECs and VSECs, and the implications for determining impact significance and assessing cumulative effects.

Action:

- Generally there was agreement for Doug B and INAC to work through outstanding issues as needed.
- BIM will look at impacts on subsistence hunters who choose not to work with the mine and direct/indirect effects on harvesting, food security.
- BIM will provide more analysis on risks if employment or other economic predictions are not realized.
- BIM will work with QIA and other agencies to begin the development of a monitoring program.
- QIA, GN and AANDC will further discuss the elements of a monitoring program, including roles and responsibilities, an appropriate integrated structure, indicators and development timelines over the period of the Technical Review and come back to BIM.
- GN will send BIM and QIA the DPA with Agnico-Eagle.
- BIM will prepare a document in response to concerns raised by INAC:IR-105 concerning cumulative effects.
- BIM will review the experience from Nanisivik and Jericho mines for additional insight and possible areas meriting further analysis with regards to relevant VSECs for inclusion in the FEIS. BIM anticipates including a discussion of effects on households as a Subject Of Note in Volume 4, Section 6.6.

Note: QIA made a request to CANNOR/NPMO to provide funding for a tour by representatives of all regulators involved in the project, to provide the affected communities with information on the review and regulatory processes.

OTHER MEETINGS AND EVENTS

The following lists other important meetings and events related to the Project review for which minutes or notes are not available.

Community Meeting via Radio (Igloolik, May 18, 2011)

Attendees: General Public in Igloolik, QIA technical support staff

Purpose: To provide information on Baffinland's submission to NIRB on the Mary River Project.

Conference Call (Affected Communities, May 24, 2011)

Attendees: QIA Community Liaison Officers - Clyde River, Pond River, Arctic Bay, Igloolik, Hall Beach, Kimmirut and Cape Dorset, QIA technical support staff

Purpose: To provide information on Mary River Project Committee tasks and requirements.

Community Meeting (Igloolik, July 5, 2011)

Attendees: QIA Project Committee in Igloolik and Hall Beach, Baffinland technical staff, QIA technical support staff

Purpose: To discuss the Port Site location at Steensby Inlet and the Community's concerns and requests to have it moved from Steensby Inlet to Nuvuiit, project components and project feasibility.

Rail Route and Port-site Alternatives (Mary River, August 31 – September 2, 2011)

Attendees: QIA Executive with technical support staff, and, Baffinland Senior Management with technical support staff

Purpose: To fly the proposed alternative rail routes to better understand possible rail routes to the Nuvuiit peninsula. Included guided helicopter tours along several potential rail routes, extensive technical discussions on rail design and overall project context for each party.

Conference Call (Cape Dorset, September 7, 2011)

Attendees: QIA Project Committee Cape Dorset, QIA technical support staff

Purpose: To discuss the DEIS packages that Committee's have been reviewing and providing comments on, discuss NIRB's timelines, and QIA internal timelines for submission of comments on DEIS packages. (Note: conference call in lieu of meeting due to weather conditions)

Community Meeting (Kimmirut September 8, 2011)

Attendees: QIA Mary River Project Committee in Kimmirut, QIA technical support staff

Purpose: To discuss the status of Committee's review of the DEIS packages, discuss NIRB's timelines, and QIA internal timelines for submission of comments on DEIS packages.

Conference Call (Pond Inlet, September 12, 2011)

Attendees: QIA Project Committee in Pond Inlet, QIA technical support staff

Purpose: To discuss the status of Committee's review of the DEIS packages, discuss NIRB's timelines, and QIA internal timelines for submission of comments on DEIS packages. (Note: conference call in lieu of meeting due to weather conditions)

Rail Route, Pre-Feasibility Report (Montreal, September 16, 2011)

Attendees: QIA technical support staff, Baffinland Senior Management with technical support staff

Purpose: Review of Pre-feasibility Report related to a rail route from Mary River to the Nuvuiit peninsula.

Rail Route, Pre-Feasibility Report Verification (Mary River, September 17 – 19, 2011)

Attendees: Community Members from Hall Beach and Igloodik with QIA technical support staff

Purpose: To fly the proposed rail route to the Nuvuiit peninsula to better assess ground conditions and rail constructability. Included guided helicopter tours along potential rail route.

Impacted Community Tours (September 21-27)

Attendees: QIA Executive Members, QIA Clyde River Committee, QIA Pond Inlet Committee, QIA technical support staff

Purpose: To review the Executive Summary that will be submitted to the Nunavut Impact Review Board on the October 5th deadline. Notes from these visits are included in the subsections of the respective communities.

NOTE

*Due to weather the communities of Arctic Bay, Igloodik, Hall Beach, and Cape Dorset could not be visited.

Hamlet Council Briefing (Iqaluit, September 21st, 2011)

Attendees: City of Iqaluit Council Members, City of Iqaluit Committee Members

Purpose: To update the city council on the evolution of the Mary River Project, presentation of QIA role in the project and description and current events related to the formal NIRB led review process.

QIA Consultation, Rail Routing and Port Location (Igloodik, October 2nd, 2011)

Attendees:

In Igloodik: QIA Executive Members, QIA Igloodik Committee, QIA Committee Members from Hall Beach, Arctic Bay, Pond Inlet, Clyde River, Cape Dorset, Kimmirut and QIA Staff.

In Iqaluit (by teleconference): QIA Executive members, QIA IIBA and EA technical team members and QIA Staff.

Purpose: To discuss the results of pre-feasibility studies related to constructing a rail route to the Nuvuiit peninsula, the associated trade-offs of port-site location, shipping, project costs and overall project timelines.

*Due to weather and logistics meetings were held by teleconference.

QIA Community Consultation, Rail Routing and Port Location (Igloodik, October 3rd, 2011)

Attendees:

In Igloodik: General Public, QIA Executive Members, QIA Igloodik Committee, QIA Committee Members from Hall Beach, Arctic Bay, Pond Inlet, Clyde River, Cape Dorset, Kimmirut and QIA Staff.

In Iqaluit (by teleconference): QIA President, QIA EA technical team members and QIA Staff.

Purpose: To discuss the results of pre-feasibility studies related to constructing a rail route to the Nuvuiit peninsula, the associated trade-offs of port-site location, shipping, project costs and overall project timelines.

*Due to weather and logistics meetings were held by teleconference.

Information Package

Prepared from the Baffinland Iron Mines Draft Environmental
Impact Statement for the
Proposed Mary River Project

Prepared by the Mary River Coordination Team

On behalf of the Qikiqtani Inuit Association

Mary River Project

Draft Environmental Impact Statement: Community Summary Package

The materials in this document have been sourced directly from Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation's (BIMC) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The Summary Package has been prepared as a way to provide communities involved in reviewing the project with an immediate overview of the DEIS. For more detail on a particular topic, it is important to consult the complete DEIS as submitted by BIMC to the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB).

This package has not been written by QIA. The contents of this package they representative of QIA's perspective of the project.

Purpose of this Document

The Qikiqtani Inuit Association (QIA) has arranged for this Summary Package to be prepared in order to assist the communities affected by the proposed Mary River Project to better understand and discuss the findings of Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation Draft Environmental Impact Statement. This DEIS is made up of 10 Volumes covering all aspects of the Projects potential impacts on the physical and human environment and supported by many other volumes of technical baseline studies.

The Summary Package attempts to capture the Company's main conclusions from the DEIS without providing additional commentary or opinion. This is because the purpose of this document is to assist in generating discussion at the community level so that you can give your views on whether or not the conclusions of the DEIS are correct and if not, why not. It is also an opportunity for you to bring up matters that you think are important that have not been covered by the DEIS.

Each of the main sections of the DEIS has its own summary, in which we would like for you to provide your comments and recommendations. Once the communities have gone through the whole package then all comments, input, new ideas etc. will get packaged into a document that can be then used by the communities and QIA during the next stages of the NIRB process.

To the extent it is possible the Summary Package is written in the daily language of the communities and focuses on topics that would be of concern of Inuit, their families and the communities.

The newly created Mary River Review Committees, supported by QIA staff will be responsible for engaging community members around this information.

QIA contacts are:

Bob St. Eloi – QIA Director of Lands

Solomon Awa

Cheryl Wray

Stephen Williamson Bathory

P.O. Box 1340

Iqaluit, NU

X0A 0H0

Toll Free: 1-800-667-2742

Caribou:

- Air Quality
- Noise and Vibration
- Terrestrial Wildlife and Habitat
- Vegetation

ᑕᑕ:

- ᑭᑕᑕᑕᑕ ᑕᑕᑕᑕ
- ᑕᑕᑕᑕᑕ ᑕᑕᑕᑕᑕ
- ᑕᑕᑕᑕᑕ ᑕᑕᑕᑕᑕ
- ᑕᑕᑕᑕᑕ

Air Quality

What This Section is About

Emissions of gases and dust particles to the atmosphere. It discusses the baseline conditions in the Regional Study Area (RSA) and the anticipated effects on air quality as a result of the Project.

What Was Studied

- Existing air quality in the Project area was found to be typical of remote environments.
- Potential effects of the Project on air quality were evaluated using computer models and professional experience.
- Concerns raised by communities about air quality generally focused on the potential effects of dust from the Project .

Predicted Impacts

The Environmental Impact Statement considers potential effects from the Project on air quality.

- Potential effect(s) on air quality may include Total Suspended Particulate (TSP), Inhalable Particulate Matter, sulphur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and carbon monoxide (CO), as well as increased deposition of dust, metals and potential acid input (PAI).
- The following effects were predicted:
 - At Milne Port, the main sources of TSP and Inhalable Particulate Matter emissions are expected to be from fugitive sources, specifically bulk handling operations (stackers and reclaimers). Power generation is expected to account for nearly 100% of the SO₂, NO_x and CO emissions.
 - Along the Milne Inlet Tote Road, deposition levels in excess of the threshold value are expected to occur over a distance up to 250 m from the centre of the road. Similar results are expected down the entire length of the road. Effects from additional fugitive losses are expected to be approximately one-sixth of those for the railway.
 - At the Mine Site, the primary source of TSP and Inhalable Particulate Matter emissions will be mobile equipment operating in the pit and on haul roads. Power generation is expected to be the primary source of SO₂, while mobile equipment will be the largest source of total NO_x and CO. These combustion sources will also contribute to TSP, Inhalable Particulate Matter emissions. Other sources include the incinerator and idling locomotives. Aircraft emissions were not assessed due to the intermittent nature of the source.
 - Along the Railway, dust generation is expected to be limited to attrition of particles during the loading of rail cars, and is expected to be minimal. The ore is mostly larger particles which is why they are not expected to be blown around. No significant

windblown emissions are anticipated during rail transportation of the ore unless there is an accident.

- At Steensby Port, the main sources of TSP and Inhalable Particulate Matter emissions will be fugitive sources, specifically bulk handling operations (stackers and reclaimers). These were assumed to occur continuously even though precipitation can suppress them. Power generation will account for the majority of SO₂, NO_x and CO emissions. Other sources of emissions include the incinerator, idling locomotives and mobile vehicle fleet.
- Although measured levels of an air pollutant higher than the established standards (exceedances) may occur, these would generally be confined to local areas not extending beyond 1.5 km from the Project sites and are fully reversible.
- Transboundary and cumulative effects of the Project on air quality were also considered. The residual effects on air quality will not extend beyond 1.5 km from the Project site. As a result and given the location of the Project no transboundary air quality effects are possible. There are no other sources of emissions within the immediate area that would act cumulatively to affect local receptors such as people and wildlife.

Mitigation Measures

- An air quality monitoring program is proposed for each of the main areas of potential concern during the first few years of operation to confirm effects predictions.
- A number of pollution controls are proposed to minimize impacts on air quality, including best management practices for limiting air emissions, such as:
 - Using low sulphur arctic grade diesel fuel
 - Limiting driving speeds on roads
 - Enclosing ore crushing equipment and then venting these facilities and equipping them with dust collection equipment
 - Applying a dust suppressant (e.g. water) as required in high traffic areas and on stockpiles
 - Implementing a purchasing policy for equipment (incinerators, generators, vehicles) with lower emission levels or energy saving potential where feasible
 - Using granular material, where possible, for road construction, and
 - Providing regular maintenance of equipment and vehicles.

Conclusions

The proponent has concluded that with mitigation measures, there will not be a significant residual effect of the Project on air quality.

በርዕዮተኛነትና ጥበቃ ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል። ማረጋገጫውም ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል።

- ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል። ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል።

- የክፍያውን ገንዘብ ለማረጋገጥ ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል።
- ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል። ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል።
- ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል። ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል።

የክፍያውን ለማረጋገጥ ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ

- ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል። ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል።
- ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል። ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል።
- ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል። ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል።
- ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል። ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል።
- ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል። ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል።
- ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል። ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል።
- ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል። ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል።
- ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል። ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል።

ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ

ከሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል። ለሌሎች ማረጋገጫ ማድረግ ይኖርብዎታል።

Noise and Vibration

What This Section is About

Noise and vibrations. It discusses the baseline conditions in the Regional Study Area (RSA) and the anticipated effects related to noise and vibration as a result of the Project.

What Was Studied

This work is summarized below.

- Baseline noise levels in the Project area are typical of remote environments with no existing local sources of industrial noise or vibration.
- Project vibration sources were identified, measured, and modelled to assess the effects of the Project on ground-borne vibration that may be perceptible to humans or wildlife.
- Potential effects of vibrations on marine mammals are addressed in the Marine Mammals summary.
- Concerns raised by communities generally focused on the potential effects of Project-related noise and blasting.

Predicted Impacts

The Environmental Impact Statement considers potential effects from the Project on noise and vibrations in and around the Project area.

- Hunters or community members camping near the cabin to the east of the Milne Port site will likely hear noise from the Project. Because this camping area is near a stream and the ocean, it may already have similar background noise levels.
- Elevated noise levels may occur near construction activity at the Mine Site, Milne Port, Steensby Port and along the Tote Road and Railway. These noise levels may affect people and animals up to 1.5 km from the PDA.
- The operation of project facilities, including the Mine Site and ports, and transportation links such as roadways and the Railway, will generate noise, which may affect people and animals nearby.
- Noise effects from aircraft should be minor as the noise is local and intermittent.
- Decommissioning of project facilities may generate noise similar to that generated during construction, which can affect people and animals nearby.
- Mathematical modelling of noise predicted minor increases in the average hourly sound levels from truck traffic along the Tote Road during summer and winter operations.
- Increases in the predicted average hourly sound levels from movement of the train along the rail corridor should be local and minor due to the intermittent and temporary nature of this activity.

- With mitigation measures, noise effects from the Project should be minimal. The extent of these effects is limited to areas close to the Mine Site, Steensby Port, and Milne Port. Effects occurring outside of these sites are infrequent and of short duration. Noise effects are considered reversible as noise levels should return to pre-Project levels following closure.
- Blasting during construction at the Mine Site, Milne Port, Steensby Port, and along the rail corridor will generate vibration levels that extend outwards from the blast sites. However, there are no vibration sensitive environmental receptors in those areas. Therefore, significant vibration effects on land are not anticipated.
- The duration of the effect on vibration from construction activities is short term, the frequency of the effect is occasional and the effect is reversible.
- To limit potential vibration effects from blasting on freshwater fish in watercourses along the railway, measures will be taken to maintain blasting below the Department of Fisheries and Oceans guideline of 100 kPa.
- Open pit mine operations, including blasting, and railway loading/unloading and transit operations at the Mine Site may cause local vibration effects. Vibrations during these activities should be minor, with the exception of blasting at the pit working face. In general, operational vibration levels are potentially perceptible but are not of concern.
- There are no major sources of vibration associated with the Milne and Steensby Port operations, and therefore no notable vibration effects are expected.
- No vibration effects are anticipated from truck traffic along the Milne Inlet Tote Road, during the operations phase.
- During operations, trains may cause significant vibrations. These effects are intermittent and temporary, so no significant effects are anticipated.
- Vibration effects should not have significant effects during the closure phase.
- Residual effects from the Project should be minimal for vibration. The effects would be limited to areas near the Mine Site and the Steensby Port and Milne Port sites. Vibration effects are considered to be reversible.

Mitigation Measures

- Standard noise reduction measures will be implemented, including enclosing ore crushing equipment, operating generators and mobile equipment such as trucks with standard mufflers, and performing regular maintenance of engines and vehicles.
- A noise monitoring program is proposed for each of the main Project areas to verify effects predictions.
- No specific vibration controls are required for effects on land.
- Blasting will be maintained below the Department of Fisheries and Oceans guideline of 100 kPa to limit potential vibration effects from blasting on freshwater fish in watercourses along the railway.

Conclusions

Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation has concluded that with mitigation noise and vibration generated by the Project will not have any significant effects on the environment.

Terrestrial Wildlife and Habitat

What This Section is About

Terrestrial wildlife, predominately caribou, and wildlife habitat. It discusses the baseline conditions in the Regional Study Area (RSA) and the anticipated effects on caribou as a result of the Project.

What Was Studied

This work is summarized below.

- North Baffin Island caribou are currently in low numbers and appear to follow a cyclical pattern of approximately 60-70 years as identified through harvest data and Inuit Knowledge.
- Both Inuit Knowledge and aerial surveys show that during high caribou numbers the mine site area is used extensively for calving, while areas to the south are used during winter.
- Concerns raised by communities relating to caribou varied but generally focused on the Project's potential impact on caribou behaviour, calving, movement patterns, and mortality due to Project activities. The potential for the railway to interrupt movement patterns was a main focus.
- Wolves and foxes are dominant predators in the Regional Study Area that occur in low densities.

Land mammals including caribou may be found on Figures 2.1 through 2.7 of the theme based maps generated from the Inuit Knowledge Study.

Predicted Impacts

The Environmental Impact Statement considers potential effects from the Project on terrestrial wildlife and habitat.

- Habitat can be affected through direct loss within the Project footprint or through indirect loss due to Project activities that can create sensory disturbances (for example, noise or air emissions, or human presence) or reduce the effectiveness of habitats near project activities. The potential change in effectiveness of caribou habitat for the North Baffin range is predicted to be 2%, and for the RSA is predicted to be 12-13%.
- Typical caribou movement patterns can be altered as a result of project infrastructure, 12% of the Railway is predicted to form some kind of barrier to caribou movement. The trains may add to the barrier effect of the railway. The length of sections that may pose a barrier range from 1.0 to 2.9 km, which is below a threshold of average daily caribou movement.
- Caribou mortality may occur due to collisions and likely to be few. Collisions if they occur will be limited to individuals and it is not expected that this will have a significant effect on the number of caribou in the region. Access to harvesting is not expected to have a significant effect on mortality since there will be no increased hunter access provided by the Project.
- A study determined that the potential for contaminants to affect caribou from the release of contaminants such as dust from Project activities was low.
- The Project is not expected to have a negative effect on wolves and foxes.

Mitigation Measures

- Traffic controls will be in place to monitor sightings of caribou and other wildlife.
- Waste will be carefully managed to prevent attraction and scavenging by wildlife.
- Seasonal stoppages for trains are possible if large groups of migratory caribou return to the area.
- Snow management will grade snow banks along railway and roadway to facilitate caribou crossing.
- The railway embankment will be constructed of fill material at five identified trails for easier caribou movement across the railway embankment at these five locations.
- Train traffic will be limited to four passes per day (each train is about 1 km long) to reduce physical barriers from trains.
- No intensive monitoring of caribou will occur unless higher numbers are detected, movements are being impacted (deflection from crossing will be examined), or asked to do so.

Conclusions

The proponent is moderately confident that with mitigation measures, the Project will not have a not significant effect on caribou habitat or movement. The Project will not have a significant effect on overall north Baffin Island caribou mortality.

Vegetation

What This Section is About

Vegetation including abundance, diversity and health and plants used by Inuit. It discusses the baseline conditions in the Regional Study Area (RSA) and the anticipated effects on vegetation as a result of the Project.

What Was Studied

This work is summarized below.

- Plant species and abundance were identified during four summers.
- No rare or endangered plant species were identified during plant surveys within the RSA.
- Particular attention was paid to blueberries as the most often harvested vegetation that Inuit may use.
- The potential effects on vegetation due to use of land to build and operate the Project were predicted.
- The potential effects on vegetation due to emissions into the air of dust and gases were studied.
- The potential introduction of invasive species due to Project activities was estimated.

Information about berry picking is provided in Figures 1.5 and 1.6 from the Inuit Knowledge Study.

Predicted Impacts

The Environmental Impact Statement considers potential effects from the Project on vegetation abundance, diversity and health.

- Vegetation can be affected through direct loss within the Project footprint or through indirect loss due to Project activities (for example air emissions) or by inadvertent introduction of invasive plant species.
- Vegetation abundance and diversity will be reduced in the Project's Potential Development Area (PDA), or footprint, where the ground will be used to build and operate the Project. The predicted loss of the terrestrial habitat within and outside the PDA is estimated to be a very small (0.36%) portion of the RSA.
- Dust released into the area will affect an area larger than what is disturbed to build the Project. No vegetation classes sensitive to dust deposition are predicted to be adversely affected by dust outside of the PDA.
- A possible zone of influence of dust deposition on vegetation that will influence caribou distribution and abundance is possible, currently predicted at 59 km² of terrestrial habitat surrounding the Mine Site (outside and including the Project Development Area).
- Dust released during the Project activities will contain metals. Although accumulation of metals in the soils at the mine site and port site may occur as a result of dust deposition, the effects on caribou and vegetation (including blueberries) are not expected to have a significant adverse effect.

- Nitrogen dioxide emissions from combustion sources (i.e., power generators) outside of the PDA will occur. No vegetation classes are predicted to be adversely affected by nitrogen dioxide emissions outside of the PDA.
- Nitrogen deposition is not predicted to exceed estimated acceptable levels outside of the PDA.
- Effects on vegetative health as a result of dust are mainly reversible when dust-producing activities end.
- The reduction in blueberry cover is expected to be minor compared to baseline conditions at the scale of the RSA. New disturbances to blueberry cover will occur along the railway and at Steensby Port.

Mitigation Measures

- Project activities will be planned and conducted to minimize the Project footprint.
- Project vehicles will stay on the established roads within the Project Development Area during operation, limiting new disturbance.
- Revegetation of the terrestrial habitat will be allowed to occur naturally. The mitigation will reduce the likelihood of invasive plant species getting established within the RSA due to Project development activities.
- Equipment brought to the Project site will be cleaned of soils that could contain plant seeds that do not naturally occur in the RSA. This will reduce the likelihood of invasive plant species getting established within the RSA due to Project development activities.
- Mitigation of dust effects on vegetation will be addressed by those measures used to mitigate effects on air quality.
- Vegetation health will be monitored during the life of the Project.

Conclusions

- The proponent is highly confident that Project related activities will have a not significant effect on vegetation abundance and diversity within the Regional Study Area.
- The proponent is moderately confident that Project related activities will not have a significant effect on plant health within the Regional Study Area.
- The proponent is highly confident that Project related activities will not have a significant effect on culturally valued vegetation within the Regional Study Area.

- ጋና ታሪካዊ የጥቅም (ዲጋታይት ርዕሰ ሐረግ) ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ (ለግል ለመጠየቅ) ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ
- ዲጋታይት ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ
- ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ
- የግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ

የግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ

- ከዚህ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ
- ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ
- ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ
- ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ
- ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ
- ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ

ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ

- ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ
- ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ
- ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ ለግል ገቢ ለመጠየቅ

Travel:

- Climate Change
- Landforms, Soils and Permafrost

Δፍጥናቶች

- ገረገሪ ልዩነቶች ምክንያቶች
- ምድሪ ልዩነቶች ምክንያቶች, ልዩነቶች ምድሪ ልዩነቶች

Climate Change

What This Section is About

Weather and climate in the Project area, including how the climate is expected to change over time, how these changes could affect the Project and how the Project could contribute to climate change.

What Was Studied

- Baseline climate conditions as well as future predicted changes in climate due to future greenhouse gas emissions, land-use changes and other driving forces were estimated using global climate change models.
- Concerns raised by communities about climate change include how the Project could affect climate change and how climate change might affect the Project.

Predicted Impacts

The Environmental Impact Statement considers potential effects from the Project on climate change as well as potential effects of climate change on the Project.

- Over the next several decades, precipitation and evaporation in the Project area are both expected to increase due to climate change. The change to the overall moisture input is expected to be minimal.
- Snow depths are not expected to change over the life of the Project.
- Extreme weather (i.e. significant snowdrifts, extreme rainfall events), as well as global climate change, has the potential to affect Project infrastructure and in turn represent concerns for human safety and the environment.
- Overall wind speeds are not expected to change significantly over the life of the Project.
- Changes in sea ice cover due to climate change will not significantly affect the shipping operations in the Foxe Basin.
- Climate change will affect sea levels. Steensby Port is in an area of falling sea levels.
- The permafrost active layer depth is projected to increase by approximately 50% for most permafrost regions in the High Canadian Arctic over the next 100 years. This is predicted to have little effect on the very cold and deep permafrost conditions in the mine site area over the planned life of the Project.
- Over its life, the production of greenhouse gases by the Project will increase, potentially by as much as twice the current GHG emissions for Nunavut. This is not a significant change on a national or global scale.

Mitigation Measures

- Potential implications for the stability and safety of infrastructure due to climate change on hydrology and permafrost have been taken into account in the engineering design of the Project.
- The project facilities for Steensby Port will be conservatively designed to account for changes in sea levels.
- Baffinland will attempt to mitigate climate change and reduce the increase in GHG emissions due to its activities by using arctic grade diesel fuel and rail transportation of ore instead of trucks.
- Baffinland will also explore ways of conserving energy as the Project moves through development and will adapt accordingly.
- Baffinland will also report annually on performance indicators, including energy use and GHG emissions management by the Project.

Conclusions

The proponent concludes that the effects of the Project on climate change are not significant. A cumulative effect on climate change will occur through the release of greenhouse gases. These emissions will be very small compared to national GHG emissions and insignificant in terms of global GHG emissions. The effects of climate change on the Project have been mitigated through conservative design of the Project.

Landforms, Soils and Permafrost

What This Section is About

Landforms, soils and permafrost. It discusses the existing conditions in the Regional Study Area (RSA) and the anticipated effects on landforms, soils and permafrost as a result of the Project.

What Was Studied

This work is summarized below.

- Topography varies across the Project's Regional Study Area (RSA).
- The geology on or near the surface of the area consists of sediments of glacial, river, or marine origin, with occasional outcrops of bedrock and sedimentary rock formations.
- The thickness of the active layer (upper portion of soil that thaws each summer) varies across the region and is typically between 1 to 2 m thick in the Project area depending on the local soil cover.
- Soils throughout the RSA were found to be generally poor in nutrients.
- Permafrost thickness in and around the RSA is deep, typically in the 400 to 700 m depth range.
- In the RSA, the most common sensitive landforms are thaw sensitive soils and massive ice deposits.

Predicted Impacts

The Environmental Impact Statement considers potential effects from the Project on landforms, soils and permafrost.

- Project activities that have the potential to affect sensitive landforms include:
 - Fills over existing ground
 - Excavation
 - Backfilling
 - Various uses of water including water intake, ponding, etc., and
 - Berms.
- Soil destabilization and erosion are potential effects in all areas where the naturally occurring topography and soils are altered as a result of Project implementation. Soil destabilization and erosion effects are expected to be minor.
- No major eskers (a long, narrow ridge of coarse gravel deposited by a stream flowing in or under a decaying glacial ice sheet) or wetlands within the LSA will be affected by the Project
- The Project infrastructure, dust generated, and noise will be the main project components and activities that will affect aesthetics during the life of the Project.

Mitigation Measures

- Geotechnical investigations will continue to be carried out to avoid, where possible, locating project activities on sensitive landforms.

- Foundations will be designed to protect the underlying permafrost from degradation due to construction or climate change.
- Stream crossing structures will be designed to accommodate extreme flooding events.
- Drainage systems will be designed to provide adequate drainage and prevent ponding of water.
- The Project sites will be built in a manner that does not disturb sensitive landforms outside the Project Development Area (PDA).
- Permafrost protection measures for the waste stockpiles will be designed for potential effects of climate changes.
- Waste stockpile slopes will be monitored on an ongoing basis during operations. Any cracks that develop will be monitored and repaired as required to minimize inflow of surface water and ice wedge formation within the stockpiles.
- Best Management Practices will be used for sedimentation and erosion control.
- A sediment control monitoring program will be implemented to detect potential issues arising from soil destabilization and erosion and assess whether these changes are naturally occurring variations (e.g., suspended sediment increases during spring thaw) or Project-related effects.

Conclusions

The proponent is highly confident that with mitigation measures, the Project will not have a significant effect on sensitive landforms.

ᑕᑚᑦ, ᑕᓪᓴᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦᓴᑦ

ᑖᑚ ᑕᑚᑦ ᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ

ᑕᑚᑦ, ᑕᓪᓴᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦᓴᑦ. ᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦᓴᑦ ᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦᓴᑦᑕᑦᓴᑦ ᑕᑖᓴᑦᑕᑦᓴᑦ ᑕᑖᓴᑦᑕᑦᓴᑦᑕᑦᓴᑦ ᓴᑕ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦ ᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦᓴᑦᓴᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦᓴᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦᓴᑦᓴᑦ.

ᑕᓪᓴᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ

ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᑕᑖᓴᑦᑕᑦ.

- ᓴᑕᓴᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ.
- ᓴᑕᓴᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ.
- ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ (ᑕᓴᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ) ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ.
- ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᑕᓴᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ.
- ᑕᑖᓴᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ, 400ᑕᓴᑦ 700ᑕᓴᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ.
- ᑕᓴᓴᓴᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ, ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ.

ᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ

ᑕᑖᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ.

- ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ:
 - ᑕᑕᑕᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦ ᓴᓴᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦ
 - ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦ (ᓴᑖᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦ)
 - ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ
 - ᓴᑕᓴᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑦ ᓴᑖᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦ, ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦ, ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦ, ᓴᑕᓴᑦ
 - ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦ.
- ᓴᓴᓴᓴᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ.
- ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ (ᑕᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ) ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ.
- ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ, ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ, ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ.

ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ

- ᓴᑕᓴᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦ ᓴᑖᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ ᓴᑕᓴᑦᑕᓪᓴᑦᑕᑦ.

Shipping and Marine Mammals:

- **Marine Habitat and Biota**
- **Marine Mammals**
- **Marine Water and Sediment Quality**
- **Migratory Birds and Habitat**
- **Sea Ice**

Marine Habitat and Biota

What This Section is About

Marine habitat and Arctic Char. It discusses the baseline conditions and the anticipated effects of the Project on the marine habitat and Arctic Char at Milne and Steensby Ports.

What Was Studied

This work is summarized below.

- Sea run Arctic Char were the most commonly found fish in the coastal marine habitats of Milne Port and Steensby Port, and the focus of the assessment on marine habitat and biota.
- Various Project activities that could affect marine fish habitat and Arctic Char in the vicinity of the proposed port sites were considered in the Environmental Impact Assessment. These included:
 - Discharge of ballast water from supply vessels and ore carriers;
 - Airborne dispersion of dust from ore stockpiles;
 - Discharge of treated wastewater; and
 - The modeled 95% probability distribution of diesel spills (considered in Volume 9 of the DEIS, cumulative effects and other assessments).
- Concerns expressed by communities generally focused on the effects of the Project on fish.

Information about fish and resources is provided in Figure 6.13 from the Inuit Knowledge Study.

Predicted Impacts

The Environmental Impact Statement considers potential impacts on marine habitat and Arctic Char from the Project.

- The area of marine habitat directly lost as a result of ore dock footprints at Milne Port and Steensby Port is less than 1% at both port locations.
- Alteration of near shore marine habitat due to propwash and other dock side activities should be less than 0.1% of available habitat, and these activities should have little effect on biological productivity at either port.
- Ballast water discharged at the Steensby Port may cause local changes in temperature, salinity, and/or nutrients. These changes may be different in summer and winter. They may cause some shift in benthic productivity but the magnitude of any changes should be low to moderate relative to the overall productivity of the Local Study Area.
- Underwater noise disturbances will occur throughout the life of the Project. These effects would occur year-round at the Steensby Port and during the open water season at the Milne Port. They could cause fish to avoid nearby habitats but any effects should not be significant and will end with Project closure.
- Suspended sediments, possible increases of metals in tissue, and discharge of wastewater at both port locations could affect Arctic Char health. But, any negative effects on Arctic Char health should not be significant.
- Sediments stirred up from the bottom by propwash currents in areas of high vessel activity near the docks will decline over time (through construction and into the operational phase) as

fine grained particles are redistributed out of those areas. Sediment grain size composition will eventually equilibrate, the seabed will stabilize, and the amount of sediment resuspended will become negligible.

- The effects on Arctic Char habitat should be low in magnitude and reversible upon completion of the Project.

Mitigation Measures

- Baffinland must provide compensation under the *Fisheries Act* for any harmful alteration, damage, or destruction of fish habitat. This has been addressed in the Fish Habitat Compensation Plan.
- The use of silt curtains will reduce the areas affected by sediment that is mixed into the water during construction and closure activities.
- At Steensby Port, runoff from the ore stockpile and site will be collected and allowed to settle prior to summer discharge to reduce silt discharges into the marine environment.
- Treated sewage effluent will be discharged at depth into Steensby Inlet year-round.

Conclusions

- Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation has concluded that the effects of the Project on marine habitat at both Milne Port and Steensby Port should not be significant. No adverse residual effects on sea run Arctic char in Milne and Steensby Inlets are anticipated.
- Project activities leading to short-term water quality guideline exceedances and any related effects on marine habitat (e.g., changes due to ballast water) should be reversible. As a result, the Project should not have significant adverse residual effects on marine fish habitat. The Project would cause a negligible loss of habitat within Project footprints.

ጋራ ለሆነው ሁሉም ግብርና ለማድረግ ማስፈጸም ይቻላል። ለዚህም ለግብርና ለማድረግ ማስፈጸም ይቻላል።

- ለግብርና ለማድረግ ማስፈጸም ይቻላል። ለዚህም ለግብርና ለማድረግ ማስፈጸም ይቻላል።

ግብርና ለማድረግ ማስፈጸም ይቻላል።

- ግብርና ለማድረግ ማስፈጸም ይቻላል። ለዚህም ለግብርና ለማድረግ ማስፈጸም ይቻላል።
- ለግብርና ለማድረግ ማስፈጸም ይቻላል። ለዚህም ለግብርና ለማድረግ ማስፈጸም ይቻላል።
- ለግብርና ለማድረግ ማስፈጸም ይቻላል። ለዚህም ለግብርና ለማድረግ ማስፈጸም ይቻላል።
- ለግብርና ለማድረግ ማስፈጸም ይቻላል። ለዚህም ለግብርና ለማድረግ ማስፈጸም ይቻላል።

ግብርና ለማድረግ ማስፈጸም ይቻላል።

- ግብርና ለማድረግ ማስፈጸም ይቻላል። ለዚህም ለግብርና ለማድረግ ማስፈጸም ይቻላል።
- ግብርና ለማድረግ ማስፈጸም ይቻላል። ለዚህም ለግብርና ለማድረግ ማስፈጸም ይቻላል።

Marine Mammals

What This Section is About

Marine mammals, predominately ringed seal, walrus, beluga whale, narwhal, bowhead whale, and polar bear. It discusses the baseline conditions in the Regional Study Area (RSA) and the anticipated effects on these marine mammals as a result of the Project.

What Was Studied

This work is summarized below.

- Ringed seals are present year-round along shipping routes to and from both Milne and Steensby Inlets. Stable landfast ice offers preferred seal habitat for breathing holes and lairs. The seals disperse during open-water periods.
- Traditional knowledge indicates that small numbers of walruses are present in Steensby Inlet. Key walrus areas are west of Rowley Island, along the floe edge or on moving pack ice. Walruses also occur in Hudson Strait. Very few are present along the shipping route in Eclipse Sound and Milne Inlet. About half of the footprint of the Steensby Port dock is unsuitable as walrus habitat.
- Beluga whales occur seasonally along both shipping routes. One population is found along the northern route, and all four occur along the southern route. Belugas are found in Foxe Basin in the summer and fall, and are in Hudson Strait and Davis Strait during migration and winter. Belugas were widespread in Foxe Basin and Hudson Strait during aerial surveys.
- Narwhals are more common in the northern area of the Regional Study Area. About 20,000 summer in the Eclipse Sound and Milne Inlet area where they are thought to calve and feed. Relatively few narwhals have been present in Foxe Basin. They are thought to overwinter in the eastern portion of Hudson Strait.
- Hudson Strait is an important overwintering area for bowhead whales and north-western Foxe Basin is considered a nursing area. Milne Inlet, Eclipse Sound, and to a lesser degree Koluktoo Bay are used by bowhead whales.
- Polar bears are abundant in northern Foxe Basin including the shorelines of Steensby Inlet and Koch, Rowley and Bray islands. A small number of polar bears likely occur in Milne Inlet and Eclipse Sound during the open-water season. Elders have noted that the southeastern portion of Steensby Inlet provides good denning habitat. Polar bears also overwinter in Hudson Strait.
- Community concerns about ringed seal focused on potential disturbances from the Project caused to ringed seal pups on landfast ice. Community members noted that Steensby Inlet has a high density of ringed seal birth lairs.
- Community concerns over walrus focused on their potential displacement and disruption along the shipping route and in the Steensby Port.
- Community consultations about beluga whales noted that shipping might frighten them and that they may move closer to shore in response to ships.
- Community concern on narwhals focused on the potential negative effect of shipping on them. They were concerned the narwhals might respond negatively to the ships and might leave the area, particularly Milne Inlet.
- Communities also expressed concern about possible effects of shipping noise on bowhead whales in the spring.
- Community members noted that shipping would not directly affect polar bears but that Project effects on their prey may cause polar bears to seek food in other areas.

Marine mammals are shown on Figures 3.1 through 3.16 of the theme based maps generated from the Inuit Knowledge Study.

Predicted Impacts

The Environmental Impact Statement considers potential effects from the Project on marine mammals including ringed seal, walrus, beluga whale, narwhal, bowhead whale, and polar bear.

Ringed Seals

- Project activities such as construction, vessel traffic, ice breaking, and aircraft overflights may disturb ringed seals.
- Ringed seals are generally tolerant of on-ice industrial activity and shipping. They may be susceptible to disturbance when mating, giving birth and nursing pups. Ringed seal habitat will be changed by ice breaking in locations where vessels transit.
- The acoustic modelling results and mitigation measures suggest that ringed seals would not be exposed to sound levels high enough to cause hearing impairment.
- Ringed seal vocalizations are at higher frequencies than most shipping and construction noises, and Project noise should not mask ringed seal calls
- Mortality from shipping collisions should be limited in the ice cover season. In the open water season ringed seals exhibit localized avoidance and should not be hit by ships.
- The Project should not have a significant negative effect on ringed seals.

Walrus

- Construction activities, vessel traffic, icebreaking, and aircraft overflights may disturb walrus. Walrus show local avoidance of vessels and variable responses to aircraft. The disturbances from these activities should not affect calving areas west of Rowley Island.
- Less than 2% of total landfast ice edge leading into Steensby Port and less than 1% of pack ice in Hudson Strait will be changed as a result of the Project.
- Walruses should not be exposed to sound levels causing hearing impairment, and there should be no significant effects on Project noise on masking walrus calls.
- No mortality of walruses is expected to occur as a result of the Project.
- The Project should not have a significant negative effect on walruses.

Beluga Whales

- Ore vessels passing through Hudson Strait may alter the habitat of beluga that spend the winter there. The change to the pack ice will be temporary. The changes to habitat caused by dock structures and temporary changes to overwintering habitat are below the threshold value and should not be significant.
- Beluga responses to industrial activities are variable. With mitigation, disturbance of belugas by construction, shipping and aircraft overflights should not be significant.
- Construction activities should not expose belugas to sound levels that could damage their hearing. With mitigation, effects on beluga hearing should not be significant.
- Shipping noise and beluga vocalizations overlap in frequency, and ship noise could mask the vocalizations of belugas. These effects will be short-lived and should not be significant.
- No mortality of beluga whales is expected to occur as a result of the Project.
- The Project should not have a significant negative effect on beluga whales, although there is uncertainty with predictions on effects of disturbance caused by shipping during the winter and on the effects of masking.

Narwhal

- The interaction of the Project with the narwhal population is limited to shipping activities in Milne Inlet during the open water season.
- The change in habitat as a result of dock structures at Steensby and Milne Ports will be a small footprint of the available marine habitat in the respective area.
- The shifting of pack ice in Hudson Strait will be limited as currents and wind will restore pack ice distribution.
- In general, with mitigation, disturbance effects on narwhal from construction, vessel traffic, icebreaking, and aircraft overflights should not be significant. There is no clear evidence that narwhals immediately abandon an area transited by a vessel.
- Narwhals hearing should not be damaged by Project activities including construction and shipping.
- Masking effects from construction should be limited, but there is potential for some masking from shipping noise. These effects should be localized and not significant.
- No mortality of narwhals is expected to occur as a result of the Project.
- No significant effects of the Project on narwhals are expected, although there is uncertainty with predictions on effects of disturbance caused by shipping and on the effects of masking.

Bowhead Whales

- Based on studies of their response to ships and icebreakers, bowhead will likely avoid at least the immediate area around ships and thereby avoid collisions with ships.
- The change in habitat caused by dock structures and temporary decrease in bowhead overwintering habitat caused by ice-breaking will be relatively small.
- Bowhead whale responses to industrial activity are variable. With mitigation in place disturbance effects on bowhead whales from construction, shipping, and aircraft overflights should not be significant.
- Bowhead whales are unlikely to occur within 25 meters of construction activities, so hearing impairment is unlikely from the sound levels caused by pile driving. Bowhead whales are not predicted to be close enough to ore carriers to suffer hearing impairment. The effect of hearing impairment on bowhead whales is predicted to be not significant.
- The potential for masking of bowhead whale sounds is increased compared to other whales because there is a large amount of overlap in the frequencies produced by construction and shipping noises and those used by bowheads. Masking effects should be localized and short-term, and should not be significant.
- No mortality of bowhead whales is expected to occur as a result of the Project.
- No significant effects of the Project on bowhead whales are predicted, although there is uncertainty with predictions on effects of disturbance caused by shipping during the winter and on the effects of masking.

Polar Bears

- Interactions of the Project with the polar bear population should be limited.
- Polar bears may avoid or approach ships and port sites. The change in landfast ice habitat in Steensby Inlet and Foxe Basin as a result of the Project represents 5.6% and 0.36% respectively of suitable polar bear habitat. The change in pack ice is less than 1% of pack ice in Hudson Strait, Foxe Basin, and near Steensby Port.
- The disturbance effects on polar bears from construction, shipping, and aircraft overflights should not be significant.
- There is a risk of polar bear mortality as a result of polar bear and human interaction. However, mitigation measures will be in place to reduce risk of a bear encounters and the chances that a bear would have to be killed in defence of human life. With mitigation measures no mortality of polar bears is anticipated.
- No significant effects of the Project on polar bears are predicted.

Mitigation Measures

- Blasting during pupping and nursing periods for ringed seals will be mitigated.
- To reduce sound transmission from blasting, an underwater bubble curtain will, as necessary, be employed.
- Dock structures were designed to minimize their footprint in the marine environment.
- Icebreaking vessels will control the width of the shipping lane by moving along the same track as much as possible through landfast ice in Steensby Inlet.
- The shipping lane into Steensby Port will be delineated with markers to notify the ship's crew of the boundaries of previous vessel track lines.
- Icebreaking tugs and ore carriers will minimize the area of broken landfast ice at the Steensby Port.
- Vessels will maintain a constant course and appropriate speed
- Ore carriers have a modern design that should limit noise output.
- Vessels will minimize idling of engines when docked at Milne and Steensby ports.
- Except during takeoff and landing, Project aircraft will be operated at a minimum altitude of ~450 meters over marine areas, when weather conditions allow. In addition, aircraft will be prohibited from flying low over wildlife for passengers to 'get a better look' or for photography.
- Project personnel will be educated about bear safety.
- Strict management of waste will reduce the chances of human-bear interaction.
- Polar bear monitors will be hired to ensure worker safety.

Conclusions

Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation has concluded that with mitigation measures, the Project will not significantly affect marine mammals.

ርቢዮገደር ስራ ርዕሰ ክፍል ጠባቂዎች 3.1ገር 3.16ገር ወዲህ ተጠቃሚ ካሳገዱት ልዩ ልዩ ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል።

ግብርና ስራዎች

ርቢዮገደር ስራ ርዕሰ ክፍል ጠባቂዎች ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል። ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል። ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል።

ግብር

- ለርቢዮገደር ስራ ርዕሰ ክፍል ጠባቂዎች ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል።
- ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል።
- ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል።
- ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል።
- ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል።
- ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል።

ግብር

- ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል።
- ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል።
- ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል።
- ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል።
- ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል።

ግብርና ስራዎች

- ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል።
- ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል።
- ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል።
- ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል።
- ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል።
- ስራዎች ላይ ማስተካከል ይገባል።

Marine Water and Sediment Quality

What This Section is About

Marine water and sediment quality. It discusses the baseline conditions and the anticipated effects of the Project on the marine water and sediment quality around Milne and Steensby Ports.

What Was Studied

This work is summarized below.

- The baseline water quality of Milne Inlet and Steensby Inlet was nearly neutral (pH around 7), hard, and clear with moderate amounts of nutrients. Nutrient concentrations were generally typical of nearby arctic waters.
- The concentrations of major elements in water samples collected from Milne Inlet and Steensby Inlet were typical of marine waters (e.g., chloride, sodium, sulphate, magnesium, etc.). Several metals, including cadmium and iron, were present in concentrations too low to measure.
- The baseline mercury concentration at Milne Inlet exceeded the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment guideline for the protection of marine aquatic life in two samples collected from Milne Inlet.
- Bottom sediments in shallow areas of Steensby Inlet usually had more coarse material than those in deeper areas; this was not observed for Milne Inlet sediments.
- Petroleum compounds measured in Milne Inlet were low, as in other regional studies.
- Baseline concentrations of arsenic, cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, mercury, and zinc at Milne Inlet and Steensby Inlet were always below Probable Effects Levels. In Milne Inlet all of these metal concentrations were below the Interim Sediment Quality Guidelines identified in the CCME Canadian Sediment Quality Guidelines for the Protection of Aquatic Life, while in Steensby Inlet some exceeded these guidelines.
- Baseline metal concentrations at Steensby Inlet were higher in sediments with higher proportions of fines, similar to trends observed in previous studies of the region.
- Concerns expressed by the communities generally focused on the effects of spills, contamination, and pollution from the Project on the marine environment.

Predicted Impacts

The Environmental Impact Statement considers potential impacts from the Project on marine water and sediment quality.

- Activities that occur at Milne and Steensby Inlets during the construction, operation, or decommissioning phases of the Project that may alter water or sediment quality include:
 - Construction of docks;
 - Disruption and erosion of sediments by barge and ship traffic;
 - Discharge of ballast water by ships;
 - Emission of dust from ore stockpiles; and

- Runoff and discharges from land-based Project activities (e.g., wastewater, stockpile run-off, and site water).
- Dust can affect marine water and sediment quality by settling onto the surface, mixing into the water, and depositing onto the bottom. Dust will be present year-round at Steensby Port and during the winter may accumulate on nearby ice and snow. Milne Port will only be in operation during the open water season when dust deposition could cause low level increases in levels of metals and thereby affect water quality in local areas of fresh and salt water. Dust deposition may occasional increase concentrations of metals and total suspended solids (TSS).
- Run-off from the port sites to the adjacent marine environment will occur during all phases of the Project, due to land based activities such as travel on roads, ground disturbance, dusting and snow management.
- Construction at Milne Port and at Steensby Port may cause temporary local increases in the total suspended solids (TSS) and associated nutrients and metals in water.
- Ships' propellers can also increase sediments in the port waters by stirring up the seabed in relatively shallow water. This may increase suspended sediment, nutrient levels, and metal levels in the water column. The area affected by barge and ship traffic at both Steensby and Milne Ports is relatively small and should not to significantly reduce water quality.
- Discharges from ships at the docks should not harm water or sediment quality. These vessels will be operated and maintained in compliance with pollution prevention laws and regulations that prohibit discharge of bilge water or sewage while at the dock side.
- Ballast water will be pumped from each ore carrier when it arrives at Steensby Port. This water will have a slightly higher temperature and salinity than the surrounding water at each port. The pumped water will settle to the sea floor and result in small changes in the area.
- At Milne Inlet water quality could be affected by the following land-based discharges:
 - Treated sewage effluent
 - Treated melt water from the tank farm containment area, and
 - General site drainage.

These may decrease water quality by raising the metal concentrations, changing the acidity (pH), and/or increasing the total suspended solids (TSS) In all cases, the discharges will rapidly dilute in the environment. No effects on sediment quality are anticipated.
- At Steensby Port water quality could be affected by three land based discharges:
 - Sewage wastewater
 - Ore stockpile runoff, and
 - General site drainage.

As these sources will all be treated prior to release, few decreases in water quality are expected.
- When the Project is decommissioned, the removal of docks and other structures at Steensby and Milne Ports reduce both water and sediment quality.

Mitigation Measures

- The use of silt curtains will reduce the area affected by silt that is mixed into the water during construction and closure activities.
- At Steensby Port, runoff from the site and ore stockpile will be collected. Particles in the water will be allowed to settle to the bottom so they are not discharged in summer into the marine environment.
- Treated sewage effluent will be discharged at depth into Steensby Inlet year-round.

- Sewage, oily water, truck wash, water from maintenance facilities, and explosives equipment washwater will all be treated prior to discharge into the marine environment.
- Emergency and Spill Response Plans will deal with any land-based and shipping spills or accidents.
- No discharge of ship waste will be permitted at dock side.
- Dust suppression and dust control measures will be in place to limit emissions of particulates to the atmosphere that could settle in port waters.

Conclusions

- Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation is moderately confident that the Project will not cause significant adverse effects on marine water and sediment quality in Milne Inlet and Steensby Inlet.

Migratory Birds and Habitat

What This Section is About

Birds and bird habitat. It discusses the baseline conditions in the Regional Study Area (RSA) and the anticipated effects on migratory birds and habitat as a result of the Project.

What Was Studied

This work is summarized below.

- Harvesting birds and their eggs is important to the residents of North Baffin Island.
- Key indicator bird species were selected to focus the assessment of Project effects. The selected species include Peregrine Falcon (a cliff-nesting raptor commonly found in the area), Snow Goose and Common and King Eider (waterfowl species harvested by Inuit), and Red-throated Loon (commonly found in the area and a species that is sensitive to changes in water quality and disturbance and therefore a good species to monitor during the life of the Project).
- No large seabird colonies or large feeding flocks were identified around the shoreline and waters of Milne Inlet and Steensby Inlet.
- Concerns raised by communities generally focused on the potential effects of the Project on bird behaviour, migrations, lifecycle, nests and locations and diets.

Bird maps may be found on Figures 4.1, 4.2 and 6.12 of the theme based maps generated from the Inuit Knowledge Study.

Predicted Impacts

The Environmental Impact Statement considers potential effects from the Project on migratory birds and habitat.

- Migratory birds may be affected by the Project due to loss and changes in habitat, potential mortality (i.e., bird strikes with aircraft; nest disruption during ground disturbances), and potential influences on health.
- Habitat will be affected through direct loss of habitat due to the Project area which will be unavailable for use by species.
- Indirect habitat loss will occur as a result of Project related activities such as dust, noise, increased human presence, the Railway, and shipping lanes.
- The potential effects on falcons, geese, eiders, and loons is expected to be low and localized to a small zone of influence relative to the amount of suitable habitat available to these species.
- Mortality could potentially occur as a result of project activities through collisions with vehicles, aircraft, or permanent structures. This is expected to occur to individuals without significant effects on the overall populations. Increased access to the area by hunters may also result in bird mortality, although this is not expected to have a significant effect on bird populations.
- The potential for contaminants released by the Project affecting the health of birds was determined to be low.

- Ships travelling through Eclipse Sound, Foxe Basin and Hudson Strait could come in contact with large colonies of seabirds, but it is unlikely that ship presence will affect these populations.

Mitigation Measures

- Ground disturbance activities will be planned to take place outside the breeding season to minimize the effects of the Project on the key indicator species.
- The footprint of Project facilities will be minimized to limit ground disturbance.
- All employees will be required to take an awareness program will about the importance of avoiding known nests and nesting areas and large concentrations of foraging and moulting birds.
- Where possible, aircraft approach and departure flight paths will be charted to avoid birds.
- Where possible, a 500 m radius will be maintained around nests until fledging takes place.

Conclusions

With mitigation measures, the Project will not have a significant effect on habitat loss, mortality and health of key indicator bird species including Peregrine Falcons, Snow Geese, Common and King Eiders and Red-throated Loons.

Sea Ice

What This Section is About

Sea ice. It discusses the baseline conditions and the anticipated effects on sea ice in Hudson Strait, Foxe Basin and Steensby Inlet as a result of year-round shipping by the Project. Large ships designed to carry iron ore will make 102 round trips (204 one-way trips) between Steensby Inlet and the ports where they unload the ore. About 68 of these round trips (136 one-way trips) may occur when landfast ice is present in the inlet. Each ship will be about 53 m wide and carry about 200,000 cubic metres of ballast water. Ship tracks through landfast ice may be reused up to seven times, while ships travelling through pack ice may be able to follow the same track.

What Was Studied

This work is summarized below.

- Each winter extensive ice forms along the coastal areas of Foxe Basin and Hudson Strait. Landfast ice extends throughout Steensby Inlet as far south as Koch Island. Much of Foxe Basin and Hudson Strait are covered by moving pack ice.
- Stable areas of landfast ice provide important hunting areas for Inuit.
- The distribution of sea ice and its relationship to open water plays an important role in determining the distribution, movement patterns, and abundance of marine biota. Microalgae and associated secondary producers establish on the bottom of the ice each spring, providing forage for fish such as Arctic cod and for seabirds. Marine mammals use ice as a platform and are greatly influenced by its quality and presence.
- Communities were concerned that ice-breaking associated with year-round shipping would disturb the sea ice. Such disturbances could affect Inuit travel and hunting activities and animals, such as marine mammals and seabirds that are associated with, and rely on, sea ice and sea ice edges for various life history functions.

Information about sea ice is provided in Figures 3.19 and 3.20 from the Inuit Knowledge Study.

Predicted Impacts

The Environmental Impact Statement considers potential impacts of the Project on sea ice

- Ice breaking will occur along the length of the nominal shipping corridor. The primary interaction between the Project and sea ice will be physical alteration or disturbance due to the passage of many ships. Other effects due to ice breaking, particularly increased underwater noise, will have no effect on the sea ice itself, but will interact with marine species and animals associated with the ice.
- Construction activities on ice will have no effect on landfast ice beyond the immediate work areas.

- Less than 1% of the Local Study Area and less than 0.5% of the Regional Study Area pack ice will be disturbed by ice breaking ore carriers during operation. Since pack ice is in constant motion, the ship track through pack ice will quickly close leaving little evidence of the passage.
- Due to density differences between ballast water and water in Steensby Inlet, ballast water that is discharged in port should have little or no effect on ice except right at the dock side.
- Annual icebreaking activity will cause physical alteration of landfast ice in Steensby Inlet. A maximum of 6.1% of the landfast ice in Steensby Inlet and less than 0.5% of the landfast ice in Foxe Basin and the Regional Study Area may be affected by shipping. The effects on integrity of landfast ice should not be significant.

Mitigation Measures

- The width of the shipping lane through fast ice will be minimized to the extent possible. The shipping lane into Steensby Port will be delineated with markers that can serve to identify the boundaries of previous vessel tracks and act as a guide for the vessel.
- Icebreaking tugs and ore carriers will restrict their area of operation to the extent practical such that the total area of broken landfast ice at the Steensby Port is limited.

Conclusions

Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation has concluded that with mitigation measures, the Project will not have significant negative effects on sea ice or on the landfast ice regime because of the relatively small amount of ice that will be disrupted. Although there will be some alteration of landfast ice in Steensby Inlet due to ice breaking activities, the area of disrupted ice in relation to local and regional areas is small and will not have any consequential effects on the local or regional ice regime.

Freshwater Fisheries:

- **Freshwater Biota and Habitat**
- **Surface water and sediment quality**
- **Water quantity – surface water hydrology**

ርቢጥጥጥጥጥጥ ስጦትጥጥጥጥ

- **ገጠናዎች ስጦትጥጥጥጥ**
- **ገጠና ስጦትጥጥጥጥ ስጦትጥጥጥጥ**
- **ገጠና ስጦትጥጥጥጥ - ገጠና ስጦትጥጥጥጥ**

Freshwater Biota and Habitat

What This Section is About

Freshwater biota and habitat. It discusses the baseline conditions in the Regional Study Area (RSA) and the anticipated effects on Arctic char, other biota and aquatic habitat as a result of the Project.

What Was Studied

This work is summarized below.

- Arctic char and ninespine stickleback were the only fish species found in fresh water.
- Landlocked Arctic char were widely distributed and were found in lakes, rivers and streams along the Milne Inlet Tote Road, at the Mine Site, along the Railway, and at Steensby Port.
- Sea-run Arctic char were located in freshwater systems at Milne Port and Steensby Port and in the Cockburn River system.
- Communities raised concerns about the potential effects of the Project on fish.

Information about fish can be found on Figures 5.1 and 5.2 of the theme based maps generated from the Inuit Knowledge Study.

Predicted Impacts

The Environmental Impact Statement considers potential effects from the Project on Arctic char, aquatic biota and their habitat. The assessment focused on the potential effects on Arctic char.

- Mitigation measures should prevent Arctic char and char eggs from being killed during blasting or stranded when water is removed from lakes in winter.
- Water diversions that alter flows will cause some habitat changes or loss. For example, the diversion of water around the waste rock stockpile may reduce flows to one Sheardown Lake tributary by 18%. The effect should not be significant but will be monitored to ensure these changes do not harm juvenile Arctic char.
- Small areas of stream and lake habitat will also be lost when water intakes, wastewater outfalls, culverts, bridges, and embankments are constructed.
- Indirect habitat changes and loss of productivity can result from activities that reduce water quality in Arctic char habitat or in headwaters that drain into Arctic char habitat. These activities include the discharge of effluents, such as treated sewage effluent from the Mine Site and stockpile runoff; the introduction of dust; runoff from work areas and infrastructure, blasting; and other non-point sources. Increased sedimentation due to dust deposition or erosion can adversely affect fish habitat and the health and survival of fish eggs. These effects should not be significant.

Mitigation Measures

- A number of proven mitigation measures have been included in the Project to reduce potential effects on water quality, freshwater fish, fish habitat, and other aquatic organisms.

These measures are described in the Site Water Management Plan, Wastewater Management Plan, Waste Management Plan and Emergency and Spill Response Plan.

- Baffinland must provide compensation under the *Fisheries Act* if fish habitat is harmfully altered, damaged, or destroyed (addressed in the Fish Habitat Compensation Plan).
- Other examples of mitigation measures include:
 - Fishing by Mine employees will not be permitted.
 - Runoff from fuel storage and maintenance facility areas will be contained and treated as necessary to meet regulatory requirements.
 - Sewage and wastewater from truck and rail maintenance facilities, and from explosives equipment-washing facilities, will be treated to meet established standards before being discharged to the natural environment. An Emergency and Spill Response Plan will be in place to promptly clean up any spills that occur.
 - The roads and railway both cross many streams. Some of these streams provide fish habitat. Culverts and bridges for stream and river crossings will be designed to limit barriers to fish movement. Where these streams provide important fish habitat minimum flows will be maintained, where possible.
 - Since railways cannot turn sharp corners, building sections of the railway into the edge of several lakes will be unavoidable. While some fish habitat will be lost, a compensation plan has been proposed to offset this loss. This plan will be further developed and finalized in consultation with Fisheries and Oceans Canada and the Qikiqtani Inuit Association.

Conclusions

Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation has concluded that with the proposed mitigation measures, the Project will not have significant adverse effects on aquatic ecosystems, fish habitat, or freshwater fish including Arctic char. The effects on Arctic char and their habitat and other freshwater species will be monitored and any effects should be reversible upon closure of the mine.

Surface Water and Sediment Quality

What This Section is About

Surface water and sediment quality. It discusses the baseline conditions and the anticipated effects of the Project on fresh surface water and sediment quality.

What Was Studied

This work is summarized below.

- Water in the Mary River area is turbid and contains naturally elevated concentrations of dissolved oxygen, aluminum, and iron. Cadmium, mercury and pH are also naturally elevated in fresh water, at levels above water quality guidelines of the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment.
- Streams or lakes that may receive water from the Project are not particularly sensitive to acidic inputs.
- Community concerns focused on the potential effects of spills, pollution, and contamination by the Project on the aquatic environment.

Predicted Impacts

The Environmental Impact Statement considers the potential impacts of the Project on fresh water and sediment quality in lakes, rivers, and streams near the Project.

- Ground preparation and earthworks activities for the Project may have minor to moderate negative effects on the water quality. These effects should occur only during construction and closure phases of the Project. They should occur during spring runoff, when high flow conditions will dilute water coming from the Project and keep water clarity near baseline conditions.
- Water from the Mine Site may have a minor to moderate negative effect on water quality. These effects should occur at the same time as the spring freshet, when dilution by high flow conditions should keep concentrations near baseline conditions.
- Water from laydown areas and activities may have a minor to moderate negative effect on water quality. Sediments added to the water loading may occasionally exceed the CCME threshold relative to baseline conditions. These effects are most likely to coincide with freshet conditions, which have the potential to reduce the magnitude of the potential effect through added capacity to buffer these inputs. They are limited to summer months when construction and closure activities are scheduled.
- The manufacture, transportation, storage, and use of explosives may cause a minor to moderate reduction in water quality. Ammonia, nitrates, nitrites, and petroleum hydrocarbon residues from blasting activities may occasionally exceed their respective CCME thresholds in the freshwater receiving environment. These effects should coincide with the snow melt when accumulated nitrogen and petroleum hydrocarbon residues are released during the thaw. High flow during the spring freshet should dilute these elevated concentrations and reduce the negative effects.

- Rock from the quarries and borrow is non-reactive, meaning that it is unlikely to release acids or metals pits when wet. Residues originating from blasting activities as well as sediment-laden water will be confined to the water management infrastructure within each quarry and borrow site.
- Rail line and road construction activities that may affect surface water and sediment quality include culvert installation, bridge construction, infilling of right-of-way through watercourses (encroachment), rail bed construction, grading and water management. Sediment entering the water may occasionally exceed the CCME threshold relative to baseline conditions. These effects will likely occur mainly during the spring freshet when freshwater runoff is high and will mitigate the effects through dilution.
- Dust from Project activities has been addressed in the Air Quality summary. Dust that is raised by equipment and vehicle use and deposited in freshwater lakes and streams will have minor to moderate adverse residual effects.
- At camps, water withdrawal (described in Water Quantity – Surface Water hydrology summary), waste management, fuel storage, and discharge of sewage may reduce water and sediment quality. Treated water that is discharged from these activities should not exceed CCME thresholds for contaminants.
- Activities at the airstrip, including aircraft deicing and dust suppression, may reduce water and sediment quality. Sediment loading may occasionally exceed the CCME threshold relative to baseline conditions. These exceedances would likely coincide with freshet conditions during snow melt, which is likely to dilute and mitigate any potential effects. Use of propylene glycol as a de-icing agent may result in a negligible to minor reduction in water quality.
- Minor exceedances from aqueous point source discharges from mine contact water areas, e.g. open pit, waste stockpiles, ore stockpiles, may result in (i.e., less than an order of magnitude greater) of the CCME guidelines for protection of aquatic life (PAL) may occasionally occur due to extreme climatic events (such as flood conditions). These should not adversely affect water and sediment quality.
- Exploration drilling effluent discharged into Mary River during the construction and operation phases of the Project should not harm the water and sediment quality.
- Treated sewage effluents will be discharged into fresh water at the Mine Site, throughout the Project, and at Sheardown Lake and the Midrail Camp during railway construction. These discharges should not harm water and sediment quality.

Mitigation Measures

- Runoff water from fuel storage and maintenance facility areas will be contained and treated as necessary to meet regulatory requirements.
- Sewage and wastewater from facilities such as camps, truck and rail maintenance facilities, and explosives equipment-washing facilities will be treated to meet established standards before being discharged to the natural environment. An Emergency and Spill Response Plan will be in place to ensure prompt clean-up of any spills.
- The permanent bulk explosives factories, mixing plants, explosive reagent storage facilities, and truck wash facilities will be constructed to contain any solid explosives or water that has come into contact with explosives for appropriate treatment before it is discharged into lakes or streams.
- Runoff from the waste rock stockpile and from ore stockpiles will be collected in ponds, to settle out solids and treat the water as necessary to meet Metal Mining Effluent Regulations and water licence requirements before releasing the water to the environment.
- Facilities and quarries will be sites at least 30 m from stream or water bodies and will be removed and restored as soon as practical to reduce the risk of potential effects of erosion and sediment transport. Similarly, water conveyance features such as culverts and bridges will be removed to restore pre-disturbance drainage patterns.

- The use of non-reactive rock for construction reduces the potential for acid generation and metals leaching that could affect surface water and sediment quality.
- Detailed rail line design, construction and operation will be completed in compliance with *Fisheries Act* Authorization requirements that are intended to protect water quality as an integral component of fish habitat.

Conclusions

Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation has concluded that with the implementation of mitigation measures, the impact of the Project on surface water (i.e. freshwater) and sediment quality is not significant.

- ሁለተኛው ልማት ስልጠናውን በሚከተለው ሁኔታ ያካሂዳል፡-
የግብርና ልማት ስልጠናውን በሚከተለው ሁኔታ ያካሂዳል፡-
የግብርና ልማት ስልጠናውን በሚከተለው ሁኔታ ያካሂዳል፡-
የግብርና ልማት ስልጠናውን በሚከተለው ሁኔታ ያካሂዳል፡-

ልማት ስልጠና

ይህ ስልጠና የግብርና ልማት ስልጠናውን በሚከተለው ሁኔታ ያካሂዳል፡-
 ልማት ስልጠናውን በሚከተለው ሁኔታ ያካሂዳል፡-
 ልማት ስልጠናውን በሚከተለው ሁኔታ ያካሂዳል፡-

Water Quantity – Surface Water Hydrology

What This Section is About

The natural flow of water through the Project area. It discusses the baseline water flow conditions and the anticipated effects on the flow and quantity of water as a result of the Project.

What Was Studied

This work is summarized below.

- The extremely cold temperatures of the region, combined with the permafrost, result in a short period of runoff that typically occurs from June to September. All rivers and creeks, with the exception of the very largest systems, freeze during the winter months.
- Due to the combination of low temperatures, low infiltration due to permafrost, and the minimal vegetative cover, surface water is abundant. The region is dotted with thousands of small lakes and streams.
- Community concerns generally focussed on the potential changes to water flows and quantities in the Project area and the effects of these potential changes on fish and fish habitat resulting from the Project.

Predicted Impacts

The Environmental Impact Statement considers potential effects from the Project on the flow of water in the Project area.

- The removal of water from lakes for water supplies, the diversion of watercourses, or the diversion of runoff into watercourses were identified as potential issues that could affect fish and fish habitat.
- In general, there will be no major alterations in water quantities or drainage paths as a result of the Project (i.e. no dams or major watercourse diversions).
- Culverts installed along the Railway, construction access roads and the Milne Inlet Tote Road will result in minor changes to surface water flows where sheet flow becomes concentrated as it flows through the culverts.
- Water will be withdrawn from several lakes to supply the camps. These withdrawals were estimated to be negligible relative to the amount of water in these lakes.
- Treated effluents from sewage treatment plants and ore stockpile areas will be discharged to the Mary River. These additional discharges are minor relative to the amount of flow in the Mary River.
- Water flow into the open pit is expected to be minor, consisting primarily of direct contribution during precipitation events and blowing snow events. Little, if any, dewatering of the pit will

be required during operations. However, excess water that does collect within the open pit will be pumped onto the waste rock stockpile.

- Runoff from the waste rock stockpile will be collected and directed to a pond so that solids settle out before the runoff water is discharged to fish bearing waters. The water is expected to be of good quality. The runoff collection plan will result in approximately 18% less runoff entering a stream flowing into Sheardown Lake that is used by juvenile fish because the water will be diverted toward Camp Lake. It is not expected that this flow reduction to the Sheardown Lake tributary stream will be significant to juvenile fish using the stream.
- Some culverts along the Milne Inlet Tote Road, already identified as being prone to blockage, are currently being closely monitored and will undergo resizing during construction activities to help prevent future blockages.
- During closure and post-closure, the Open Pit will be allowed to naturally fill with water to create a pit lake. The filling process should take approximately 85 to 150 years. Once filled, the pit lake will discharge to the Mary River.
- During closure and reclamation of the Project, all drainage and crossing structures along the alignments will be removed and natural drainage paths and water flows will be restored.

Mitigation Measures

- Monitoring of water in the pond collecting the discharge from the waste rock stockpile will verify water quality and water treatment will be carried out to meet established water quality limits if necessary.
- Monitoring will be carried out to confirm that the diversion of runoff from the waste rock stockpile toward Camp Lake does not significantly affect juvenile fish in the stream flowing into Sheardown Lake.
- All new culverts installed along access roads and the Railway will be monitored throughout the life of the Project in order to quickly identify blockages. These blockages will be quickly cleared through high pressure wash.
- Project facilities will be designed to minimize impacts to fresh water quantity and to maintain current drainage patterns as much as possible.
- Baffinland will report annually on water takings and effluent discharge amounts as will be required by its water licence.

Conclusions

The proponent has concluded that with the proposed mitigation measures, the Project will not have significant effects on water quantities in the Project area.

Information Document

Draft Environmental and Social Impact Statement for the Proposed Mary River Project

Prepared by the Qikiqtani Inuit Association

March 2011

This document was prepared to assist the communities affected by the proposed Mary River Project to better understand the contents of the socio-economic portions of the DEIS prepared by Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation. Every attempt was made to present the information objectively. Any inconsistencies or misrepresentations are the sole responsibility of the QIA.

Purpose of this Document

The Qikiqtani Inuit Association (QIA) has prepared this document to assist the communities affected by the proposed Mary River Project to better understand and discuss the findings of Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). This study is made up of 10 Volumes covering all aspects of the Projects potential impacts on the physical and human environment.

This document focuses on topics related to the social and economic impacts. Based on the community field work done by Baffinland to prepare the study, 12 topics were selected to summarize the scope of the potential impacts on the social and economic environment of the communities, people and region.

The socio-economic part of the DEIS presents information about what the communities and people in the region are like, and tries to predict both the positive and negative effects that the Project may have on them (from the time of construction until after the mine closes). The Company then suggests ways to enhance potential benefits and to reduce negative effects (called “mitigation measures”). The resulting “impact” is then evaluated based on the likely “residual” effect assuming that the mitigation measures are implemented successfully.

The socio-economic impact assessment looks at the impacts of the Project on employees and their families, on community life as a whole, and on the wider region as a whole. The communities that are mainly considered are Hall Beach, Igloolik, Arctic Bay, Pond Inlet, Clyde River, and Iqaluit because these are points of hire for the Project. Kimmirut and Cape Dorset are not included in the socio-economic assessment with the exception of impacts associated with harvesting and land use because of the shipping route.

We have attempted to capture Baffinland’s main conclusions from the study without providing any of our own analysis. This is because the purpose of this document is to assist in generating discussion at the community level so that you can give your views on whether or not the Impact Statement is correct and if not, why not. Also it will be very important for you to highlight areas where you think that concerns may have been overlooked. This information can then be used in the first stage of the review that is being conducted by the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) – that is to identify areas where additional information is required. Future stages of the NIRB review process will provide additional opportunities to ensure your thoughts and comments on his document are meaningfully applied to the proposed project.

To assist discussion, the following general questions should be kept in mind while you are reviewing each section of the document:

- Are the concepts presented understandable and relevant to you, your family and your community?
- Do you agree with the statements presented and how they represent life within your community?
- Do you agree with the Company’s conclusions about the potential effects to your personal lives and life in your community??
- Do you feel there are additional areas for discussion or questions that need answers?

1. Population and Demographics

This part is about:

- People moving into or leaving North Baffin communities (on a more permanent basis rather than for a short time).

The Impact Statement says:

- Southern workers are not likely to move to northern communities because they are flown from Ottawa in the south directly to the Mary River site and back, and they can still live at home. Some qallunaat may decide to stay, for example if they enter into a relationship with a community resident.
- Some Inuit from the North Baffin who have moved away may return to work at the mine. Or Inuit or qallunaat from other regions may decide to move to the North Baffin to work at the mine or for other economic opportunities related to the mine.
- Mine employees from the North Baffin may choose to move to Iqaluit or Ottawa or another community that is a point of hire since they could still continue to work at the mine.

Baffinland's Conclusion: The number of people who would move into or out of the North Baffin will not be large enough to negatively change life in the communities.

COMMUNITY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:

2. Education and Training

This part is about:

- The opportunities for education, training and “life skill” development that the Project will bring to Inuit, and incentives for youth to stay and succeed in school.

The Impact Statement says:

- All of the jobs at the mine require literacy and numeracy skills sufficient to work safely on site. There are some “entry-level” positions where on-the-job training is enough, but most of the jobs require specialized training, trade certifications or post-secondary education (see Livelihood and Employment below).
- The availability of jobs over a long period of time (at least 20 years) will likely provide youth and adults an incentive to attain higher levels of education. Some may prefer to leave school early to start work at the mine and learn on-the-job. However a minimum age of 18 is required to work at Mary River. In addition, the Company is doing several things to help Inuit gain the skills they need to be hired and to progress into better jobs over time:
 - Opportunities for people to understand what it is like to work at the mine before they start (e.g., information sessions, job-readiness training, summer experience at the mine for youth)
 - Inuit education and training coordinators to help people figure out what job they may want, what training they need, and how to get it. An Inuit elder will also be available to consult on site.
 - Mine-related training courses, such as heavy equipment operation, will be offered in communities through partnerships between the Company and other organizations like QIA and Kakivak. Some courses will be offered while the mine is under construction so that people have time to complete them before the mine begins operating.
 - Training courses and upgrading opportunities at the site on an on-going basis.
- People who work at the mine for some time can develop skills that are useful in any job and in their lives generally, such as: self-discipline, reliability, wise money management, and the ability to make healthy choices personally and for their families. Getting hired and staying with the job long enough to learn these “life skills” is recognized as a challenge for those who need them the most. To mitigate these difficulties, the Company offers employee support and counselling. Those who make a mistake may be allowed a ‘second chance’ to come back to work, except for drug or alcohol violations. Those with a criminal record will not be automatically rejected.

Baffinland’s Conclusion: The Project is expected to have a significant positive and long-term impact on levels of education, training and life skills in the communities.

COMMUNITY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:

3. Livelihood and Employment

This part is about:

- The creation of new jobs, and the employment and career paths of Inuit.

The Impact Statement says:

- Traditional harvesting has a fundamental role in livelihoods and food security. However Inuit have raised concerns about the high cost of harvesting activities and inadequate transfer of land skills and knowledge to younger generations. Without the infusion of jobs and income that the Project will bring to the region, harvesting activities will continue to decline.
- During the bulk sample phase (2007 to 2009), 265 Inuit from North Baffin communities and 212 more from Iqaluit worked at Mary River at one time or another. However turnover was high and there were cases where Inuit did not even complete the first 2-week rotation. About one in ten employees were women. In total, about two thirds of all employees hired were Inuit, and the remaining one third of workers were flown in from the south. Although, if looked at in terms of the number of hours, the situation is the reverse: Inuit worked only about one third of the total hours and workers from the south worked two thirds.
- During the construction phase 1460 workers on average will be needed (with a peak of well over 2000), and about 960 annually during the operation of the mine. Most of the jobs require at least high school and/or specialized training (e.g., equipment operators, administrative support). Jobs such as drillers, train operators, supervisors and managers require advanced training, accreditation or college/university education. Training for jobs such as labourers, kitchen helpers, and cleaners is usually provided on-the-job; this type of job accounts for about 25% of the jobs available during operation.
- It is hard to predict, but it is estimated that there will be roughly 300 full-time equivalent positions that Inuit can fill given current skill levels in the region. It is also expected that the turnover will be high initially as Inuit try out work at the mine and the fly-in fly-out lifestyle.
- Although some Inuit may only want to work casually at the mine, the Company supports job retention and career advancement for Inuit employees through several initiatives outlined in an Inuit Human Resources Strategy; for example: opportunities to gain skills (see Education and Training above), career counseling, and Inuit preference in hiring and promotion decisions. Special efforts will be made to encourage youth and women to work at the mine.
- After the mine closes, long-time employees and those dependent on the income from mine work will experience disruption. However, there will be skills transferable to other jobs, and mine workers will have had training and support in career planning and financial planning.
- It is expected that many indirect jobs will be created in Nunavut due to the economic stimulation that the Project brings to the territory. Such jobs will benefit Inuit in the North Baffin and Iqaluit to the extent that they have the skills and ability to fill them.

Baffinland's Conclusion: The Project will have no significant negative effects on livelihoods and employment. With successful implementation of proposed mitigation measures, there will be a significant positive effect on available jobs and career advancement for Inuit in North Baffin communities and Iqaluit.

COMMUNITY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:

4. Human Health and Well-being

This part is about:

- The well-being of families (especially children), issues around substance abuse, and the overall health of communities.

The Impact Statement says:

- Both positive and negative effects can result from the income generated by working at the mine. In most cases it is expected that income will be used to provide nutritious food (country food or store-bought) and needed supplies, and to improve living conditions and wealth. It is acknowledged, however, that in some cases the money may be spent unwisely, for example on drugs and alcohol. An increase in the flow of drugs and alcohol into the communities is a particular concern since there are negative implications for all residents. Children are especially vulnerable and the consequences can be severe and long-lasting.
- Adapting to rotational work will require a period of adjustment for employees and their families. Negative effects could include loneliness and jealousy from separation and additional stress on those responsible for domestic chores and childcare at home. Periodic absences of one family member can also cause household disruptions, inconsistent parenting, and emotional cycles.
- Time on site away from the community may have positive effects for some mine workers if it removes them from unhealthy home environments or tendencies toward substance abuse.
- Reactions and the ability to adapt to working at the mine will vary depending on the individual and the situation in each family. It is also difficult to predict the extent to which positive or negative effects will permeate or change community life. The Company will do several things to support employees, families and communities:
 - Support for employees and their families will include: a strict no alcohol or drug policy on site (including baggage searches for substances); orientation and training programs that discuss health and safety, stress management, adjustment to rotational work schedules, addiction issues, and financial planning; and counselling services on site with an Inuit elder available for consultation.
 - Through the Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement (IIBA) negotiations, the Company and QIA have agreed to create and equally contribute to a community support fund (called the Ilagiiktunut Nunalinnullu Pivalliajutsait Kiinaujat fund, to be administered by the QIA). Communities can draw on this fund to build community capacity, ensure fair distribution of benefits, and deal with any negative effects that arise from the Project despite implemented mitigation measures. For example, the fund could sponsor activities such as youth-elder programs, cultural and harvesting activities, educational incentives, social support organizations and healing programs.
 - In addition, it is assumed that revenues paid by the Company to the Government of Nunavut (GN) and QIA will be reinvested in ways that support community needs, development and adaptation.
 - The Company will monitor the effects on employees and their families, and the performance of mitigation and management plans. In addition, the Company will support the efforts of a regional Socio-economic Monitoring Committee (Q-SEMC) and perhaps others to monitor effects in communities. Monitoring should ensure timely interventions and continued improvement in Project management and the relationship between the Company and Inuit.

Baffinland's Conclusion: Mitigation measures and monitoring will minimize any potential negative impacts and have an overall positive effect. The health and well-being of mine employees and their families will be significantly improved. There may be some negative effects from substance abuse initially but as employees adjust to the demands of work at the mine and make use of education programs and counselling available to them, there will likely be a positive shift in attitudes toward healthy lifestyle choices. The periodic absence of mine employees from the community is not expected to affect life in the community generally.

COMMUNITY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:

5. Economic Development and Self-reliance

This part is about:

- The contributions that the Project can make to identified community and regional economic development objectives, while it is operational and after it closes.

The Impact Statement says:

- Any negative effects to the land or to harvesting from the Project will be minimized. There may also be positive effects on harvesting if mine employees use some of their income to go out on the land, to support other hunters, or to purchase country food. However the overall impact is uncertain.
- Project activities (e.g., shipping) will disrupt the “wilderness experience” that tourists come to see. Since the industry is small, the Company believes that the frequency of interactions with tourists will be low and therefore the impact will not be significant.
- The Project increases long-term job and training opportunities, especially for youth.
- The overall wealth in North Baffin communities and Iqaluit is expected to increase through employment wages, local procurement and business contracts. This benefit depends on the ability of communities to take advantage of opportunities.
- There may be some loss to local organizations and businesses if key people go to work at the mine or leave the community, but this is expected to be small. Further, the Company (with partner organizations) will implement initiatives to help develop the capacity and skill levels of businesses and the labour force. A community support fund, co-sponsored by the Company and QIA, also may be used toward developing capacity.
- Together with the many indirect jobs and general economic growth and diversification, the Project will have a large effect on the entire territorial economy.
- Substantial revenues will be paid to Inuit (through the IIBA) so that Inuit in the Baffin region may benefit. Money will also be paid to the government in royalties, fees and taxes. If these funds are reinvested in infrastructure, housing, health care and education, the Project will indirectly improve the basic needs of Inuit living in the communities.

Baffinland’s Conclusion: Overall the Project will have a positive impact on the economic development and self-reliance of the North Baffin and of Nunavut as a whole.

COMMUNITY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:

6. Community Infrastructure and Public Services

This part is about:

- The effects that the Project may have on community services.

The Impact Statement says:

- The Project will create competition for skilled workers. This may pose a short term problem for the Hamlets. For example, there may be some reductions in services, such as longer wait times for water delivery, but Hamlets will be able to deal with it. Soon, however, the effect of the training programs being offered by the Project will increase the skilled labour force overall which will benefit the Hamlets.
- Increased revenues flowing to the GN will provide for more ability to invest in community infrastructure and improved services. Also the various training and employee and family support activities that the Company will offer can be combined with existing GN services with the result of improving services available in the communities.
- The Company and QIA will contribute every year to a community support fund that will be created through the IIBA. This fund can be combined with existing GN programs which will increase funding available to support communities, families and individuals.
- The Milne Inlet Tote Road could be left operational after the Project closes as long the landowners (mainly the QIA) take over maintenance responsibilities. If not, then the bridges and culverts will be removed and the area returned to pre-Project conditions.

Baffinland's Conclusion: Overall any negative impacts on availability of workers and community services will be short term as Project-initiated training leads to improved level of skill and experience in the Inuit labour force.

COMMUNITY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:

7. Contracting and Business Opportunities

This part is about:

- Opportunities for business and contracts, and what can be done to help Inuit companies.

The Impact Statement says:

- The Project will create opportunities for local businesses to expand. Between 2006 and 2010 there was \$10 million of goods and services purchased from North Baffin businesses and \$39.9 from Iqaluit.
- There are no other significant development projects in the foreseeable future for the North Baffin region.
- The capacity of local businesses to get Project contracts is low right now. The Company will implement programs to support local business development.
- Increased income in the communities will result in new purchasing power. Where that money is spent will be up individuals and families. However local businesses could capture this new disposable income.
- Local businesses that are developed only to service the Project will need to expand their client base to survive after the Project closes.
- The successful implementation of the support measures to be provided by the Company, and the active participation of individuals in the programs will determine the degree to which businesses will benefit.

Baffinland's Conclusion: The Project will have a significant positive effect on the level of opportunities available for business and contracting.

COMMUNITY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:

8. Cultural Resources

This part is about:

- The effects of the Project on archaeological and other cultural sites of importance to Inuit.

The Impact Statement says:

- The Milne Inlet and Steensby Inlet port sites both have high densities of archaeological sites. The Philips Creek valley contains a large number of sites which confirms it as an important travel corridor. No sacred places or burial sites were identified or located.
- Project facilities are located whenever possible away from archaeological sites.
- The Company is following all of the regulations and policies set out by the Department of Culture, Language, Elders and Youth (CLEY) and the Inuit Heritage Trust in terms of protection of sites and their contents.
- Project employees will be trained to identify and report potential archaeological sites during construction. Work will be stopped and an archaeologist will be available to confirm finds and recommend mitigation in according with the Cultural and Heritage Resources Plan which will be approved by CLEY.

Baffinland's Conclusion: The Project will not result in significant adverse effects. Procedures are set in place to limit the effect of the Project on cultural resources.

COMMUNITY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:

9. Resources and Land Use

The part is about:

- The potential effects of the Project on Inuit harvesting, land use and quality of country foods. It is also about traditional patterns of sharing food and by-products from the hunt and a general sense of well-being in areas where there is the most Project activity.

The Impact Statement says:

- The caribou assessment studies conclude that there will not be a noticeable change to the abundance and distribution of caribou therefore harvesting is not expected to be significantly affected either in terms of quantity or effort needed.
- The risk for collisions along the railway with caribou is minor. If this does occur, meat will be salvaged and given to Inuit workers at the camps.
- Based on all the studies done on marine mammals, it is predicted that the Project will have a minor effect on marine mammal harvesting.
- Narwhal may be disturbed in certain areas, at certain times of the year (Milne Inlet for example) and this may affect harvesting. However other harvesting areas are still available.
- The effects of year round shipping on beluga and walrus in Foxe Basin for Igloodik and Hall Beach are not expected to be significant because most harvesting occurs close to the community and west of Rowley Island. Ship disturbance is distant from these areas.
- Disturbance of narwhal and beluga from shipping in Hudson Strait is predicted to be low to medium. However Kimmirut and Cape Dorset harvesting zones are along the shore and the floe edge and far away from shipping so harvesting is not expected to be affected.
- There may be some mortality of ringed seals from shipping but this will not have any effect on ringed seal populations. There may be more disturbances in Steensby Inlet, but since this is not the main location for harvesting, it is considered negligible.
- Harvesting of fish appears to be a secondary activity while Inuit are out on the land hunting for larger game or traveling. The Project will have a negligible effect on fish harvesting.
- Inuit workers will not be permitted to harvest on Project sites. Other Inuit can but only to the extent that public safety is not an issue.
- The Company will undertake a monitoring program and if there are effects, the IIBA will provide for compensation.
- Shipping in Milne Inlet is not expected to meaningfully affect use of open water by hunters but hunters will see the ships. Since Inuit travel generally occurs close to shore, no direct interaction is likely. Information on shipping will be communicated for public safety reasons.
- The Port sites themselves will be off limits. All Project sites are industrial sites and Inuit passing through will be encouraged to check in at the main office to make their presence known. Camping and traveling elsewhere can continue without limitation however it is implied that the quality of camping areas close to Project facilities will be different (noise, dust).
- Travel through the mine area and the Milne Inlet Tote Road will be restricted. Check-ins will be encouraged.
- 6 crossing areas along the railway for ATVs and snowmobiles will be constructed at locations to be determined in consultation with the communities.
- Direct travel on land fast ice across Steensby Inlet will no longer be possible once shipping begins.

- The presence of the Port sites will provide a safe place for Inuit traveling in the area. The Company will be able to assist travelers in the immediate area in the event of an emergency.

Baffinland's Conclusion: The Project will not have a significant effect on harvesting or the quantity or quality of country food. Travelling will not be significantly altered by the mine infrastructure. There will be some local effects at specific sites such as the Ports, road and railway.

COMMUNITY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:

10. Cultural Well-being

This part is about:

- How the Project may change how Inuit feel about themselves and their communities and if Inuit will feel welcome and comfortable working at the Project.

The Impact Statement says:

- The cultural well-being of Inuit is an Inuit activity and responsibility. The Company will not be paternalistic or take on the main role in preserving Inuit well-being. Instead it will support the Inuit and QIA to do this.
- The message from Inuit during the public consultations and working groups is the desire to preserve traditional lifestyles and land use activities and the need for economic development.
- Elders have consistently indicated a strong desire for economic development as the future for their youth. Harvesting and other traditional activities require money to maintain.
- Employment may help individuals become more self-sufficient and independent. Life skills learned from employment will enable individuals to take greater pride and control in their lives. This can be translated to greater personal confidence and increased opportunities to pursue cultural activities.
- Change is already occurring in the communities, including the loss of language and culture. This is seen by youth's increased interest in modern technology and media and decreasing preference for participating in Inuit cultural activities. Consumption of store bought food is also increasing.
- Education has shifted toward the need for academic knowledge rather than traditional knowledge.
- The Company will provide inspected country food at the work place. Use of Inuktitut, will be encouraged.

Baffinland's Conclusion: The project will fit in with the pre-existing cultural changes occurring in the affected communities, most notably by providing employment to younger generations. Inuit who wish to work will have that opportunity. Due to the distance away from the communities the Project will not affect the daily routine of Inuit or their local cultural pursuits.

COMMUNITY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:

11. Benefits, Royalty and Taxation

This part is about:

- How benefits, royalties and taxes from the Project flow to Inuit organizations and governments.

The Impact Statement says:

- The annual budget for the GN is currently \$1.2 billion. Almost all of this comes from Federal transfers. Debt load is low, however projections are that the Government will need to increase spending in the in the areas of public health and social services. Forecasted revenues from mining will assist.
- The Project will produce revenue streams to the GN through taxes. The total is expected to be in the \$10s of millions during construction and growing to \$225-\$350 million per year during production.
- NTI as the owner of sub-surface rights will be paid royalties. During full operation they are expected to be \$100 million per year or more, and to exceed \$2 billion over the life the Project.
- There will also be an IIBA with QIA which may include cash payments.
- The Company will also contribute funding to capacity building and long-term social development through the joint QIA/Company Ilagiiktunut Nunalinnullu Pivalliajutsait Kiinaujat Fund.
- There will also be some tax revenue to both the GN and Federal Government through personal income tax from Inuit working at the mine. This will depend on how many local residents work and their patterns of employment.
- Governments could choose to use some of this additional revenue to support new investments in the communities such as in the areas of education and infrastructure.

Baffinland's Conclusion: The Project will provide new revenues to Governments and Inuit organizations which could allow for new spending. This is considered a significant beneficial effect.

COMMUNITY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:

12. Government and Leadership

This part is about:

- How the Project complements the existing strategic priorities of government, Inuit organizations and communities.

The Impact Statement says:

- The Project fits into the GN and local community economic development strategies, particularly regarding the need to build local capacity and create employment and business opportunities.
- The IIBA to be completed before the Project can proceed will set out a process for supervising and governing events throughout the Project.
- The Company is open to considering another level of oversight – a Development Partnership Agreement with the GN. A Development Partnership Agreement could provide an effective way of carrying out responsibilities for commitments made regarding the Project.
- The monitoring programs that the Company will establish and implement will also contribute to providing data and sharing in the responsibility for making positive adjustments to activities throughout the Project.

Baffinland's Conclusion: The Project will have a positive effect.

COMMUNITY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:

Cumulative Effects Assessment

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement also considers potential effects of the Project in interaction with existing or possible future activities and projects in the region and beyond. Examples of other activities and projects include: further development of Mary River (deposits No.2 and No.9), other exploration and mines (such as Roche Bay), the Separation Lake hydroelectric project, and the Nanisivik Naval Facility.

The effects of all activities and projects together on the region and over time are called “cumulative effects.” Effects that extend to other regions, for example the rest of Canada, are called “transboundary effects.”

From the socio-economic perspective, only potentially negative cumulative or transboundary effects are considered in the analysis. These are: migration into and out of the Baffin region, substance abuse, competition for skilled workers, and effects to archaeological sites and to land and marine use.

The Cumulative Effects Assessment says:

In-migration and out-migration

- With additional jobs available from other projects in the region, more southerners and Inuit might come for work and some of these may decide to stay on more permanently. However, it is likely that they will stay in the larger centres.
- Inuit, having gained skills from training programs and working at Mary River, may decide to leave the region in order to work on other projects or to take advantage of opportunities such as better services, schools and recreation in other locations. This ability to choose is considered a positive effect. Negative effects could be experienced if too many skilled people leave the North Baffin or any one community, but the number of Inuit who would choose to leave and the number that would begin to adversely effect the function of a community or the region is uncertain.
- The number of Inuit that may move south, to Ottawa for example, is not expected to have an effect on the population of those cities.

Baffinland’s Conclusion: Any negative cumulative effects due to migration into the North Baffin will be minimal. The effect on communities of out-migration of Inuit is uncertain and no significant negative cumulative effect is assessed. The effect on southern communities from Inuit moving to these locations is expected to be negligible.

Substance abuse

- More projects and people coming into the region in the future could have a negative effect on substance abuse since there is more money generally to be spent on drugs and alcohol and there are more ways in which these substances can find their way into communities.
- Strict policies are in place on the Mary River site to prevent alcohol and drugs on site and their transport through the site to communities. It is possible that future projects unrelated to Mary River may not adhere to the same high level of restriction of substances, though this is not considered likely given the recognized risks to safety and liability that drugs and alcohol pose to any site.

Baffinland’s Conclusion: The effect that future projects may have on substance abuse is uncertain but the interaction with Mary River to result in cumulative effects is considered to be limited.

Competition for skilled workers

- If other projects in the region go forward, it is possible that they will draw even more skilled workers away from communities, potentially causing disruption in municipal services and reduced capacity in local businesses and organizations. However local employment is perceived as preferable by many Inuit, and other projects may not be hiring directly from the same communities as the Mary River project. Also, with training initiatives, the number of skilled workers available over time is expected to increase.

Baffinland’s Conclusion: No significant negative cumulative effect on competition for skilled workers is anticipated.

Archaeological sites and land use

- Baffinland has implemented policies to ensure conduct and mitigation concerning archaeological sites in accordance to standards and permits required by CLEY. The GN and Inuit make clear the importance of these sites, and all employees and contractors will receive training on appropriate protocols.
- The Mary River Project will implement mitigation measures to minimize the disturbance to land use and wildlife, and to address safety concerns for Inuit travelling on the land, water or ice. The effects that other projects may have on marine use are not along the same shipping routes as those of the Mary River Project, and if effects do occur they will likely be to Hall Beach and Arctic Bay. “The effect would not be cumulative above and beyond the effects of the Mary River Project, as they will affect other users within the land use study area.” (Volume 9, p.48)

Baffinland’s Conclusion: It is not anticipated that Mary River in combination with other foreseeable projects and with traditional harvesting activities will result in significant negative cumulative effects to archaeological sites. Overall cumulative effects to land and marine use are not expected to be significant.

Future Cumulative Effects Assessments:

In the future, if the Mary River Project proceeds, other proposed projects and activities will have to undergo an environmental assessment that includes the potential for cumulative effects with the Mary River Project. At such time, these potential cumulative effects would be reviewed by regulatory agencies and any significant effects would be mitigated.

COMMUNITY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:

- በበኩላቸው ለሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ምላሽ ለመስጠት ማቻላቸው?
- ሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ለማሟላት ምላሽ ለመስጠት ለማቻላቸው ለሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ምላሽ ለመስጠት ማቻላቸው?
- ሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ለማሟላት ምላሽ ለመስጠት ለማቻላቸው ለሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ምላሽ ለመስጠት ማቻላቸው?

1. ለመጠየቅ ምላሽ ማስገባት

እርስዎ ለማሳያዎች:

- የደንበኞችን ጥያቄዎች ለማሟላት ለማቻላቸው ለሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ምላሽ ለመስጠት ማቻላቸው (የሌሎችን ጥያቄዎች ለማሟላት ለማቻላቸው ለሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ምላሽ ለመስጠት ማቻላቸው)

የሌሎችን ጥያቄዎች ለማሟላት ለማቻላቸው ለሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ምላሽ ለመስጠት ማቻላቸው:

- ሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ለማሟላት ለማቻላቸው ለሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ምላሽ ለመስጠት ማቻላቸው ለሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ምላሽ ለመስጠት ማቻላቸው
- ሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ለማሟላት ለማቻላቸው ለሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ምላሽ ለመስጠት ማቻላቸው ለሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ምላሽ ለመስጠት ማቻላቸው
- ሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ለማሟላት ለማቻላቸው ለሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ምላሽ ለመስጠት ማቻላቸው ለሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ምላሽ ለመስጠት ማቻላቸው

የሌሎችን ጥያቄዎች ለማሟላት ለማቻላቸው ለሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ምላሽ ለመስጠት ማቻላቸው ለሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ምላሽ ለመስጠት ማቻላቸው

የሌሎችን ጥያቄዎች ለማሟላት ለማቻላቸው ለሌሎች ጥያቄዎች ምላሽ ለመስጠት ማቻላቸው:

መርህ-ጥያቄ ለመግለጽ ለሚያገለግሉ:

መርሐ-ሙሉ ልማት ለሰጠው:

መርህ-ጽሑፍ ልማት ለጽሑፍ ልማት:

መ.ር.ሚ.ሪ. ስርዓተ ጥበቃ ለግብርና:

መርህ ስርዓት ለማረጋገጥ ለሚያስፈልጉት ሰነድ፡

8. ለጽሑፍ ለመጻፍ ለሚያስፈልጉት ነገሮች ለማግኘት ለሚያስፈልጉት ሰዎች ለማግኘት

መርሖም ስጦታዎችን ለማረጋገጥ፡

መርህ ልማት ለግብርና ለግብርና:

12. ԵՎԼԱՎՍ ԲՆԱԿՆԱԿՆԵՐ

ጅልጅጃጃጃ ምክርቤት፡ ማዕቀብ፡ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ
ለሙሉ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ
ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ
ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ

ግሉግ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ

ግሉግ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ
ለሙሉ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ
ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ
ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ

ሞላሽን ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ ማዕቀብ፡

**TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF RESIDUAL BIOPHYSICAL EFFECTS**

TERRESTRIAL ENVIRONMENT					
Valued Ecosystem Component	Key Indicator(s)	Potential Effect(s)	Mitigation Measures	Residual Effect(s)	Significance Rating
Landforms, soil and permafrost	Sensitive landforms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil contamination • Soil structure alteration • Soil destabilization and erosion • Thaw weakening and settlement • Creep settlement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siting of facilities and alignment of roads and railway • Design foundations suitable for site conditions • Design stream crossing structures for extreme flood event • Ensure adequate drainage and prevent pooling of water 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No residual effect (disturbance of sensitive landforms) after mitigation 	Not significant
Vegetation	Vegetation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of vegetation abundance and diversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit physical footprint of facilities • Limit areas of access for vehicles • Progressive reclamation / closure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of vegetation limited to Project Development Areas (PDA) 	Not significant
Birds	Peregrine falcon Snow geese Eider Red-throated loon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Destruction of nests • Habitat loss • Mortality • Influences on health • Sensory disturbance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employee awareness / environmental induction program • Minimize footprint of facilities • Conduct nest search prior to start of activities • No hunting policy • Avoidance of areas of large concentrations of foraging or moulting birds • Avoidance of known nests or nesting areas • To the extent possible, enforce closure of a 500 m radius of the nest until fledging occurs • Nest-specific management plans • To the extent possible, develop appropriate aircraft approach and departure flight paths • Refer to mitigation measures outlined in Appendix 10D-11 Terrestrial Environment Management Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitat loss • Mortality • Influences on health 	Not significant

**TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF RESIDUAL BIOPHYSICAL EFFECTS**

TERRESTRIAL ENVIRONMENT					
Valued Ecosystem Component	Key Indicator(s)	Potential Effect(s)	Mitigation Measures	Residual Effect(s)	Significance Rating
Terrestrial wildlife and habitat	Caribou	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitat loss • Restriction of movement • Mortality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of dust suppressant on Tote Road during growing season • Speed limits for trucks and trains which will provide more time for caribou to get off the road or rail, and will increase the chance of a truck being able to stop before a collision with a caribou. • The train is expected to operate 300 days per year, so seasonal stoppages are possible if large groups of migratory caribou return to the area. • Baffinland has a no hunting policy for all personnel while working on site. • Snow management that will grade snow banks along railway and roadway so that caribou are able to easily cross the transportation corridor without being blocked by steep snow banks. • The railway embankment will be constructed of finer fill material at the five identified trails for easier caribou movement across the railway embankment. The finer fill will replicate natural trail conditions. • Physical barriers from trains will be reduced by limiting train traffic to four passes per day. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitat loss • Restriction of movement • Mortality 	Not significant

**TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF RESIDUAL BIOPHYSICAL EFFECTS**

FRESHWATER AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT					
Valued Ecosystem Component	Key Indicator(s)	Potential Effect(s)	Mitigation Measures	Residual Effect(s)	Significance Rating
Water quantity	Water quantity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reductions in water quantity due to water withdrawals • Increases in water quantity due to effluent discharges • Redistribution of water flows in the natural environment due to diversions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit required for water withdrawal • Measurement of withdrawal quantities as per Water License • Implement measures to reduce water consumption 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redistribution of water flows in the natural environment due to project use 	Not significant
Surface water and sediment quality	Water and sediment quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in water quality due to point-source, non point-source and airborne emissions • Changes in sediment quality due to point-source, non point-source and airborne emissions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siting of facilities/quarries at least 30 m from stream or water body • Install range of sediment and erosion control structures • Install diversion/collection channel or containment berms where appropriate • Routine inspection and maintenance • Ice and freshet management • Implementation of BMPs for surface water management • Sewage treatment • Wastewater treatment plant (oily water, truck wash, maintenance facilities, explosives equipment wash water) • Management of potentially acid generating rocks from waste rock pile, ore stockpiles, quarries and mine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in water quality due to point-source, non point-source and airborne emissions • Changes in sediment quality due to point-source, non point-source and airborne emissions 	Not significant

**TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF RESIDUAL BIOPHYSICAL EFFECTS**

FRESHWATER AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT					
Valued Ecosystem Component	Key Indicator(s)	Potential Effect(s)	Mitigation Measures	Residual Effect(s)	Significance Rating
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimize footprint of stream crossing • Compensation plan for HADD • Appropriate design of stream/river crossing structures (culvert, bridges, etc.) • Limit barrier to movement with site specific design of rocky ramps at culvert crossing (where required) • Channel enhancement where required • Maintain minimum flow in impacted streams where possible • Monitor low flow stream, fish salvage if necessary • Fish barrier for extremely low flow streams • Use of explosives in or near streams/water bodies as per DFO Guidelines • Prevent discharge of contaminants • All hazardous materials stored on impermeable surface/secondary containment • Tank farm and large storage tanks placed in secondary containment structures (lined and impermeable) • Smaller tank – double wall iso-containers • Refuelling on impermeable surfaces and runoff contained • Emergency and Spill Response Plan 		

**TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF RESIDUAL BIOPHYSICAL EFFECTS**

FRESHWATER AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT					
Valued Ecosystem Component	Key Indicator(s)	Potential Effect(s)	Mitigation Measures	Residual Effect(s)	Significance Rating
Freshwater fish, fish habitat, and other aquatic organisms	Arctic char	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects on Arctic char health • Effects on Arctic char movement • Effects on Arctic char habitat quality • Arctic char mortality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siting of facilities/quarries at least 30 m from stream or water body • Install range of sediment and erosion control structures • Install diversion/collection channel or containment berms where appropriate • Routine inspection and maintenance • Ice and freshet management • Implementation of BMPs for surface water management • Sewage treatment • Wastewater treatment plant (oily water, truck wash, maintenance facilities, explosives equipment wash water) • Management of potentially acid generating rocks from waste rock pile, ore stockpiles, quarries and mine • Minimize footprint of stream crossing • Compensation plan for HADD • Appropriate design of stream/river crossing structures (culvert, bridges, etc.) • Limit barrier to movement with site specific design of rocky ramps at culvert crossing (where required) • Channel enhancement where required • Maintain minimum flow in impacted streams where possible • Monitor low flow stream, fish salvage if necessary • Fish barrier for extremely low flow streams 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects on Arctic char health • Effects on Arctic char movement • Effects on Arctic char habitat quality • Arctic char mortality 	Not significant

**TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF RESIDUAL BIOPHYSICAL EFFECTS**

FRESHWATER AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT					
Valued Ecosystem Component	Key Indicator(s)	Potential Effect(s)	Mitigation Measures	Residual Effect(s)	Significance Rating
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of explosives in or near streams/water bodies as per DFO Guidelines • Prevent discharge of contaminants • All hazardous materials stored on impermeable surface/secondary containment • Tank farm and large storage tanks placed in secondary containment structures (lined and impermeable) • Smaller tank – double wall iso-containers • Refuelling on impermeable surfaces and runoff contained • Emergency and Spill Response Plan 		

**TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF RESIDUAL BIOPHYSICAL EFFECTS**

MARINE ENVIRONMENT					
Valued Ecosystem	Key Indicator(s)	Potential Effect(s)	Mitigation Measures	Residual Effect(s)	Significance Rating
Sea ice	Fast ice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disruption of shore fast ice in Steensby Inlet Potential change to timing of shore fast ice break up and formation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimize width of shipping lane through fast ice to the extent possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disruption of shore fast ice along shipping route in Steensby Inlet 	Not significant
Marine water and sediment quality	Marine water and sediment quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in water and sediment quality in Steensby and Milne Inlets Accident and malfunction (e.g. oil spill) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site runoff water management as per management plan Hazardous substances contained within impermeable areas as per Waste Management Plan Sewage treatment and wastewater treatment plant (oily water, truck wash, maintenance facilities, explosives equipment wash water) Emergency and Spill Response Plan, Milne Port OPEP and Steensby Port OPEP; SOPEP for all ships Ship on-board waste management - no discharge at sea 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in water and sediment quality in Steensby and Milne Inlets Accident and Malfunction 	Not significant
Marine habitat and biota	Marine habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disruption of marine coastal habitat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimize footprint of marine structures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss marine coastal habitat for ports 	Not significant
	Arctic char	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects on Arctic char health, habitat quality, and mortality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimize footprint of marine structures Compensation plan for HADD Appropriate design of marine structures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects on Arctic char health and habitat 	Not significant

**TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF RESIDUAL BIOPHYSICAL EFFECTS**

MARINE ENVIRONMENT					
Valued Ecosystem	Key Indicator(s)	Potential Effect(s)	Mitigation Measures	Residual Effect(s)	Significance Rating
Marine mammals	Ringed seals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Habitat change resulting from icebreaking and/or ice management Disturbance caused by airborne and/or underwater noise from construction, shipping, and aircraft Hearing impairment and/or damage caused by noise from construction activities Masking of environmental sounds caused by vessel and construction noise Mortality from collisions with vessels and blasting during construction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dock structures were designed to minimize the footprints in the marine environment Schedule dock construction activity during period of low mammal occurrence – April to June (blasting, pile driving, dredging) Use proven mitigation measures to mitigate noise during construction (DFO’s guideline of 100 kPa overpressure limit, bubble curtain system for blasting) Discourage marine mammals from the blast area with potential use of acoustic deterrent device Vessels will maintain a constant course and speed whenever possible - reduce vessel speed in Milne Inlet Vessels will minimize idling of engines when docked at Milne and Steensby ports Aircraft will be operated at a minimum altitude of 450 m over marine areas, when weather conditions allow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Habitat change from icebreaking and/or ice management Disturbance caused by noise from construction, shipping, and aircraft overflights Mortality from icebreaking Masking caused by shipping noise 	Not significant
	Walrus				Not significant
	Beluga whales				Not significant
	Narwhals				Not significant
	Bowhead whales				Not significant
	Polar bears	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Habitat change resulting from icebreaking and/or ice management Disturbance caused by noise from construction, shipping, and aircraft Mortality from human-bear interactions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aircraft will be prohibited from flying low over marine mammals for sightseeing or photography Primary use of Mary River airstrip during the Operation Phase Educate workers about bear safety Work areas kept clean of food scraps, garbage, and toxic materials Use of bear monitor at camp sites Use of bear deterrent devices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Habitat change from icebreaking and/or ice management Disturbance caused by noise from construction, shipping, and aircraft overflights Mortality if a bear is killed in defence of human life 	Not significant

**TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF RESIDUAL SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS**

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT					
Valued Socio-Economic Component	Key Indicator(s)	Potential Effect(s)	Mitigation Measures	Residual Effect(s)	Significance Rating
Population demographics	Demographic stability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-migration of a small number of workers from south will have effect on the demographic make-up of communities Migration of non-Inuit Project employees into the North Baffin LSA Migration of non-Inuit into North Baffin for indirect jobs Inter-community Inuit migration Out-migration from the North Baffin 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designation of North Baffin communities as "Point of Hire" (Arctic Bay, Clyde River, Hall Beach, Igloolik, and Pond Inlet) Iqaluit and Ottawa are also designated "Point of Hire" Free transportation from "Point of Hire" to Mine Site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-migration of a small number of workers from south or other Nunavut communities will have effect on the demographic make-up of communities 	Not significant
Education and training	Life skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved life skills amongst many LSA residents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Job readiness training Supportive work environment "Second chance" hiring policy "No drug, no alcohol" policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved life skills amongst many LSA residents 	Significant - positive
	Schooling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incentives related to school attendance and success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum age of 18 yrs for Project employment Career planning Priority hiring for Inuit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incentives related to school attendance and success 	Significant - positive
	Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunities to gain skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upgrading opportunities Summer experience Career counselling Training MOU 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunities to gain skills 	Significant - positive

**TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF RESIDUAL SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS**

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT					
Valued Socio-Economic Component	Key Indicator(s)	Potential Effect(s)	Mitigation Measures	Residual Effect(s)	Significance Rating
Human health and well-being	Substance abuse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport of substances through Project sites • Affordability of substances • Attitudes towards substances and addictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “No drug – no alcohol” policy • Baggage search • Focus on health and safety • Employee assistance • Addiction counselling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative - transportation of substances through the site, combined with increased ability to afford substances will have effects on substance abuse • Positive – focus on health and safety, employee assistance and counselling will increase awareness of employees 	Not significant
	Well-being of children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in parenting • Increased household income and food security 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orientation and training related to fly-in/fly-out adaptation • Fund to support family services • Money management training • Orientation and training related to health and well-being 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved well-being of children 	Significant - positive
	Community and social stability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absence from community during work rotation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orientation and training related to fly-in/fly-out adaptation • Short rotation (two week in / two week out) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absence of residents while they are working at Project will have effect on community social stability 	Not significant

**TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF RESIDUAL SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS**

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT					
Valued Socio-Economic Component	Key Indicator(s)	Potential Effect(s)	Mitigation Measures	Residual Effect(s)	Significance Rating
Community infrastructure and public service	Competition for skilled workers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competition for skilled workers Labour force capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early start for skills training On-going training Employment experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competition for skilled workers may lead to temporary effects on municipal services. 	Not significant
Cultural resources	Cultural resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disturbance or removal of archaeological sites Unauthorized removal of artefacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-development archaeological surveys, mitigation by SDR prior to construction, implementation of a chance finds procedure Training, flagging and exclusion zones, management plans, implementation of chance finds procedure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unmitigated archaeological sites subject to accidental or deliberate partial or complete destruction Increased access to interior could result in chance finds Increased traffic at Steensby Inlet could affect archaeological resources 	Not significant
Resources and land use	Inuit harvesting of wildlife	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in caribou harvesting Changes in marine mammal harvesting Changes in fish harvesting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prohibition of harvesting by employees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in caribou harvesting Changes in marine mammal harvesting Changes in fish harvesting 	Not significant

**TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF RESIDUAL SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS**

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT					
Valued Socio-Economic Component	Key Indicator(s)	Potential Effect(s)	Mitigation Measures	Residual Effect(s)	Significance Rating
Resources and land use	Travel and camps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safe travel around Eclipse Sound and Pond Inlet Safe travel through Milne Port Emissions and noise disruption Sensory disturbance and safety along Milne Inlet Tote Road Detour around Mine Site HTO cabin closure Difficulty and safety relating to railway crossings Detour around Steensby Port Restrictions on camping locations around Steensby Port 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road Management Plan Mine Closure Plan Safety Plan IIBA Agreement with QIA Designated railway crossing locations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safe travel around Eclipse Sound and Pond Inlet Safe travel through Milne Port Emissions and noise disruption Sensory disturbance and safety along Milne Inlet Tote Road Detour around Mine Site HTO cabin closure Difficulty and safety relating to railway crossings Detour around Steensby Port Restrictions on camping locations around Steensby Port 	Not significant

**TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF RESIDUAL SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS**

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT					
Valued Socio-Economic Component	Key Indicator(s)	Potential Effect(s)	Mitigation Measures	Residual Effect(s)	Significance Rating
Governance and leadership	Governance and leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IIBA Agreement with QIA Development of leadership skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation in initiatives to identify indicators of relevance to regional monitoring programs, share data generated by activities related to the Project, and discuss the interpretation of this data with others involved in these initiatives Fit well with the strategic priorities identified for both the RSA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IIBA agreement with QIA Development of leadership skills 	Significant - positive
Livelihood and Employment	Job creation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creation of jobs in the LSA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LSA points of hire 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creation of jobs in the LSA 	Significant - positive
	Local employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employment of LSA residents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment strategy Inuit hiring policy Management commitment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employment of LSA residents 	Significant - positive
	Career path	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Job progression and career advancement – new career paths 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Job progression and career advancement – new career paths 	Significant - positive
Economic Development and Self-reliance	Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased land use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lease agreement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased land use 	Not significant
	People	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased local recruitment Increased education and awareness Development of community support funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inuit recruitment strategy Education and training program Community support fund 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased local recruitment Increased education and awareness Development of community support funds 	Significant - positive

**TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF RESIDUAL SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS**

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT					
Valued Socio-Economic Component	Key Indicator(s)	Potential Effect(s)	Mitigation Measures	Residual Effect(s)	Significance Rating
Economic development and self-reliance	Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved community economy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inuit contracting strategy Capacity building fund Cooperation with QIA to develop and support local entrepreneurs/businesses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved community economy 	Significant - positive
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved territorial economy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct and indirect job creation Taxes and royalties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved territorial economy 	Significant - positive
Contracting and business opportunities	Marketplace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanded market - business services to Project Expanded market - consumer goods and services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inuit contracting strategy Cooperation with QIA to build Inuit capacity Establish a fund to support and build capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanded market — business services to Project Expanded market — consumer goods and services 	Uncertain - positive
	Entrepreneurial capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased entrepreneurial capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management assistance to Inuit designated firms Opportunities for local entrepreneurs to work with Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased entrepreneurial capacity Increased entrepreneurial capacity 	Uncertain - positive
Benefits, taxes and royalties	Territorial own-source revenues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased taxes and revenues Payments of payroll and corporate taxes to territorial government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased taxes and revenues Payments of payroll and corporate taxes to territorial government 	Significant - positive

ገጽ					
ግብርና-የደብዳቤ ልማት	የግብርና ልማት	የግብርና ልማት	የግብርና ልማት	የግብርና ልማት	የግብርና ልማት
ገጽ ልማት ልማት	ግብርና ልማት	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ገጽ ልማት ልማት ገጽ ልማት ልማት 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ገጽ ልማት ልማት ገጽ ልማት ልማት 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ገጽ ልማት ልማት ገጽ ልማት ልማት 	ገጽ ልማት ልማት
ገጽ ልማት ልማት	ገጽ ልማት ልማት	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ገጽ ልማት ልማት ገጽ ልማት ልማት 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ገጽ ልማት ልማት ገጽ ልማት ልማት ገጽ ልማት ልማት ገጽ ልማት ልማት ገጽ ልማት ልማት ገጽ ልማት ልማት ገጽ ልማት ልማት ገጽ ልማት ልማት 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ገጽ ልማት ልማት ገጽ ልማት ልማት ገጽ ልማት ልማት ገጽ ልማት ልማት 	ገጽ ልማት ልማት
ገጽ ልማት ልማት	ገጽ ልማት ልማት	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ገጽ ልማት ልማት 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ገጽ ልማት ልማት ገጽ ልማት ልማት 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ገጽ ልማት ልማት 	ገጽ ልማት ልማት

ግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ					
የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ	የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ	የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ	የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ	የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ	የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ
<p>የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ</p>	<p>ግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ 	<p>የግብርና ተጠቃሚነት ማረጋገጫ</p>

ጥራት ማረጋገጫ					
የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ	የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ	የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ	የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ	የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ	የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ
የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ	የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ ለገገረ ለገገር የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ ለገገረ ለገገር የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ ለገገረ ለገገር 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ ለገገረ ለገገር የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ ለገገረ ለገገር የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ ለገገረ ለገገር 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ ለገገረ ለገገር የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ ለገገረ ለገገር የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ ለገገረ ለገገር 	የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ
የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ	የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ ለገገረ ለገገር የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ ለገገረ ለገገር የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ ለገገረ ለገገር 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ ለገገረ ለገገር የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ ለገገረ ለገገር የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ ለገገረ ለገገር 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ ለገገረ ለገገር የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ ለገገረ ለገገር የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ ለገገረ ለገገር 	የገንዘብ ጥራት ማረጋገጫ

ርዕስ ሰጠኛ					
የገንዘብ ስራ ሪፖርት	የገንዘብ ስራ ሪፖርት	የገንዘብ ስራ ሪፖርት	የገንዘብ ስራ ሪፖርት	የገንዘብ ስራ ሪፖርት	የገንዘብ ስራ ሪፖርት
			<p>ርዕስ ሰጠኛ</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> የገንዘብ ስራ ሪፖርት ለውጥ የገንዘብ ስራ ሪፖርት ለውጥ የገንዘብ ስራ ሪፖርት ለውጥ 		

APPENDIX 1E

GLOSSARY

TABLE 1E-1.1
MARY RIVER PROJECT GLOSSARY

English Terminology	ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ	French Translation of Term	English Definition	Inuktitut Definition	French Definition
Open pit mine	ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ	Mine à ciel ouvert	1. A mine working or excavation open to the surface. 2. Mine by digging a big hole on top of the land.	1. ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ. 2. ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ.	1. Mine exploitée par excavation ouverte à la surface. 2. Immense cuvette que l'on creuse en enlevant des couches de sol.
Permafrost	ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ	Pergélisol	1. A permanently frozen layer of soil or subsoil, or even bedrock. 2. Ground that is permanently frozen. It occurs in polar regions (in the Arctic and Antarctic) and can reach depths of 600 meters below ground. While a shallow layer of soil on top of the ground may thaw during summer, the ground below remains frozen. Contraction and expansion of the permafrost caused by high summer and low winter temperatures can break up road surfaces and move buildings, sometimes causing damage. 3. Ground that is always frozen.	1. ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ. 2. ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ. 3. ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ.	1. Couche de sol, de sous-sol ou même de substratum gelé en permanence. 2. Sol gelé en permanence. On trouve ce sol dans les régions polaires (dans l'arctique et l'antarctique), il peut atteindre jusqu'à 600 mètres sous terre. Bien qu'une couche superficielle au-dessus du sol puisse décongeler l'été, le sol en dessous reste gelé. La contraction et l'expansion du pergélisol qui se produisent en raison de températures élevées en été et basses en hiver peuvent endommager les revêtements routiers, déplacer des bâtiments et parfois causer des dommages. 3. Sol toujours gelé.
Permitting process	ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ	Processus de délivrance de permis	A process in which an applicant requests and acquires a permit from a regulatory agency.	ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ.	Processus par lequel un requérant demande qu'un permis lui soit délivré et obtient ce dernier d'un organisme de réglementation.
Petroleum	ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ	Pétrole	A type of non-renewable energy that comes from the ground. Often called oil (crude), it is an oily liquid that is usually black. Petroleum is a hydrocarbon and is used to make gasoline, naphtha or other products.	ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ.	Type d'énergie non renouvelable provenant du sol. Liquide visqueux habituellement noir qu'on appelle souvent huile brute. Le pétrole est un hydrocarbure utilisé pour la production d'essence, de naphte ou d'autres produits.
Plant	ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ	Plante	A living thing that is not an animal. Trees, shrubs, herbs, grasses, flowering plants, moss, fungi, algae are all plants. Most depend on sunlight to live. Energy from the sun is used to make food for the plant inside the leaves or body of the plant.	ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ.	Organisme vivant autre qu'un animal. Les arbres, les arbustes, l'herbe, les graminées, les plantes à fleurs, la mousse, les champignons et les algues sont tous des plantes. La plupart ont besoin de lumière pour croître. Les feuilles ou le corps de la plante utilisent l'énergie solaire pour s'alimenter.
Polar bears	ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ	Ours polaires	Large creamy-white carnivorous bears (Ursus maritimus syn. Thalarctos maritimus) that inhabit arctic regions.	ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ.	Grands ours carnivores de couleur crème (ursus maritimus syn. thalarctos maritimus) qui habitent les régions arctiques.
Pollution	ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ	Pollution	1. The action of polluting especially by environmental contamination with man-made waste. 2. Substances in the air, water, or on the land that are not supposed to be there. They can harm living things if they are in sufficient amounts or stay for long periods of time.	ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ ᐃᓄᐸᐢᐃᐣᐣ.	1. Action de polluer, tout particulièrement par la contamination de l'environnement par les déchets synthétiques. 2. Substances étrangères dans l'air, l'eau ou le sol. En quantité suffisante ou sur de longues périodes d'exposition, ces substances peuvent nuire aux organismes vivants.

TABLE 1E-1.1
MARY RIVER PROJECT GLOSSARY

English Terminology	ᐃᓄᐱᓂᓐ ᐅᓄᓄᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	French Translation of Term	English Definition	Inuktitut Definition	French Definition
Potable water	ᐃᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Eau potable	Water suitable for drinking.	ᐃᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Eau d'une qualité telle qu'elle peut être destinée à la boisson.
Pre-strip	ᓄᓄᓄᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Pré-extraction	To remove extraneous or superficial matter from [mine site] in advance.	ᐅᓄᓄᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Enlèvement à l'avance de matières superflues ou superficielles du site minier.
Primary crusher	ᓂᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Concasseur principal	First machine in order of time or development to reduce to particles by pounding or grinding.	ᓂᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Appareil utilisé en premier ou pour le développement afin de concasser le minerai en particules par martèlement ou broyage.
Primary screening	ᓂᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Criblage de préclassement	To pass (as coal, gravel, or ashes) through a screen to separate the fine part from the coarse for a first time.	ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Passage du charbon, du gravier ou des cendres à travers un tamis afin de séparer pour la première fois les particules fines de grains grossiers.
Production	ᐅᓄᓄᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Production	1. Bring out of ore by physical effort. 2. Total output especially of a mining industry.	1. ᐅᓄᓄᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ. 2. ᐅᓄᓄᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ.	1. Extraction du minerai par effort physique. 2. Production totale, particulièrement lorsqu'il s'agit d'une industrie minière.
Progressive reclamation	ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Remise en état progressive	They fix the land, water, air and living things while they work. It is a type of reclamation that is done during the construction and operation phases of a mine prior to final closure.	ᓄᓄᓄᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Restauration du sol, de l'eau, de l'air et de l'habitat des organismes vivants entreprise en cours d'exploitation. Remise en état effectuée pendant les étapes de la construction et de l'exploitation d'une mine avant la fermeture définitive.
Project proposal	ᓄᓄᓄᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Proposition de projet	A written paper that explains why a project should go ahead, when it should start and finish, how it should be done, what will be done, how much it will cost and who will do the work. A proposal is a plan to do something, building a new school for example. The proposal is read by a group of people who will decide whether to allow the project.	ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Document écrit qui explique pourquoi un projet devrait aller de l'avant, quand il doit débuter et prendre fin, comment il sera accompli, ce qui sera fait, ce qu'il coûtera et qui accomplira le travail. Une proposition est un plan permettant d'accomplir une action; la construction d'une nouvelle école par exemple. La proposition est lue par un groupe de personnes qui décideront d'autoriser ou non le projet.
Project schedule	ᓄᓄᓄᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Échéancier de projet	A schedule wherein activities are assigned a duration and sequenced in a logical order.	ᓄᓄᓄᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Calendrier indiquant la durée d'une activité et sa séquence logique.
Railway	ᓄᓄᓄᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Voie ferrée	A permanent road having a line of rails fixed to ties and laid on a roadbed and providing a track for cars or equipment drawn by locomotives or propelled by self-contained motors.	ᓄᓄᓄᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Chemin de roulement constitué d'une ou plusieurs files de rails dont l'écartement est maintenu par une fixation sur des traverses sur lequel circulent des convois ferroviaires, de l'équipement tiré par des locomotives ou propulsé par des moteurs autonomes.
Raptors	ᓄᓄᓄᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Rapaces	Birds that only eat meat.	ᓄᓄᓄᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Oiseaux carnivores.
Reclamation	ᓄᓄᓄᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Remise en état	Restoration of disturbed and/or mined land to its original contour, use, or condition. Fixing the land after a development is done there.	ᓄᓄᓄᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ ᐱᓂᓂᓐ	Restauration d'une terre perturbée ou exploitée pour une mine à sa forme, son usage et sa condition d'origine. Restauration du sol après le développement.

cumulative effects	ከባህሪ በሆነው ሕዝብ ጋር ጋራ የሚኖሩ ችግሮች	Cumulative effects are changes to the biophysical, social, economic, and cultural environments caused by the combination of past, present and "reasonably foreseeable" future actions that accumulate to produce observable impacts on the land and people	በህዝብ ጋር ጋራ የሚኖሩ ችግሮች ምሳሌዎች ለማሳደግ ይህ ዓይነት ስርዓት ጠቅላላ ስርዓቶችን ለማስፈረግ ጥሩ ስራ ያስፈልጋል።	Positive socio-economic cumulative effects of a project like Mary River can include increased jobs, increased average salary, and increases in number of skilled workers.			
atmospheric	የሥራ	pertaining to, existing in, or consisting of the atmosphere; atmosphere: the gaseous envelope surrounding the earth, the air	የአየር ንፍቅ ማሰብ፣ የሥራ ስርዓት ማኑ፣ የሥራ ስርዓት ማኑ ለማሳደግ ይህ ዓይነት ስርዓት ጠቅላላ ስርዓቶችን ለማስፈረግ ጥሩ ስራ ያስፈልጋል።	The atmospheric environment includes climate, air quality, and noise.			
Aquatic	የአየር ንፍቅ	Relates to water. Some plants and animals live in water habitats, such as fish living in water. ³ Aquatic relates to both fresh and saltwater. ³	የአየር ንፍቅ ማሰብ፣ የሥራ ስርዓት ማኑ ለማሳደግ ይህ ዓይነት ስርዓት ጠቅላላ ስርዓቶችን ለማስፈረግ ጥሩ ስራ ያስፈልጋል።	Kelp is an aquatic plant because it can only survive in water. ³ Swimming is an aquatic sport.	Marine organism; aquatic beings		
Total suspended particulate matter (TSP)	የሥራ ስርዓት ማኑ	The total amount of particles floating in the air. The fraction of airborne particulates that will remain airborne after their release in the atmosphere. ¹	የሥራ ስርዓት ማኑ ለማሳደግ ይህ ዓይነት ስርዓት ጠቅላላ ስርዓቶችን ለማስፈረግ ጥሩ ስራ ያስፈልጋል።	The total suspended particulate matter in the air increased during road construction.	Suspended particulates floating in air		
Inhalable Particulate Matter (PM10 and PM2.5)	የሥራ ስርዓት ማኑ ለማሳደግ ይህ ዓይነት ስርዓት ጠቅላላ ስርዓቶችን ለማስፈረግ ጥሩ ስራ ያስፈልጋል።	are tiny subdivisions of solid matter suspended in a gas or liquid; in this case, they can be taken into the lungs, and occur both naturally in the environment or by human activities	የሥራ ስርዓት ማኑ ለማሳደግ ይህ ዓይነት ስርዓት ጠቅላላ ስርዓቶችን ለማስፈረግ ጥሩ ስራ ያስፈልጋል።	The burning of fossil fuels can create Inhalable Particulate Matter, as well as the eruption of volcanoes (which creates soot).			
sulphur dioxide (SO2)	የሥራ ስርዓት ማኑ ለማሳደግ ይህ ዓይነት ስርዓት ጠቅላላ ስርዓቶችን ለማስፈረግ ጥሩ ስራ ያስፈልጋል።	Sulphur dioxide (SO2) is a colorless gas that smells like burnt matches. SO2 is generally a byproduct of industrial processes and burning of fossil fuels.	የሥራ ስርዓት ማኑ ለማሳደግ ይህ ዓይነት ስርዓት ጠቅላላ ስርዓቶችን ለማስፈረግ ጥሩ ስራ ያስፈልጋል።	Approximately 69 per cent of the SO ₂ emitted in Ontario in 2006 came from smelters and utilities.			
nitrogen dioxide (NO2)	የሥራ ስርዓት ማኑ ለማሳደግ ይህ ዓይነት ስርዓት ጠቅላላ ስርዓቶችን ለማስፈረግ ጥሩ ስራ ያስፈልጋል።	NO ₂ is a reddish-brown gas with a pungent and irritating odour. It transforms in the air to form gaseous nitric acid and toxic organic nitrates.	የሥራ ስርዓት ማኑ ለማሳደግ ይህ ዓይነት ስርዓት ጠቅላላ ስርዓቶችን ለማስፈረግ ጥሩ ስራ ያስፈልጋል።	Approximately two-thirds or 68 per cent of NO ₂ emitted in Ontario in 2006 came from the transportation sectors.			
carbon monoxide (CO), as well as increased deposition of dust	የሥራ ስርዓት ማኑ ለማሳደግ ይህ ዓይነት ስርዓት ጠቅላላ ስርዓቶችን ለማስፈረግ ጥሩ ስራ ያስፈልጋል።	CO is a colourless, odourless and tasteless but poisonous gas produced primarily by incomplete burning of fossil fuels	የሥራ ስርዓት ማኑ ለማሳደግ ይህ ዓይነት ስርዓት ጠቅላላ ስርዓቶችን ለማስፈረግ ጥሩ ስራ ያስፈልጋል።	Over 85% of the CO emissions in Ontario come from the transportation sector.			

topography	ጠፍኛ ጭህኔ ጭልረህሊህኛ	the land forms or surface configuration of a region	ጠፍኛ ልዩነቶች ለሰላም ጭህኔ ጭልረህሊህኛ	During the winter months the treeless topography and fine powdery snow produce blowing snow conditions.			
excavation	ጠፋኛ ጋረጥ ለኃይል	an area in which excavating has been done or is in progress; excavating: to make hollow by removing the inner part; make a hole or cavity in; form into a hollow, as by digging	ጠፋኛ ጋረጥ ለኃይል ለሰላም ጠፋኛ ጋረጥ ለኃይል ለሰላም ጠፋኛ ጋረጥ ለኃይል ለሰላም	The ground was excavated at the archaeological site.			
Berm	ከጋረጥ	A barrier wall made of earth on the ground.	ከጋረጥ ጠፋኛ ለሰላም ጠፋኛ ጭህኔ	The workers built a 300m berm to protect the maintenance building.	Barrier		
Geotechnical (knowledge of rock)	ጭህኔ ጭህኔ ጭህኔ ጭህኔ	Of or relation to a science that deals with the application of geology to engineering.	ጭህኔ ጭህኔ ጭህኔ ጭህኔ	Geotechnical studies were conducted along the proposed rail line to avoid areas were landslides and rock fall were possible.			
geotechnical (investigation)	ጭህኔ ጭህኔ ጭህኔ ጭህኔ	performed by geotechnical engineers or engineering geologists to obtain information on the physical properties of soil and rock around a site	ጭህኔ ጭህኔ ጭህኔ ጭህኔ	A geotechnical investigation determined the site was composed of high-grade iron ore.			
magnitude	ጭህኔ ጭህኔ	Greatness in size or extent; greatness in significance or influence	ጭህኔ ጭህኔ ጭህኔ ጭህኔ	The magnitude of the residual effects of components of the project have been assessed to forecast their impact.			



ᖃᖅᑕᑦ ᐃᑭᐃᑦ ᑲᑕᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᓂᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 ᐃᑭᑦᑲᑦ ᐅᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Serving the
 communities of

**APPENDIX B – MARY RIVER PROJECT COMMITTEE
 MINUTES**

ᐃᑦᐱᑦᑲᑦ
 Arctic Bay

ᖃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Cape Dorset

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Clyde River

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Grise Fiord

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Hall Beach

ᐃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Igloolik

ᐃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Iqaluit

ᖃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Kimmirut

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Pangnirtung

ᖃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Pond Inlet

ᖃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Resolute Bay

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Sanikiluaq

**MARY RIVER PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEES
 Meeting Minutes, March to May 2012
 Based on notes available as of May 30th 2012**

Community	Date of Meeting
Arctic Bay	April 4, 2012
Arctic Bay	April 10, 2012
Arctic Bay	April 16, 2012
Arctic Bay	April 17, 2012
Arctic Bay	April 20, 2012
Arctic Bay	May 10, 2012
Cape Dorset	May 10, 2012
Clyde River	March 7, 2012
Clyde River	March 13, 2012
Clyde River	May 10, 2012
Hall Beach/Igloolik/Pond Inlet	March 5, 2012
Hall Beach	March 19, 2012
Hall Beach	March 27, 2012
Hall Beach	April 3, 2012
Hall Beach	April 18, 2012
Hall Beach	May 3, 2012
Hall Beach	May 9, 2012
Igloolik	March 28, 2012
Igloolik	April 16-18, 2012
Igloolik	April 25, 2012
Igloolik	May 10, 2012
Kimmirut	March 29, 2012
Kimmirut	April 12, 2012
Kimmirut	April 17, 2012
Kimmirut	April 18, 2012
Kimmirut	May 8, 2012
Pond Inlet	March 29, 2012
Pond Inlet	March 30, 2012
Pond Inlet	April 5, 2012
Pond Inlet	May 3, 2012
Pond Inlet	May 5, 2012



ᖃᐅᖅᓃᓂ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑲᑖᖅᓴᖅᑲᑲᑲᖅ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᓴᑦᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
ᓄᓇᑦᓃᓴᑲᑲᑲ ᐅᑲᓄᖅᓴ
Serving the
communities of

Arctic Bay Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes Hunters and Trappers Organization Office April 4, 2012 @ 2:00 pm

ᐃᖅᐱᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Arctic Bay

Present:

ᐅᖅᓴᓴᐃᑲᑲ
Cape Dorset

Member – Koonoo Oyukuluk
Member – Leah Kalluk
QIA Rep – Levi Barnabas
CLO – Niore Iqalukjuak

ᑲᖅᓴᖅᓴᓴᖅ
Clyde River

1. Opening and prayer @ 2:11 p.m.

ᐃᓄᐃᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Grise Fiord

2. Appointment of chair for this meeting.

ᖅᓴᓴᓴᖅ
Hall Beach

3. A committee member states that he is a part of the Executive Committee and chair of Qikiqtaaluk Corporation and will have to declare conflict of interest from time to time when dealing with contract issues.

ᐃᑲᓴᑲᑲᑲ
Igloolik

4. Dealing with correspondence and review agenda.

ᐃᖅᓴᓴᐃᑲᑲ
Iqaluit

5. Start having meetings to deal with issues starting April 10 @ 2:00 p.m. when more members are available to attend.

ᐅᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Kimmirut

6. Adjourn @ 2:57 p.m.

ᐃᖅᓴᓴᓴᖅ
Pangnirtung

ᑲᖅᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Pond Inlet

ᖃᐅᖅᓃᓂ ᐃᓄᐃᑲᑲ
Qikiqjarjuak

ᖅᓴᓴᓴᓴᖅ
Resolute Bay

ᖅᓴᓴᓴᓴᖅ
Sanikiluaq



ᖃᖃᖅᕕᖅ ᐃᐅᐃᖅ ᑲᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᖅ
Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
ᐅᐅᐅᐅᐅᐅᐅ
Serving the
communities of

Arctic Bay Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes
Hunters and Trappers Organization Office
April 10, 2012 @ 2:00 pm

ᐃᖅᐱᐅᖅ
Arctic Bay

ᖃᖅᕕᖅ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᖅᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Clyde River

ᐅᐅᐅᐅᐅᐅᐅ
Grise Fiord

ᑲᐅᐅᐅ
Hall Beach

ᐃᖅᐅᖅ
Igloolik

ᐃᖅᐅᐅᐅᐅ
Iqaluit

ᖃᖅᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Kimmirut

ᐅᐅᐅᐅᐅᐅ
Pangnirtung

ᖃᖅᕕᖅ
Pond Inlet

ᖃᖅᕕᖅ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᖃᖅᕕᖅ
Resolute Bay

ᑲᐅᐅᐅ
Sanikiluaq

Present:

- Member – Leah Koonark
- Member – Leah Kalluk
- Member – Koonoo Oyukuluk
- HTO Rep – Simionie Olayuk
- QIA Rep – Levi Barnabas
- CLO – Niore Iqalukjuak

Opening and prayer @2:24 p.m.

1. Review of letter read aloud.
2. **Selection of Chairperson:** K. Oyukuluk was selected to be the Chairperson for the MRPC
3. **Regarding Appendix 3B** - The Committee has no concerns on the use of the two lakes that will be used as the Committee knows that the lakes will be monitored and there should be reports. Also monitor the water lake and do samples at it.
4. **Appendix 3B attachment 5** – Emergency Response Plan – The only concern is do not have floating docks as there may be spills.

Adjourn @ 4:30 p.m.



ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ ᐃᐃᐃᐃᐃ ᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱ
 ᐃᐃᐃᐃᐃᐃᐃ ᐃᐃᐃᐃᐃ
 Serving the
 communities of

**Arctic Bay Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes
 Hunters and Trappers Organization Office
 April 16, 2012 @ 2:00 pm**

ᐃᐱᐱᐱᐱ
 Arctic Bay

ᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱ
 Cape Dorset

ᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
 Clyde River

ᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
 Grise Fiord

ᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
 Hall Beach

ᐃᐱᐱᐱᐱ
 Igloolik

ᐃᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
 Iqaluit

ᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱ
 Kimmirut

ᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
 Pangnirtung

ᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱ
 Pond Inlet

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑲᑲᑲᑲ
 Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
 Resolute Bay

ᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
 Sanikiluaq

Present:

- Chairperson – Koonoo Oyukuluk
- Vice Chairperson - Olayuk Naqitarvik
- Member – Leah Koonark
- Member – Leah Kalluk
- QIA Rep – Levi Barnabas
- CLO – Niore Iqalukjuak

1. Opening and prayer @ 2:17 p.m.

2. Review of Appendix 3B Attachment 5 – Emergency Response and spill

- Concerns – To periodically check for spills. There was a spill that was not detected for a long while. There were also barrels left on a lake that were not checked if they were leaking, have any fuels checked in a timely manner.
- It will have impacts on wildlife if there is a spill especially when there are lakes and rivers.
- Do water quality checks on a timely manner with nearby lakes.
- Perhaps it would be better if QIA sets aside funds to check for water quality?

3. Concerns or Questions to Item 11

- To have tests done to Aquatic life in all places that has plans to have unnatural material placed on them before the material is put in place and also test the aquatic life for any contaminants after the material has been put in place.

4. Item 20 – Appendix 10D -10

- To have some sort of mesh to collect plankton or deep sea aquatic life that have been collected by the ship while travelling from overseas and have them collect this rather than dump it to our Northern waters when they drain the water. Have a filter to collect the impurities or micro sea life as it drains.

5. Item 21 – Terrestrial Environment Management

- Concerns – To share all findings with Communities and also address concerns put forth by Inuit in adjoining Communities. To have compensation available if there is a negative impact and have them share any information with all Communities involved.

Adjourn @ 3:43



ᖃᖅᑕᑦ ᐃᑭᐃᑦ ᑲᑕᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 ᐃᑭᑦᑲᑦ ᐃᑭᑦᑲᑦ
 Serving the
 communities of

Arctic Bay Mary River Project Review Committee – Meeting Minutes
Hunters and Trappers Organization Office
April 17, 2012 @ 2:00 pm

ᐃᖅᐱᑦᑲᑦ
 Arctic Bay

ᖃᖅᑲᑦ
 Cape Dorset

ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Clyde River

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Grise Fiord

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Hall Beach

ᐃᑦᑲᑦ
 Igloolik

ᐃᑦᑲᑦ
 Iqaluit

ᖃᑦᑲᑦ
 Kimmirut

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Pangnirtung

ᖃᑦᑲᑦ
 Pond Inlet

ᖃᖅᑲᑦ
 Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Resolute Bay

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Sanikiluaq

Present:

Vice Chair – Olayuk Naqitarvik
 Member – L. Koonark
 Member – Leah Kalluk
 QIA Rep – Levi Barnabas
 CLO – Niore Iqalukjuak

1. Opening and prayer @ 2:08 p.m.
2. **Item 22 – Appendix 3B Attachment 5 – Environmental Monitoring plan**
 Concerns – The concern is that Mining wouldn't stop if something wrong is noticed or that Mining wouldn't slow down even while something negative is taking place once the mining starts. Unsure that any problems that may occur are corrected in a timely manner.
3. **Item 23 – Appendix 3B Attachment 5 – Environment Effect Monitoring Plan**
 Concern – To have a person to monitor any of these issues. Let this be done by an Independent Body through contracts and renewed periodically.
4. **Appendix 10D – 14**
 No concerns to this issue
5. Meeting Adjourned @ 4:34 p.m. with next meeting scheduled for 8 p.m. tomorrow



ᑭᑭᑭᑕᑭ ᐃᐁᐃᑕ ᐆᑕᑎᑦᐆᑎᑦᑕᑦ
Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᑦᑕᑕᑦᑎᑦᑕᑦ
 ᐁᐁᑕᑦᑎᑦ ᐅᑕᑦᑕᑦ
 Serving the
 communities of

**Arctic Bay Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes
 Hunters and Trappers Organization Office
 April 20, 2012 @ 2:00 pm**

ᐃᑦᐱᑕᑦᑎᑦ
 Arctic Bay

ᑭᑦᑕᑦᑎᑦ
 Cape Dorset

ᑭᑦᑕᑦᑎᑦ
 Clyde River

ᑭᑦᑕᑦᑎᑦ
 Grise Fiord

ᑭᑦᑕᑦᑎᑦ
 Hall Beach

ᑭᑦᑕᑦᑎᑦ
 Igloolik

ᑭᑦᑕᑦᑎᑦ
 Iqaluit

ᑭᑦᑕᑦᑎᑦ
 Kimmirut

ᑭᑦᑕᑦᑎᑦ
 Pangnirtung

ᑭᑦᑕᑦᑎᑦ
 Pond Inlet

ᑭᑦᑕᑦᑎᑦ
 Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑭᑦᑕᑦᑎᑦ
 Resolute Bay

ᑭᑦᑕᑦᑎᑦ
 Sanikiluaq

Present:

Chairperson – Koonoo Oyukuluk
 Vice Chair – Olayuk Naqitarvik
 Member – L. Koonark
 Member – Leah Kalluk
 QIA Rep – Levi Barnabas
 HTO Rep - Simonie Olayuk
 CLO – Niore Iqalukjuak

1. Openng and prayer @ 2:14 p.m.
2. **Item 24 – Appendix 10D – 14 MMER**
 The only concern is the Arctic Terns from their nesting grounds as they nest on the Island that the Dock will be built, the tugboats will continue to be mobile throughout the season and will disrupt the nesting grounds of the Arctic Terns.
3. **Item 25 – Appendix 10-F-1 – Stakeholders Statement Plan**
 No Concerns stated
4. **Appendix 10F-2 – Cultural Resource Protection**
 The concern is that the ore dust will fly off in the wind and will make the land dirty. Have all old Archeological sites along the railway route documented and photographed AND also specify what sites were destroyed along the route. Notify all Communities of what items were removed or destroyed along the railway route. Notify the Communities where they were taken and also document and photograph any Inukshuks that are along the railway and document if they have been destroyed. Also mark the Inukshuk's location and why it was built and also photograph them.
5. **Item 28 – 10F-3**
 They will have to have someone look after logistics; they will have to hire someone to look after that for sure. This person will have to be a mediator for the Management and the Employee's. MRPC would also like to meet with the local Economic Development Officer to see what our Community can benefit from all this.
6. The Committee would like a copy of what Honoraria were paid to Members from the start of the meetings up to now.
7. Selection of two Committee members to attend the Pond Inlet meeting regarding the Caribou and to discuss IIBA issues. They would like the agenda of the proposed meeting before hand.
8. A question also came up as to what the budget is for each Community members in all of Baffin.

Adjournment @ 3:18 p.m.



ᖃᕈᕐᕋᕆᕐ ᕈᕆᕆᕐ ᖃᕐᕆᕐᕋᕆᕐ
Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᕐᕆᕐᕆᕐᕋᕆᕐ ᖃᕐᕆᕐᕋᕆᕐ
 Serving the
 communities of

**Arctic Bay Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes
 QIA Consultation on FEIS Review
 May 10, 2012**

ᕈᕆᕆᕐ ᕈᕆᕆᕐ
 Arctic Bay

ᕈᕆᕆᕐ ᕈᕆᕆᕐ
 Cape Dorset

ᕈᕆᕆᕐ ᕈᕆᕆᕐ
 Clyde River

ᕈᕆᕆᕐ ᕈᕆᕆᕐ
 Grise Fiord

ᕈᕆᕆᕐ ᕈᕆᕆᕐ
 Hall Beach

ᕈᕆᕆᕐ ᕈᕆᕆᕐ
 Igloolik

ᕈᕆᕆᕐ ᕈᕆᕆᕐ
 Iqaluit

ᕈᕆᕆᕐ ᕈᕆᕆᕐ
 Kimmirut

ᕈᕆᕆᕐ ᕈᕆᕆᕐ
 Pangnirtung

ᕈᕆᕆᕐ ᕈᕆᕆᕐ
 Pond Inlet

ᕈᕆᕆᕐ ᕈᕆᕆᕐ
 Qikiqtarjuaq

ᕈᕆᕆᕐ ᕈᕆᕆᕐ
 Resolute Bay

ᕈᕆᕆᕐ ᕈᕆᕆᕐ
 Sanikiluaq

Committee Members Present:

- Koonoo Oyukuluk, Chair
- Leah Koonark, MRPC member
- Leah Kalluk, MRPC member
- Levi Barnabas, QIA director.

Meeting Note Taker: Levi Barnabas

1. Meeting opening:

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 pm, and a prayer was given.

2. Purpose of Meeting

QIA requests that the MRPCs assist QIA by providing input into QIA's final written comments to NIRB and a presentation to be made at the Final Hearing for the proposed Mary River Project. These steps in the review process are the last chances for QIA and the communities to tell NIRB, other agencies, and the public what Inuit think about the Project, before the decision of weather or not to approve it is made.

3. QIA Questions for Committee Discussion

a) When the Baffinland is finished with the land and start to reclaim the land they need to properly restore the fuel storage areas. There needs to be monitoring when tunnelling when dynamites are used adjacent to the lake to make sure the fish and their diet are not dyeing off. There need to be monitoring near the dumping sight of the storage area near the loading dock at the shore line. MRPCs want to inspect the mine sites before and after when projects are done and get reports on any projects.

b) 1. MRPCs most important to our concern is the properly restoration of fuel storage sights. 2. Dumping of water from Europe to Canadian water to balance the ship how that will be monitored and if that water will be filtered and if filtered where will they dump the filtered water. 3. Where the extra quarry will be located from tunnelling site. 4. How the fish will be monitored when Baffinland start blasting the lake adjacent to the lake and how the report will be done. 5. particals flying from wind when the train is dumping to the loading site.

c) MRPC would satisfy on concerns if they are met and reported and employment is staisfatory and programs are provide to the community and data collection are reported on time. MRPC want the facility needs from the hamlet are met from the priority needs identified from the survey.

d) MRPC feel that what kind of out come will happen from the first project and MRCP feel that there should not be binding agreements written on stone.

e) The MRPC support the project and support the development of Mary River Project with the understanding that Nunavut Land Claims Agreement is followed and MRPC and QIA continue to



ᖃᖅᑲᑦ ᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑦᑲᑦ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱ
ᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Serving the
communities of

monitor the projects and receive reports.

4. Additional Comments: The MRPC want to be continued to be informed on the IIBA and be part of it.

ᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Arctic Bay

5. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 4:50 pm.

ᖃᖅᑲᑦ ᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Clyde River

ᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Grise Fiord

ᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Hall Beach

ᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Igloolik

ᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Iqaluit

ᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Kimmirut

ᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pangnirtung

ᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pond Inlet

ᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Resolute Bay

ᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Sanikiluaq



ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Serving the
communities of

Cape Dorset Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes Hunters and Trappers Organization Office May 10, 2012

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Arctic Bay

Mary River Project Committee - FEIS Review.
Meeting held in the QIA and HTO office in Dorset

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Cape Dorset

Present: Ejetsiak Peter, Nitani Peter, Atsiaq Alaasuaq, Qimmiata Nungutsuituq, Adamie Nuna, Oloosie Manning CLO.

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Clyde River

Minute taker: Oloosie Manning

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Grise Fiord

Purpose of meeting: Review the FEIS consultation

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Hall Beach

Community Concerns: we were mentioned to get community concerns but we have not been doing that. We need to get Radio membership. (QIA or MRPC)

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Igloodik

Purpose: some members are concerned about Walrus, Walruses are very sensitive to noise even on Outdoor motors, The ship that will be carrying the Iron will be Big and bigger propellers and will make much more vibration. The ship will also be making more noise. Inuit hunt Walrus and sure think that Walruses will be affect a lot around this area.

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Iqaluit

MRPC were told that they need to be notifying the community were this plan is going and what is talking about. What plans are being discussed. My concern is that, if we would be doing this last minute? Would we cause any delay for the hearing?

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Kimmirut

QIA needs to get radio membership, we would have gone through the air if we had radio membership. The CLO was told to get QIA to have membership. We could have a radio shop to get communities input in the Mary River Project. CLO is not able to go on air about QIA until the radio membership is paid for.

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Pangnirtung

Another Member: we still have time to notify the Community what is going on. We also have notified community in the beginning of becoming the MRPC.

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Pond Inlet

Maybe we can go on radio after the meeting. And we still would have time, and some have listened to the CBC and TV. And we would just need to update the community and gather their input on the MRP.

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Qikiqtarjuaq

We also have the barrier crossing from the metal dump are here in Dorset and to connects to the other side of the bay. We would like to get a bridge. It would benefit People Cape Dorset. The Gravel pit in municipality of Cape Dorset, Dorset people could use the gravel for all year round.

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Resolute Bay

There is also trainings available for the Mary River project work available soon. We should also try to educate local people of what might be expected of the work and restrictions. Nunavummiut are going to benefit from it. We should try to learn more about it.

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Sanikiluaq

Another concern that we have, Nanisivik, We have heard of Nanisivik that their heavy equipment, As for Mary River Project if those equipment can be used for other Nunavut communities, or shared and split between Communities that are in need. Some Communities have very old heavy equipments and need to get new ones and we are sure that not all have money for it as soon as



ᖃᕕᕐᑕᕈ ᐃᐅᐃᑦ ᑲᕐᖅᕐᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᖅᕐᕐᖅᕐᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Serving the
communities of

ᐃᖅᐱᕐᕐᕐᑲᖅ
Arctic Bay

ᕕᖅᕐᕐᕐᕐᑲᖅ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᖅᖃᕐᕐᕐᑲᖅ
Clyde River

ᑲᕐᐅᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᑲᖅ
Grise Fiord

ᑲᕐᕐᕐᕐᑲᖅ
Hall Beach

ᐃᕐᕐᕐᕐᑲᖅ
Igloolik

ᐃᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᑲᖅ
Iqaluit

ᕕᕐᕐᕐᕐᑲᖅ
Kimmirut

ᑲᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᑲᖅ
Pangnirtung

ᕕᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᑲᖅ
Pond Inlet

ᖃᕕᕐᑕᕐᕐᕐᕐᑲᖅ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᑲᖅ
Resolute Bay

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᑲᖅ
Sanikiluaq

they need it. And for the fold away houses, Inuit can reuse these equipment. Maybe this would fall under the IIBA the equipment that are being used and maybe when the mining is finished they can be given to Nunavut communities. We as Nunavummiut should try to avoid this same thing happening. We would like to have this put in the hearing of the N.I.R.B.

Rail Road, We would like to have the rail road considered to be build, The rail road I'm sure would be a blockage to caribou migration. Caribou's migrate and do not change their direction that easy, when it is migration time. Some may run away and from shock or getting scared from something loud or getting hit, but during their migration they go one direction, and they have used that pass for so many years. Caribou may be not in this area for a while now but we do believe that they will come around again to this area sometime in the future. Plants are going to be affected too, and maybe some animals food will no longer be available some animals and some animals will no longer be available around here.

Also the rail road tracks that are going to be used or destroyed, Inuit can also use those for anything, making shacks or use them for coats, or other things.

The sea mammals will also be affected. In this area we think that there would be great affect, Inuit around Cape Dorset have hunted for animals all year round for so many years. Inuit here hunt whales, seal of different kinds, there's also smaller things such as clams, and krill and other things. If there was money or an agreement in place for Inuit around this area and other places affected, For Example, Seals, If there was no more seals available in this area if there was an agreement for Dorset and other communities Something saying that we are allowed to order seals from other places maybe Northern Quebec. Or other communities, If there is a reverse plan in place also would help Inuit. Feeding grounds might be affected for some animals. This should really be looked at for the hearing, for something to be put in place like an agreement. Compensation.

Researchers, They should come to this community to do surveys around migration time to show that we do have animals all year round, Some animals are not active around the time that surveys are being done. Inuit know when there is a certain animal migrating or mating season in certain areas and certain animals in this certain time.

We do agree and support the plans for the Mary River Project to continue. Nunavummiut are going to benefit from this project, by employment and under the NLCA.

We would like to see pavement on the roads too, If we can get some money to pave the roads, we are going to have some impact in this community and this area. Shipping route will be just outside of Cape Dorset. We can use the pavement in this community, it would help some people in a lot of ways, the pot holes would decrease during the year if spring and fall. And it would be less dust for on the roads as we live here and know that dust season is around the corner. Summer time is always dust in this community. Just to consider the pavement in this community. It might have been mentioned before maybe with the Hamlet but we would like to ask Baffinland for this. The road conditions are being worked on all year round.

Housing shortage is always mentioned all over Nunavut and Shortage of Correctional centers. Inuit can re use the fold away housing that are going to be used in the mining camp. It can be used as a correctional center or local housing for a community for those who are really need of housing more than other communities.

Archeology sights. There are a lot of archeology sights in Nunavut. Some are being monitored and some are not known, It would be good for Inuit are employed with this railroad making, maybe some will know where sights are. It would also be helpful in employment for some elders, who do not have employment and would like to find something to do. IQ guide.



ᖃᖅᑕᑦ ᐃᑭᐃᑦ ᑲᑕᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᑭᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᐃᑭᑦᑲᑦ
Serving the
communities of

Clyde River Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes Hamlet Office Council Chambers March 7, 2012

ᐃᖅᐱᑦᑲᑦ
Arctic Bay

Present: Jerry Natanine QIA and HTO Representative
Ootoovah Audlakiak Member
Ijah Hainnu Member
Jayko Apak Member

ᖃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Cape Dorset

Other: Lizzie Palituq, Community Liaison Officer

ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Clyde River

Absent: Jayko Ashevak Member and Hamlet Representative

Meeting starts at 3:10 p.m. at the Hamlet office Council Chambers.

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Grise Fiord

There is no agenda to follow, so the Committee decides to appoint a Chair and a Vice Chair. Solomon Awa was supposed to be join the meeting through phone from QIA office, but he was in another meeting and not available.

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Hall Beach

Jerry Natanine is appointed as a Chairman and Igah Hainnu is appointed as Vice Chairperson. All of the committee members approve both appointments.

ᐃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Igloolik

Community Liaison Officer informs the committee that QIA wanted to have a meeting with the committee regarding the upcoming visit from Baffinland Iron Mines.

ᐃᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Iqaluit

Baffinland Iron Mines have requested to have a meeting with the committee on March 13th, from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon. The committee also have been invited to have lunch with them that day. Place of meeting will be announced on a later date.

ᖃᖅᑲᑦ
Kimmirut

NIRB have approved the Requests from Baffinland Iron Mines, except for the wintering of the barge at Steensby Inlet. Members discuss what they have heard and what they know about that issue.

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pangnirtung

Meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

ᖃᖅᑲᑦ
Pond Inlet

ᖃᖅᑲᑦ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Resolute Bay

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Sanikiluaq



ᖃᖅᑕᑦ ᐃᑭᐃᑦ ᑲᐃᖅᑕᖅᑎᖅᑕᖅ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᖅᑎᖅᑕᖅ
ᐃᑭᖅᑕᖅ ᐃᑭᖅᑕᖅ
Serving the
communities of

ᐃᖅᐱᑦᑕᖅ
Arctic Bay

ᖃᖅᑕᖅ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᖅᑕᖅᑎᖅ
Clyde River

ᑭᖅᑕᖅᑎᖅ
Grise Fiord

ᖅᑕᖅᑎᖅ
Hall Beach

ᐃᖅᑕᖅ
Igloolik

ᐃᖅᑕᖅ
Iqaluit

ᖃᖅᑕᖅ
Kimmirut

ᑕᖅᑎᖅᑕᖅ
Pangnirtung

ᖃᖅᑕᖅ
Pond Inlet

ᖃᖅᑕᖅ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᖅᑕᖅᑎᖅ
Resolute Bay

ᖅᑕᖅᑎᖅ
Sanikiluaq

Clyde River Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes March 13, 2012

Present:	Jerry Natanine	Chairman – QIA and HTO Rep
	Jayko Ashevak	Member – Hamlet Rep
	Jayko Apak	Member
	Ootoovah Audlakiak	Member
	Lizzie Palituq	Community Liaison Officer - QIA
	Joe Tigullaraq	Baffinland Iron Mines
	Gary Aipellee	Community Worker – Baffinland Iron Mines

Absent: Igah Hainnu Vice Chair

Meeting called to order at 9:10 a.m.

Baffinland starts by telling the Committee about the history of Baffinland Iron Mines. When they started, which years they went through NIRB, Water Board, QIA, Government of Nunavut, Federal Government, Natural Resources Canada, Parks Canada, etc.

Baffinland also talks about the community visits and public hearings during the fall of 2011. NIRB did visits to Iqaluit on October 18 to 20 and November 6/7 in Igloolik, and November 9/10 in Pond Inlet. NIRB did community visits to hear public concerns and hear recommendations about Baffinland Iron Mines. They also discussed the projected work to be done during the summer of 2012.

One of the questions raised was, why can't they store the fuel on land?

This is due to the large volume of fuel. In order to store them on land, they would have to make a lot of fuel tank farms in order for them to be stored properly. Keeping the fuel stored as planned did not require them to build the tank farms.

Another question raised, will the mine produce little particles that will be fine as dust. We heard that an arctic hare turned red from the dust from the mine.

There was also research done on the land where contaminated particles can travel far distances due to the wind direction from a mine or a place that has contaminated work being done. We've heard that since the air is so dry and warm and cold air are separate, that contaminated air can travel long ways, affected areas that they would not even affect if they weren't in the north.

There will be a lot of money going to Inuit beneficiaries through Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and Qikiqtani Inuit Association. These organizations are working together with Baffinland so that Inuit can benefit as much as possible from the mine.

Another concern raised is heritage areas. Baffinland said that whenever an area is designated as an archaeological site, it will not be touched. Even if they find artifacts from non designated areas, the right people that deal with artifacts or archaeological issues would be contacted right away. This is already in the agreement with the Inuit organizations.

The beneficiaries can also inform their Inuit organizations of what they can benefit from the mine, as a community. Please contact your regional organizations to see what can be included in the Benefits Impact Agreements. This way it will not only benefit the people that work there, but also the communities that will be affected.



ᖃᖅᓴᓂ ᐃᓂᐃᓂ ᓃᓂᓴᓂᓴᓂᓴᓂᓴᓂ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᓴᓂᓴᓂᓴᓂ
ᓂᓴᓂᓴᓂᓴᓂ ᐃᓂᓴᓂ
Serving the
communities of

ᐃᓴᓂᓴᓂ
Arctic Bay

ᖃᓴᓂᓴᓂ
Cape Dorset

ᓃᓴᓂᓴᓂ
Clyde River

ᓂᓴᓂᓴᓂ
Grise Fiord

ᓴᓂᓴᓂ
Hall Beach

ᐃᓴᓂᓴᓂ
Igloolik

ᐃᓴᓂᓴᓂ
Iqaluit

ᖃᓴᓂᓴᓂ
Kimmitut

ᓂᓴᓂᓴᓂ
Pangnirtung

ᖃᓴᓂᓴᓂ
Pond Inlet

ᖃᓴᓂᓴᓂ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᓂᓴᓂᓴᓂ
Resolute Bay

ᓴᓂᓴᓂ
Sanikiluaq

There will be another hearing sometime this fall around September/ October with the Nunavut Water Board, NIRB and Federal Government. The usual process will commence as usual. Next year around March or April, being given the time and depending on the approvals or recommendations, then construction can proceed. If things go as planned, Mining would start around 2016.

Since there was a concern raised due to the transportation of the mined goods to the ship, will they be covered so that they will not produce dust particles?

Yes, they will be covered during transportation. We will make sure that this is implemented.

Baffinland Iron Mines will make sure that Inuit beneficiaries will be informed of all activities that will impact Inuit and Inuit Owned Lands.

If mining cannot proceed at Nuluujaat, they will go ahead and work in other countries, such as Africa.

In other regions, such as Northern Quebec, there are really good Impact Benefit Agreements in place. Now is the time to go ahead and make recommendations on what can be included in the benefits agreement. Communities need a lot of help, with projects such as wharfs, airport, fishery, etc. There is a lot of potential benefit that can come out of an agreement.

A question was raised if there would be an assessment for the impact of routes between Qikiqtarjuaq and Clyde River? This was brought up due to the possible impact by the transportation of the Iron ore.

The Baffinland representative knows that the only assessment being done will be direct impacts of the areas that will be impacted during mining and transportation. They do not include areas outside of the proposed sites.

This is about it for now, if there aren't any more comments or questions. Representatives of the Baffinland Iron Mines plan to come back on May 12th for another meeting. There will be a Technical meeting in Iqaluit around May 18 to 22. We'll probably invite representatives from the communities. The last time that we had representatives, we had invited nine communities. NIRB did, not Baffinland.

There is a public meeting this evening if you wanted to attend that one. It will be held at the community Hall.

Thank you, Baffinland brought some promotional items so there was a draw and also gave out bags and toques and caps.

Meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.



ᖃᖅᑕᑦ ᐃᐃᑦ ᑲᐃᓴᑦᑲᐃᓴᑦ
Qikiqtani Inuit Association

Clyde River Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes
Meeting with Baffinland
May 10, 2012

ᐱᓴᑦᑲᓴᑦᑕᑦ
 ᐃᓴᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦ ᐃᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦ
 Serving the
 communities of

ᐃᓴᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦ
 Arctic Bay

ᖃᖅᑕᑦ
 Cape Dorset

ᑲᓴᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦ
 Clyde River

ᑕᑲᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦ
 Grise Fiord

ᑲᓴᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦ
 Hall Beach

ᐃᑲᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦ
 Igloolik

ᐃᑲᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦ
 Iqaluit

ᖃᖅᑕᑦ
 Kimmirut

ᑕᑲᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦ
 Pangnirtung

ᖃᖅᑕᑦ
 Pond Inlet

ᖃᖅᑕᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦ
 Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᓴᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦ
 Resolute Bay

ᑲᓴᑦᑕᑦᑕᑦ
 Sanikiluaq

Present: Jerry Natanine Chair of the MRPC and QIA Director
 Jayko Ashevak Hamlet Rep
 Jayko Apak Member at Large
 Ootoovah Audlakiak Member at Large
 Lizzie Palitug Qikiqtani Inuit Association CLO
 Joe Tigullaraq Baffinland
 Doug Brubacher Baffinland
 Gary Aipellee Baffinland
 Jacob Jaypoody Interpreter
 Absent Igah Hainnu Member at Large, absent as she was not granted time off
 from Work

Opening prayer, said by all.

Meeting starts at 9:05 a.m.

This meeting is in regards to Socio Economic Information Session as well as community concerns that they might have. Baffinland starts by recapping the previous meeting with Clyde River Mary River project committee meeting as well as the technical meeting that was held in Iqaluit recently. There were also meetings held in Igloolik, Pond Inlet, Hall Beach and Clyde River. We are here to inform the community about the Socio Economics but also to hear any concerns if there's any. Baffinland Iron Mines is up to date in their application for permits. Sometimes they include other communities, such as Kimmirut and Kinngait, but mostly only for shipping routes. We want to keep the communities informed on the status of Baffinland Iron Mines.

There will be a public meeting this evening at the Community Hall with three draws of \$50.00 gift cards.

Baffinland went through what was discussed in the previous meeting. There was a misunderstanding on the barge issue, where people assumed barges are large square flat platforms that carry drums of fuel, without engines, but an actual barge that Baffinland Iron Mines wanted to use is a ship with facilities as well as fuel storage. That misunderstanding was the cause of the disapproval from Inuit beneficiaries. Not just beneficiaries, but as well as the Federal Government, Gov't of Nunavut as well. They all thought it was too risky to overwinter. Other issues were approved, but they cannot proceed due to the lack of fuel for all operational equipment.

Baffinland Iron Mines is not permitted to build Fuel tanks on the land.

Baffinland Iron Mines have already awarded contracts to build buildings and for the road and wharf construction. It will be up to the main contractors to provide sub contractors, but we will keep looking for sub contractors that are available within Nunavut. The construction year has been delayed to 2013 due to the limited fuel supply.

There will be training opportunities which Baffinland will get into later.



ᖃᖅᑕᑦ ᐃᑭᐃᑦ ᑲᑎᑦᑲᑲᑲᑦ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᑲᑦᑎᑦᑲᑦ
ᐃᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᐃᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Serving the
communities of

There will be a hearing by NIRB on July 16th, for three or four days. It will be up to NIRB to invite who they want in the hearings. There will be like 200 people invited, about 5 people from each community, but it is up to NIRB who the invites are. Other communities might also be invited, such as Resolute Bay, Coral Harbour, Grise Fiord, etc.

ᐃᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Arctic Bay

July 16 to 27 are the dates for NIRB public hearing's.

ᖃᑲᑲᑦ
Cape Dorset

After break, Baffinland starts on the Human Resources – Employment & Training, Business opportunites and Community. There are details about the three issues.

ᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Clyde River

Baffinland Iron Mines has also started some training opportunities through local organizations, such as Iliasaqivik.

ᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Grise Fiord

There will be great opportunities for local businesses. Baffinland talks about some actual businesses that worked with mining companies, and grew into larger businesses, around Yellowknife and British Columbia.

ᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Hall Beach

A question was raised on dust particles being blown by wind. It has been confirmed that dust particles do not blow very far, but it is the power sources fumes that can travel far, such as smoke. That is being carefully researched to make sure that the impact is going to be minimal.

ᐃᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Igloolik

There was a concern on the ballast water, but it will be within the Canadian waters, and the ballast water will mostly be from the North, as the ships going back south will need it to balance the ship on it's way back south. Coming up north will be full. Water will not be dumped in the arctic waters.

ᐃᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Iqaluit

You can always voice your concerns to Baffinland Iron Mines if there are any concerns that we cannot answer.

ᖃᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Kimmirut

That's it from Baffinland, there is one other issue for the committee members.

ᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Pangnirtung

There will be a meeting in Pond Inlet, and three Mary River project Committee members are to be identified.

ᖃᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Pond Inlet

The Chairman identifies three members. If any one of them becomes unavailable, an alternate is appointed to replace him/her.

ᖃᖅᑕᑦᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Qikiqtarjuaq

Meeting adjourned at 12:10 noon.

ᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Resolute Bay

ᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Sanikiluaq



ᖃᖅᑕᑦ ᐃᑦᐃᑦ ᑲᐅᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᐅᑦᑲᑦ
Serving the
communities of

ᐃᖅᐱᑦᐅᖅ
Arctic Bay

ᖃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᖅ
Clyde River

ᐱᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Grise Fiord

ᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Hall Beach

ᐃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Igloolik

ᐃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Iqaluit

ᖃᖅᑲᑦ
Kimmirut

ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pangnirtung

ᖃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pond Inlet

ᖃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᖃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Resolute Bay

ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Sanikiluaq

Hall Beach Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes Teleconference with QIA and Representatives from Igloolik and Pond Inlet March 5, 2012

ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᐅᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᐃᖅ 05, 2012

Present:

Solomon Qanatsiaq – Chair
Abraham Qammaniq – Vice Chair
Jopie Kaerner – Hamlet member
Alice Saqina – Committee
Levi Kaunak – HTO Rep
ᐱᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ

Sam Anguratsiaq – Communiy at Large
Solomon Awa – QIA staff
Lizzie Phillip-Qanatsiaq – CLO
Jesse Nutaraq – Pond Inlet MRPC
Marie Airut – Igloolik MRPC
Zac Kunuk – Igloolik MRPC

ᐅᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ

ᑲᖅᑲᑦ ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ – ᐃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᐱᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ – ᐃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᖅᑲᑦ
ᐃᖅ ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ – ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᐱᖅᑲᑦ ᑲᖅᑲᑦ – ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᑲᖅᑲᑦ ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ

ᐱᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ – ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᑲᖅᑲᑦ ᐱᖅᑲᑦ – ᖃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᑲᖅᑲᑦ ᑲᖅᑲᑦ – ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᑲᖅᑲᑦ ᐱᖅᑲᑦ – ᐃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᑦ – ᐃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ

1. Opening of the meeting

Meeting starts @ 3:13pm

QIA representative start off with that Pond Inlet ask what Igloolik and Hall Beach think about Steensby port? Baffinland is still planning to get a port in Steensby. Amitu people has concerns about it.

Igloolik – Our community Director resign and we are going to have a re-election in April for Community Director and we are going to ask them if Igloolik People if they like Baffinland start?

QIA – this has been main topic if Steensby is not going to be port Baffinland will not start. If the port is going to be in Steensby Baffinland will start. Nuvuit port will cost too much and Baffinland will not make any money if port is going to be in Nuvuit. That is reason why they like to be in Steensby.

There was this guy went to Igloolik to report and this person was from ArcelorMittal the one who bought Baffinland. This companies have so many mines all over the world. And they were saying Mary Rivers metal is the best of all. The reason is they don't have to add anything just milt the core and make metal. Even its being hard to get but they still want it. If we don't approved our grad kids can look after this or even our great great grad kids can look after this.

Hall Beach – I announce this to the community by CB since we have no radio we don't even hear the CBC now. When I announce this on CB more people approved and not even 20. I did not expected people to approved the Steensby but it turn out more people were agreeing on this.



ᑖᑭᑖᑕᑦ ᐃᑭᐃᑦ ᑲᑕᑦᑲᑖᑕᑦ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᑭᑖᑕᑦ
ᑭᑖᑕᑦ ᐃᑭᑖᑕᑦ
Serving the
communities of

Hall Beach – seems like it can be like this if Baffinland don't open it can be open in the future. And if it's going to be open and Steensby is going to be the port we like them to use what we want to see. And keep monitoring our animals so we can see what is being affected. Maybe if they can do some longer time to go ahead with the next ship it be great. And this our thought.

ᐃᑭᑖᑕᑦ
Arctic Bay

Igloolik – some time ago archeology was here in Igloolik to talk about the old things and saying they will put them in a safe place and store them till Igloolik have an museum to put the old things. And I agree to them at that time and now I am thinking we just don't have to listen to them they are trying to bribe us. Since Mary River has the best iron and first nation should win over this. We have to let our elders know on this and let them go to that land first to heal and look at the land they use to live on. And we like to listen to our elders unlike white people.

ᑭᑖᑕᑦ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᑖᑕᑦ
Clyde River

Hall Beach – I have talked about this, they like to see this going and we have committees has concerns and we like to add to make sure we have compensation and to make sure they monitor our animals and let us join the monitoring and if they ever have a accident we like to get 10 million dollars. If they are still going to use the Steensby these are our main points that has to be followed. We just don't want them to have the mine, we want them to use what we what them to use. And if they don't go ahead that is fine. Our great grad kids can look after this. And we have told our community members about this.

ᑕᑖᑕᑦ
Grise Fiord

ᑲᑖᑕᑦ
Hall Beach

Hall Beach – I like to add this we all have different ideas and thoughts some people are thinking our animals are going further, we don't even know about animals we all think differently and some are thinking that we are going hunting further places and some are thinking animals who don't come here might come here.

ᐃᑕᑕᑦ
Igloolik

Hall Beach – If Baffinland is going to start we are not even prepared for the jobs (our community) we have to start planning for this and do some training for the jobs. We have to start planning for this now.

ᐃᑕᑕᑦ
Iqaluit

ᑭᑖᑕᑦ
Kimmirut

QIA – even if it's not ready they will have to review and they will plan the make camp for 3 to 5 years but when they make the camp they will not send the iron till the camp is done due to no rail road. We now have to plan for this if it will start. All the jobs will be there all the jobs in community will be there. All the Hamlet jobs will be there. They will even have to set a education building or a school there. The only job is different is mining. First 4 to 5 years they will need carpenters.

ᑕᑖᑕᑦ
Pangnirtung

Pond Inlet – this was mention social worker's and education. They have wrote a letter to NIRB and I can ask them since its two department education and health and social services. We sure have to be ready and get our government notice especially education department.

ᑕᑖᑕᑦ
Pond Inlet

ᑖᑕᑕᑦ
Qikiqtarjuaq

QIA – If our people say no to Steensby, Baffinland will not start that is what Baffinland is saying and due to this people are changing their mind about Steensby. And if the mine is going to start we are not even prepared so I'll look in to this.

ᑕᑖᑕᑦ
Resolute Bay

Hall Beach – since we are getting ready to approved we have to make sure we have someone looking after this and while we have someone they must live in this camp and instead of Baffinland telling us this camp can tell us. And contracts they don't even train for example Kudlik constriction they don't train people and bring their employees. We like to see training on the job and moving forward.

ᑕᑖᑕᑦ
Sanikiluaq

Pond Inlet – I like to know about Igloolik committee without votes. What are they thinking now about Steensby port? Or at least I like to know what you think?



ᖃᕈᕐᕐᕐᕐ ᕐᕐᕐᕐ ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Serving the
communities of

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Arctic Bay

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Cape Dorset

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Clyde River

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Grise Fiord

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Hall Beach

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Igloolik

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Iqaluit

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Kimmirut

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Pangnirtung

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Pond Inlet

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Resolute Bay

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Sanikiluaq

Igloolik – my follow committee members I don't know what happen maybe they cannot dial. If Steensby is accepted I/we like to see the ones who use to live there, they have to be the first one to go there to counseling. We wanted the port to be in Nuvuit for the port. And they really want the port to be in Steensby. So if the Steensby is going to be the port I like to see the people who use to live there go there first. I was going to ask some but I forgot what I was going to say.

Igloolik – we don't know what Igloolik people are thinking about the port. That is why we are letting them vote. Older people like 40 and up are agreeing on this and younger people might not I don't know, but we will see. I like to know what Pond Inlet is thinking?

Pond Inlet – I think I can just answer this. Yes we have not let them vote for this but our community is agreeing on this port and looking at more jobs opening. They are looking at more jobs will be created but here in North Baffin there is no Economic Base but once they start they will kill the animals from ocean and land also our fish. And now they really want to start and there is going to be 1500 jobs and 54% should be in North Baffin but they will not fill all of it since not enough education and they will eventually hire from somewhere else. If we had the education started. Since education up here is not all good, I like to see more education I don't know how but we have to push them more to do some training. This is what we think. And more people are agreeing on the Steensby port, and few people are disagreeing on this.

Igloolik – we like to see our people driving the HEO and foremen and this is so sudden and we are not even prepared.

Pond Inlet – we have to get our people to train for the rail road.

QIA – we can move to next on the list.

Pond Inlet – Baffinland has given what the summer plan is and like to keep the barge whole year long, I like to know if Hall Beach people are accepting this?

QIA – they have disagree on this one I have seen it in minutes. Also NIRB is having a concern on this.

Pond Inlet – ok that is good

QIA – Right now Baffinland has send a new plan to NIRB and NIRB has send it to us. QIA has a new helper now we are 3 of us including the MRPC's. We will meet more maybe even whole week on some. We are going to have a workshop around in May here in Iqaluit. We will let you know. And in July there is going to be a final hearing in Igloolik and Pond Inlet. And all the concerns are going to be there. Here are new things we got to look at:

1. How can we have less impact?
2. How is the monitoring is going to be best?

NIRB agreement has not been looked at and not done yet. If it's done it will say this and that and we will have to look at it and make changes if we have to and Hall Beach's concerns will be used. We will have to use it right. And get all the concerns we can get.

Hall Beach – Is NIRB will invite us for the hearing?

QIA – Igloolik, Hall Beach Cape Dorset and Kimmirut will go Igloolik and we have told the NIRB to invite MRPC instead of Hamlet. Also in Pond Inlet will be Arctic Bay, Pond Inlet, Clyde River and maybe Coral Harber, Resolute Bay, and Grise Fiord.



ᖃᖅᑕᑦ ᐃᑭᐃᑦ ᑲᑕᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Qikiqtani Inuit Association

**Hall Beach Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes
 March 19, 2012**

ᑭᐃᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
 ᐃᑲᑲᑦ 19, 2012

ᐱᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 ᑭᐃᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
 Serving the
 communities of

ᐃᑲᑲᑦ
 Arctic Bay

ᖃᑲᑲᑦ
 Cape Dorset

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
 Clyde River

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
 Grise Fiord

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
 Hall Beach

ᐃᑲᑲᑦ
 Igloolik

ᐃᑲᑲᑦ
 Iqaluit

ᖃᑲᑲᑦ
 Kimmirut

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
 Pangnirtung

ᖃᑲᑲᑦ
 Pond Inlet

ᖃᑲᑲᑦ
 Qikiqtarjuaq

ᖃᑲᑲᑦ
 Resolute Bay

ᖃᑲᑲᑦ
 Sanikiluaq

Present:

Solomon Qanatsiaq – Chair
 Abraham Qammaniq – Vice Chair
 Levi Kaunak - HTO Rep
 Sam Anguratsiaq – Communiy at Large
 Jopie KaernerK – Hamlet member
 David Kanatsiak – CLARC member
 Alice Saqpina – Committee
 Lizzie Phillip-Qanatsiaq – CLO

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
 ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᖃᑲᑲᑦ - ᐃᑲᑲᑦ
 ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᖃᑲᑲᑦ - ᐃᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
 ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᖃᑲᑲᑦ - ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
 ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᖃᑲᑲᑦ - ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
 ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᖃᑲᑲᑦ - ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
 ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᖃᑲᑲᑦ - ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
 ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᖃᑲᑲᑦ - ᑲᑲᑲᑦ

1. Opening of the meeting

Solomon Qanatsiaq calls the meeting to order at 5:05pm, prayer by David Kanatsiak.

2. Correspondence

A letter from NIRB. RE: Acceptance of FEIS and Next Step in the NIRB's Review and the NWB's Water Licensing Process of Baffinland Iron Mines Corp's Mary River Project

Committee Member reads the letter in Inuktitut to the board.

– What is the last thing?

– Through tech (letter) they are fixing all our concerns

– If they get a sense they would go somewhere?

– They would go forward if they get approved. Seems like our community is approving and I think they don't really work here.

– When we have a meeting with Baffinland they only talk about the positive side of the project there is never negative side of it. We have to look in to this, there are so many ships that is going back and forth in their plan. I think we can monitor them for 5 years first if our animals are not impact as much as we think they can go ahead with so many ship.

– I wonder if this is not even concerned... even if the government is available if accident happens and only coast guard would have to look in to this, and the coast guard ship would be so far.

– And if they have an accident in the water (ocean) government has to be the one going there like coast guard.

– How many can go Canada (coast guard)

– The one can come here are 3.



ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᑕᑖᑕᑖ ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᑕᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 ᑕᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᑕᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Serving the
 communities of

ᑕᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Arctic Bay

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Cape Dorset

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Clyde River

ᑕᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Grise Fiord

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Hall Beach

ᑕᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Igloolik

ᑕᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Iqaluit

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Kimmirut

ᑕᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Pangnirtung

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Pond Inlet

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑕᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Rolute Bay

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Sanikiluaq

– The ships that are going to be made are so big. And there is going to be more jobs for the arctic. We have to get this monitored. When government give the money they can make it happen. We have to look in to this I don't know how long to have this monitored. Since they will disposed water a lot of to our water that has to be monitored. I don't know but if they can get more advice and get less impact. And if they don't do much impact we can say yes.

– I wonder why so many ships?

– Money... it's cost too much.

– Where are they giving the iron?

– Germany and somewhere.

– This is why they think too much money. If you go fisher men and when you get just one fish go to the community and go back and forth. When they have so much big ships it would cost less.

– They are being so smart, they are asking so much and if government says we can only accept this much they would still get a lot. And government will do whatever they like to do.

– Does Cape Dorset have committee too since the ship will use their water too?

– Yes.

– Water licence type A is it employees water use? Or is it just use the water or is it for work proposes?

– For water use in Mary River they are using from a lake and dump it in other lake. And for work like using the water for iron which they don't have to since they just have to crush the iron.

– Type A is higher then type B water licence.

– I wonder if Roach Bay will have a big ships too?

– Since it's looking after by china yes.

– I don't know what they are doing now they might get a committee sometime and I don't know who is looking after them.

– They are now trying to get us approved.

– Meeting in July I don't like it when only few people can go. We are so close and all of us can go since our air fare is not that high and if we cannot go plan we can go by boat.

– When we ask the community only 12 people had concerns and the population is 700 and those 12 people will have the right since more people were agreeing to approval of the Baffinland.

– Main thing all of the committee want to go to the final hearing in July.

3. adjourn

Meeting closed at 6:20pm



ᖃᖃᖅᑕᓂ ᐃᓂᐃᑦ ᑲᑎᑲᑦᖃᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᑲᑦᑲᑲᑦ
ᓂᓇᑕᑦᓂᑦ ᐅᑲᓂᑲ
Serving the
communities of

Hall Beach Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes March 27, 2012

ᓂᑲᑲᑦᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑦᑲᑲᑦ
ᐱᑲ 27, 2012

ᐃᑲᐱᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Arctic Bay

ᖃᖃᑲᑲᑦ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᖃᖃᑲᑲᑦ
Clyde River

ᐃᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Grise Fiord

ᑲᓂᑲᑲᑦ
Hall Beach

ᐃᑲᑲᑲᑦ
Igloolik

ᐃᑲᑲᑲᑦ
Iqaluit

ᖃᖃᑲᑲᑦ
Kimmirut

ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑲᑦ
Pangnirtung

ᖃᖃᑲᑲᑦ
Pond Inlet

ᖃᖃᑲᑲᑦ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᑲᑲᑲᑦ
Resolute Bay

ᑲᓂᑲᑲᑦ
Sanikiluaq

Present :

Solomon Qanatsiaq – Chair
Abraham Qammaniq – Vice Chair
Jopie Kaernerk – Hamlet member
Alice Saqina – Committee
David Kanatsiak – CLARC member
Levi Kaunak - HTO Rep
Sam Anguratsiaq – Communiy at Large
Lizzie Phillip-Qanatsiaq – CLO

ᐅᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᓇᑲᑲᑲᑦ - ᐃᑲᑲᑲᑲᑦ
ᐃᑲᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑲᑦ - ᐃᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑲᑦ
ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑲᑦ - ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑲᑦ
ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᓇᑲᑲᑲᑦ - ᓂᓇᑕᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑲᑦ
ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑲᑦ - ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑲᑦ
ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑲᑦ - ᓂᓇᑕᑲᑲᑲᑦ
ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑲᑦ - ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑲᑲᑦ

1. Opening of the meeting

Meeting called to order at 7:00pm

Committee Member start off at section 21.0 in Inuktitut.

– Employees will not hunt?

– Yes! No hunting and, no fishing.

– So that is the reason why they will know they are impacting? When we went for meeting in Igloolik, concerns were the dust of the iron that they might go everywhere, but if there is going to be that many for ships there is going to be an impact.

– When they first start they should have few ships first for monitoring.

– In Kimmirut when whales are crossing it takes about all day to cross that area.

– It be great first year they have fewer ships not start with so many.

– I have been flying going back and forth to Iqaluit and my thought was not true. There has not been any multiyear ice. It's all water.

– Ship route, around that Tikiraq there are a lot of walrus and they are going that area and they are going to see a lot of walrus and some walrus are not afraid of anything and try and do whatever they like. And I like to know what Baffinland will do to walrus. And that area has a very small to cross.

– When Baffinland start who is going to look after them and have say in this?

– QIA

– When employees come here to work, they will not know what is out there.



ᖃᐅᖅᑕᓂ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑲᓄᕐᖃᑲᑲᑲᖅᑕᖅ

Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᕐᑲᑲᖅᑕᖅ
ᓄᓄᑦᑕᓂᖅ ᐅᓄᓂᖅ
Serving the
communities of

ᐃᖅᐱᑦᑲᖅ
Arctic Bay

ᐅᖅᐱᑦᑲᖅ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Clyde River

ᐊᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Grise Fiord

ᖃᓂᖅᑲᖅ
Hall Beach

ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Igloolik

ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Iqaluit

ᐅᖅᑲᖅ
Kimmirut

ᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Pangnirtung

ᐅᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Pond Inlet

ᖃᐅᖅᑕᖅᑲᖅ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᖃᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Resolute Bay

ᖃᓂᐅᖅᑲᖅ
Sanikiluaq

ᖃᑲᖅ - ᐅᖅᑲᖅ ᐅᖅᑲᖅ ᐃᓄᖅᑲᖅ ᐱᓄᕐᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐱᓄᕐᑲᖅᑲᖅ. ᑕᐃᐱᓄᖅᑲᖅ ᐅᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐱᓄᕐᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᑲᓄᕐᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐅᖅᑲᖅ ᐃᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐊᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐅᑕᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ. ᐅᖅᑲᖅ ᐅᖅᑲᖅ ᐊᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐅᖅᑲᖅ ᐊᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐱᑕᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐊᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ.

ᑕᖅᑲᖅ - ᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐊᖅᑲᖅ ᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ.

ᐊᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ - ᐅᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐃᑕᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ 3ᐱ ᐃᑕᖅᑲᖅ 5 -

ᖃᖅ - ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᑲᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐅᖅᑲᖅ ᑕᐃᑲᖅ ᐅᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᑕᐃᐱᓄᖅ ᐅᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐊᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐊᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐊᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐱᐅᑕᖅ ᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ.

ᖃᑲᖅ - ᐃᐱᓄᖅᑲᖅ ᑕᐃᑲᖅ ᐅᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐃᓄᖅᑲᖅ ᐊᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐅᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐅᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐃᓄᖅ ᐊᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐅᖅᑲᖅ ᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐱᑕᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ.

ᑕᖅᑲᖅ - ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐅᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐊᓄᖅᑲᖅ ᑕᖅᑲᖅ ᐅᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐱᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ.

ᖃᑲᖅ - ᐅᖅᑲᖅ ᐅᖅᑲᖅ ᐃᓄᖅᑲᖅ ᐱᓄᕐᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐱᓄᕐᑲᖅᑲᖅ. ᑕᐃᐱᓄᖅᑲᖅ ᐅᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐱᓄᕐᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᑲᓄᕐᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐅᖅᑲᖅ ᐃᑕᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐊᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐅᑕᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ. ᐅᖅᑲᖅ ᐅᖅᑲᖅ ᐊᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐅᖅᑲᖅ ᐊᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐱᑕᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐊᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ.

ᑕᖅᑲᖅ - ᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐊᖅᑲᖅ ᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ.

ᐊᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ - ᐅᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ ᐃᑕᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ 3ᐱ ᐃᑕᖅᑲᖅ 5 -



የዋሽቶኒ ልዑክ ነጋሥቲ ባህሪ ግንባር
Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ለጎረቤቶቻችን
ገቢ ለሕዝብ
Serving the
communities of

ርዕሰ ጉዳይ - ለደቡብ ቅርጽ ልካይነት ለጎረቤቶቻችን የሚሰጠን የግንባር ስራ ለማግኘት ይረዳል።

ሰነድ - ለጎረቤቶቻችን ለደቡብ

አርክቲክ ባህርይ
Arctic Bay

ሰነድ - የሌሎች ሰነድ ስራ?

ዋሽቶኒ
Cape Dorset

ርዕሰ ጉዳይ - ከሌሎች ሰነድ ስራ ለማግኘት

ክሊድ ባህርይ
Clyde River

ሰነድ - ለጎረቤቶቻችን ለጎረቤቶቻችን የሚሰጠን የግንባር ስራ ለማግኘት ይረዳል። ለጎረቤቶቻችን ለጎረቤቶቻችን የሚሰጠን የግንባር ስራ ለማግኘት ይረዳል። ለጎረቤቶቻችን ለጎረቤቶቻችን የሚሰጠን የግንባር ስራ ለማግኘት ይረዳል።

ግሪስ ባህርይ
Grise Fiord

ሰነድ - ለጎረቤቶቻችን የሚሰጠን የግንባር ስራ ለማግኘት

ሀል ባህርይ
Hall Beach

ሰነድ - የጎረቤቶቻችን ስራ ለማግኘት

ግሊልክ ባህርይ
Igloolik

ሰነድ - ለጎረቤቶቻችን ለጎረቤቶቻችን የሚሰጠን የግንባር ስራ ለማግኘት ይረዳል። ለጎረቤቶቻችን ለጎረቤቶቻችን የሚሰጠን የግንባር ስራ ለማግኘት ይረዳል። ለጎረቤቶቻችን ለጎረቤቶቻችን የሚሰጠን የግንባር ስራ ለማግኘት ይረዳል።

ግባሊት ባህርይ
Iqaluit

ርዕሰ ጉዳይ - ለጎረቤቶቻችን የሚሰጠን የግንባር ስራ ለማግኘት

ካሚሪት ባህርይ
Kimmirut

ሰነድ - የጎረቤቶቻችን ስራ ለማግኘት

ፕጎንቲንግ ባህርይ
Pangnirtung

ሰነድ - ለጎረቤቶቻችን ለጎረቤቶቻችን የሚሰጠን የግንባር ስራ ለማግኘት ይረዳል። ለጎረቤቶቻችን ለጎረቤቶቻችን የሚሰጠን የግንባር ስራ ለማግኘት ይረዳል። ለጎረቤቶቻችን ለጎረቤቶቻችን የሚሰጠን የግንባር ስራ ለማግኘት ይረዳል።

ፖንዲት ባህርይ
Pond Inlet

ሰነድ - ለጎረቤቶቻችን የሚሰጠን የግንባር ስራ ለማግኘት

ባካካታርጋታ ባህርይ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ግንባር ባህርይ
Resolute Bay

ሰነድ ባህርይ
Sanikiluaq



ᖃᑭᑭᑦᑕᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑲᑕᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᓐᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 ᓄᓇᑦᑲᑦ ᐅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Serving the
 communities of

**Hall Beach Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes
 May 3, 2012**

ᓄᓄᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
LA 03, 2012

ᐃᑦᐱᑦᑲᑦ
 Arctic Bay

ᑭᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Cape Dorset

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Clyde River

ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Grise Fiord

ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Hall Beach

ᐃᑲᑲᑦ
 Igloolik

ᐃᑲᑲᑦ
 Iqaluit

ᑭᑲᑲᑦ
 Kimmirut

ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Pangnirtung

ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Pond Inlet

ᖃᑭᑭᑦᑲᑦ
 Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Resolute Bay

ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 Sanikiluaq

Present :
 Solomon Qanatsiaq – Chair
 Abraham Qammaniq – Community Director
 Alice Saqina – Committee
 David Kanatsiak – CLARC member
 Sam Anguratsiaq
 Lizzie Phillip-Qanatsiaq – CLO

ᐅᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ - ᐃᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ - ᖃᑭᑭᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦ - ᓄᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ - ᓄᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ - ᓄᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦ - ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ

Absent:
 Jopie Kaernerk – Hamlet rep – out of town
 Levi Kaunak – HTO rep – out of town

ᐅᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ:
 ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦ - ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ - ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦ - ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
 - ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ

1. Opening of the meeting
 Meeting called to order at 7:00pm

2. Next steps for Mary River Project Committees
 Committee Member reads the next step for Mary River Project Committees to the board.

- On the news, concern is ballast water.
- Only if the rail road had lights.
- Explosives, they are going to make the water/ocean to make it deep and use the explosive. They are going to kill the microscopic and they will have to monitor if that water/ocean has microscopic and how much they kill.
- Animals and fish food. They will have to estimate them how many they are. We have to tell them that it is dangerous.
- Campers they will have to get equipment. To monitor the Baffinland.
- We want a boat and that has to be for sure. It will be for monitoring also good for emergency. And this boat has to be look after by Inuit.
- We need monitors to even who never seen the land, they can do training while monitoring. To our youth training on the job for them.
- How are the animals are going further? And this was never mention.
- Also ship's noise is one of the concerns to whales and animals too.



ᖃᖅᑕᑦ ᐃᑭᐃᑦ ᑲᑕᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᐃᑭᑦᑲᑦ ᐃᑭᑦᑲᑦ
Serving the
communities of

ᐃᑦᐱᑦᑲᑦ
Arctic Bay

ᖃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Clyde River

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Grise Fiord

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Hall Beach

ᐃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Igloolik

ᐃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Iqaluit

ᖃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Kimmirut

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pangnirtung

ᖃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pond Inlet

ᖃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Resolute Bay

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Sanikiluaq

– While they don't get use to the noise they will have an impact for sure. And when they are breaking the ice on winter time they will make a lot of noise.

– 3a) are they going to do some set up for 5 years?

– Just Mary River part is 21 years and there are more after.

– That area has a lot of animals.

– There always has to be monitoring the whole time when mining is running.

– How are they trying to think? They will have to do some monitoring before they start for few years. And keep monitoring. Also monitor the ice as well. And currents of the ocean, and old ice.

– Our animals are now different from the past. Some years we have more and less other then Polar Bears.

– Back then when we had winds from east we had more animals.

– When the ice is not milted and when we have flow edge there are some walrus, ring seals and harp seals .

– We have to push them more on monitoring.

– We should have our committees to be there at all times taking turns 2 weeks at a time.

– And get these documented.

– Around in Nuvuit there is a good camp area.

– They like to start within 5 years when they are in planning stage. And us Inuit are not ready yet or not even in planning for this. This is a sudden for us. For example, Kivalikq are having a hard time hiring locals.

– Inuit are now too spoiled by our government and when they work there house rent go too high.

– If are not going to make this important, they will not care about anything. As long as they get what they are here for iron. And they might not even use there plan.

– Inuit are relying on Income support. And they think if they start working there rent will be too high.

– We also look at the people who are going to be left at home while the spouse is working by weekly. How can we help them? We have to look in to this too. We just have to leave them alone.

– For the ballast water. Our animals will eat the microscopic and we are going to eat the animals and we also have to be monitored.

– We are not prepared for this even our school is not in good shape. They have to start good education. They will have to learn how to work too.

– Our animals has to be monitored before they even eat the microscopic from the ballast water.



ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Serving the
 communities of

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Arctic Bay

– QIA will have to have a say on this even if the mining start. As soon as they get approved they will not stop and it will be hard for us to let them stop when they are impacting. Even if they are running we will have to have a say on something when they are impacting us too much. That way QIA will have a say in them when they do something wrong.

– It would be great if we keep this committee that way we can tell them what are they doing wrong. And we have to keep up to date with them work with them too.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Cape Dorset

– Once they start, I am going to have no more walrus and I am going to be one of the people who don't make money.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Clyde River

– When Baffinland start are they going to impact us for good or bad?

– Pond Inlet people cannot wait for the road that will be build so they can use the road for caribou hunting.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Grise Fiord

– Inuit will lose a lot on some jobs because a lot of them have no paper.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Hall Beach

– When Baffinland starts are we going to be impact to good or bad?

– We are going to have a good impact on money.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Igloodik

– For the damage on the land how are we going to get impact? Is our live will be impact too? How? For example, when they impact our animals that we have to go hunting further, also when our people are not going to work well.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Iqaluit

– This was in concerns, us Inuit will not have a second chance when they carry alcohol and drugs. I rather see the people who get caught get counselling or get second chance. That has to be look at instead of firing that person try and get them help.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Kimmirut

– It's going to be impact both good and bad.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Pangnirtung

– It's going to be a concern for the people who are not going to be employed.

– It would be great if they listen to us what we want from them. It will be good for our generation only if they listen to us but if they don't what's the point trying to get concerns.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Pond Inlet

– Only if our students willing to work, but they like to go hunting too.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Qikiqtarjuaq

– Iqaluit will be a main road to get white people to work.

– We are going to be replaced by white people.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Resolute Bay

– More people from out of town will be more interested in us.

– We will have to give them an idea to get them hire from affected communities, then other communities, then outside of Nunavut. This can be an improvement if only we want to.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Sanikiluaq

– Now that I understand more I am not approved of this because Inuit will be in laborer and have the cheapest pay.



ᖃᖃᖅᑕᑦ ᐃᑦᐃᑦ ᑲᑎᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᐅᑦᑲᑦ
Serving the
communities of

ᐃᖅᐱᑦᑲᑦ
Arctic Bay

ᖃᖅᐱᑦᑲᑦ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Clyde River

ᐃᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Grise Fiord

ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Hall Beach

ᐃᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Igloolik

ᐃᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Iqaluit

ᖃᖅᑲᑦ
Kimmirut

ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pangnirtung

ᖃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pond Inlet

ᖃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᖅᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Resolute Bay

ᖅᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Sanikiluaq

- This is not our culture employment, we are not like white people. But some Inuit are very good with work too. Like I know this who was a labor at fist become a leader at his job. If they see people who like that person they will go up too.

- I think it would be great if we are more supportive to the people who go out for work, that way they will want to work more. We will have to encourage them that they have to work.

- We have to meet Baffinland and negotiate with them.

- When they start working have Inuit training on the job and go higher.

- Inuit has to be recognize that they do so much work on the land. They have to know Inuit have so much knowledge.

Meeting closed at 8:35pm

1. ᑲᑎᐱᑦᑲᑦ ᐅᑦᐃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ

ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᐱᑦᑲᑦ ᐅᑦᐃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ 7:00ᐱᑦᑲᑎᑲᑲ.

2. ᖃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᐱᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᐱᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ.

ᐃᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᐅᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑎᑎᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᐱᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᐱᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ.

- ᑲᑦᐃᑦᑲᑦ ᐱᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᐃᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᐃᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ.

- >ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᐱᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ

- ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᐃᑎᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᐃᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᐱᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ. ᖃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᐃᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ.

- ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᐃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᐱᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖃᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᐱᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ.

- ᐃᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᐱᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᐱᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ.

- ᐃᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ.

- ᑲᑎᐱᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ.

- ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᐱᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᐱᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ.

- ᐃᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ.

- ᐃᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ.



ᖃᐃᑦᑕᑦ ᐃᑭᐃᑦ ᑲᑎᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᐃᑭᑦᑲᑦ ᐅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Serving the
communities of

Hall Beach Mart River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes May 9, 2012

ᐃᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑎᑎᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᐃᐃ 09, 2012

ᐃᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Arctic Bay

ᐃᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Clyde River

ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Grise Fiord

ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Hall Beach

ᐃᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Igloolik

ᐃᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Iqaluit

ᐃᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Kimmirut

ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pangnirtung

ᐃᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pond Inlet

ᖃᐃᑦᑕᑦᑲᑦ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Resolute Bay

ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Sanikiluaq

Present

Solomon Qanatsiaq – Chair
Abraham Qammaniq – Vice Chair
Alice Saqina – Member at large
Sam Anguratsiaq – Member at large
David Kanatsiaq – CLARC rep
Jopie Kaerner – hamlet rep
Lizzie Phillip – Qanatsiaq

ᐅᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ

ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ - ᐃᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᐃᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ - ᐃᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᐃᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ - ᐃᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ - ᐃᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ - ᐃᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ - ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ - ᖃᐃᑦᑕᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ

Absent :

Levi Kaunak - HTO Rep

ᐅᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ:

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ - ᑲᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ

1. Opening of the meeting

Meeting called to order at 1:20pm

– There is no Agenda but DFO is here to talk about the how they can less damage the land and how can we replace them? That is going a question. And going to give presentation on what they do. If we do what, how can we create replacement not money.

For example fish. If the river is going to be used how can they put a river and be useful for the fish. And ballast water fish will eat on that. And that is trying to be plan.

Monitoring summer time and monitoring time when they start dumping the ballast water. And check the water from the bottom and high area every few miter. Also monitoring on spring time when the ocean is more fresh water. That way when there is much changes we can say it is going to be effected.

Are they here for the fish that goes to lakes?

Yes to lakes also rivers.

Right now they are more focuses on lands but you can ask about the ocean too.

Regarding Baffinland there are all kinds of organization is looking after this each have different concerns. And they go to QIA for meetings. But most of them has same concerns.

There are a lot of river at our other side.

There is a quota for 176 thousand pounds in one of these lakes.

DFO goal is to listen to the people and use QIA for concerns. They can do it themselves but this that impact is too big so QIA had to get committees. We are hearing community committees and let



ᑖᑭᑖᑕᑦ ᐃᑭᐃᑦ ᑲᑕᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Serving the
communities of

ᐃᑦᐱᑦᑲᑦ
Arctic Bay

ᑭᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Clyde River

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Grise Fiord

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Hall Beach

ᐃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Igloolik

ᐃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Iqaluit

ᑭᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Kimmirut

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pangnirtung

ᑭᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pond Inlet

ᑖᑭᑖᑕᑦᑲᑦ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Resolute Bay

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Sanikiluaq

the DFO and NIRB know so they can look at them. And we give them your concerns how you guys what Baffinland to be. You want them to be monitored so we are going to ask them to be monitored. NIRB will write to minister and they are going to include your concerns that is why we are asking for concerns. We have send the concerns on the 29th since we cannot cover all of it Pond Inlet is looking after Mile Inlet, Hall Beach Steensby, Arctic Bay and Clyde River caribou. Us from Amittuq we are looking after some and Kimmirut and Cape Dorset is looking after the ocean since they will pass by. On July 16 NIRB will have a reading in Iqaluit and go to Igloolik also Pond Inlet.

For example if they are going to make bridge they say it will not impact as much when the river started and fish go threw bridge or if the bridge breaks when fish go up or down the river it has to be fix right.

How big is the river? The one that is going to be covered?

It's not going to be covered they are going to make a bridge. And they are going to make huge bridge at tasikutaak steensby there are about 100 rivers.

Is it too wide to make a bridge

I answered the iron is so heavy to make a that kind of river.

How do they make bridge over there.

They always have to repair them and always monitor them all the time. they are hard to keep up they always have to repair them.

Don't just wait for the bridge to break be prepared get things ready at all times.

And have them closed before it freeze and snow and when it's milting. Have them ready at all times.

We fly threw that rail road plan and this specialist was saying it's possible so we just have to make the right one.

They have not told us which they will be using for making bridge steal stainless steal, cement. But inuit say cement is best.

When the aged ice pass by it will break the bridge. It would be great if they can make a crusher and crush them before they hit the bridge. And have that crusher not close to the bridge.

One time I was in naluqajaqvik and when the river started there was this huge ice that was rolling over. Rivers are very strong.

They can even make energy for that river since they are very strong.

It would be so disappointed to make the bridge all the time.

They don't want to use too much money and they will have to make the bridge all the time if they make crusher they will save a lot for not repairing the bridge all the time.

We are about done with the bridge and now how can we protect this fish.



ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᐃᑖᐃᑖ ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᐃᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Serving the
communities of

ᐃᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Arctic Bay

When they start working they are going to use some explosive.

They say they will use the explosive when all the ice is gone. Only on summer time.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Cape Dorset

The lakes with fish that are just going to be pass by, they will have fish since on tv big companies still fish while this company is working there.

Since white people have good equipments for monitoring I like them to test how fish die easily. Since our fish don't hear noise they might die from any loud noise. They will have to test when they start explosives how fish die easily. And I like to see the bubbles that they use to keep the noise close.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Clyde River

Before they start they have to do some studying especially on fish.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Grise Fiord

Our ocean noise never stops. One time I was with this study and they put a microphone on the water and there was always noise even if we cannot see them.

There is this study and this was one of the concerns that ships that don't stop up here now and the concern is are they effecting blue whales. Since they just tip to the ground when they die. And this winter on the news they were saying blue whales are not more week then before.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Hall Beach

Since Baffinland is not making the ships now we can ask them if they can make the ship less noise. When the ship is touching the ice. They can now make the submarine that has very little noise. They can learn from the military to make less noise ships.

ᐃᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Iqaluit

There are all kinds now to make anything less noise, safer. They can now test them which one is better.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Kimmituk

They will have small tug boat writing all the time to keep the ocean from frizzing.

Also have the fish monitored every year. They will have to keep monitoring the fish all the time when they are running. Also from lakes before they go to ocean and before they go back to lake.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Pangnirtung

Is once a year good enough? Why not every few months.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Pond Inlet

We Inuit have to get equipments not using Baffinland equipments for monitoring.

When Baffinland start we will have to keep an eye on them, there is going to be some dust

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Qikiqtarjuaq

This has to be ask " how dangerous is the iron rust?

Do you guys have any questions for DFO?

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Resolute Bay

According to DFO policy it says if they are going to impact our water they have to replace them with something that is going to help us. What can we get that is going to be replace by that lake when its damage.

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Sanikiluaq

For that quota lake if that lake is impact what can be a replacement?

They can look for a lake that can be a fishing spot. And have that research.



ᖃᖅᑕᑦ ᐃᑭᐃᑦ ᑲᑎᑦᑦᑲᑲᑦ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᑦᑲᑲᑦ
ᑭᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᐅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Serving the
communities of

Igloolik Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes Hunter and Trappers Organization office March 28, 2012 @ 10:30 a.m.

ᐃᑦᐱᑦᑲᑦ
Arctic Bay

Present from members:

ᖃᑦᑲᑲᑦ
Cape Dorset

Solomon Mikki, Chairperson
Elisapee Quassa, Member at large
Zacharias Kunuk, Vice Chair
David Irgaut, CLARC

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Clyde River

Absent members:

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Grise Fiord

Louis Uttak, Member at large, w/c
Marie Airut, Member at large w/c

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Hall Beach

Present from Staff:

Sidonie Ungalaq, Community Liaison Officer

ᐃᑦᑲᑲᑦ
Igloolik

1. February 29, 2012 NIRB file # 08MN053 NWB file # 2AM-MRY---

Acceptance of FEIS and Next steps in the NIRB's Review and the NWB's Water Licensing Process for Baffinland Iron Mines Corp's Mary River Project.

ᐃᑦᑲᑲᑦ
Iqaluit

The Igloolik MRPC members would like to see minutes from March 23, 2012 teleconferencing Pond Inlet, Hall Beach.

ᖃᑦᑲᑲᑦ
Kimmirut

CLARC and HTO has to hear about these Water License.

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pangnirtung

Igloolik MRPC approves the Water License.
NWB 2AM-MRY---
NIRB 08MN053

2. Next-face-to-face-meeting

ᖃᑦᑲᑲᑦ
Pond Inlet

April 3, 2012 @ 10:00 a.m
MRPC Review of Baffinland FEIS Management Plan

ᖃᖅᑕᑦ
Qikiqtarjuaq

3. Adjournment:

Adjourn of March 28, 2012 MRPC meeting @ 4:30 p.m.

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Resolute Bay

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Sanikiluaq



ᖃᖅᖃᖅ ᐃᓄᐃᖅ ᑲᑕᑲᑲᖅᑲᖅ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᑲᑲᑲᑲᖅ
ᓄᓄᓄᓄᓄᓄ ᐃᓄᓄᓄᓄ
Serving the
communities of

Igloolik Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes Hunters and Trappers Organization Boardroom April 16-18, 2012

ᐃᖅᐱᐃᖅᐱᖅ
Arctic Bay

Present:

Solomon Mikki, Louis Uttak, Elizabeth Quassa, Zacharias Kunuk, David Irngaut, Marie Airut

ᖃᖅᐱᐃᖅ
Cape Dorset

1. Meeting started at 10:30am, and opened with a prayer.

ᑲᖅᖅᑲᑲᖅ
Clyde River

2. **Environmental Protection Plan:** The lagoons have to be built far away from the beach, like a water treatment plant when its being built it should be far from the beach. Any waste water should not be dumped into the lakes and rivers.

ᐃᑲᖅᐱᐃᖅᐱᖅ
Grise Fiord

For safety reasons all construction taking place should be built away from the actual mine site, especially for the employees living quarters.

ᖅᓄᑲᖅ
Hall Beach

3. **Emergency Response and Spill Contingency Plan:** If there was a plane crash, any fuel got spilled, if employees were to be injured due to an accident; an emergency response team should be ready. There should also be fire fighters. Inuit skilled in emergency situations should be employed; and security personnel should be available 24/7.

ᐃᖅᓄᑲᖅ
Igloolik

Once the site has been established then RCMP can be there too.

ᐃᖅᑲᓄᐃᖅ
Iqaluit

Hunters should be considered in any emergency because of their knowledge of the land and the sea ice.

ᖃᖅᖅᖅ
Kimmirut

4. **Steensby Port – Oil Pollution Emergencies Plan:** A floating dock was discouraged from being built, just so that any spills do not go into the ocean. Currents of the ocean have to be known in their nature. All animals whether they walk on land or they are marine mammals are not idle therefore any changes to them will have direct affects to humans.

ᑲᖅᓄᑲᖅ
Pangnirtung

First Aid training or emergency response training should be made available so that employees can deal with situations needing attention immediately. Where the tide comes and goes, natural cracks are formed and if ships were to get caught in these cracks, they could break. All employees should be trained in emergency response.

ᖃᖅᑲᑲᖅ
Pond Inlet

Marie had to leave due to a Health Centre appointment at 3:30pm.

ᖃᖅᖅᖅᑲᖅ
Qikiqtarjuaq

The port has to be built further down because it is safer (closer to Kangiq & Umajuk).

ᖅᓄᑲᖅ
Resolute Bay

5. **Surface Water and Aquatic Ecosystem and Management Plan:** We want a lagoon to be built because the lakes in the area have fish therefore any waste water should not be dumped into the lakes and the rivers.

ᖅᓄᑲᖅ
Sanikiluaq

Once the iron is being transported the vehicles carrying them should have sealed covers so that the raw materials are not dripping into the ocean. The inspection of bridges or culverts should not just be done annually; inspection should be more frequent.

Meeting adjourned for the day at 4:47pm.

April 17, 2012 meeting started at 10:25am.



ᖃᖃᕐᕐᕐᕐ ᕈᕐᕈᕐᕐ ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Serving the
communities of

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Arctic Bay

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Cape Dorset

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Clyde River

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Grise Fiord

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Hall Beach

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Igloolik

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Iqaluit

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Kimmirut

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Pangnirtung

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Pond Inlet

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Resolute Bay

ᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐᕐ
Sanikiluaq

Present: Solomon Mikki, Louis Uttak, Elizabeth Quassa, David Irngaut
Absent: Marie Airut, Zacharias Kunuk

6. **Shipping and Marine Mammal Management Plan:** Security personnel should be available both at Mary River and Steensby Inlet. Security should be available so that no illegal substances are being brought in.

Islands within that area have to be monitored as there are sea birds that nest there.

7. **Terrestrial Environment Management and Monitoring Plan:** Small birds that eat insects, bigger birds, including lemmings, weasels, foxes, rabbits, wolves and other animals will need testing so that any changes to them can be detected immediately. Changing weather, like when the snow is melting will cause the streams and rivers to flow all over therefore any sediments that fall from the transporting of iron will spread.

8. **Environmental Monitoring Plan:** (QIA is called and put on speaker phone for clarification on terms being used in Inuktitut). I would want to know how long the railway is; poles should be made so that drivers will know information such as this area is where caribou herds are, this area is a nesting ground for birds and so on.

9. **Environmental Effect Monitoring Plan:** Animals crossing over to Baffin Island from the Nunavik region will be affected by the shipping route as this area is their migration route. Traditional knowledge from Inuit should be utilized when monitoring is being conducted. Elders should be accompanied by younger people so that this knowledge can be passed on, and know what activities are taking place at Mary River. This utilization of traditional knowledge will also be passed onto the mining company.

Zacharias left at 2:53 due to an appointment.

10. **MMER Environmental Effects Monitoring Study Design Framework:** The diet of animals and the food chain of fish, seals, ringed seals, walrus have to be documented. The fish eat smaller mammals and these smaller mammals eat tiny organisms.

Royalties should be paid to the Inuit according to their diet getting affected. A laboratory should be built in an Inuit community so that any changes happening to the animals they harvest can be known as change is happening.

Meeting adjourned for the day at 3:53pm.

April 18, 2012 meeting started at 10:45am.

Present: Solomon Mikki, David Irngaut, Elizabeth Quassa
Absent: Louis (medical travel); Marie (IAP business); Zacharias (film travel).

11. **Stakeholders Engagement Plan:** Economic opportunities arising from iron mining can greatly benefit the communities therefore community members should be well versed/informed so as to take advantage of the opportunities. It was felt that the municipalities should be part of the stakeholders so that municipal services (roads, airports) can be improved; this was also to gain experience with mining companies and in turn be used to educate community members.



ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Serving the communities of

Iglolik Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes
Hamlet Office Chambers Room
April 25, 2012 @ 7:00 p.m.

- ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Arctic Bay
- ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Cape Dorset
- ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Clyde River
- ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Grise Fiord
- ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Hall Beach
- ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Iglolik
- ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Iqaluit
- ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Kimmirut
- ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Pangnirtung
- ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Pond Inlet
- ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Qikiqtarjuaq
- ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Resolute Bay
- ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Sanikiluaq

Members Present:

Solomon Mikki.....	Chairperson
Elisapee Quassa.....	Member at large
Marie Aired.....	Member at large
David Irngaut.....	CLARC
Jacobie Malliki.....	HTO member
Jerry Iyyiraq.....	HTO member
Paul Quassa.....	Hamlet Council

Members Absent:

Louis Uttak.....	Member at large	w/c
Zacharias Kunuk.....	Vice Chair	w/c

Delegates:

Solomon Awa..... Environmental Assesment Co-ordinator Q.I.A.

Present from Staff:

Sidonie Ungalaq, Community Liaison Officer

1. Call to order:

Opening prayer conducted at 7:00 p.m.

2. Status Report on Mary River Project:

Opening introductions thanks the members for coming to a meeting.

– Major Projects are not only for MRPC but that it affects all land Issues. Archeologist Sylvie LeBlank will be in Iglolik this summer to do a survey in Nuvuit,

– Archeologist has to come up with a land lease permits if they want to do a survey in Inuit Own Land.

– They will have to go through Heritage Trust and C.L.E.Y because it is not in Inuit Own Land.

– 2 people will be in town this summer to do a survey in Nuvuit, Sylvie LeBlank and one from Baffinland.

– One (1) bulk sample will end after 21 years, and after 21 years they will start to look at the other 9 samples.



ᖃᖃᖅᑕᑖ ᐃᑖᐃᑕ ᑲᑕᓐᐅᖅᑲᑲᖅ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᓐᐅᑲᑲᑲᑲ
ᑖᑖᑕᑕᑕᑕ ᐅᐅᑕᑕᑕᑕ
Serving the
communities of

ᐃᖅᐱᑕᑕᑕ
Arctic Bay

ᖃᖅᐱᑕᑕ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᖅᖅᑕᑕᑕ
Clyde River

ᑖᑖᑕᑕᑕᑕ
Grise Fiord

ᖅᑕᑕᑕ
Hall Beach

ᐃᑕᑕᑕ
Igloolik

ᐃᖅᑖᑕᑕ
Iqaluit

ᖃᖅᑕᑕ
Kimmitur

ᑕᑕᑕᑕᑕ
Pangnirtung

ᖃᖅᑕᑕᑕ
Pond Inlet

ᖃᖅᑕᑕᑕ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᖅᑖᑕᑕᑕᑕ
Resolute Bay

ᖅᑕᑕᑕᑕ
Sanikiluaq

– Can we replace a member who knows more about land issues, also talked about IG-03 and IG-05 that NTI can't wait to hear from Igloolik CLARC?

– QIA is not rushing about IG-03 and IG-05 to be approved, say's that NTI should wait until Igloolik gets a Community Representative.

– How come only the affected communities have MRPC when it affects all the Baffin communities?

– All the communities are affected by the mining companies, they have other mining companies who are working in there area.

– Q.I.A. should go through CBC or the local radio's to ask the people if they want Steensby Inlet as a port site.

– Housing cost will climb up and young people who are working at the Mary River might quit because of the housing cost.

... more talk about housing issues.

– Committee Member collected names who lived in Steensby Inlet, and asked if they can go to Steensby Inlet before they destroyed it, say's that it has to be looked at again.

– Igloolik Hamlet said yes to Steensby Inlet as a port site in the past, Committee Member says that he has regrets of what he said about Nuvuit as a port site, but up to now he is happy what he started it because people of Igloolik are now looking at what they need if Steensby Inlet becomes a port site.

– President of QIA is now having hard time trying to come to Igloolik.

– If President wants to meet with Igloolik MRPC why not Igloolik go to Iqaluit to meet with the President.

3. Next-face-to-face-meeting

Open.

4. Adjournment:

Adjourn of April 25, 2012 M R P C meeting @ 9:30 p.m.



ᖃᖅᑕᑦ ᐃᑭᐃᑦ ᑲᑕᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᓂᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᑭᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᐃᑭᑦᑲᑦ
Serving the
communities of

Igloodik Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes Hunters and Trappers Organizations Conference room May 10, 2012 @ 10:00 a.m.

Members Present:

Solomon Mikki.....	Chairperson
Zacharias Kunuk.....	Vice Chair/Q.I.A Community Rep
David Irgaut.....	CLARC
Elisapee Quassa.....	Member at large
Marie Airut.....	Member at large
Louis Uttak.....	Member at large

Present from Staff:

Sidonie Ungalaq, Community Liaison Officer

1. Call to order:

Conducted the opening prayer at 10:30 a.m.

2. Next steps for MRPC

Committee member talks about attending the International Polar Year in Yellowknife, also that every meeting agenda comes from QIA, and that MRPC sends there minutes to Q.I.A.

– Government and NTI are not voicing out enough on Mary River Project.

– Concern that if the ship over runs a sleeping Walrus that the Walrus would become all bloody and would become not good to eat, so would the Caribou, it would become not good to eat if killed in the railroad, Inuit do not eat punctured meat.

– Would not want the fishes to be relocated because they will just die.

– The big ship won't be able to stop even when there is animal ahead of them, if they kill then we need royalties.

– When Walrus bereave they do not go under water they will be visible even when there is a boat near by, it will be on the way, so we need to see Inuit monitors 24/7 on the ship.

– Animals have great hearing, if there is a ship going there way they will run but not all the animals run from noise pollution, some sleep through the noise and they stay in deep waters

– Inuit are going to have to vote whether they want Steensby Inlet for a port site, all the affected communities are going to have to work together.

– MRPC from Pond Inlet, Hall Beach and Igloodik should get together and voice there concerns altogether.

ᐃᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱ
Arctic Bay

ᖃᖅᑕᑦ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Clyde River

ᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Grise Fiord

ᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Hall Beach

ᐃᑲᑲᑲ
Igloodik

ᐃᑲᑲᑲ
Iqaluit

ᖃᖅᑕᑦ
Kimmirut

ᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Pangnirtung

ᖃᖅᑕᑦ
Pond Inlet

ᖃᖅᑕᑦ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Resolute Bay

ᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲᑲ
Sanikiluaq



ᖃᖅᑕᓂ ᐃᓂᐃᑦ ᑲᓄᓐᓇᑲᓄᓐᓇᑲᓄᓐᓇᑲᓄᓐᓇ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᓄᓐᓇᑲᓄᓐᓇ
ᐃᓂᓇᑲᓄᓐᓇ ᐃᓄᓇᑲᓄᓐᓇ
Serving the
communities of

ᐃᓐᐱᐃᓄᓐᓇ
Arctic Bay

ᖃᓐᑲᐃᐃᑦ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᓐᓐᓇᑲᓄᓐᓇ
Clyde River

ᑲᓄᓐᓇᑲᓄᓐᓇ
Grise Fiord

ᑲᓄᓐᓇᑲᓄᓐᓇ
Hall Beach

ᐃᓄᓄᓄᓄᓐᓇ
Igloolik

ᐃᑲᓐᓇᑲᓄᓐᓇ
Iqaluit

ᖃᓄᓄᓄᓄᓐᓇ
Kimmitut

ᑲᓄᓐᓇᑲᓄᓐᓇ
Pangnirtung

ᖃᓄᓄᓄᓄᓐᓇ
Pond Inlet

ᖃᖅᑕᓂᓄᓐᓇ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᓄᓐᓇᑲᓄᓐᓇ
Resolute Bay

ᑲᓄᓄᓄᓄᓐᓇ
Sanikiluaq

- We were told not to worry about money so why don't the affected communities get together.

- We can visit Pond Inlet or Hall Beach and or Pond Inlet and Hall Beach can come to Igloolik, either way can work.

- When we are committed in doing stuffs we leave what we are doing and we go out because we have to, then it can be that way too, look at it in a emergency situation and have the Baffin MRPC get together. They can be here on May 25-26-27 and go home on the 28th of May, this has to happen. All the members agreed to have Pond Inlet Hall Beach and Igloolik to get together on May 25-26-27 and go home May 28, 2012.

- Concern that when Walruses, Bearded Seals, and other sea mammals are sleeping on the ice or on land they might not wake up because animals are heavy sleepers, we need Inuit monitors who are always on the watch out, on the ships and on land monitors.

- If the MRPC from Pond Inlet Hall Beach and Igloolik meet together then we can come up with good results and talk about the most important issues.

- MRPC's heard that there is going to be a jet landing to Mary River, how will we monitor the people who are going to work, it is said that so many percent of Inuit should work, are the white people going to be hired more then the Inuit when there is a jet landing to Mary River from down south. Our Children has to work and we have to give them a chance to work in Mary River.

- Baffinland said that Inuit will be able to work even when they do not talk in English.

- Inuit Monitors are going to have to be located in all the busy areas, in the ships and on land.

- We should not leave out the environment where hunters go, we do not want our hunting grounds to be destroyed.

- We do not want our animals to be indangered, we do not want to see a animal killed from the big ship and from the railroad, they become none edible.

- The birds that feed from the sea waters, they will be affected because they eat from the sea waters, and for the birds that feed from the land and eat other animals they will have to be monitored all the way to there eggs.

- Baffinland had said that even when the Inuit can't speak in English they will be able to work in Baffinland, let this be true to have Inuit as employees even when they can't speak in English.

- There will always be hunters going hunting to Steensby Inlet area all through the year round, the ships rout will be used to cross so therefore we need Inuit monitors 24/7.

- The lakes that has fishes will have to be monitored very carefully, when the train starts to run, so they won't be in danger.



ᖃᖃᖅᑕᑎ ᐃᑭᐃᑦ ᑲᑎᖅᑲᖅᑲᑎᖅᑲᖅ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
ᐃᑭᑎᖅᑲᖅ ᐃᑲᑎᖅᑲᖅ
Serving the
communities of

ᐃᖅᐱᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Arctic Bay

ᖃᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Clyde River

ᑲᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Grise Fiord

ᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Hall Beach

ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Igloolik

ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Iqaluit

ᖃᖅᑲᖅ
Kimmirut

ᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Pangnirtung

ᖃᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Pond Inlet

ᖃᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Resolute Bay

ᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅᑲᖅ
Sanikiluaq

– Baffinland will have to follow the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement and have Inuit working in Baffinland and in Steensby Inlet, let the Inuit go first in hiring employees and in training.

– Igloolik MRPC will want to know soon if Pond Inlet and Hall Beach can come to Igloolik and discuss the most important issues, or Igloolik can go to Pond Inlet or Hall Beach to meet with there MRPC's

3. Next-face-to-face-meeting

Open

4. Adjournment:

Adjourn of May 10, 2012 M R P C meeting @ 3:30 p.m.



ᐱᓂᑦᑲᓂᑦᑲᓂᑦ
 ᓂᓇᑕᓂᑦ ᐅᓂᓂᑦᓴ
 Serving the
 communities of

**Kimmirut Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes
 Meeting with Baffinland and Kimmirut Council Members
 March 29, 2012**

ᐃᖅᐱᑦᑲᓂᑦ
 Arctic Bay

ᖃᖅᓴᐃᑦ
 Cape Dorset

ᑲᖅᓂᓂᓴᐱᓂᑦ
 Clyde River

ᐃᓂᓂᓂᓂᑦ
 Grise Fiord

ᖅᓂᓂᓂᓂᑦ
 Hall Beach

ᐃᓂᓂᓂᓂᑦ
 Igloolik

ᐃᓂᓂᓂᓂᑦ
 Iqaluit

ᖃᖃᑦᑕᓂᑦ
 Kimmirut

ᐃᓂᓂᓂᓂᑦ
 Pangnirtung

ᖃᖅᑲᑕᑦᑲᓂᑦ
 Pond Inlet

ᖃᖃᑦᑕᓂᑦ
 Qikiqtarjuaq

ᖅᓂᓂᓂᓂᑦ
 Resolute Bay

ᖅᓂᓂᓂᓂᑦ
 Sanikiluaq

MRPC Members:

- Mikidjuk Lyta
 Mialiralaaq Judea
 Joe Arlooktoo
 Aibilee Kolola
 Joannie Ikkidluak

Baffinland:

- Joe Tigullagaq
 Grant
 Bevin
 Oliver

Meeting started 3:00 p.m.

Agenda items:

- 2012 Activity Report
- Final Environmental Impact Statement
- Project Location
- Transporting Ore to Europe
- Milne Inlet
- Mary River Mine Site
- Steensby

Baffinland: During summer about 150 people work at the Mary River site and about 50 people at the Steensby Inlet, the slide show shown at the proposed port site is where they would transport the ore to the and island where they would load it the ships.

This year a lot of activity was going to take place hauling machinery/equipment/supplies if approved, but Q.I.A. and other agencies pushed back projects.

Baffinland: Environmental Studies. Marine Mammal Surveys was conducted between Iqaluit, Cape Dorset and Kimmirut area.

Overview of Review Process.

1. 2005 project proposal given to N.I.R.B. and Q.I.A.
2. 2006/07/08 Environmental baseline to understand the environmental studies done
 - Inuit knowledge Main Issues: interested what effects it will have on marine and land animals
 - Scientific studies Training and Jobs
3. 2010 N.I.R.B. lengthy list guidelines of E.I.S.
4. 2011 D.E.I.S. 1 year to review
5. 2012 F.E.I.S.

Important Q.I.A./Mary River Project Review Committee to look at impact statements.
 - What project is about and what concerns there are



ᖃᕈᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ ᕈᕋᕋᕐ ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐ

Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐ
ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐ ᕐᕋᕋᕐ
Serving the
communities of

- Conditions for environment monitoring & adoptive measure
- Important for Communities to know these

Baffinland: Environment Studies on Hudson Strait

ᕈᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Arctic Bay

Member: I have a question on shipping route, where from Europe would the ships drop off the ore?

Baffinland: They would transport the ore from Steensby Inlet to Europe

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Cape Dorset

Member: What is the name of the port in Europe they would drop off the ore?

Baffinland: Lauderdale, Netherlands.

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Clyde River

Member: What will they do with the ore?

Baffinland: They will make steel out of it.

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Grise Fiord

Baffinland: The Environmental Statement includes large amount of data of Inuit Knowledge.

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Hall Beach

- Research/surveys animal life along shipping route. D.E.I.S. review some agencies felt more information was needed during winter season on marine mammals.

- A survey was started on March 20, 2012 and it is almost done sometime this week.

- Slide show shows an area that they tried to cover lines which represent flight paths by airplane from West to East.

ᕈᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Igloolik

- And the line shows the proposed shipping route, and the three points on the slide show are where Federal Fisheries Department has placed receivers that can hear noises.

- While doing an aerial survey, it can also mean what it hears is what we could see.

ᕈᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Iqaluit

- Twin Otter used doing the surveys, the airplane is rigged out to do the surveys. It flies 500 feet while doing the surveys. There are observers on each side of the plane to look out for animals or ice conditions, there are also cameras on each side of the plane that take pictures every few seconds automatically. All the information collected from the surveys are then recorded on to a laptop.

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Kimmirut

- There will be a second survey done that will take 2 to 3 three days, which will come from the opposite of where they came from.

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Pangnirtung

- To gather all the data it might take anywhere 2 to 3 months to come out with reports on findings on the surveys.

Member: Who was on the plane while doing the surveys?

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Pond Inlet

Baffinland: LGL was contracted to do the surveys, they are experience in marine mammal surveys, there was also an Inuk on board to do a training role on how to do survey on sea birds. Environment Canada

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Qikiqtarjuaq

During surveys between Kimmirut and Cape Dorset a person from each Community was on board to observe how studies were done for a day.

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Resolute Bay

Member: The reason I asked there should be an Inuk included in surveys, if your coming up with a report you can mention not only the people contracted to do the work, but you included local people in the surveys.

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Sanikiluaq

Member: Do the receivers that were put out there have possibility of disrupting animals?

Baffinland: I can't tell you how exactly they receiver work, Federal Fisheries can tell how exactly they work, but they do not disrupt animals, it only records.



ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Serving the
 communities of

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Arctic Bay

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Cape Dorset

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Clyde River

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Grise Fiord

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Hall Beach

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Igloolik

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Iqaluit

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Kimmirut

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Pangnirtung

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Pond Inlet

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Rolute Bay

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Sanikiluaq

Member: Are the receivers in deep waters?

Baffinland: Yes they are in deep waters.

Member: How are they going to retrieve them?

Baffinland: Coast Guard put them out there and they will retrieve them when they are done.

Baffinland: This study was done in cooperation with Nunavik Government due to the locations of the receivers.

Member: How long will they be in the ocean to record any sounds?

Baffinland: The acoustic monitoring was going to be for 1 year, September to September.

Q.I.A. selected an individual to be on board to observe the surveys.

Member: There is a mine in Northern Quebec, have you talked to them on how the animals might have been affected because of the activity?

Baffinland: Not a lot of study on effects identified.
 The receiver should be able to hear the ship that goes to Raglan Mine.

Member: Can the aerial survey be seen once it is done?

Baffinland: Baffinland would be happy to provide the report. It is going to take awhile to gather all the data.

Canadian Wildlife Service

- Program Studying Eider Ducks; 12 years ago C.W.S. did a study near Kimmirut, Duck Unlimited did the surveys. Hudson Strait, Kimmirut, and Cape Dorset area.
- What we are doing and planning
- Concerns were raised that people in Greenland were over hunting ducks during summer seasons.
- CWS is doing studies on Southampton Island, they put metal bands which are harmless to ducks. Most of the ducks that we put band on are shot in around Newfoundland, Labrador, Northern Quebec and some were shot around Cape Dorset and Kimmirut.
- In 2002 C.W.S. worked with Greenland to lower harvesting of Eider Ducks. Good news Greenland agreed to reduce and more ducks are coming back.
- Bad news, dead ducks were found around Southampton Island, a sickness for birds called Avian Cholera which came from U.S.A. and southern Canada.
- There were interviews done with Inuit between Kimmirut, Cape Dorset, Igloolik, Hall Beach and Nunavik and everyone agreed the disease arrive in 2004. The avian cholera does not affect humans.
- 3 years ago there was a study done by boat in Baffin Island and Nunavik region to see how far it spreads
- The data will be used for the future to see what effects there will be
- 2 Biologists 4 Inuit guides to observe looking for dead birds and count live birds. Go to the nesting islands and do studies.
- A lot of Bears were spotted while doing studies, bears eating eggs has become a growing problem.



ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ ᑕᑭᑭᑭᑭ ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
 ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
 Serving the
 communities of

- We will continue to do studies like we did 12 years ago.
- Canadian Wildlife Service along with Baffinland will do studies to see where the ducks go during Fall, Winter, and Spring. That's the brief overview on plans and what we do.

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
 Arctic Bay

Member: Birds and animals can travel far.

Baffinland: One of the studies showed breeding, they can go as far away as Greenland in two days. King Eiders are usually where there is strong currents.

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
 Cape Dorset

Baffinland: We will be working with Inuit during the Summer and put transmitters to see where they go. The Hudson Strait is the most important area for birds.

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
 Clyde River

Member: The ducks dying, where are they usually found?

Baffinland: The disease comes and goes in different areas.

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
 Grise Fiord

Member: What are the signs of the disease?

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
 Hall Beach

Baffinland: It kills them so fast, but the signs are they are flapping their wings uncontrollably and acting strange. The disease comes from the south and believed to come through Snow Geese.

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
 Igloolik

Member: I usually go and get eggs every season I myself have not seen any signs of the disease in Kimmirut area.

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
 Iqaluit

Member: How can you detect signs of the disease?

Baffinland: Dead birds everywhere. They found dead ducks in Ivujivik area. If you see these kind report it to us when you see a lot of birds dead.

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
 Kimmirut

Member: Asking specifically on the slide show picture how that duck died?

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
 Pangnirtung

Baffinland: that disease is a bacteria.

Member: Birds are very important in the area will the Canadian Wildlife Service keep studying the birds in the area if and when the mine starts?

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
 Pond Inlet

Baffinland: Yes, we will keep monitoring the birds, we are in to 3 years in to the study and we have a 4 year plan. Agencies are working together.

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
 Qikiqtarjuaq

Member: Long ago, there use to be hardly any ducks in the winter, now it is starting to be more common to see the ducks in the winter, maybe there are too many ducks now and some are sticking around?

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
 Resolute Bay

Baffinland: We do not know yet why, but studies with transmitters will shed some light. Lack of ice could be one of the factors. Less ice means they can stay longer.

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
 Sanikiluaq

Baffinland: We will meet with the public tonight at 7:00 p.m., thank you for coming to this meeting and see you tonight.

Meeting ended 4:53 p.m.



ᑭᑭᑭᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ
Serving the communities of

Kimmirut Mary River Project Review Committee – Meeting Minutes May 8, 2012

ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ
Arctic Bay

ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ
Cape Dorset

ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ
Clyde River

ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ
Grise Fiord

ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ
Hall Beach

ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ
Igloolik

ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ
Iqaluit

ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ
Kimmirut

ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ
Pangnirtung

ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ
Pond Inlet

ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ
Resolute Bay

ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ ᑕᑦ
Sanikiluaq

Members present:

Josephie Padlu
Joe Arlooktoo
Mikidjuk Lyta
Aibilee Kolola
Mialiralaq Judea

Member(s) absent:

Joannie Ikkidluak

C.L.O.: Perry Ikkidluak

1. Opening Prayer at 1:14 p.m.
2. Reading correspondence: Next steps for Mary River Project Committees & Mary River Project Review Committee Q.I.A. Consultation on FEIS Review Meeting Minutes
3. Members asking whether we should write down concerns aside all of the concerns that were given from this meeting before May 30, 2012? Should we be saying if this happens do it this way? Or are the technical team good enough?

From all of the concerns that have been forwarded, what are the most important issues or concerns regarding the possible mine, for example ships will be going back and forth not far from Kimmirut; will our animals be affected by that?

They want to hear from you on this before May 11, 2012 for May 30, 2012 Final Comments Submission.

Member: Asking to see if the people who will be observing the ships route or will be on ships as Observers, has this already been included in their planning? As we know the ships will be passing each other every so many hours.

Member: Commenting that what has been given to us a Committees; we have been reviewing them and give our comments of concerns to best of our abilities. I can not think of any other thing or scenario that we have to think of about the possible mine. But if we can think of more concerns would be great.

Member: When we started to meet with this Committee, we recommended to have sheds for Observation for ships that are going back and forth to the mine and we asked to have study on animals first before everything kicks into gear to see what effects the mine might have on our animals. We want the animals/birds/ice/small micro organisms that bigger animals eat.

Looking at their proposed shipping route, the route seems way too close to this side of the land where the water has fast currents.

Member: I don't know other concerns I can share regarding the proposed mine, but if we don't voice our concerns it won't be good either. We need to voice any concern that we have so we will not regret later. We are not getting a lot of help regarding meetings or giving us directions, so lets give them our voice any concerns that we have.



ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ ᐃᑭᐃᑭᑭ ᑲᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ ᐃᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Serving the
communities of

ᐃᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Arctic Bay

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Clyde River

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Grise Fiord

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Hall Beach

ᐃᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Igloolik

ᐃᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Iqaluit

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Kimmirut

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Pangnirtung

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Pond Inlet

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Resolute Bay

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Sanikiluaq

Member: Our biggest concerns are the animals that we hunt for sustenance, if they are affected; now what do we do? Are we going to be compensated if the animals that we eat are affected by the ships going back and forth? I'm sure we would not be happy if the animals that we eat are no longer around because of the activities.

There should be studies done animals so we can see before and after. So we can see what affects there might be. And have a local participate in studies near their Communities.

Member: Would like to ask, all the meetings that we had now; will there be any use of this? Are we just being used? That is my concern.

Member: They can try and use us to become a mine, what are the possibilities we will benefit from it if it becomes a mine. We have to think of how we will benefit.

Member: If the mine is approved, I would want to see observation sheds to make sure the ships are on their route and have locals working on as observers.

Members would like to get help on where exactly they should do regarding these documents given to us. They would like more direction on what they should be doing.

Meeting adjourned 2:45 p.m.



ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Serving the
 communities of

**Pond Inlet Project Review Committee – Meeting Minutes
 March 29, 2012**

Present:

Jesse Nutarak.....	Chairperson (recorder)
Jayko Aooloo.....	Member, Member-at-Large
Cornelius .K. Nutarak.....	Member, Member-at-Large
Abraham Kublu.....	Member, Hamlet Rep

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Arctic Bay

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Cape Dorset

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Clyde River

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Grise Fiord

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Hall Beach

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Igloolik

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Iqaluit

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Kimmirut

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Pangnirtung

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Pond Inlet

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Qikiqjarjuaq

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Rolute Bay

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Sanikiluaq

0. Opening of meeting

The meeting was brought to order at 1:10 pm and a prayer was given.

1.a Correspondence – Vice chairperson, Mathias Qaunaq had written a letter of resignation effective today, as Committee member for MRPC, as per the known procedure and policy, all members are encouraged to look for a committee member. We (the committee members) will look for replacement, once we have number of names forwarded, we will pick one and have election for the Vice-chairperson.

1. Final Environmental Impact Statement – Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation

Now that the Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation (BIMC) has submitted their final environmental impact statement to Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB), the Committee has to review the document and submit within the timeframe given, our concerns to Qikiqtani Inuit Association (QIA) as per correspondence from QIA.

QIA has suggested that we start with the “Plain Language” section, this section deals with the broad overview of the volumes and covers most of all the components of the proposal. We could use the ‘plain language’ volume as a base for reviewing the document and we could go to specific volume if and when we need to consult on certain issue/topic or we could go through each volumes and if we do it this way it may lead us to go back and forth to the same concern.

Committee members agreed to start with the “Plain Language” section and review each section.

Section 2.0 Air Quality

The concern has been that the railroad carts will not be covered while transporting crushed ore to loading port, the committee is concerned that the dust will separate along the railroad, the dust will accumulate over time. The Committee suggests and strongly recommends that the carts be covered with tarp or some other means of covering to minimize the distribution and separation of dust to the environment. We know the vegetation up north grows very slowly and is easily disrupted by surrounding activities.

Emission from power generators and carbon monoxide from vehicles will be discharged at all times if they do not find and use alternative means to generate power, it will eventually impact the area, knowing that there'll be ten gigantic vessels gradually going to Steensby if the proposal ever materialize as planned.

BIMC is saying that they will eventually have ten vessels to transport 18 [mega] tonnes per year ore, there never has been vessels in the area and region of this magnitude up to present, does the BIMC know or have predictions as to how much will the air quality be impacted in the whole circumpolar region.



ᐱᑐᑖᑲᑖᑕᑦ
ᑭᑲᑖᑕᑦ ᐅᑲᑦᑲᑖ
Serving the
communities of

ᐃᑦᐱᐁᑦᐱᑦ
Arctic Bay

ᑭᑲᑖᑕᑦ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᑦᑦᑲᑖᑲᑦ
Clyde River

ᐁᑲᑖᑕᑦᑖᑕᑦ
Grise Fiord

ᑲᑖᑖᑖᑦ
Hall Beach

ᐃᑖᑖᑖᑦ
Igloolik

ᐃᑲᑖᑕᑦ
Iqaluit

ᑭᑲᑖᑕᑦ
Kimmirut

ᑖᑕᑖᑖᑕᑦ
Pangnirtung

ᑖᑕᑖᑕᑦ
Pond Inlet

ᑖᑕᑖᑕᑦᑖᑕᑦ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᑖᑖᑕᑦᑖᑕᑦ
Resolute Bay

ᑲᑖᑖᑕᑦ
Sanikiluaq

Even small occurrences like leaking oil from any vehicle can add up in a number of years, therefore leaks from all vehicles should be monitored and attended to anyway possible. The small leak from vehicles will accumulate within the life of the project, thus making it more vulnerable to the deterioration of the air quality.

There is no adequate data on arctic air quality, how do they (BIMC) know and say there'll be no drastic impact on the quality of air in this arctic region when there is no data to compare the quality of air?

Section 3.0 Archaeology and Cultural Resources

During the archaeology presentations by BIMC they have mentioned that the tent formations, if they are on the route of the railroad, pictures would be thoroughly taken and well documented, after that they can destroy them and build railroad on it. This practice does not seem ethical but that's what the regulations and legislations allow.

Does the company pay the Governments or the museum, in order for them be allowed to destroy Inuit archaeological sites?

Nunavut Planning Commission has all the documentations and records of Inuit activities in the region and in each area of regions, where Inuit have lived and spend their seasonal hunting grounds but do not know why they are so quiet on these issues.

Old Sites venues and artifacts retained from these old sites should be collected and preserved for schools and educational purposes as this is the history of Inuit in the whole Baffin region. Mary River was a venue for seasonal gathering, caribou hunting and fishing, significant gathering place from all points and directions of Baffin region.

Since the archaeologists and staff of BIMC are only visiting old sites by air, only partial portions will be collected, seen and find as most of them are now underneath the surface. The previous consultants, Knight Piesold consulting had collected significant finds and documented only partial findings are included in the FEIS.

If the only partial portions of artifacts and only some of the old sod sites are recorded then the prove of Inuit being in the region for thousands of years may be undermined.

Government of Nunavut, department of education should be encouraged to teach and use these old sites as part of education for our today's children now, today.

The archaeological sites like old sod house formations should also be identified as to whom it was build by and belonged to, we could also do what Igloolik had intended to do, have the actual people and their relatives to visit the old sites before the project starts, there are few families in Pond Inlet who had grown up in Steensby Inlet area.

Archaeological sites – employees in Mary River will be encouraged and for some it may be mandatory requirement that they should respect and be able to tell old sites and be able to recognize if the old site belongs to Dorset, Tuniit or modern day Inuit.

2. Other business

The committee will need to ask people for replacement, if they want to be a member of the Mary River Project Committee.

3. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by the Chairperson at 3:48pm.



ᐱᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
ᐅᐅᐅᐅᐅ ᐅᐅᐅᐅᐅ
Serving the
communities of

**Pond Inlet Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes
March 30, 2012**

ᐃᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Arctic Bay

ᐱᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Cape Dorset

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Clyde River

ᐃᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Grise Fiord

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Hall Beach

ᐃᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Igloolik

ᐃᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Iqaluit

ᐱᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Kimmirut

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Pangnirtung

ᐱᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Pond Inlet

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Resolute Bay

ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ
Sanikiluaq

Present:

- Jesse Nutarak..... Chairperson (recorder)
- Jayko Aooloo..... Member, Member-at-Large
- Cornelius .K. Nutarak..... Member, Member-at-Large
- Abraham Kublu..... Member, Hamlet Rep
- David Qamaniq..... Community liaison Officer (in & out)

1. Opening of meeting

The meeting was brought to order at 1:40 pm, and opened with a prayer.

2. Completed section 2.0 & 3.0 in the last meeting. Continuation from where we left off on Plain Language.

Section 4 – Climate Change:

- a. BIMC to make reports on climate changes on perpetual basis. Smoke produced by railroad will land on the end meaning heavier particles will be left on snow & melt to the rivers and drainage areas and spread.
- b. There are permafrost spots on Nunavut soil that are melting rapidly and it is going to change the landscape. The railroad may be on the permafrost and that may cause the land to deteriorate and damage the infrastructure. Once the permafrost starts to crack beneath the surface from blastings nearby, melting will increase more rapidly thus impacting the railroad.
- c. Permafrost can cause damages and floods and this happens occasionally. So the rail would have to be lifted up above the ground certain height in some areas along the railroad.
- d. How would the BIMC minimize the risk of accidents when there has been blasting along the railroad.
- e. Hydro Power on Angajurjuaq Lake should be sought in order to minimize the emission and other air pollution. If there's hydro power then all three locations (Steensby, Milne and Mary River) can be powered by hydro. The issue of hydro power will eliminate a lot of emissions, global warming and other air quality threatening substance.
- f. Solar Panels should also be considered since it will eliminate smoke, gases and emission. BIMC should try the solar panel.
- g. Wind power may be less interest as it may not be feasible at some point in time.
- h. Route from Mary River to Steensby Inlet is on the permafrost and blastings from creation of tunnels will impact the rail road during the project.
- i. There are cases in NB and perceived to have the same occurrences around the port where there has been land slides eroding and floods from the natural occurrence.



ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Serving the
communities of

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Arctic Bay

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Cape Dorset

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Clyde River

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Grise Fiord

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Hall Beach

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Igloolik

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Iqaluit

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Kimmirut

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Pangnirtung

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Pond Inlet

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Resolute Bay

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Sanikiluaq

- j. Air quality was tested in Russia Arctic and same air type surfaces in Igloolik later in years.
- k. Birds and ducks will drastically be impacted in long term from emissions from ships and other machinery.
- l. Roads should be built during the summer. Not in the winter, as it will need to be re-build due to the changing of temperature and the wind direction.
- m. West Nile Virus and other poisonous carrying insects need to be monitored as it has more mosquitoes inland particularly in MR, new types of flies surfacing in the high arctic – due to the global warming
Global warming is something that none of us has control over.
- n. Heat of the Sun is now hotter- impacting ice quality and condition.
How can they prevent substances going into the air?
Where would the garbage and septic waste go? (residential Barge)
Steensby port should be clear from seals and fish, to prevent sea mammals from getting too close to comfort- monitoring mammals around surrounding area.
- o. Climate change- needs lab in Baffin region – Scientific lab in the region should be erected to monitor the climate and environment and to collect data from the region including mammal behaviors and characteristics.

Section 5.0 Fresh Water Lakes

Fish- land lock & other types.

Milne Inlet, Mary River, Steensby.

Lakes & Rivers- have fish both landlock and migrating fish.

Impact of fresh water fishes in the lakes and 18% of the Rivers as per the document, if this number is based on an annual occurrence since most of the researched information in this proposal seems to have been done in this fashion, then twenty year period will be a lot different as forecasted.

- Funding should be provided for damages on lakes and other freshwater fauna activity driven dynamics and researches should be done in universities.
- Do not block the lakes and other hydrology system completely because, this will block the fish from going somewhere and may jeopardize quality of water.
- DFO regulations stipulate that no culvert be placed on lakes. Fish or not in the lake.
- There is about 150 thousand pounds of quota in the area for Igloolik fisheries, once the blasting has been done, habitat population will change.
- The rivers and lakes along the Milne Inlet tote road have to be monitored sufficiently, monitoring effects of dust from the road.

Milne Inlet:

- Funds would have to be provided to compensate the loss of fish in Milne port and along the road to the mine.
- Fisheries compensation may not work in the North. The new lakes and man made lakes would be different in plants and food chain.

Qattiktuq- river along the Igloolik area.



ᖃᖅᑕᑦ ᐃᑭᐃᑦ ᑲᑯᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᑭᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᐃᑯᑦᑲᑦ
Serving the
communities of

ᐃᑲᐱᑦᑲᑦ
Arctic Bay

ᖃᑦᑲᐃᑦ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Clyde River

ᑲᑯᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Grise Fiord

ᑲᑯᑦᑲᑦ
Hall Beach

ᐃᑲᑯᑦᑲᑦ
Igloolik

ᐃᑲᑯᑦᑲᑦ
Iqaluit

ᖃᑦᑲᑦ
Kimmirut

ᑲᑯᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pangnirtung

ᖃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pond Inlet

ᖃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᑯᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Resolute Bay

ᑲᑯᑦᑲᑦ
Sanikiluaq

- Plants are eaten by fishes' food and will impacted greatly from blasting nearby.
- IQ stipulates that whenever there is a blast within the lakes and rivers, fish habitat dies from sudden loud noise, the planned tunnel is in the vicinity of lakes with fish that have quota for commercial fisheries.
- This area is calving ground for caribou and should be restricted from heavy construction work, the caribou once it has been bothered with noise and other human activities, it will eventually leave the area for good.

The committee feels that they should adjourn for now and continue following day at the same time and place.

3. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by the Chairperson at 4:39pm



ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
 Serving the
 communities of

**Pond Inlet Mary River Project Review Committee – Meeting Minutes
 April 5, 2012**

Present:

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ Arctic Bay	Jesse Nutarak- chair
	Jayko Alooooloo
ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ Cape Dorset	Abraham Kublu- rep for Hamlet of Pond Inlet
	Elijah Kadloo Panipakochoo- MHTO Rep
	Joel Nashook – Member-at-large
	Cornilius Nutarak – Member-at-large
ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ Clyde River	Eleanore Arreak- recording secretary

1. Opening of Meeting

The Chairperson opened the meeting at 7:15, and a prayer was given.

Committee members welcomed Joel Nashook, Chairperson briefly explained the Committee Terms of Reference and Goals and Objectives of the Committee created by the Qikiqtani Inuit Association.

– We just have been reporting to QIA about our meetings. Right now we are working on the final Environmental Statement we are also looking at all the binders in preparation for the NIRB hearings on the BIMC Mary River Project.

2. Selection of Vice-chairperson:

I'd like to welcome the new member here to our team. We are looking at the volumes/ binders and making statements what changes we would like to see with the project planning for Mary River. Tonight we will talk about, we looked at the rivers and creeks and we have discussed our concerns regarding the fish and rivers and lakes.

– Now that we are a complete team, I would like to open and vote for Vice- chairperson, you can now nominate:

The committed voted Jayko Alooooloo for the position of Vice-Chairperson.

3. Continuation of Plain Language - 6.0 Hydrology

– I am very concerned about the time limit we have, to give our statements for the 14th and look at these binders. I know we had to work on these earlier but can we ask QIA to postpone the date.

– I will try to ask QIA, see what we can do because there is so much to go over and we could also ask some organizations in the community to review parts of volumes for their input, we could be creative.

The team wants to work faster and have meetings more often to go through all the binders and give the statements to QIA as soon as possible.

Read 6.0 Hydrology

- 6.1
- 6.2
- 6.3
- 6.4
- 6.5

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Arctic Bay

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Cape Dorset

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Clyde River

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Grise Fiord

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Hall Beach

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Igloolik

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Iqaluit

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Kimmirut

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Pangnirtung

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Pond Inlet

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Resolute Bay

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ
Sanikiluaq



ᑭᑭᑖᑕᑦ ᐃᑭᐃᑦ ᑲᑕᑦᓄᑦᑲᑦ
Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᑖᑦᑕᑖᑦ
ᑭᑭᑦᑕᑦᓄᑦ ᐅᑖᑦᓄᑦᑲ
Serving the
communities of

ᐃᓐᐱᑖᓐᑲᑦ
Arctic Bay

ᑭᑦᓄᑲᑖᑦ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᓐᓂᑕᑖᑦ
Clyde River

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑦ
Grise Fiord

ᑲᑖᑖᑖᑦ
Hall Beach

ᐃᑖᑖᑖᑦ
Igloolik

ᐃᑖᑖᑖᑦ
Iqaluit

ᑭᑖᑖᑖᑦ
Kimmiti

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑦ
Pangnirtung

ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑦ
Pond Inlet

ᑭᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑦ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᑖᑖᑖᑖᑦ
Resolute Bay

ᑲᑖᑖᑖᑖᑦ
Sanikiluaq

- I am not too familiar with the environmental stuff, but I am quite worried about all the things that can be dangerous to our environment. I would be more satisfied if it had been cleaned.

- simiktautunnariaqarmat- (looking at the map)

Comments and concerns: while the team is looking at the map

- what and where they will be blocked
- how many creeks are they exactly talking about?
- Which creeks will be blocked
- And how long are the creeks?

Break- 8:20- 8:30

- I believe that if the road is turned, it will not affect if they are just creeks.

More comments and concerns:

- It sounds like they are not just talking about 1 creek. How many creeks?
- Might the fish be affected and get destroyed?
- Because the fish and nines pine stickle back were the only ones found, where will they go if it is blocked?
- Believed Land lard was also being looked by the WWF?
- Iron that will not be used being out to somewhere, it sounded like it talked about that. Should we be concerned about that? Overfill-tuvinigguuq taikunga kuvijauqattarniaqput from the lake.
- Different kinds of fish were being sighted before in that area by Inuit
- I know Igloolik people will be also affected of fish, we are still not too sure if it has already affected the fish, we should ask Igloolik what concerns they have because they are the ones that will be more affected by this.
- talking about the meeting we had at the c-hall, I am quite concerned about the DFO because he did not seem to talk about what is being done or what the concerns they have, should we push the DFO to do some more research? I believe that the DFO should be part of the project of this with Knight Piesold because from what I recall, they were the ones that declined our proposal to create a bridge between Salmon Creek & Akua.
- Are we saying that DFO should do this everyday even though there is one working on this everyday over in Mary River? We had requested for them to hire an Inuk being part of the project and they have done so. From what I know that they will keep working on his everyday.
- Knight Piesold has researchers, and DFO is part of this project, I would be more satisfied 3 researchers is better than one. We would like to make it succeed as much as possible because we eat the animals and mammals.
- At the last meeting in February, DFO and Environment (Avatilirijiit), I believe that they should postpone the deadline because they were not able to answer all the questions as we had asked. Scientist who are working for Knight Piesold are slowly getting DFO together but DFO has never communicated well with us since the beginning, no one from DFO has came to talk to us about anything regarding the fish.
- There was nothing said when there was an oil spill when it was very serious.

Break 9:20-9:30



ᑕᑰᑦᑕᑦ ᐃᑭᐃᑦ ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ

Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Serving the
communities of

ᐃᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Arctic Bay

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
Clyde River

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
Grise Fiord

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
Hall Beach

ᐃᑲᑲᑦ
Igloolik

ᐃᑲᑲᑦ
Iqaluit

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
Kimmirut

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
Pangnirtung

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
Pond Inlet

ᑕᑰᑦᑕᑦ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
Resolute Bay

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
Sanikiluaq

Section 7.0 Inuit Qaujimajaqutingitigut knowledge

Reading 7.0 Inuit Qaujimajaqutingitigut knowledge

7.1

7.2

7.3.2

7.4

Questions:

- As long as the project exist, will they have researchers working?
- from what I understand, it is saying that there will always be an elder helping with the researching.
- what and how will they tell their side? Corporations and bodies usually ask for qualified people, how will they hire and when? Are they planning on training people?
- This is a short reading for it to be IQ. IQ can be said in so many ways, a lot is not mentioned here.
- those that we know of about caribou and ship, we can make suggestions and tell them what to do to protect our marine mammals. IQ will be useful here.
- Sounds like they are letting elders be involved in this project, does this mean they will have interpreters at all times?
- Elders that will spend time there, should be constantly involved with all the higher ranked people and communicate we with each others. Since we also suggested before to always have an Inuk monitoring when departing and arriving into the land. We should add for elders to get educated as to what is expected from them to prevent someone to just be there and not have anything to do or to not know what things to do.
- The problem we have is that IQ is not written.
- Any ships should be stopped while the mating season is happening.
- From what I have experienced, I had spent 3 weeks on the ship just because I was an Inuk, not because of what I knew, when I asked what I had to do to the headquarters, they just responded that I was only there because I was an Inuk. I believe that Inuit will also go through this.
- This is a great concern so it does not happen like how it did there. Inuit Qaujimajatuqangitigut, youth should be trained before being hired to go there so they will not be told that they cannot work very well. I think we should suggest for youth to get trained and be involved with the head quarters as well.
- I believe that HTO will do its part now that they know how and what it is like.
- I am glad that IQ is being used, what is more concerning is the danger of or for our Environmental issues, socializing and etc....IQ knowledge should also all be known regarding our environment.



ᑖᑭᑖᑭᑦ ᑎᑎᑦ ᑖᑖᑖᑖ ᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖᑖ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᑎᑎᑎᑎᑖᑖ
ᑎᑎᑎᑎᑖᑖ ᑎᑎᑎᑎᑖᑖ
Serving the
communities of

ᑎᑎᑎᑎᑖᑖ
Arctic Bay

ᑎᑎᑎᑎᑖᑖ
Cape Dorset

ᑎᑎᑎᑎᑖᑖ
Clyde River

ᑎᑎᑎᑎᑖᑖ
Grise Fiord

ᑎᑎᑎᑎᑖᑖ
Hall Beach

ᑎᑎᑎᑎᑖᑖ
Igloolik

ᑎᑎᑎᑎᑖᑖ
Iqaluit

ᑎᑎᑎᑎᑖᑖ
Kimmirut

ᑎᑎᑎᑎᑖᑖ
Pangnirtung

ᑎᑎᑎᑎᑖᑖ
Pond Inlet

ᑎᑎᑎᑎᑖᑖ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑎᑎᑎᑎᑖᑖ
Resolute Bay

ᑎᑎᑎᑎᑖᑖ
Sanikiluaq

- 7.0 is very short, I'll comment that there are so many things to learn about IQ, as of today, Nunavut Wildlife Act says that Inuit should be included, I think we should add more.
- I am seconding to train more people for IQ. QIA had hired an elder to talk about anything and that went very well.
- Just because you're an Inuk- the seater in the ship should definitely get a job description when entering the ship so the person will not be too confused. I would like to add the JD into our concerns.
- When the money isn't around, it will never exist.
- I thought you guys already worked on this before? Nothing is being processed?
- IQ is very complex and very complicated, they are willing to work on it, but the workload is so much. If they hire an Elder Inuk, I am sure that they will not tell them what to do such as giving them a JD.

5. Adjournment,
Meeting closed 10:15pm.



ᕆᕐᕈᕐᕋ ᕈᕈᕐᕋ ᕆᕐᕈᕐᕋ
Serving the
communities of

Pond Inlet Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes May 3, 2012

- Present:**
- | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Jesse Nutarak..... | Chairperson |
| Elijah K. Panipakoocho..... | Mittimatalik HTO rep |
| Abraham Kublu..... | Hamlet council rep |
| Joel Nashook..... | Member-at-large |
| Kooneeloosie Nutarak..... | Member-at-large |
| David Qamaniq..... | CLO Pond Inlet (in & out) |
| Gee Killiktee..... | MLA Assistant, observer |
- Absent:**
- | | |
|------------------|--|
| Jayko Aaloo..... | Member-at-large, excused (out-of-town) |
|------------------|--|

ᕈᕈᕐᕋ ᕆᕐᕈᕐᕋ
Arctic Bay

ᕈᕈᕐᕋ ᕈᕈᕐᕋ
Cape Dorset

ᕆᕐᕈᕐᕋ ᕆᕐᕈᕐᕋ
Clyde River

ᕈᕈᕐᕋ ᕈᕈᕐᕋ
Grise Fiord

ᕈᕈᕐᕋ ᕆᕐᕈᕐᕋ
Hall Beach

ᕈᕈᕐᕋ ᕆᕐᕈᕐᕋ
Igloolik

ᕈᕈᕐᕋ ᕆᕐᕈᕐᕋ
Iqaluit

ᕈᕈᕐᕋ ᕆᕐᕈᕐᕋ
Kimmirut

ᕈᕈᕐᕋ ᕆᕐᕈᕐᕋ
Pangnirtung

ᕈᕈᕐᕋ ᕆᕐᕈᕐᕋ
Pond Inlet

ᕈᕈᕐᕋ ᕆᕐᕈᕐᕋ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᕈᕈᕐᕋ ᕆᕐᕈᕐᕋ
Resolute Bay

ᕈᕈᕐᕋ ᕆᕐᕈᕐᕋ
Sanikiluaq

- 1. Opening of meeting**
The meeting was opened by the Chairperson, with a prayer at 7:21pm.

- 2. Agenda**
We have written agenda in front of you and they are more of a information items and once we are done, we need to discuss the EA Lead questions. We will use the questions on the letter from EA Lead, QIA as agenda items since they are pretty straight forward open end question.

- i. List any concerns your community still has about the Project.
- ii. If you have listed several concerns above, can you also identify which are the most import to your community.
- iii. What could be done to satisfy your concerns?
- iv. Overall, do you think the expected benefits of the Project outweigh the risks of negative impacts?
- v. Given everything you have learned about the project as a committee, does your committee support the development of the Mary River Project. Are there specific reasons for your thoughts?

Delegation to Technical meeting in Iqaluit.
The Committtee members selected two members and one alternate, if there should be any delegation to technical meeting, no dates mentioned.

Department of Fisheries and Oceans Community Consultation Visit.
The DFO is planning to come to Pond Inlet to for community consultation visit on the Mary River project on May 17, 2012 and want to have meeting with MRPC and HTO during the day and public meeting in the evening.

NIRB Public Final Hearing – July 26 -28, 2012
The Final NIRB hearing will be held in Pond Inlet on July 26 to 28, 2012 at the community hall, Igloolik hearings on July 23 – 25 and Iqaluit hearings on July 16 to 20, 2012. Logistics, invitations, agenda items and all the scheduling are done by NIRB.



ᖃᕈᕐᕋᕐ ᕈᕋᕋᕐ ᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ ᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ ᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Serving the
communities of

ᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Arctic Bay

ᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Cape Dorset

ᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Clyde River

ᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Grise Fiord

ᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Hall Beach

ᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Igloolik

ᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Iqaluit

ᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Kimmirut

ᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Pangnirtung

ᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Pond Inlet

ᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Resolute Bay

ᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Sanikiluaq

This meeting with DFO will and may be an opportunity to start dialogue with them on the monitoring and collection of data on sea mammals and land mammals including fish and other sea mammals. There should be research on all species in Steensby, Milne and the vessel route and create a laboratory for all the data collected, ideally with Universities down south. To monitor the contaminates and other life threatening substances arising from the mine and its vicinity.

Committee Concerns on the MR Project as whole

We now have had identified most of the major concerns on the Mary River project in the past year and we can start off with what each member believe to be biggest concern and how can be done to satisfy you.

Mercury

We've already heard that Qaanaaq Inuit were advised not to eat any more seal meat due to the excessive amount of mercury and lead presence in the sea mammals. The sea water is part of the ocean that we hunt from and they are pretty close to us. Once the mining in Mary River commenced they will increase the level of contaminates in the water.

The committee feels that they really have to have meeting with the HTO so that they can dialogue with the department and keep on top of things with them.

Water and Contaminates

There was a conference on the sea mammals concerns and how the contaminates accumulated in the sea water.

There are species which are believed to be contaminated that we use for food.

Ballast water was a concern at the Tech meeting. That is also our concern. It will impact the sea water and sea life.

Arctic Char Fish

The arctic char in that area is known to be the best fish, ballast water was a great concern to Inuit and it will impact the sea mammals, ultra-violet lights should be encouraged to be used while the water is in the vessel so that the foreign species of planktons will not be transported to our waters.

Natural mitigation

The sea ocean current carries the contaminants to all over the world. There is known plant underwater, a while plant with holes in it that purifies sea organisms. That plant should be studied and be used.

Break for ten minutes.

Concern:

When they start making the tunnel to make way for the railroad, they will need to blast off the hills, once they start blasting it will impact the fish in the area and the permafrost underneath. The lakes with fish are on the way of the railroad, once they are blasted, it will kill the fish in the lake and those lake have quota in which the Inuit from Igloolik harvest for economic reasons and food.

Human Rights

- some parts of the FEIS seems to discriminate Inuit when it comes to alcohol and drug abuse, the document seems to imply that Inuit cannot keep a job for long period of time and they abuse drugs and alcohol. The committee feels that a lawyer should be approached for legal opinion, if the document is, in fact, in discrimination.



ᖃᕈᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ ᕈᕋᕋᕐ ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Serving the
communities of

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Arctic Bay

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Cape Dorset

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Clyde River

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Grise Fiord

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Hall Beach

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Igloolik

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Iqaluit

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Kimmirut

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Pangnirtung

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Pond Inlet

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Resolute Bay

ᕐᕋᕋᕐᕋᕐᕋᕐ
Sanikiluaq

Support for employment

We encourage the project to go ahead for our descendents' sake and that all employment should be accessible to all Inuit as career and professions.

Closure and Ramification

Milne Inlet Tote road including the culverts should be left the way it is when the mine is finished if it ever is exhaust. The hunters and Inuit can use the road when hunting and leisure times.

Blasting Explosives

When blasting, they should use all the precautionary measures and safety nets (whatever it may be) to prevent unexpected accidents. Blasters should be professionals and experienced that are hired to do blasting. Mats should also be used.

Caribou Crossings

Long time caribou biologist, [name removed] may be able to or willing to help us in identifying caribou crossings inline with their natural century old trails.

Biggest Concerns

- Caribou and land mammals
- Blasting explosives close to lakes
- All Sea mammals
- Inuit education and credential development
- Children in schools
- Human resources management
- employee families

Caribou and land mammals

Impact on caribou on their migrating route and movement and the calving area. Government of Nunavut Caribou biologist should be assisting the Inuit hunters as to where the caribou are and to provide information to us and other Inuit organizations. ... Caribou biologist who would provide aerial information and abundance of caribou in the region should be commissioned who also would be monitoring and collecting data on the whole issue of caribou monitoring and mitigating the impact.

Will the BIMC be willing to participate in the monitoring and collecting information that can be used by schools and universities since the information is limited if not in non-existence. Caribou management is priority number one.

We will try to keep up in producing the meeting minutes in the absence of recording secretary.

Next meeting

Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 1:30pm in Qaggivik.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by the Chairperson at 10:00pm



ᑖᑭᑖᑦᑕᑦ ᐃᑭᐃᑦ ᑲᑕᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᑦᑕᑖᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᑭᑦᑕᑦᑲᑦ ᐃᑭᑦᑲᑦ
Serving the
communities of

Pond Inlet Mary River Project Committee – Meeting Minutes May 5, 2012

ᐃᑦᐱᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Arctic Bay

ᑭᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Clyde River

ᑲᑭᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Grise Fiord

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Hall Beach

ᐃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Igloolik

ᐃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Iqaluit

ᑭᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Kimmirut

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pangnirtung

ᑭᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pond Inlet

ᑖᑭᑖᑦᑕᑦᑲᑦ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Resolute Bay

ᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Sanikiluaq

Present:

Jesse Nutarak.....	Chairperson
Elijah K. Panipakoocho.....	Mittimatalik HTO rep
Abraham Kublu.....	Hamlet council rep
Joel Nashook.....	Member-at-large
Kooneeloosie Nutarak.....	Member-at-large

Absent:

Jayko Alooosie.....	Member-at-large, excused (out-of-town)
---------------------	--

1. Opening of meeting

The meeting was opened by the Chairperson at 1:15 pm, and a prayer was given.

2. Agenda

No formal agenda - continuation from May 3rd, 2012 on Fortier letter, EA Lead.

Media

In the news media, Mary River Project life span is expected to be around 37 years while the original estimate was 21 years for the first deposite.

Concerns:

When land was used for hunting, Inuksuit and landmarks were erected all over the Mary River area, but they are being destroyed especially in the Takmaartarvik area where it is believed to be old settlement with all the sightings of camp and sod houses.

Inuit had special landmarks that were supposed not to be disturbed or destroyed and even removed, these areas were gathering and meeting places for all the Baffin region Inuit.

Land formation

Chief archaeologist of Government of Nunavut, had said there are navigational implements and formations that were the longest that has ever been found and these areas should be protected. They have significant importance to Inuit history and should be well preserved and recorded. There are other types of Inuksuks that are not else where, they are called sannaliit, the rocks and/or stones formed to point where fish is plenty in the lake or river. Inuit used these rock formations to find fishing spots and they are navigational objects and they should not be destroyed or disturbed otherwise it will no longer point to intended area.

Caribou should not be prevented from crossing the railroad or otherwise disturbed with their migrating routes and calving grounds. Other land animals ie: wolves, foxes and others should also be protected and taken into consideration, since they too live and feed in the area that are all part of and make up of the land.

Underwater Devices

Federal Government and all their departments SHOULD NOT authorize the use of underwater devices or sonars that are used to scare the sea mammals from the area.

Ducks and other sea birds will also be impacted including their prey

Land mammals will be impacted, we may not notice drastic change or the impacts within 5 to 10 years but it will eventually crawl upon us.



ᖃᖅᑕᑦ ᐃᑭᐃᑦ ᑲᑲᐅᐅᑦᑲᑦ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᑲᐅᐅᑦᑲᑦ
ᐃᑲᑦᑕᐅᑦ ᐅᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Serving the
communities of

ᐃᐅᐅᐅᑦ
Arctic Bay

ᖃᐅᑲᑦ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᑲᐅᑲᑦ
Clyde River

ᐃᑲᐅᐅᑦ
Grise Fiord

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
Hall Beach

ᐃᑲᑲᑦ
Igloolik

ᐃᑲᑲᑦ
Iqaluit

ᖃᖅᑕᑦ
Kimmituk

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
Pangnirtung

ᖃᖅᑕᑦ
Pond Inlet

ᖃᖅᑕᑦ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
Resolute Bay

ᑲᑲᑲᑦ
Sanikiluaq

Spouses of employees in the mine will need to be cared for in terms nutritious food and access to programs that their children may be able to utilized while their other parent is working in the mine. Provide programs for spouses of the employees at the mine and be or have access to nutritional food.

Break for 10 mins
Resumed at 2:49pm

The population in Mary River will climb and increase when its in full operation, thus garbage and other debris on the ground will impact the environment. The environment will need to be cleaned up periodically.

Surrounding communities should take part in recycling materials. All the of things brought from south need to be transported back but no funds. Re-use, recycle and refill.

If there are recycling units or materials being re-use, communities should also be encouraged to reuse and or recycle.

The whole process can be written and used for schools and other public institutions or even experiment the use of recycle or reuse, environmental stewardship and management of resources in the newly developed Territory.

Member suggesting that there should be swimming pool available to the employees in the mine, physical exercises can prevent fatigue, stress and relief of depression.

Mary River Impact

Changes will be seen, the community will be impacted and people will have to be given an opportunity, in any way possible, otherwise there'll be more social problems.

Underwater devices and/or sonars disturb and scare sea mammals in all of the Nunavut Settlement Area and should ceased to be used especially if there purpose is to scare them off.

The land has or was selected because of its resources and an opportunity to participate in obtaining economic base for Tununiq region when the land selection took place prior to creation of Nunavut. Inuit should be given first priority in obtaining employment and other benefits pertaining to Mary River project or its land use by the company.

Mine Closure

Old sites that has already been destroyed; what have been done and what are they planning to do? They should provide compensation for destroying of old sites and areas significant to Inuit history. Re-usable energy should be developed and utilized, so that the surrounding communities can try something in re-using alternate energy.

The plants that absorb dirt and moist should be used to assist the environment on its reproduction cycle.

In the year 2040, if you vision that there wouldn't be as abundan of animal as there re today.

The opening of Northwest Passage should also be taken consideration, its eminent that there'll be vessel traffic with gigantic ships in the region. The impact on people will be great, Mary River will be good for employment and other wealth necessities. It will also impact on land and enviornment including mammals, both on land sea. Inuit can only be participants on the development and exploratory phases of the proposed project and it is their right to be full participants.



ᖃᖅᑕᑦ ᐃᑭᐃᑦ ᑲᑕᖅᑲᑦᑲᑦ Qikiqtani Inuit Association

ᐱᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
ᐃᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ ᐃᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Serving the
communities of

ᐃᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Arctic Bay

ᖃᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Cape Dorset

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Clyde River

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Grise Fiord

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Hall Beach

ᐃᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Igloolik

ᐃᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Iqaluit

ᖃᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Kimmirut

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pangnirtung

ᖃᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Pond Inlet

ᖃᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Qikiqtarjuaq

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Resolute Bay

ᑲᑲᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ
Sanikiluaq

The committee needs to know the status of wildlife position, statistics or otherwise, what level of mercury or other contaminants are present on all animals. We will need to work very closely with governments and strive for benefits that are rightly belong to Inuit as per Nunavut Land Claims Agreement.

The governments are now working to shorten the review process in or on any given department, this move could be a devastation to Inuit as it will even shorten the opportunity to fully participate in decision making process.

All the data collected from research on land, sea, waters and air should all been maintained and kept in one central venue, Research laboratory should be erected and in operation, affiliation with University from south with an objective to create Nunavut University.

Oceans North are doing something but who are these people, what is their purpose? And who do they represent and report to? People should be fully aware that these organizations exist and know what their doing and for what.

The committee wants to be informed as to the level of contaminants present in the animals and fish, and that the information should be provided on timely and acceptable fashion.

Next meeting

Date of next meeting will be on Monday, May 7th, 2012

Adjournment

The meeting was declared closed by the Chairperson at 5:04pm