

RECEIVED

By Licence Administrator at 9:27 am, May 30, 2011

Date: 26 May, 2011 4:30-5:30pm

Group/Organization: Nunavut Water Board (NWB)

Meeting Location: Hatch Office by Conference

PRESENT:

Baffinland Representatives – Jim Millard, Oliver Curran, Fernand Beaulac

Hatch Representatives – John Binns, John Donetz, Tessa Mackay

NWB – Dionne, Richard Dwyer, Sean Joseph (Project Manager), David Hohnstein (Project Director)

The meeting notes were recorded by OC.

Meeting Minutes

JM – introduces the group and the meeting objectives.

FB – outlines where we are in process (submission of DEIS, submission of IR's from agencies). NIRB has now asked for BIM to provide a document outlining what changes to the assessment will result from removal of the road haulage alternative.

Dionne – We did receive DEIS and it has been reviewed for conformity. Conformity is being completed. NWB needs to give their perspective on where DEIS is deficient or will need more emphasis. Examples would be spill contingency plans with respect to construction and operation. This relates to how pre development works and operational works will be divided into the different phases of the Project and types of licenses.

Dionne – NWB apologizes for delay and needs to work out the different thresholds as to what is required in the DEIS and what relates to future license requirements. This will be provided. Next 2 weeks is Dionne's commitment. There are several other projects and a meeting with INAC that causes the delay.

FB – Ok. Submission from water board is very important to maintain timelines within the coordinated process.

Dionne – On June 20th, Sean will be in Cambridge Bay with NIRB to discuss thresholds.

Perhaps BIM can be there?

FB – Yes, we can be there. We will make ourselves available.

Dionne - suggests that meetings with NIRB and proponent need to include NWB. All 3 parties should be involved.

FB – Agreed

FB – Document outlining road haulage changes will be provided from BIM by June 13th.

Dionne – This means that NWB would need to provide their information on thresholds by this time?

FB – Correct.

Dionne – We will sort our feedback for the DEIS based on what is process and what is IR. For example, QIA's IR's that relate to the NWB are not IR's but related more to process. NWB did not submit letter in relation to QIA's IR's since they were process related and not IR's.

FB – We agree that process related IR's are not requests for more information within the DEIS and it would be very helpful for BIM if the NWB could separate IR's as suggested.

FB – Is the NWB concerned with BIM's engagement with agencies?

Dionne - not as it relates to the DEIS. The NWB encourages engagement. The NWB just needs to be kept informed and the NWB concern is whether the NWB can keep up with the process. The NWB just needs to ensure that everything is being considered. The NWB encourages BIM to keep records so that they can become part of the public record. The NWB encourage transparency.

FB – We would like to present the detailed information that the NWB requires as a separate chapter within the FEIS.

Dionne – For the Water License Application the NWB is trying to determine the level of detail required. It is our view that you would need stamped drawings issued for construction. The NWB is currently struggling with this.

FB – In most jurisdictions, conceptual drawings are acceptable on condition that stamped drawings/as-built drawings are provided before start-up of the facilities (60 to 90 days prior to start up).

Dionne – For another project the proponent did not live up to this commitment. Therefore regulators are taking a harder line on the review and level of details required in submissions. The NWB is currently struggling with this issue and is in consultation with the Association of Professional Engineers as well as other agencies regarding level of details and what information requires stamped drawings/documents for the application stage of the permitting process.

Dionne – It is requested that input/suggestions from BIM/Hatch on what could be workable for this process would be appreciated. This would assist NWB in their discussions with other agencies and regulators. NWB suggested BIM contact Maurice Reichardt (SRK) who is also struggling with this issue on another Project.

FB - BIM committed to provide NWB a position paper on this issue to be passed on to the NWB the week of June 13.

Dionne – Perhaps June 19th (while Sean is in Cambridge Bay) would be good to sit down and review the Hatch documentation (proposed engineered drawings and timing).

FB – We will make ourselves available for that date.

FB – We have an aggressive schedule and there is a lot of staging required for shipment of ore in 2017.

Dionne – You need to have a procedural document laid out on what you are requiring for pre development as per 10.12.2.

FB – In Q3 we will provide a scope of work for pre development and anything required for staging. This is how NIRB suggested we approach it.

Dionne – There is a gap in that pre development was not adequately addressed in DEIS and now you need to submit a supplemental pre development package prior to the FEIS. This will cause a delay in Technical Review since it was not provided in DEIS.

FB – This is why we need this pre development supplemental document ASAP.

FB – Would it be useful to have frequent working sessions up to submission of FEIS. It would be useful from BIM's perspective.

Dionne – This would be fine to keep things on track. They would need to occur with NIRB so that both agencies can be involved with decisions being made. NIRB is still the lead and we fit into their process.

FB – Any other points you would like to mention?

Dionne – For any correspondence please keep us informed. NWB has the role of trying to provide some confirmation of understanding of different levels of requirements at each stage of the process. It will be important for everyone to take NWB thresholds (regulatory and EA) and determine where the distinctions lie.