

From: Bathurst Inlet Lodge [bathurst@internorth.com]

Sent: Wednesday, July 07, 2004 1:08 PM

To: zmoghal@nirb.nunavut.ca

Cc: 'Agnes Egotak'; 'Alan Ehrlich'; 'Andy Couvrette'; 'Andy Mitchell'; 'Anjala Puvananathan'; 'Anna Kaotalok'; 'Anne Snider'; 'B. & E. Fanning'; 'Barry Putt'; 'Bathurst Inlet HTO'; 'Ben Hubert'; 'Bernie MacIsaac'; 'Bill Klassen'; 'Bill Tilleman'; 'Bob Phillips'; 'Brendan Bell'; 'Brian Aglukark'; 'Carl McLean'; 'Carolyn Dunn'; 'Carson Gillis'; 'Charlie Evalik'; 'Chris Alway'; 'Christopher King'; 'Colette Meloche'; 'Connie Kapolak'; 'Dave Smith'; 'David Abernethy'; 'David H. Searle'; 'David J. Robinson'; 'Debra Myles'; 'Derrick Moggy'; 'Don Law-West'; 'Doug Page'; 'Doug Soloway'; 'Doug Stenton'; 'Earle Baddaloo'; 'Elwood Johnston'; 'Enuk Pauloosie'; 'Eric Hopkins'; 'Francois Berniolles'; 'Frank Pokiak'; 'Gavin More'; 'Geoffrey Clark'; 'George Hakongak'; 'Gjoa Haven HTO'; 'Gord MacKay'; 'Gordon Norberg'; 'Grant Scott'; 'Greg Smith'; 'Henry Zoe'; 'HTO'; 'Jack Kaniak'; 'Jaida Ohokannoak'; 'Janice Traynor'; 'Jason Sharp'; 'Jeremy Ford'; 'Jim Stevens'; 'Jim Talbot'; 'Jimmy Oleekatalik'; 'Joel Holder'; 'John Donihee'; 'John Morrison'; 'John Ramsey'; 'Josee Galipeau'; 'Joseph Haluksit'; 'Keith Morrison'; 'Kevin O'Reilly'; 'Kugaaruk HTO'; 'Larry Carpenter'; 'Mark Calliou'; 'Mary Ellen Thomas'; 'Maureen Bungaard'; 'Melodie McLeod'; 'Michael McLeod'; 'Michael Setterington'; 'Michelle Boyle'; 'Mike Vaydik'; 'Mitch Taylor'; 'Monica Angohiatok'; 'NWT/ Nunavut Chamber of Commerce'; 'Page Burt'; 'Paula Pacholek'; 'Pete Ewins'; 'Peter Enzoe'; 'Peter Scholz'; 'Philippe di Pizzo'; 'Phyllis Beaulieu'; 'Rachel Crapeau'; 'Raymond Kamookak'; 'Robert Eno'; 'Robert Hornal'; 'Robin A. Fonger'; 'Robyn Abernethy-Gillis'; 'Scottie Edgerton'; 'Shelagh Montgomery'; 'Suzanne Richards'; 'Taloyoak HTO'; 'Tania Gordanier'; 'Tim Byers'; 'Tony Iacobelli'; 'Tony Keen'; 'Vern Christensen'; 'William Beveridge'; 'Zabey Nevitt'

Subject: Bathurst Port and Road Project Newsletter

Dear Zainab:

These are comments from the Bathurst Road and Port Committee and we expect this e-mail to be filed on the public registrar and in addition be presented to the Board.

First off I do like the newsletter for communication but I believe this is the first time I have seen this type of communication for NIRB projects that are forwarded for their review process.

Although I think the newsletter is a great form of communication the information in them must tell the whole story of what needs to be communicated to those receiving this form of communication.

I was informed that this initial meeting was very preliminary and not something that our Committee really needed to attend especially when no members were available on the dates set and that the Committee requested the dates to be changed or that NIRB would make arrangements for the Chair of our Committee to attend in Cambridge Bay; neither of which were accommodated by NIRB. By the way that the newsletter presents the outcome of the meetings and the fact that a summary of the meetings has been provided in a project specific newsletter makes me wonder that others and those who attended will see the importance of the meeting and who did and who did not attend. Being representatives of the closest effect community to the project many will wonder why there was not representation. This will be enforced with the fact that we requested the reading of our letter sent to NIRB prior to the meetings. Obviously we were informed that our letter will be on the public register but this is not what was requested however needs to be included in the project communications. It was specifically requested that the letter be read. Another request that of our committee made to NIRB but was not accommodated. The letter that we sent to you was our representative at these meetings so it should have been read as if a representative from our committee was in attendance. I hope that this type of request is granted in the future as the committee members are from a remote community and have little access to meetings when located in locations that are not easily accessible or economically feasible.

From my discussions with you and Dionne at the airport in Yellowknife (mostly Dionne) she said that the proponents Project Manager (Tony Keen) and both Charlie Avalik and Charlie Lyle (KIA) were not in attendance at these meetings. These three gentlemen are the proponents that have met with our committee in Bathurst and it is Tony Keen that has distributed all of the project information to us. I would suggest that their absence at the meeting is also an important fact that should be recognized. I do know however that the proponent was represent by two other gentlemen their names I do not know.

Several points about the information provided in the newsletter.

Albert Ehalok states " we were thrilled at the turn out. Overall we had sixty people attend, many in Yellowknife. This was the first step in preparing for the review of this important project". The emphasis on "thrilled by the turnout" suggests that the main players may have been in attendance. This in our view was not the case from a proponents perspective and ours. Also he states " this important project" . If it is important then maybe the comments in our committees letter should have been taken more seriously

when we requested that the meeting dates be changed, we could not attend, and our letter should have been read at the meetings so that our comments could have been heard aloud not just placed on the registrar where our comments may not be viewed by many, unless of coarse they were to visit your website or visit your office. This I am unsure if some or many of the attendees would put the effort in doing so.

“ The scoping sessions were to facilitate development of issues, components, resources and project alternatives in relation to the Environmental Review of the project proposal.....” Again our attendance we feel should have been as important to hear the views and input by the community that maybe most affected and another reason our letter should have been read.

In the list of public comments Intervener funding is not mentioned and I believe this was verbally discussed with both Dionne and Stephanie prior to the meetings. If the community is to be involved in the review process, the discussion of issues, determination of the proponents requirements, attendance at meetings outside of the community and the ability to have technical people assist the committee in understanding the technical issues of such a large undertaking then we must be accommodated and allowed to participate what ever the cost whether it be a financial cost or the cost of rescheduling meetings.

Also noted in the newsletter it is NIRB’s intention to send staff to the communities to meet with the residents, committees and others to discuss this project and the issues related to the review process and the scope of the review. It is important for our committee and the groups of people and organizations that it represents to be fully accommodated when it comes time to schedule these meetings, in other words the schedule for these meetings must be at a time in which the community residence and committee will be present in Bathurst Inlet.

In the Minister’s letter to NIRB identifying the level of review the Minister states “it is my view that the scoping exercise to determine the project specific guidelines that are to be issued to the project proponent for the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), as required by section 12.5.2 will be critical”.. We emphasize the Ministers words “will be critical”. This suggests to our committee that our attendance at these meeting is extremely important and thus again the reason why we wanted a change in the recent meeting dates for Yellowknife and Cambridge Bay as well as the reason why we wanted our letter read.

The reading of the letter would have provided to all attendees the importance that we place on the meetings and our participation.

The Minister also states “ Section 12.2.27 requires NIRB to take all necessary steps to promote public awareness and participation”. The necessary steps, we think, have not been taken by NIRB by conducting these meeting at a time when so many interested parties could not attend (i.e., key people that represent the proponent as well as our committee).

The Minister also states “I will be looking to NIRB for their advice on who should participate and who may require funding, and would request a detailed analysis for participant funding be included in your project budget submission to the Nunavut Implementation Panel”.

These remarks that the Minister has included in his letter suggest the intervener funding should have been stated as one of the nine (or number 10) issues that need to be considered in the formulation of review guidelines.

The Bathurst Inlet Road and Port Committee very much wants to work with NIRB on this proposed project but we also want to be respected as an important group of people, residence, organizations that could potentially be impacted the most. The fact that the consideration of delaying the initial meetings, accommodating the request to assist a member of the committee to attend one of the meetings and the fact that the committees’ letter sent to NIRB was not read aloud suggests that the committee’s concerns are not being overly considered, especially at the very early stages of this proposed project review.

Our committee would be happy to meet with NIRB at the earliest possible time, and would like to have a more detailed set of minutes taken at both meeting. Although the newsletter is a great idea it is not detailed enough and it can be seen as not representing the views of all participants.

We appreciate your time to read our correspondence and hope that all aspects of it are taken into consideration for the future.

Yours truly,

Craig J. Thomas
Secretary/Treasurer
Bathurst Road and Port Committee (BRPC)
c/o PO Box 820

Yellowknife, NT
X1A 2N6
ph. (867)920-4330
fax:(867)920-4263
bathurst@internorth.com