

Sent: Friday, May 28, 2004 12:02 PM

Subject: 2. Was Kugluktuk considered as a location for scoping meetings, and if so, why was our community not selected as a site for these meetings? As indicated NIRB is aware that Kugluktuk, umigmaktuk and Bathrust Inlet will have Re: BIPAR Scoping Meetings

Hi Philippe,

Any advice on responding to this email: my response in blue.

First let me say these scoping meeting are initial meetings to set the stage. If it is determined through feedback from interested parties such as yourself that additional scoping meeting need to be held, then NIRB can consider the request.

In response to your individual questions.

1. What was the rationale used by NIRB to determine the location of Scoping meetings?

At this point in time the NIRB has a very small window of opportunity to get the project started given that the Doris hearing was delayed for one month and based on NIRB existing work schedule only had a one week window in which to schedule the meetings. Several factors were considered in this decision:

- Minister direction to assess transboundary implication of the project; as this is the first transboundary project NIRB has had to address; many outstanding question on process etc need to be clarified and therefore key to determine potential parties outside of Nunavut therefore meeting in Yellowknife assessed as needed. NIRB is aware that the community of Kugluktuk will have issues.
- NIRB has currently advertised for two Hearing coordinators for this project who's main function will be to solicit community participation and ensure community concerns posted on the public registry for the Board to consider.
- NIRB head office in Cambridge Bay
- Proponent head office in Cambridge Bay
- Given time for the meeting it was thought that most community representative would be participating in traditional activities on the land during this time of year and alternative arrangements were proposed.

2. Was Kugluktuk considered as a location for scoping meetings, and if so, why was our community not selected as a site for these meetings?

As indicated NIRB is aware that Kugluktuk, umigmaktuk and Bathrust Inlet will have significant concerns with this project. NIRB is in process of hiring Hearing coordinators to do more one on one personal scoping within each of these communities. This is the first scoping meeting NIRB will be holding for a project of this scale and selected Yellowknife and Cambridge bay as initial locations.

3. What is the potential for including a scoping meeting in Kugluktuk at this stage?

The NIRB given time constraints (i.e. if initial meeting are not held as proposed next alternate dates would be in September); The Board wanted to act quickly on the file. The process for the development of draft guidelines will take several months and NIRB proposes that the Hearing coordinators will do one-one meeting with community to address scoping issues. NIRB will ensure that Kugluktuk has the opportunity to provide comments at this stage just not at the June meetings.

4. I have quickly reviewed your various Board procedures, and I have not come across with a reference to any mechanism for facilitating public and community involvement in scoping meetings in other communities. If a delegation from our community wished to participate in these scoping meetings, and could not as a result of them being held in another location, what options would exist to allow this to happen?

NIRB would be willing to entertain paying the costs for one hamlet representative to attend either the Yellowknife or Cambridge Bay meeting. This is not a standard practice of the Board.

5. If little if any Kugluktuk community involvement were to take place during the existing sessions, would there be any other venue for this community to provide meaningful input into the issues identified in item 1 a thru g of the letter?

Definitely yes through the one-one community consultation being developed by NIRB to take place throughout the summer through the hearing coordinator.

Should you wish to discuss this matter further please do not hesitate to give me a call.

Regards,
Dionne

Dionne Filiatrault, P. Eng.,
Manager Technical Services
Nunavut Water Board & Nunavut Impact Review Board
P.O. Box 119,
Gjoa Haven, NU X0B 1J0
Tel: (867) 360-6338
Fax: (867) 360-6369
email: srtech@nwb.nunavut.ca

----- Original Message -----

From: [Stephanie Briscoe](#)
To: 'Dionne Filiatrault'
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2004 11:04 AM
Subject: FW: BIPAR Scoping Meetings

Can you take a stab at this...

Steph

-----Original Message-----

From: Alex Buchan [<mailto:mgrcomdv@polarnet.ca>]
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2004 11:02 AM
To: sbriscoe@nirb.nunavut.ca
Cc: 'Grant Scott'
Subject: BIPAR Scoping Meetings

Hello Stephanie.

We have just received a copy of your letter to the BIPAR group outlining the Scoping process for this project. Given the magnitude of this project, and the level of public and Council interest in BIPAR over the last 2 years, it will be provided to our Council at our next regular meeting.

In order to provide to provide background into this issue and anticipating some questions from Council that may arise, I would like to request the following:

1. What was the rationale used by NIRB to determine the location of Scoping meetings?

At this point in time the NIRB has a very small window of opportunity to get the project started given that the Doris hearing was delayed for one month and based on NIRB existing work schedule only had a one week window in which to schedule the meetings. Several factors were considered in this decision:

- Minister direction to assess transboundary implication of the project; as this is the first transboundary project NIRB has had to address; many outstanding question on process etc need to be clarified and therefore key to determine potential parties outside of Nunavut therefore meeting in Yellowknife assessed as needed. NIRB is aware that the community

31/05/2004

of Kugluktuk will have issues.

- NIRB has currently advertised for two Hearing coordinators for this project who's main function will be to solicit community participation and ensure community concerns posted on the public registry for the Board to consider.
 - NIRB head office in Cambridge Bay
 - Propent head office in Cambridge Bay
2. Was Kugluktuk considered as a location for scoping meetings, and if so, why was our community not selected as a site for these meetings? As indicated NIRB is aware that Kugluktuk, umigmaktuk and Bathrust Inlet will have significant concerns with this project. NIRB is in process of hiring Hearing coordinators to do more one on one personal scoping withing each of these communities. This is the first scoping meeting NIRB will be holding for a project of this scale and selected yellowknife and cambridge bay as initial locations.
 3. What is the potential for including a scoping meeting in Kugluktuk at this stage?
 4. I have quickly reviewed your various Board procedures, and I have not come across with a reference to any mechanism for facilitating public and community involvement in scoping meetings in other communities. If a delegation from our community wished to participate in these scoping meetings, and could not as a result of them being held in another location, what options would exist to allow this to happen?
 5. If little if any Kugluktuk community involvement were to take place during the existing sessions, would there be any other venue for this community to provide meaningful input into the issues identified in item 1 a thru g of the letter?

Our next regular meeting will be held on Monday. The agenda for this is pretty well set and I do not know if this item will be discussed. However, the next one after that is June 7th.

Regards,
Alex