



NIRB File No.: 09MN003
KIA File No.: KVPL08D02
AANDC File No.: 5510-5-25-3
DFO File No.: 08-HCAA-CA7-00002
NRCan File No: NT-070
EC File No.: 4703 001 006

February 27, 2013

Kiggavik Distribution List

Sent via email

Re: Schedule of Technical Meeting and Pre-Hearing Conference Dates for the NIRB's Review of AREVA Resources Canada Inc.'s Kiggavik project and Further Direction on Format of Technical Review Comment Submissions

Dear Parties:

On February 6, 2013 the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB or Board) commenced the technical review and public comment period for AREVA Resources Canada Inc.'s (AREVA or Proponent) *Draft* Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Kiggavik project (NIRB File No. 09MN003). As indicated in previous correspondence to parties, the Board has requested that technical review comments be submitted to our office on or before **April 8, 2013**. Following the receipt of technical review comment submissions, and offering the Proponent an opportunity to provide an overview response to these comments, the NIRB will be hosting a Technical Meeting in Rankin Inlet and a Pre-Hearing Conference (PHC) in Baker Lake for the Review of the Kiggavik project proposal. The NIRB is now able to confirm the scheduling for these events as follows:

May 28-31, 2013: Technical Meeting in *Rankin Inlet* at the Siniktarvik Hotel and Conference Centre.

June 4-6, 2013: Community roundtable and PHC in *Baker Lake* at the Community Recreation Centre.

Parties are advised that simultaneous English-Inuktitut interpretation will be made available for the Technical Meeting, community roundtables and PHC. A draft agenda will be circulated to parties in advance of meeting dates.

Technical Meeting

As noted above, the NIRB has scheduled the Technical Meeting to be held from May 28th to May 31st, 2013 at the Siniktarvik Hotel and Conference Centre in Rankin Inlet. The Technical Meeting will involve informal, face-to-face discussions on technical matters related to the technical review comments submitted in respect of the DEIS and will aim to resolve outstanding technical issues prior to the PHC. As such, the Board is not present at this meeting and will be facilitated by the NIRB staff, and will involve the participation by the Proponent, responsible authorities and interested parties. Break-out sessions are often utilized with each break-out group (e.g., may be related to engineering, wildlife, socioeconomic issues, etc.) being facilitated by the NIRB staff. The agenda for the meeting will be developed to reflect the outstanding issues raised in the technical review comments submitted by parties on April 8, 2013 and will be circulated to allow additional input prior to being finalized. Parties and the Proponent will be asked to submit any presentation or printed materials required for the Technical Meeting following the receipt of technical review comments and prior to the commencement of the Technical Meeting.

During the Technical Meeting, the NIRB staff will track all the commitments made by the Proponent regarding resolution of technical issues, with all commitments compiled into a list forming part of the meeting record. The list of commitments would then be carried forward to the PHC for consideration by the Board and the possible incorporation into the NIRB's PHC Decision Report.

Pre-Hearing Conference

The NIRB has scheduled the PHC for June 4th to June 6th, 2013 to be held in Baker Lake at the Community Recreation Centre. The objective of the PHC is to allow for discussion of such matters as: timelines for submissions and the Final Hearing, future meetings, evidence, document exchange, Final Hearing venue(s), Final Hearing format and any other matters related to the logistics of the Final Hearing. The PHC provides an opportunity for parties to present to the Board those issues that were resolved during the Technical Meeting, and those issues which remain outstanding. The PHC also provides an opportunity for the public to provide the NIRB with input regarding the information contained in the DEIS. While the Technical Meeting provides a structured but largely informal opportunity for technical experts to resolve outstanding issues, participation in the PHC is somewhat more restricted and formalized, and generally has more limited participation, with key individuals representing each responsible authority and the Proponent.

The Board will facilitate a Community Roundtable session in Baker Lake in conjunction with the PHC with representation from communities identified as potentially impacted by the proposed project in order to provide an opportunity for meaningful participation in the Board's Review of the Kiggavik project. The NIRB will work with the Hamlet offices and other organizations within each community to identify up to three representatives from each which will be invited to attend these meetings, with costs for travel and lodging to be covered by the NIRB. Community representatives will be briefed on the format of the PHC during an information session and will then have an opportunity to question the Proponent directly regarding its project proposal and provide the NIRB with input during the community roundtable.

The community roundtable in Baker Lake will include participation from representatives from Arviat, Chesterfield Inlet, Coral Harbour, Rankin Inlet, Repulse Bay, Whale Cove, and the host community of Baker Lake.

Following the PHC, the Board will issue a PHC decision which will provide direction to the Proponent for its preparation of a Final EIS and which outlines the procedures for parties' review of the Proponent's Final EIS once submitted, and for the Final Hearing.

Next Steps in the NIRB's Review Process

The next steps in the NIRB's Review of the Kiggavik proposal are as follows:

- April 8, 2013:** Submission of technical review comments to the NIRB by **12:00 pm MST**. The NIRB has provided a suggested format for technical review comment submissions in the attached Appendix A.
- May 8, 2013:** AREVA to provide response to technical review comments.
- May 13, 2013:** Circulation of *draft* agenda for the NIRB technical meeting.
- May 28-31, 2013:** Technical Meeting to be held in Rankin Inlet.
- June 4-6, 2013:** Community roundtable and PHC to be held in Baker Lake.
- July 4, 2013:** The NIRB to issue its PHC Report for the Kiggavik Project.

Format for Technical Review Comments

The technical review will serve as a detailed review of the DEIS with the intent of analyzing the completeness and quality of the information presented by the Proponent in its DEIS. The NIRB is requesting that responsible authorities, interested parties and those with specialist advice provide their technical review comments to the NIRB by the conclusion of the public comment period, at **12:00 pm MST, April 8, 2013**. As outlined in previous correspondence, technical review comments should include the following:

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

Further, the NIRB has provided a suggested format and approach for parties' development of technical review comments. The Board requests that parties consider providing their comment submissions in a similar format to that outlined in the attached Appendix A. To ensure public accessibility, and recognizing that the technical review comments will be discussed at the community roundtable and the PHC in June, submissions should be provided in a fully functional, electronically searchable Word or PDF file and must contain an Executive Summary which provides an overview of the key issues presented in both English and Inuktitut. Technical review comments should address the points set out above, and should provide specific reference to relevant sections of the Proponent's DEIS and any other supporting materials (i.e., volume/document, section, page number, etc.) as may be included and/or referenced within the comment submission.

The NIRB appreciates the continued support and participation of all parties during the Board's review of this file. As a reminder, technical review comment submissions must be provided to the NIRB no later than **12:00 pm MST, April 8, 2013**. The complete DEIS as received by the Board can be accessed online at the NIRB's public registry using the following link:

<http://ftp.nirb.ca/02-REVIEWS/ACTIVE%20REVIEWS/09MN003-AREVA%20KIGGAVIK/2-REVIEW/>.

Furthermore, in order to ensure adequate logistical planning, the NIRB requests that parties include with technical review comment submissions, an indication of the number of representatives anticipated to be in attendance at the Technical Meeting and at the PHC.

If you have any questions or require further clarification related to the NIRB's Review process, please do not hesitate to contact Sophia Granchinho, Senior Technical Advisor, at sgranchinho@nirb.ca or (867) 793-4633.

Sincerely,



Amanda Hanson
Director, Technical Services
Nunavut Impact Review Board

cc: Tammy Van Lambalgen, AREVA Resources Canada Inc.
Diane Martens, AREVA Resources Canada Inc.

Attachment: Appendix A: Suggested Format for Technical Review Comment Submissions

Appendix A: Suggested Format for Technical Review Comment Submissions

Format & File Size

Parties are requested to provide technical review comment submissions in a fully functional, electronically searchable Word or PDF file. Noting the current constraints with respect to internet bandwidth and speed, the NIRB requests that all submissions, including any maps, diagrams etc. be submitted as individual files no larger than 5 MB (note this may require that more than one file is submitted to make up the technical review comment submission).

Executive Summary

To ensure public accessibility, and recognizing that the technical review comments will be discussed at the community roundtables and Pre-Hearing Conferences, submissions must contain an executive summary (approximately 1-2 pages in length) which provides an overview of the key issues presented and conclusions reached in both English and Inuktitut.

Table of Contents

While not required, a Table of Contents will assist the Proponent and other reviewers to efficiently locate information within the documentation and to easily reference section/page numbers within the technical comment submission in a future response (Proponent) and during the Technical Meeting and/or Pre-Hearing Conference.

Introduction

Submissions should include an introductory section describing the parties' mandate and outlining the capacity in which comments are provided, including the following:

- Relevant aspects of the organization's mandate and jurisdiction
- List of general subjects/sections reviewed
- Indication that comments have been submitted for all issues identified
- Statement of capacity in which comments are provided (e.g., responses are offered as expert advisor, intervener, consultant, etc.)

Technical Comments

Parties are asked to ensure that technical review comments address the points set out below, providing specific reference to relevant sections of the Proponent's DEIS and any other supporting materials (i.e., volume/document, section, page number, etc.) as may be included and/or referenced within the comment submission:

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

- Any comments regarding additional information which would be useful in assessing impacts – and reasons to support any comments made.

Parties may find efficiencies in structuring comment submissions by issue, and are asked, where possible, to align their submission in accordance with the ordering of materials as presented within the EIS Guidelines and DEIS submission. Parties may also consider organizing technical review comment submissions in a manner similar to that utilized in the preparation of Information Requests, noting that however presented, the issues, supporting rationale, recommendations and other relevant information presented should be clearly defined and that comments should follow a uniform structure throughout the submission. Note that a tabular presentation may also be employed as a means of systematically organizing technical review comment submissions.