



Convention de la Baie James et du
Nord québécois
Comité fédéral d'examen Nord

James Bay and Northern Quebec
Agreement
Federal Review Panel North

ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT OF THE CANADIAN ROYALTIES INC. PROJECT IN DECEPTION BAY : WHARF CONSTRUCTION AND SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT

FEDERAL REVIEW PANEL- NORTH (FRP-N)

PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCEEDINGS

KANGIQSUJUAQ, MAY 6TH 2013

SALLUIT, MAY 7TH, 2013

**Notes from the public consultation session on the Nunavik Nickel Port
Infrastructure project in Deception Bay
May 6th 2013 19h30
Kangiqsujaq, Conference Center, gymnasium**

Inuttitut Interpreter: Aloupa Kulula

Start at 19h30: Opening by Deputy Mayor

Part I: Presentation by FRP-N, DFO, TC and CRI

- 1- Presentation by FRP-N by Claude Langlois (start 19h35)
- 2- Presentation of DFO's mandate by Judy Doré (start 20h00)
- 3- Presentation of TC's mandate by Melanie Sanschagrin (start 20h15)
- 4- Presentation of the project by CRI Gail Amyot (start 20h25)

Part II: Presentation by different organizations

- 1- Mark Tertluk. – Deputy mayor Kangiqsujaq

Q1: Scuba diver in Deception bay at the landslide site. Ecosystem is dead and can something be done to bring back to life the ecosystem in the area?

CRI answer: Fish habitat compensation projects for site affected in 2011 were proposed, Deception Bay area is part of the sites proposed. The landslide site will be restored.

Q2: Contract by CRI to same company that did the 1st wharf design?

CRI answer No, not the same and it is a brand new design.

DFO is requesting from community to submit any proposals for project compensations, improvements for fish habitats.

- 2- Aloupa Kulula – Landholding Corp (21h)

Q1: Under DFO's fisheries act, fish covers beluga whale. Compensation for loss of fish habitat is a big word. The community has concerns for the population of arctic Char, and Seal pups. To CRI, the recommendation "no ships between March 15th and June 15th" must be applied.

Q2: Boats will be coming from Finland and Russia, big boats filled with ballast waters. The community requests that ballast waters be emptied before arriving close to dock. In order to respect the distance of 250 km from high tide line, would be emptied close to Kangiqsujaq, this can cause proliferation of alien species.

Q3: For the compensation for loss of fish and marine mammals' habitat, Kangiqsujaq is closer than Salluit to marine mammals and seal habitat; therefore the compensation should take this into consideration.

3- ARK by Michael Barrett, four areas of concerns:

1. Wharf design: Were engineering experts hired by Federal Review Panel to review the design of the project? If reports are available, please provide them to CRI.
2. Management of sediments: Sediments to be dredged, what is the current volume? Initially was to be disposed at sea, DFO refused now to be disposed on earth. How will the sediments be contained, will there be a membrane in place and what is the estimated time for sediments to be drained?
3. Committees management of monitoring after the project is constructed:
The area to be dredged is an important area for harvesting, an environmental sediment management committee must be created and conditions must be established for the monitoring committee. This committee will only look at the environmental aspects of the project (no links with the IBA, contracts, etc.). It will be an independent follow-up committee.
For example, the project by Tata steel. An environmental committee must be created with representatives of community representatives, monitoring during whole length of project and formerly established.
4. Reports to be submitted to all governments: Reports produced by CRI as part of the follow-up and monitoring programs will have to be reviewed by all levels of government including by KRG.

Answer from CRI:

Questions by LHC

Yes, for restriction period from March 15 to June 15, for the ships.

Noise level limitations until July 15th, it's what CRI presented.

Ballast tanks: there are TC regulations to comply with, and if too close to Kangiqsujaq, CRI will tell the boat company to empty ballasts before reaching 250km distance from Kangiqsujaq.

No issue, CRI wants to be equal with both communities (Salluit). CRI said they have treated Kangiqsujaq equal to Salluit since the beginning. Puvirnituk, do not use the bay, but there are other measures specific to their concerns regarding the mine's infrastructures. Created PUV Inc (Landholding Corporation) and CRI met with them.

Questions by KRG

- Stability report done considered worst case scenario, membrane will be in place in the bottom of the dyke. Not in ESIS because was conceptual. Expertise was done and result is that is required.
- Sea water will be drained in 2 basins before being released in the sea.
- Environmental monitoring committee (as Tata Steel), good idea. CRI could put that in place. The intention is to do environmental survey of construction and monitoring afterwards. Will have to discuss the creation of committee with KRG. CRI asked KRG if it was the committee with Xstrata.
- CRI accepts to provide copies of all reports to KRG as well as to the Federal and provincial departments. If reports are missing, write to Gail and she will provide them.

Part III: Questions from audience

Questions from audience

1. Expression of appreciation for the presentations and the opportunity to have voice in the committee (FRP-N)
2. Don't believe in compensation of loss of habitat, if a habitat is lost it cannot be restored. We can rebuild or restore fish habitat, but doubt that habitat can fully recover.
3. Worried about dredging, it is almost guaranteed that spillage and contamination will happen in that area because there is no such thing as a perfect project. What measures will be taken by CRI?
4. Is there a way to have less sediment in suspension in the water because it is the area where fish feeds?
5. Instead of build docks in water why not build a railroad, or to transport the ore by plane? If I had the power to change I would do this, so that no spill in water, to contaminate food, marine mammals are not fixed in place they travel.

Answer from FRP-North by Claude Langlois:

FRP is here to take into consideration the public's concerns in our recommendation report. FRP learned a lot during the meeting with representatives today and from the presentations by various groups tonight. It might orient the authorization or not to be given by the Federal Administrator, and if it goes forward we received many propositions for monitoring measures.

Question from audience

1. Recommendation for dredging in Deception Bay. Since Inuit love the arctic char and that the species are in their sea run in July and August, why not consider doing the dredging in September after the arctic char has left the sea?
2. LHC comment: the arctic char is one of the most important part of the feeding components for Inuit

Answer from DFO:

Sometimes fish habitat can't recover, that is why DFO considers some of the affected fish habitats will be destroyed. Sometimes they recover but it is very long, that is why through compensation, new habitats can be created or existing habitats can be restored and the productivity can be increased. DFO tries as much as possible to create new habitats that are equivalent to the lost ones.

Answers from FRP-N to KRG'S questions:

FRP-N asked experts from Government of Canada to review the plans and design to give us their advice. Some questions were sent to CRI based on the information submitted by the proponent to FRP-N in December 2012.

Answers from CRI to KRG's questions: The FRP-N questions were received last Friday. The answers will be sent to KRG and to other governments.

Answer from FRP-N: Since the design has changed compared to the November 2012 report, some questions may not be relevant anymore.

Question from audience

Thank you for giving opportunity to being consulted because parents were not consulted. For CRI regarding compensation of loss, appreciate compensation given to Yaka. Willing to compensate food programs in community, food for community? In 2013, caribous are not migrating to the communities like they used to, so must go far to hunt, number of seals has gone down according to hunters. Poverty rate is very high. According to Université Laval study, high cost of living in region is 57% higher than in the south. Is CRI opened to provide more compensation, reduce high cost, food programs, etc.?

Temporary wharf concept and permanent wharf concept: even though she is not an engineer, she thinks as soon as there will be hurricane force wind there will be problems, the wharf will be impacted.

Answer from CRI:

The design is made to resist high winds, and based on similar designs for wharves in Nunavut. According to the IBA, compensation will be paid to the community as soon as CRI can ship concentrate, when revenue will start for CRI it will be shared.

A precision is made by Mr. Aloupa Kulula: As Farmers in the South gets financial compensation if they lose parcels of fields; this mechanism should apply for fish habitat loss (as they will lose subsistence food).

Question from audience

Compared to south Toronto, Montreal, cost of living in Kangiqsujuaq is much higher. The members of the community depend on harvesting to eat. We hope that the compensation will take that aspect in consideration.

Answer from CRI:

Food contribution projects are not approved by DFO, however CRI is open to receive proposals. Emergency response equipment in case of spills is present. Each boat has an emergency response plan.

If there is a change of dredging dates to push back to fall it will cause a delay of construction to the following year. So shipment of ore would stop from December to May. Ore will be ready to ship in August and shed would be full in winter and no shipping during winter, is a problem.

Questions from the audience

1st: wants CRI to be transparent, regarding all incidents. He requests that they be communicated, because Nunavik people will eventually know if there is an unreported incident. So he asks CRI to be transparent.

2nd: for compensation of loss habitat, since it is a learning trend, he would like DFO to figure the best way to compensate so that people will be satisfied. Ask for everybody to start finding ways to figure how to compensate.

Mr. Aloupa Kulula:

Expresses the appreciation for public consultation in Kaniqsujuaq. M. Kulula is surprised of the number of people that showed up. Hopes that the CRI project will go well. He asks again CRI to be transparent and to have an open communication to try to make things work out.

CRI, Mme Amyot:

CRI wants to be transparent. All reports are sent to LHC, and there is regular communication with Kangiqsujuaq NV and LHC. Nothing is hidden.

Chairman of FRP-N Mr. Langlois:

Thank you for your participation, on behalf of the FRP-N, DFO and TC who participated in this public consultation. Comments will be taken into consideration. A special thanks to NV, LHC, especially Mr. Kulula for his help in organizing the event.

End 22h45

**Notes from the public consultation session on the Nunavik Nickel Port
Infrastructure project in Deception Bay
May 7th 2013, 19h30
Salluit community Center**

Inuttitut interpreter: Paul Okituk

Start at 20h15: Prayer by elder

20h20: Start of the consultation

Part I: Presentation by FRP-N, DFO, TC and CRI

- 1- Presentation for the FRP-North by Claude Langlois
- 2- Presentation for DFO by Judy Doré
- 3- Presentation for TC by Melanie Sanschagrin
- 4- Presentation for CRI by Gail Amyot

Part II: Presentation by different organizations

Q1 Mayor Paulusie Saviadjuk: Deception bay is an important hunting and fishing land for the Salluit population. On the subject of compensation, the community will have to get back on that, there are some concerns with the aspects presented.

Q2 Adamie Delisle Alaku-Alaku (Makivik Corporation, Resources department, member Nunavik Nickel committee, Chair of CCCPP):

“There are major concerns, mining companies will come and go to come and get minerals. FRP-N and Federal Departments ensure good strong regulations are applied to protect fish habitats which are important. There are voices from Salluit and Wakeham Bay that express concerns. We want the voices to have weight. It has been observed that native parties will bring resolutions to committees but the ministers will rather listen to other lobbies. Here is a message to civil servants: people eat from the land, mussels and seals. The dredging in the sea will cause harm and impacts on the resources in Deception bay. Although the mining companies come and go, I want everybody to be heard today”.

Answer from FRP-N by Claude Langlois:

It is important to express the concerns and they will be taken into account in the recommendations that the panel will make to the Federal Administrator, which is why the Panel is here today.

Part III: Questions from audience

Question from audience: My point is very simple: why do you not just talk to Xstrata to put an extension on their wharf and use the same infrastructure?

Answer from FRP-N: Mme Amyot explained in her presentation the reason for this choice.

Answer from CRI: the X-Strata wharf is not big enough to receive 2 ships and not big enough to receive 2 sheds. Since the concentrates are different (physical and chemical properties) they must be managed separately. It was easier for CRI to build a second wharf and impacts were contained in one location.

Question from audience

4 points to present:

- There are concerns with the impacts on migratory birds and marine mammals, the community is dependent on them because of the high cost of foods shipped here, so we cannot rely on the groceries;
- The major and recurrent winds in Deception bay maybe due to all the projects in area;
- Some people wonder what would it take for you (ref: *proponents of development projects*) to leave us alone, would it take us to form some self-government to stop you from exploiting our resources?
- The impact of the landslide, did it have other negative impacts, was there a domino effect?

Answer from CRI: There was no domino effect observed. The loss of fish habitat was compensated by CRI. They will try to put life back on that land.

Answer from FRP-N: the panel will make sure that all additional mitigation measures that should take place will be implemented by the proponent.

Questions from member of the audience

For DFO, the term “fish” means the whole aquatic mammals and small species?

Answer from DFO: Almost everything that lives in water, so yes it covers the mammals and the small species.

2) Emptying of ballast waters will it be done close to us?

Answer from CRI: Regulation says the distance must be 150 km from the shore, and the people from Kangiqsujuaq requested more than that. CRI will see which distance and method is convenient to both communities, and respects regulations.

3) Regulations to make sure that ballast waters are emptied before coming into bays.

Answer from CRI: We are unaware of the specific aspects regulated. The verification will be made and CRI will make sure no invasive species come into the waters of Deception bay.

4) The waters can't be released too early; the boats need stabilizer to break up the ice.

Answer from CRI: The question will be asked to specialists.

5) For the dredging activities is it possible to put a wall to contain the suspended solids?

Answer from CRI: The site is too windy and because of the high tides and the strong currents it is dangerous and therefore not possible to do it. When they would remove the wall, sediments would be released.

6) Do the sediments possibly contain asbestos, and will they affect animals?

Answer from CRI: The characterization of the sediments showed non-significant concentrations of asbestos. It was undetectable in the analysis. The asbestos was measured only in the sediments around the X-Strata wharf.

Answer from FRP-N: The FRP will make sure the information is provided to the community, in response to the concerns regarding ballast waters.

Questions from member of the audience

1. What did the people from Kangiqsujuaq have to say? Do they agree to go ahead with the project? What do they think?
2. The infrastructure for the mine is it just for the mine or will CRI give it to the people to decide what they want to do?
3. If the compensation is not sufficient, in particular for loss for specific species, there should be compensation in monetary terms, probably in the millions.

Answers by FRP-N to question 1:

The panel did not have time to compile everything that was said yesterday in Kangiqsujuaq. But we can give an idea of what was expressed:

- Mention of concerns regarding ballast waters in local waters coming from Finland and European waters. Risk of introduction of alien and invasive species in their water.
- Possible impacts of dredging, suspended sediments on aquatic life, fish and fish habitat.
- Type of construction, type of wharf, expression of doubts on solidity of the structure.
- Compensation for loss of fish habitat doubts on how compensate disturbance of marine mammals.
- Reliance on marine mammals for feeding if affected in Deception bay also in Kangiqsujuaq.

Answer by DFO to question 3:

- DFO requested from the proponent to submit project proposals to compensate fish habitat losses. DFO's limits its request for fish and fish habitat because it is requested under the Fisheries Act.
- The proposals must provide sites for fish habitat restoration or habitat creation projects.
- DFO can't accept money to compensate fish habitat. Financial compensation to the communities for losses of species must come from the proponent.

Answer by CRI to question 2:

In the IBA the contract between LHC Salluit and Kangiqsujaq, NV Salluit and Puvirnituq, it is stipulated that the wharf must be offered to the community before being dismantled at the end of the mine project.

Question from audience

We are grateful that you are here to hear our concerns. The Deception bay for the Salluit community is very valuable for people of all ages and kids. We enjoy going there a lot. We are not welcomed around the Xstrata wharf; they were a bit agitated that we wanted to do our activities close to their infrastructures. We do not want to have the same situation with CRI, we request that CRI does not get agitated when we go and do our activities around your wharf.

We would like to remind the panel that the concerns raised in 2008 are still true today regarding habitats and ecosystems.

Answer from CRI: note taken

Answer from FRP-N: the concerns expressed in 2008 will be taken in consideration.

Question from audience

There is much talk about fish habitat and, it is true that we (Salluit) rely on fish, seals and vegetation to eat and, around the seabed mussels are also important. It is all a part of what we have as a diet.

The fish caught over there (*in Deception bay*), come from 3 areas where they spend winter: Lac Watts, Lac Duquet and Lac François-Malherbe

The fish go back out at sea from June to the end of August. We want to keep harvesting these lakes, to make sure we are able to do this.

During the last navigation season in Deception bay, when the landslide occurred there was also an accident. Some fuel and /or battery acids were accidentally spilled and dropped to the bottom of the bay and, some chemicals were released in the waters. This caused bad effects on the water.

And when it occurred it was not managed rapidly. If something like this occurs more attention should be taken.

Answer from CRI: Acid spill, NEAS spilled the barrel in the Bay, happened in November. The sea was turbulent. It could not be removed. According to the last news they had the authorizations to leave it in place. We refer to Michael Cameron from LHC for more information.

If a spill happens by CRI, the emergency response will be in timely manner. The emergency response plan is currently being improved with Transports Canada (TC). Actions will be taken immediately if a spill occurs.

Question from audience

I am James Greigg from TC. Seeing CRI's presentation of marine floating dock in Kangiqsujaq aroused some suspicion. I talked to my supervisor in Quebec City (TC), and to other involved stakeholders. There seems to be a lot of stress on the arm, and the ship has 6 to 9 pulls, how do you manage to move ship back and forth and tie it up?

Deception bay is exposed to Northern winds. There will be a need to inspect the conveyor. It will break down for sure. And, if it does not going to break how is it going out, turning around and coming back? TC would like to see the plans of the floating dock installation.

Answer from CRI: Part of this question, we received last Friday (ref: series of questions by FRP). CRI has not finished answering. For the filling of the ships, there are 6 sections. The ship loader can fill 3 sections at a time, and then the ship will move forward and the 3 last sections will be filled.

Reply from Mr. Greigg: Ropes will tie up the ship. The procedure will need to be evaluated by TC and see the whole picture. TC is not trying to exclude CRI's process. There are questions to be answered to see how it is going to work.

Answer from CRI: Currently engineers from TC and DFO are evaluating the information. The parameters for the winds and tides were put into the model used to build the concept. The ships will be tied up to shores.

Dust will be collected in the dust collector. There will be measures implemented to make sure there are no suspended solids discharged in the water. There will not be a lot of dust in the conveyor because it's not dry concentrate.

There is question about stability? There will be a lot of stress in the arms. For the temporary wharf, the arm is telescopic to adapt to the movement. 500 cubic meters an hour, takes 3 days to fill ship.

Question from audience

With respect to the relations between CRI and Salluit community members in Deception bay, we used to arrive unannounced to have meals and things were going well. In more recent times, we drop in the kitchen and we are not allowed to eat, we must reserve before and receive an authorization, we must go through NV mayor which extends courtesy to CRI. There is no more spontaneity. It is not something we want to see happen.

Prior to projects, they bend over backwards to give us what we need. We wonder if this will happen with CRI.

Promises are made by mining companies, to accommodate companies would move shaft's location, in response to spring thaw. There was no effort to remedy situation will also be the case with mining companies, and ignore the needs of the people.

Answer from CRI: we understand these concerns. Since there are a lot of people that are coming now to have meals, the 2 companies (Xstrata and CRI) agreed that reservations should be made 24 hours before. But in case of an emergency the meals will be served.

For requests made to Xstrata, the Nunavik Nickel committee is the best place to submit these requests. It could happen that requests are forgotten, but when they are done through proper channels, we will make sure the appropriate actions will be taken.

Question from audience

Frequency of ships arriving in Deception bay is going to double or more. There is a concern with the impacts on the ice bridge that is used to cross to harvest seals and fish. Looking at the number ships now it is manageable because the ice reseals easily after the ship has passed and it can be used. However, the increase in voyages in Deception bay will not be able to refreeze as easily and can compromise crossing over in snowmobiles. How will it be compensated?

Question from audience

The college system, what does it mean to be educated? Many things were mentioned, among these that Inuit are going to work. The training center to train Inuit to become miners, is it for that kind of mining? And where it will be done is relevant. The companies often exploit Inuit and hang them to dry, do not want to see that in Deception bay. It might occur as well this way and there should be an understanding. That route is undesirable. The way of doing things (develop mine, take away resources and disappear) is wrong; something has to be done for people who were there first.

Answer from FRP-N: Employment is a concern and for the community it is a concern, we understand that the creation of the mine will be translated in facts. The question is transferred to Mme Amyot.

Answer from CRI: traffic of ships won't double during the ice season. Measures will be taken to minimize impacts. CRI had a meeting with Xstrata in April 2013 to confirm the traffic of both ships. The 2 ships will follow each other and the track will only be open once and will be sealed afterwards. There is an agreement with Xstrata on that.

As for the employment center, a training center is already agreed in the IBA. All interested people should go to the CRI employment office and there is training offered. Training center could open in 5 to 10 yrs. For now, there is training on site for interested people who want to work within the mine.

Question from audience

Thank you for coming to Salluit to listen to our concerns. My husband was born in Deception bay, stayed there and saw the changes. For the first project there was no consultation made for the Xstrata wharf, went ahead and did it anyway. Coming here to ask us our concerns with same concepts of development is appreciated. What is happening here now, is not what happened many years ago. If you are listening to what people say and making recommendations that is all we wanted.

When CRI says there were no impacts, for the current infrastructures in Deception bay (shed and roads), I disagree. Fox habitats (holes) at the bottom of the mountain were destroyed. There are also impacts on marine mammals, not only on fish.

Answer FRP-N: will take into account the concerns raised for the temporary wharf to be constructed next summer.

Memoir by KRG, Michael Barrett:

Did you say that construction will start in summer 2013?

Answer from CRI : Yes

Doesn't the Federal Administrator first have to authorize and give conditions?

Answer from FRP-N: It is the plan submitted by the proponent CRI to build the wharf in the summer 2013.

M.B. Yesterday in Kangiqsujaq KRG submitted some concerns regarding the project.

KRG's mandate is to listen to inuit communities and support you.

4 concerns;

1. Choice of the site
2. Sediments taken out
3. Monitoring
4. Transfer of reports

1. 28 Feb 2008, the choice of the site was a concern back then, and a landslide occurred. Was it documented correctly? What was done, does CRI really know what is there? After 2 years the FRP-North should ensure technical people are looking at the report, to make sure the same site is safe for the public for the construction of the wharf.

2. In the reports, there is no mention of a membrane in the sediment storage site. Yesterday and today there is mention of a membrane. CRI should get the report straight and make sure sediments are well handled, and present the correct information in a timely manner.
3. Monitoring committees are recommended, to be committed to look only at environmental aspects and other committees looking at other aspects such as compensation, operational work, employment, etc.
4. All documents and reports should be transparent and submitted to all governments

Thank you for the translation by Paul.

Answer from FRP-N: we want to reassure that FRP-N already asked questions to the proponent about the technical aspects and, when received, the answers will be provided to the communities and KRG.

Answer from CRI: an environmental surveillance committee will be implemented; I guess will be in the FRP recommendations.

Location will explain the cause of the slide, if not understood.

Sediment management: Environment Canada did not authorize at sea disposal option, so CRI had to dispose on terrestrial site.

If someone wants a copy of reports, write to Mme Amyot and will send copies.

Question from audience

The tendency for sediments to go in deeper crevasses is not new, it happened before in Salluit. The concerns raised, to decide to build at the same spot seems not a good idea. Was it just soft sediment that made it happen?

When dredging, will you dredge while the fish are out at sea or will they be back in lakes? The dredging should be done after the summer. The fish go back in the river systems and into lakes. There is a delay in Deception bay of 4 weeks.

Answer from CRI: Dredging will take place between June 15 and July 15th when the fish are at sea. The migration starts in August until October and, there will be no more dredging during that period.

Question from audience

The compensation system is not fair to people, it is going to your department instead of our people. We think the money goes to DFO.

The impacts of the wharf and the mine are doubled; the ships that are supposed to be coming in from ocean will be double in size of what is already coming in.

Answer from DFO: no money is given to DFO by the proponent, the proponent must compensate with a fish habitat project in your region, which can be useful for you.

Answer from CRI: The ship is the same size as the Xstrata Ship: 25 000 tons, and is regulated by TC. There will be more shipments but the ship is of same size.

Question from audience

The project of the dock fell through and must go through the process again. To come back and ask these questions again is awkward.

Regarding compensation, who decides how to compensate? Is it the proponent's place to say here is how we will compensate? For example, if CRI decided to find a fish habitat, it is fine to decide this is what the compensation will be? But how will we ensure it is a success? Who will do the work and make sure it is a success, who will monitor to ensure it is doing what it is supposed to be doing. Will it be profitable?

Answer from DFO: DFO is responsible for the fish habitat compensation. Whereas the compensation for the impacts on the community, it is negotiated between the proponent and the community.

DFO will ensure the follow-up of the compensation project is done by the proponent to measure the success of the compensation project. If the objectives are not met, the proponent will be required to make the proper adjustments.

Question from audience

Regarding the spill event when 3 barrels of battery acid were dropped by NEAS, we want experts to participate to make sure it is done properly. Mishaps, landslide, fox holes destroyed what we consider valuable fur (warm for coats). Women used to trim furs for husbands and kids. The monetary value of that loss should probably have been compensated.

Deception bay is the only place where there is an access to all kinds of products, it is all that to us. It is where we go to pick berries, eggs, and all kinds of products.

Answer from CRI: CRI is in contact with NEAS and it was discussed recently to remove barrels in the sea in springtime. CRI asked to get the barrels out of the sea but did not get answers yet.

Question from audience

Appreciation of presence to evaluate the impacts on resources and wildlife

Impacts on mammals:

Value of livestock is immeasurable in the region of Deception bay, sea current and floating of sea dust could have impacts on migration of sea mammals. We recommend some compensation, and to be part of the ownership of the port infrastructure.

Impacts of dredging in that particular region (impact on tides after construction).

Impacts of sedimentation of ore concentrate, through the transport of ore on land, will cause free flying of particulate matter. We have concerns also on concentration of ore in sediment into the seabed at wharf site.

Answer from CRI: there will be no ore concentrate on land. It is managed at the expo site. The ore is trucked in the form of rocks. CRI will mitigate all the impacts, including the financial impacts for impacts on the community. There will be sampling to measure dust on the land, currently there is some sampling in the snow.

Question continued...

Berries harvested are contaminated by the dust caused by transportation.

There should be a determination of the community's share of the port infrastructure.

We would like to see improvements in the academics and education in the community.

Regarding the 25 000 tons of ore concentrate transported, what is the value of concentrated nickel at the pounds and ounce?

I am interested in employment, transportation and mining work.

Closing remarks

Mr. Langlois Chairman of FRP-N:

Thank you for your participation, on behalf of the FRP-N, DFO and TC who participated in this public consultation. Comments will be taken into consideration. A special thanks to NV Mayor Paulusie Saviadjuk for his help in organizing the event. Thanks to our inuttitut interpreter, Paul Okituk.

CRI: Send all your questions by mail and we will get back to you more precisely.

End of session: 1h15 am

Annex 1:

List of Participants during the question period:

1. Adamie D. Alaku
2. Lucassie Namlittuk
3. Marc Papigatuk
4. Adamie Saviadjuk
5. Amana Saviadjuk
6. Kakkinik Naluiyuk
7. James Greig
8. Ida Saviadjuk
9. Louisa Pauyungie
10. Qupenuak Padlayat
11. Michael Barrett
12. Ellasuk Pauyungie
13. Adamie Saviadjuk
14. Jimmiaq Pauyungie
15. Eva Saviadjuk
16. Kaitak Saviadjuk