

Group / Attendees	Method and Date	Topics Discussed	Overview and Feedback Received	Project Response and Mitigations
<b>Mittimatalik Hunters and Trappers Organization (HTO)</b> Board Members	Meeting, June 14, 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overview of baseline studies and research permits</li> <li>Project delivery and HTO expectations</li> <li>IQ / Traditional and local knowledge</li> <li>Project Design</li> </ol>	<p>Community and Government Services (CGS) and Advisian presented on the permitting required to undertake geotechnical and environmental baseline sampling to support a NIRB Screening for the construction of the SCH. HTO provided the following feedback and questions:</p> <p><b>Project Delivery and Expectations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The community and Hunters and Trappers Organization (HTO) members are pleased that the proposed small craft harbour (SCH) project is going forward.</li> <li>HTO expressed concern that the Project will not go forward because in the past there have been studies that start and stop with nothing concrete being done.</li> <li>HTO noted that future studies should be well documented so they can be used by other parties for subsequent phases of the project.</li> <li>Concerns raised that the SCH will not be built and want confirmation that it is a priority.</li> <li>Expect regular, ongoing communications between Community and Government Services (CGS) and the community.</li> </ul> <p><b>Inuit Qaujimanituqangit (IQ) - Traditional and Local Knowledge:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend incorporating IQ into designs and studies.</li> <li>Noted that rivers in the region, including Salmon River, deposit large volumes of sediment in the general area of the proposed small craft harbour.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expressed interest in using the sea bottom dredge material for on-land construction in the community.</li> <li>Concerns raised about why the previous project design by Ruskin was not being used. Community felt they were promised that the construction would begin in the summer of 2017.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Project Delivery and Expectations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project completed permit applications for the collection of environmental and geotechnical baseline data in anticipation of funding for the construction of the SCH.</li> <li>CGS and Advisian provided answers to questions based on the project information and scope available at the time.</li> <li>Project is committed to providing updates and creating open, transparent lines of communication.</li> </ul> <p><b>Inuit Qaujimanituqangit (IQ) - Traditional Knowledge:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IQ will be incorporated into Project design and studies and IQ workshops will be held to support the project NIRB application.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All questions, concerns and comments were noted and taken into consideration for the engineering designs.</li> </ul>
<b>Hamlet of Pond Inlet</b> Mayor and Council	Council Meeting, June 14, 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overview of baseline studies and research permits</li> <li>Project Delivery and Hamlet expectations</li> </ol>	<p>CGS and Advisian presented on the permitting required to undertake geotechnical and environmental baseline sampling to support a NIRB Screening for the construction of the SCH. Mayor and Council and the SAO provided the following feedback and questions:</p> <p><b>Project Delivery and Expectations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns were raised about whether the SCH will actually be constructed after studies are completed as it has been discussed since 1970s and never built. There is a general lack of trust as to whether the project will be going ahead.</li> <li>Questions were raised about the timeline for construction and if there was enough time to acquire the permits.</li> <li>Concerns expressed regarding perceived delay in the construction of the SCH.</li> <li>Expect a new working relationship and improved lines of communication with the CGS, with regular updates.</li> <li>Requested a letter from CGS to ensure that the Project is going ahead, similar to the letter that the Premier's office issued.</li> </ul> <p><b>Employment and Economic Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timelines for executing the Project should be communicated in advance so the Hamlet of Pond Inlet (Hamlet) can develop and implement training initiatives to prepare community members with skills required for the construction and operation phases.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expressed interest in using dredged material for construction in the Hamlet.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Project Delivery and Expectations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Permit applications for the collection of environmental and geotechnical baseline data were completed in anticipation of funding for the construction of the SCH.</li> <li>CGS and Advisian provided answers to questions based on the project information and scope available at the time.</li> <li>CGS is committed to providing updates and creating open, transparent lines of communication.</li> </ul> <p><b>Employment and Economic Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project will adhere to the Nunavummi Nangminiqagtunik Ikajuuti (NNI) policy including employment and training opportunities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The dredged material will be used in the construction of the project.</li> <li>All questions, concerns and comments were noted and taken into consideration for the engineering designs.</li> </ul>
MLA for Tununiq	Interview, June 14, 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overview of baseline studies and research permits</li> <li>Project delivery</li> <li>Project schedule</li> </ol>	<p>CGS and Advisian met with the MLA to provide a project overview of the permitting required to undertake geotechnical and environmental baseline sampling to support a NIRB Screening for the construction of the SCH. MLA Enook provided the following feedback:</p> <p><b>Project Delivery:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This Project has been of great interest to the MLA.</li> <li>The community is concerned that Project activities are being poorly communicated by the Government of Nunavut (GN). The community has experienced similar studies as those being proposed since the 1970s and feel like nothing concrete happens.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Schedule:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions were raised about whether there was enough time to secure permits for studies to start construction.</li> <li>There is a lack of trust that GN will proceed with the project within the proposed time.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Project Delivery:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CGS and Advisian provided answers to questions based on the Project information and scope available at the time. CGS is committed to providing updates and creating open, transparent lines of communication.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Schedule:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project completed permit applications for the collection of environmental and geotechnical baseline data in anticipation of funding for the construction of the SCH.</li> </ul>

Group / Attendees	Method and Date	Topics Discussed	Overview and Feedback Received	Project Response and Mitigations
<b>Hamlet of Pond Inlet</b>	Telephone Introduction September 9, 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Update on funding</li> <li>2. Set meeting with Mayor and Council</li> </ol>	<p>Upon funding approval and contract award for the design and environmental studies, Advisian contacted the Hamlet SAO to re-introduce the Project and Advisian's geotechnical and environmental team and set a meeting with Mayor and Council. The SAO provided the following feedback:</p> <p><b>Project Delivery and Schedule:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expressed concerns that new consultant hired to design project and stated that community had been promised that construction could begin in summer 2017.</li> <li>Community expected that all permits would be in place already.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Project Delivery and Schedule:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CGS and Advisian planned a meeting with Mayor and Council for September 15, 2016 to provide an update on the funding recently approved by Federal and Nunavut governments.</li> </ul>
<b>Hamlet of Pond Inlet</b> Mayor and Council HTO board members	Council Meeting, September 15, 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction of Project team</li> <li>2. Overview of engineering design and permitting phase of the project</li> <li>3. Update on funding and schedule</li> <li>4. Update on design concepts</li> </ol>	<p>CGS, EDT and Advisian presented a Project overview and introduced studies being undertaken by the geotechnical and environmental team. The Mayor and Council and SAO provided the following feedback and questions:</p> <p><b>Inuit Qaujimanituqangit (IQ) - Traditional and Local Knowledge:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions raised about how IQ will be integrated into the Project.</li> </ul> <p><b>Construction Effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions related to how social impacts on current activities near the harbour location will be managed during construction as there is a lot of activity down at project site with hunters and fishing boats.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Funding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that it seemed like the Project funding had been cut.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Winds come from the east so flipping the design of the entrance will be preferable to boat owners.</li> <li>The original design was much bigger than the one being proposed now.</li> <li>Inquired about what happened to the original design that was agreed upon.</li> <li>The design as presented won't work and needs to be fixed.</li> <li>Stated that HTO should be consulted on design.</li> <li>Questions related to how the concept design process works with the community.</li> <li>An alternative location for the quarry was identified located to the northeast from the one initially permitted under the geotechnical and baseline permit project.</li> <li>Expressed confusion about the data collection proposed and asked if the team received Ruskin data from previous work.</li> <li>Noted that the design needs to take into consideration icebergs that move along quickly and get stuck in the area over the winter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Execution:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asked how the permitting process will be streamlined to ensure that there is no slippage in schedule.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Inuit Qaujimanituqangit (IQ) - Traditional and Local Knowledge:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CGS and Advisian held IQ workshops with interpreters present. Any targeted interviews with Elders also aided by an interpreter. The information gathered is incorporated into the project design and the NIRB application.</li> </ul> <p><b>Construction Effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CGS will work with the Hamlet and with residents to sequence construction activities so that access to the boat ramp and safety is maintained at the beach.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Funding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CGS advised that project has only recently received \$41 million budget (Federal and Nunavut funding) and that no funding was cut.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CGS and Advisian advised that design presented was not final, only concept drawing.</li> <li>The design process depends on feedback from the community. The Project team will meet with HTO so that the designs meet the needs of the community.</li> <li>Data collected by Ruskin will be used.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Execution:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project strategy is that while the approval process is underway, the detail design will work in parallel so that the design is ready when the approvals are received.</li> <li>To avoid schedule delays the Project must have all the fall baseline data collection completed. The Project requires regulatory approvals and the team will concentrate on the NIRB and NPC approvals first so that the others will follow.</li> </ul>
<b>Mittimatalik Hunters and Trappers Organization (HTO)</b> Board members	Introductory meeting with HTO, September 15 and 16, 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Update on project schedule</li> <li>2. Overview of design concepts</li> </ol>	<p>As a follow up to the Mayor and Council meeting, Advisian presented the preliminary concept design to gather feedback. The HTO provided the following feedback and questions:</p> <p><b>Project Delivery and Expectations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure that HTO and Hamlet are provided all Project updates on a regular basis and sufficient notice when the team plans to visit the community.</li> <li>Stated that this harbour has been studied for a long time and they have been waiting for the SCH for years.</li> <li>Expect to be consulted on an ongoing basis so can be part of the planning before construction begins.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Execution:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commented that construction award in April 2018 is too late because of sealift timing.</li> <li>Questions raised about how social impacts will be managed (e.g. high boat traffic).</li> <li>Asked if Project construction will delay the frequency of the ships that come into the Hamlet, such as sealift.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions about whether there would be opportunity to provide input in to the design.</li> <li>Want to ensure the management plans actually reflect the reality of Pond Inlet.</li> <li>Noted that wind is normally from the east and requested to see the design entrance flipped to the other side of the harbour.</li> <li>Discussions on the location of the quarry being moved found that the area initially proposed is where the dog pound is located and is zoned for that use. Noted that the dogs will need to be temporarily moved while</li> </ul>	<p><b>Project Delivery and Expectations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CGS will provide quarterly updates and return for progress update meetings.</li> <li>The workflow presentation and details of schedule into Inuktitut will be translated and provided to Hamlet and HTO.</li> <li>Management plans will be based on the baseline studies and consultation with the community and regulators.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Execution:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will aim to award construction contract earlier but the permits will drive the award and April is feasible but not ideal to deliver large equipment by sealift. CGS will keep the community informed but the goal is to have construction start in the summer of 2018.</li> <li>CGS will work with the Hamlet and with residents to sequence construction activities so that access to the boat ramp and safety is maintained at the beach.</li> <li>Project will develop a Construction Environmental Management Plan to deal with construction impacts on the community. The Contractor will adhere to those plans.</li> <li>Project team anticipates that by summer 2018 the required construction equipment will be in Pond Inlet and should not interfere with sealift.</li> <li>CGS will work with the Hamlet and with residents to sequence construction</li> </ul>

Group / Attendees	Method and Date	Topics Discussed	Overview and Feedback Received	Project Response and Mitigations
			<p>blasting in the quarry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The original design (Ruskin) was in front of the RCMP office and concerns raised that the data is not being used.</li> <li>Concerns expressed that one boat ramp is insufficient and there is high traffic and volume waiting for hunters wanting to travel out to sea at the same time. The hunters cannot access the ramp or the road when sealift is in as the sealift takes over the ramp.</li> <li>Information received that the length of boats using the ramp will range from approximately 14 feet to 40 feet.</li> <li>Pond and Pang populations are the same; therefore, the dock sizes/capacities should be compared. The one in Pang is sufficient for community boats.</li> <li>Noted that the tidal range is minimal, about 6 to 7 feet.</li> <li>Noted that a gravel ramp will not last but the existing steel ramp has been good for three winters and everyone uses it.</li> <li>Pond Inlet community is part of the Baffin Fisheries Coalition and are interested in ensuring the design takes into account future needs for commercial fisheries boats. Noted that the Hamlet needs an area where trawlers can offload their catch.</li> <li>Community does not have a fueling station and in the future this should be considered.</li> <li>Questioned whether ice floes will go over the dock and warned that they can come into the harbour quickly in the winter.</li> <li>Icebergs don't go to shallow areas but they do come in close where the water is deep.</li> <li>Noted that the wind data from the airport is not sufficient and asked if the Project will gather wind monitoring data at the beach.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Considerations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research is happening in Pond Inlet about sea ice (Andrew Arreak from Memorial University and SmartICE – Canadian Ice Services) and arctic char (James Simonee). Also have a pool of graduates in Pond Inlet from the Environmental Technology Program (ETP). Suggested coordinating efforts with the various research teams.</li> <li>There is an interest from the Youth Organization in Pond Inlet to involve youth in any research activities. Youth are considered 16-30 years old.</li> <li>Cabins noted at James Creek (shore near proposed quarry location where access is only by 4-wheeler). The road is not suitable for cars and people hike in that area.</li> <li>The HTO inquired about a fish processing plant and whether there was alternative funding available to support it.</li> </ul>	<p>activities so that access to the boat ramp and safety is maintained at the beach.</p> <p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team will prepare concept design options with a list of pros/cons for further discussion with HTO board and members during a Design Options Workshop.</li> <li>Noted that if the design is flipped, all the sediment from Salmon River may accumulate in the harbour. Will need to study the request further.</li> <li>Requested input regarding the dock height design and whether it was too low at 5 m. Committed to investigating further.</li> <li>Responded that ice floes will not go over the dock but could get stuck in the entrance. Noted that Advisian will conduct an ice study.</li> <li>Project team reviewed the recommended quarry location and incorporated the change into the project design to avoid interference with the dogs.</li> <li>Project team confirmed that data from Ruskin will be used including waves, currents, tides and sedimentation loads.</li> <li>The Project will use topographic information and available wind data but does not plan to collect additional wind data.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Considerations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team will collaborate with the researchers and seek to involve the youth in the Project activities.</li> <li>The Project team communicated that the community future economic development interests in commercial fisheries and fueling were outside the scope of the current project but would be considered.</li> </ul>
<b>Woodward</b>	Meeting, September 22, 2016	1. Overview of Project design 2. Woodward operations	<p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting held in Iqaluit as a follow up to the engagement conducted during the feasibility study in 2009/2010 to discuss the project and understand the operational needs for the engineering design development.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team will continue to solicit design feedback from Woodward.</li> </ul>
<b>Hamlet of Pond Inlet</b>	Telephone discussion, October 5, 2016	1. Mayor and Council meeting date prior to the HTO Design Workshop	<p>Follow up call was made to organize a Mayor and Council meeting prior to the HTO design workshop. The following feedback was received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mayor and Council happy that further discussion on design options will occur.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workshops set for end of October 20 and 21, but re-scheduled for November 24, 2016.</li> </ul>
<b>Mittimatalik Hunters and Trappers Organization (HTO)</b>	Email communication, October 5, 2016	1. HTO Design Workshop and IQ Workshop date	<p>Follow up call was made to HTO Chair to organize a design workshop and IQ workshop. The following feedback was received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues noted, Chair leaving on maternity leave and working to have Acting Chair support the organization of the Workshops.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workshops set for end of October 20 and 21, but re-scheduled for November 24, 2016 with HTO board, members and/or key elders/knowledge holders.</li> </ul>
<b>Petronav</b>	Meeting, October 6, 2016	1. Overview of Project design 2. Petronav operations	<p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting held in Montreal as a follow up to the engagement conducted during the feasibility study in 2009/2010 to discuss the project and understand the operational needs for the engineering design development.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team will continue to solicit design feedback from Petronav.</li> </ul>
<b>Desgagnes / Nunavut Sealink and Supply (NSSI)</b>	Meeting, October 7, 2016	1. Overview of Project design 2. Desgagnes/NSSI operations	<p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advisian attended a joint meeting held at NSSI office with NEAS and Desgagnes in St. Catherines, Ontario as a follow up to the engagement conducted during the feasibility study in 2009/2010 to discuss the project and understand the operational needs for the engineering design development.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team will continue to solicit design feedback from Desgagnes/NSSI.</li> </ul>

Group / Attendees	Method and Date	Topics Discussed	Overview and Feedback Received	Project Response and Mitigations
<b>Nunavut Eastern Arctic Shipping (NEAS)</b>	Meeting, October 7, 2016	1. Overview of Project design 2. NEAS operations	<b>Project Design:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advisian attended a joint meeting held at NSSI office with NSSI and Desgagnes in St. Catherines, Ontario as a follow up to the engagement conducted during the feasibility study in 2009/2010 to discuss the project and understand the operational needs for the engineering design development.</li> </ul>	<b>Project Design:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team will continue to solicit design feedback from NEAS.</li> </ul>
<b>Woodward</b>	Telephone discussion, October 21, 2016	1. Project design development 2. Woodward operations	<b>Project Design:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advisian and GN held a conference call to discuss the engineering design development and Woodward operational needs.</li> </ul>	<b>Project Design:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team will continue to solicit design feedback from Woodward.</li> </ul>
<b>Hamlet of Pond Inlet</b>	Telephone discussion, November 17, 2016	1. Hiring of new SAO 2. Mayor and Council meeting	Follow up call to confirm Mayor and Council meeting. The following feedback was received: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction to the new SAO.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mayor and Council meeting set for November 24, 2016.</li> </ul>
<b>Mittimatalik Hunters and Trappers Organization (HTO)</b> Board Members	HTO Follow up Design Workshop, November 24, 2016	1. Current conditions for accessing water and ice in Pond Inlet 2. Review design options and discuss pros/cons of each option 3. Design considerations such as wind direction and strength, sedimentation, currents, seasonal changes to ice, water and ice access, and current boat traffic and ramp use 4. Quarry and access road	CGS, Economic Development and Transportation (EDT) and Advisian presented four design options to solicit feedback. HTO provided the following feedback and questions: <b>IQ and Local Knowledge for Design Considerations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Boats are anchored so they can be seen from the owner's house and that floating docks may not allow the owner to see their boat.</li> <li>Wind is increasing as the climate changes.</li> <li>The sand beach is eroding because of the increased wind and that high water and wind now reach the vegetation line. Boats are also damaged because of more waves.</li> <li>The previous fall the winds were so high, the shingles and steel roof came off some buildings and; blizzards are more frequent.</li> <li>Ice forms ridges around partially submerged boulders but there are no submerged boulders across the shoreline.</li> <li>Two floating docks would be sufficient for the community.</li> <li>The community would like to drive on the east breakwater.</li> <li>Option 3A is preferred by HTO.</li> </ul> <b>Employment and Economic Opportunities:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions raised about training opportunities with the project.</li> </ul> <b>Geotechnical Drilling Program:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dogs are put out on the ice wherever it is flat and will need to be moved for the spring geotechnical drilling.</li> </ul> <b>Effects on Fishing and Harvesting:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HTO is not concerned about ice access as ice can be accessed anywhere and they can go through the Salmon Creek area.</li> </ul> <b>Quarry and Access Road:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plants in the quarry are no longer collected because they are polluted from the sewage lagoon.</li> <li>Questions related to whether they can build a road from the quarry northeast to the shoreline where Ptarmigan and small game hunting occurs.</li> <li>Dust issues are already a concern in the community.</li> <li>Questions whether construction trucks will interfere with community services.</li> </ul>	<b>IQ and Local Knowledge for Design Considerations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design will be modified to consider the input received from the community and HTO.</li> <li>Project will include a Construction Environmental Management Plan and traffic management plan to mitigate traffic and safety concerns during construction. The Contractor will adhere to those plans.</li> </ul> <b>Employment and Economic Opportunities:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project will adhere to the NNI policy including employment and training opportunities.</li> </ul> <b>Geotechnical Drilling Program:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The community will be notified of the geotechnical drilling program for dogs to be temporarily moved.</li> </ul> <b>Effects on Fishing and Harvesting:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access will remain open year round. Harvesting activities not impacted.</li> </ul> <b>Quarry and Access Road:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An alternative road will be investigated to mitigate impacts to community services and traffic safety. Contractor will consider haul road alignment and potential erosion and stability issues.</li> <li>Road to the northeast from the quarry is outside the scope of the SCH project.</li> <li>Contractor will manage dust by spraying the road with Calcium Chloride (CaCl), water or other methods utilized by the Hamlet.</li> </ul>
<b>Hamlet of Pond Inlet</b> Mayor and Council <b>Nunavut Legislative Assembly</b> MLA for Tununig	Council Meeting, November 24, 2016	1. Project update and follow-up to introduce four design options based on feedback received from last visit 2. Operations 3. Future economic opportunities 4. Quarry and access road	Advisian, CGS and EDT presented four design options to solicit feedback. The Hamlet provided the following feedback and questions: <b>Operations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions about the dredging maintenance costs.</li> <li>Questions regarding seasonal removal and placement of floating docks and whether CGS/GN can provide funding to support the extra expense for municipal workers.</li> <li>Concerns raised that children and young people are very active in the area playing on the ice and may be a safety issue for young people during ice breakup.</li> <li>Concerns raised about mitigating erosion because if sand erodes and is not maintained then the beach will be unusable.</li> </ul> <b>Effects on Fishing and Harvesting:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>People fish and enjoy recreation in the area near the old breakwater and the project should consider options so people can continue to fish and have recreation places.</li> </ul>	<b>Operations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCH will be an EDT asset for the purposes of maintenance. Details are being worked on but there is a program to help communities called the Community Transportation Initiative Program. EDT will explore more options for operations and continue to inform the community.</li> <li>A shoreline evolution model was completed for the project to predict shoreline changes from the project. The model predicted minimal erosion of the beach predicted to the north east of the breakwater and none to the southwest and therefore there is no reason to implement erosion protection at this stage.</li> </ul> <b>Effects on Fishing and Harvesting:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project should not reduce access to recreation and fishing.</li> </ul> <b>Design Options:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sand has the potential to accumulate around the west corner of the proposed</li> </ul>



Group / Attendees	Method and Date	Topics Discussed	Overview and Feedback Received	Project Response and Mitigations
			<p><b>Design Options:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>An original design was much further out and that the Hamlet never approved a design similar to what was presented by Ruskin.</li><li>Distance in Option 3B looks like it is only 100 m from breakwater to shoreline which would be inadequate space.</li><li>Option 3B noted as the preferred option for the Mayor and two Councillors. Other Councillors did not state their opinions about a preferred option.</li><li>Questions whether location of the fixed dock could move to the outside of the harbour so that larger ships could dock at it.</li><li>Questions about how wide the entrance is on Option 3B as it appears very narrow and if the sealift is in there were concerns that residents would have a hard time accessing the harbor.</li><li>Questions raised about whether trawlers would be able to offload their catch on the outside of the harbour on the northwest breakwater.</li><li>Questions raised as to whether cruise ships could also use the potential dock as it was noted that a lot of local organizations and businesses could benefit from that.</li><li>Question raised about how many boats could be at the dock.</li></ul> <p><b>Future Economic Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Hamlet wants to see trawlers offload their catch in Pond Inlet. Question as to whether trawlers can offload at Option 1.</li><li>Shrimp and other fisheries industries are available and they have the opportunity for large revenue generation from these markets.</li><li>The Hamlet would like a refueling station as the only one available is in Greenland. Hamlet would like trawlers to refuel in Pond Inlet. Question about whether funds are available to include a refueling station.</li><li>Questions about ability for a future fueling station to be retrofitted onto the dock.</li><li>Questions about the erosion potential on the east side of the harbour after the construction of the docks and breakwater is completed.</li><li>The current ramp is inaccessible during sealift and question raised whether this will be the same for SCH during sealift.</li><li>Questions about how many containers would be able to fit in the sealift laydown area.</li><li>The easterly access road is poor and trucks can't use it.</li></ul> <p><b>Quarry Site and Access Road:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Control of dust generated from the construction of the quarry, project and roads will have to be considered.</li><li>Questions raised whether EDT or the airport could allow access to the western road that goes by the airport to reduce traffic through town from trucks hauling rock from the quarry to the SCH site.</li><li>The community wants an access road going the opposite direction from the town as there is a lot of recreation in the proposed area. Question raised as to whether the road could be extended.</li></ul> <p><b>General Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>As Baffinland may be using a trial run of winter shipping, question raised as to whether the SCH could be used during the winter.</li><li>The former Mayors have worked hard and Pond Inlet has been asking for a breakwater for many year with various designs but nothing has been done yet.</li><li>Concern raised about going with the cheapest option and wanting to make sure that SCH benefits the community and addresses their needs.</li><li>The community wants a SCH and an extension on the runway.</li></ul>	<p>west breakwater, which would need to be dredged out eventually. Frequency of dredging and cost is unknown at this time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Option 1 is shown for discussion purposes because it was the original Ruskin design presented to the community and can be used to compare with other options.</li><li>This is early stage of design and will weigh the pros and cons of all four options but will not go with the cheapest. Project budget is \$40 million in total and the plan is to decide on the highest value option balancing the community's needs and the approved budget.</li><li>If the dock was outside the harbour it would have to be 1 to 2 m taller and would be more costly but could be done if there is enough funding. The dock would be very exposed on the outside of the harbour.</li><li>Cruise ships or their tender boats, depending on the size, could use the docking area on the outside of the harbour.</li><li>Option 3B is 50% larger than the option in Pangnirtung. This facility could accommodate as many as the harbour in Pangnirtung.</li><li>The current design of the sealift laydown area can likely store up to 100 sea containers if stacked two high with shipping containers varying in storage numbers as they are much more inefficient to store.</li><li>Project could consider a road for access up to the breakwater; decisions are a balance of needs but project can consider this.</li><li>As the design progresses, it the entrance width will be determined. Currently, the harbour entrance is roughly 50 m for option 3B and roughly 75 m in Option 3A. Design will seek to accommodate maximum protection.</li><li>The floating docks would be straight and have the option to raft the boats beside one another. The number of boats depends on how many floats there are and more floats increases the cost of operations and maintenance. At the end of preliminary design phase, the number of floats that can be built will be determined.</li><li>Dock added to the outside of the harbour would be difficult to use during minor wind and wave events. The reason it is proposed to be inside the harbour is to increase protection and the amount of time it is usable. The inside dock could be made smaller and an option for a future dock on the outside could be possible.</li></ul> <p><b>Future Economic Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Current scope of the Project does not have a refueling station and it is assumed that a fuel truck would need to drive to the dock for refueling. Will look into options for refueling at the dock in the preliminary designs. The design would need a roadway that could accommodate the fuel pipeline to have this option.</li><li>All options have the ability to dock trawlers of some size but not factory ships.</li></ul> <p><b>Quarry Site and Access Road:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Airport runway route will be assessed to see if it is a viable option to transport rock.</li></ul> <p><b>General Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>An access road in the opposite direction from town is a separate project and the Hamlet would need to secure funding. Would be a good time to do it when the SCH is being built.</li><li>Noted that Baffinland likely sending heavy ore carriers in the winter and not resupply ships, regardless the new harbour would still not be useable in winter.</li><li>Project is looking to have similar features as the Pangnirtung SCH. The Pond Inlet concept is actually longer and deeper than what Pangnirtung has.</li></ul>
Hamlet of Pond Health Centre	Socio-economic baseline data collection,	1. Introduction of the Project 2. Review existing socio-economic information	CGS and Advisian met with the Nurse-in-Charge to collect socio-economic baseline data in support of the NIRB Screening application and received the following feedback:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>All information was noted and will be taken into consideration for the Project design and the construction.</li><li>Project team will consider having a dedicated project emergency responder.</li></ul>

Group / Attendees	Method and Date	Topics Discussed	Overview and Feedback Received	Project Response and Mitigations
	November 25, 2016	3. Identify community service and resource capacity	<b>Health Centre:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently under-staffed with a mix of agency and casual nurses traveling to Pond Inlet for six weeks at a time.</li> <li>Emergency cases that the health clinic cannot handle or require a doctor are flown out of Pond Inlet to Iqaluit.</li> <li>In 2012, the health centre visits increased by over 3,000 visits compared to 2011 and it was noted that this was likely due to the initiation of work at the Baffinland mine where no clear policy was in place for transport of patients. Pond Inlet was used to stabilize and transfer patients with medical emergencies.</li> </ul>	
<b>Hamlet of Pond Inlet Key Community Stakeholders</b> RCMP	Socio-economic baseline data collection, November 25, 2016	1. Introduction of the Project 2. Review existing socio-economic information 3. Identify community service and resource capacity	<b>RCMP:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Majority of offences in Pond Inlet are against persons and in general, the RCMP relationship with the community is good.</li> <li>RCMP provides support to the Canadian Border Services as Pond Inlet is becoming a point of entry into Canada for international cruise ship travelers.</li> <li>Vandalism may be a concern for the construction of the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All information was noted and will be taken into consideration for the Project design and construction.</li> <li>Project team will provide information to the Contractor to avoid potential vandalism of equipment or project site.</li> </ul>
<b>Hamlet of Pond Inlet Key Community Stakeholders</b> Co-op Store	Socio-economic baseline data collection, November 24, 2016	1. Introduction of the Project 2. Review existing socio-economic information 3. Identify business capacity	<b>Co-op:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have 14 businesses that can benefit from the construction of the SCH.</li> <li>Construction of the SCH cannot impact the sealift delivery.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All information was noted and will be taken into consideration for the Project design and construction.</li> <li>CGS and the contractor will work with the Hamlet to sequence construction to not affect sealift deliveries to residents and businesses.</li> <li>Contractor will adhere to a Construction Environmental Management Plan to coordinate construction activities to avoid impacting sealift operations.</li> </ul>
<b>Hamlet of Pond Inlet Key Community Stakeholders</b> Northern Store	Socio-economic baseline data collection, November 24, 2016	1. Introduction of the Project 2. Review existing socio-economic information 3. Identify business capacity	<b>Northern Store:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supplies and store inventory are ordered for the year to arrive by sealift and supplemental supply and produce are flown in throughout the year.</li> <li>When cruise ships arrive and request large quantities of heavy items such as soda, the store has to deny selling items as it would leave them without supply for the community.</li> <li>Construction of the SCH cannot impact the sealift delivery as this would affect the store's annual supply.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All information was noted and will be taken into consideration for the Project design and construction.</li> <li>CGS and the contractor will work with the Hamlet to sequence construction to not affect sealift deliveries to residents and businesses.</li> <li>Contractor will adhere to a Construction Environmental Management Plan to coordinate construction activities to avoid impacting sealift operations.</li> </ul>
<b>Shoreline Residents</b> Total of 22 in Attendance: 15 shoreline residents 5 community members  <b>Hamlet Administration</b>  <b>Nunavut Legislative Assembly</b> MLA for Tununig	Open Space Meeting, November 25, 2016	1. Construction impacts 2. Design options 3. Haul road	CGS, Advisian and an Ikaarvik youth attended a meeting with the shoreline residents to discuss the concept design and gather input. The residents were pleased that the project is moving forward and will be built. The Shoreline residents provided the following feedback: <b>Construction Effects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic, noise and dust during construction are a concern.</li> <li>24 hour construction schedule would not be acceptable.</li> </ul> <b>Design Options:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Options 3A and 3B were noted as preferred options.</li> <li>Sand to the east of the existing breakwater was very soft and could not be driven on. Request to cover beach with rock to make it useable for driving.</li> <li>The area above the beach to the east of the existing breakwater is very steep therefore the houses fronting the water do not use the beach often.</li> <li>Questions raised about whether erosion of the bank above the eastern beach could occur.</li> </ul> <b>Effects of the Haul Road:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Children playing and traffic safety during heavy equipment and haul truck movement is a concern.</li> <li>Dust needs to be managed.</li> <li>Suggestion was made for an alternative road for hauling freight through the subdivision adjacent to the airport.</li> </ul>	<b>Construction Effects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project will develop a Construction Environmental Management Plan and traffic management, noise and dust control will be included. The Contractor will adhere to those plans.</li> <li>CGS and the contractor will work with the Hamlet to sequence construction to minimize disturbances to the community.</li> </ul> <b>Design Options:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project design includes the placement of gravel on the north east beach to allow vehicles and ATVs to drive along the shore.</li> <li>A shoreline evolution model was completed for the project to predict shoreline changes from the project. The model predicted minimal erosion of the beach predicted to the north east of the breakwater and none to the southwest and therefore there is no reason to implement erosion protection at this stage.</li> </ul> <b>Effects of the Haul Road:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An alternative haul road will be investigated.</li> <li>Contractor will manage dust by spraying the road with Calcium Chloride (CaCl), water or other methods utilized by the Hamlet.</li> </ul>
<b>RL Hanson</b>	Meeting, December 1, 2016	1. Overview of Project design 2. RL Hansen operations	<b>Project Design:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting held in Montreal as a follow up to the engagement conducted during the feasibility study in 2009/2010 to discuss the project and understand the operational needs for the engineering design development.</li> </ul>	<b>Project Design:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team will continue to solicit design feedback from RL Hansen.</li> </ul>
<b>Ikaarvik Youth Group</b>	Telephone discussion, December 20, 2016	1. Proposal for Ikaarvik to participate in Open House, consultation and follow up to Design Workshop visit	Advisian and the Ikaarvik Coordinator discussed the inclusion of Ikaarvik in the Project and received the following feedback: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommended using Ikaarvik Youth Group (Ikaarvik) to support the preparation of the Open House, set up information table in Co-op and support consultation and IQ collection for the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advisian and Ikaarvik developed a proposal for hiring Ikaarvik to support project consultation and IQ collection.</li> <li>CGS and EDT approved the proposal and included Ikaarvik in the preparation of the Open House and IQ collection workshop held on February 27, 2017.</li> </ul>

Group / Attendees	Method and Date	Topics Discussed	Overview and Feedback Received	Project Response and Mitigations
<b>Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (NTI)</b> Representatives	Meeting, January 12, 2017	1. Provide an overview of the project	DM and ADM of CGS met with NTI to provide an overview of the Nunavut Marine Infrastructure projects and the following feedback was received: <b>Project Delivery and Expectations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No concerns raised and NTI were pleased with having the opportunity to discuss with DM of CGS.</li> <li>Noted that Hannah Uniuqsaraq, Director Policy and Planning Division is the contact person for project progress updates.</li> </ul>	<b>Project Delivery and Expectations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CGS and EDT will provide project progress updates to Hannah Uniuqsaraq.</li> </ul>
<b>Hamlet of Pond Inlet</b>	Telephone discussion, February 1, 2017	1. Open House planning 2. Haul road 3. Private property at shoreline 4. Existing roads through community	CGS and Advisian met with the Mayor and SAO to organize the Open House and community visit and they provided the following feedback: <b>Project Design:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The community wanted to know which design was being put forward.</li> <li>The newly elected Mayor and Council should be considered a priority for meetings and a Mayor and Council meeting was recommended.</li> </ul> <b>Haul Road:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The alternate haul road proposed along the east side of the airport lands would not be feasible because it was through private land.</li> <li>The private land owner (Anglican Church) wrote a letter to the Hamlet indicating that the road from the cemetery through their property was not acceptable and that they would be interested in exchanging the land with the Hamlet for property further upland.</li> <li>The Hamlet is unable to exchange land because of the Anglican Church holds fee simple land.</li> <li>The existing road through the community is very narrow and has steep drop offs on either side so if it were to be used it would need to be expanded and built up.</li> </ul>	<b>Project Design:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team noted that a revised option would be presented for further discussion with the community. The revised option incorporates the recommendations and suggestions made by the HTO and community.</li> <li>Project team confirmed there would be further opportunities for meetings and discussions and that the team planned to return at the end of February/beginning of March.</li> </ul> <b>Haul Road:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team confirmed that an alternate haul road was being investigated and it would seek a meeting with the Anglican Church to discuss using the private property for the Project construction.</li> </ul>
<b>Community Members</b> Total of 60 in Attendance	Open House, February 27, 2017	1. Project components and potential environmental and socio economic effects and mitigation	CGS, EDT, Advisian and Ikaarvik attended the Open House where the Project design, potential effects and proposed mitigation were presented. Community members provided the following feedback and questions: <b>Expectations about Project Delivery:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The community is supportive of the Project. The revised design is well received and the community recognizes that their advice, recommendations and concerns were heard.</li> <li>The sequence of construction activities makes sense to the community.</li> </ul> <b>Environmental Observations and Concerns:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dust and noise associated with the haul road and quarry during construction were noted as concerns for community members.</li> <li>It was suggested that the water truck could be used to prevent dust.</li> <li>Community members expressed an interest in the studies conducted for the project, especially regarding fish and marine life (e.g. Arctic char and marine mammals).</li> <li>The community does not think that Arctic char will be affected by the Project.</li> <li>Noise effects on wildlife are not considered a concern as construction is temporary. Noted that wildlife may leave the area for a short while, but will likely return when construction and noise are finished.</li> <li>The quarry location will not affect hunting because they do not hunt in that area.</li> </ul> <b>Safety Considerations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project needs to ensure that the construction area is safe and separate from public use.</li> <li>The haul road route is a concern as the existing Hamlet road is too narrow for construction vehicles and safety is a concern because children play along the roads and beach.</li> <li>The Hamlet road is dangerous because the permafrost is moving and causing slope instability (an example was provided of the girl who died when her ATV slipped and then flipped).</li> <li>Questions raised about whether construction was planned to go on for 24 hours, and if so, how traffic would be organized.</li> <li>Recommendation to use the most eastern road which would need to be widened slightly or the ATV trail to the west but it is quite steep.</li> <li>Community members want to ensure safe access for hunters during construction.</li> <li>The proposed road going through town does not seem safe. The children play everywhere and we need to ensure that it is safe.</li> <li>The proposed haul road is located near the graveyard, which is a concern for residents. They think that the</li> </ul>	<b>Expectations about Project Delivery:</b> CGS and Advisian thanked the community and HTO for their valuable input into the project. <b>Environmental Observations and Concerns:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project will develop a Construction Environmental Management Plan and traffic management plan to mitigate safety and traffic concerns during construction. The Contractor will adhere to those plans.</li> </ul> <b>Safety Considerations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contractor will plan construction to separate public use from construction activities. Access will remain open year round. Harvesting activities will not be impacted.</li> <li>An alternative haul road will be investigated to mitigate impacts to traffic safety and the community. Contractor will consider the haul road alignment and the cemetery, potential erosion, width, grade and stability issues.</li> <li>Construction schedules will be developed by the contractor and CGS will communicate schedules to the community. CGS and the contractor will work with the Hamlet to sequence construction to maintain access to the boat ramp and shoreline. Safety will be the first priority and if this needs to change, it will be discussed with the community and HTO.</li> </ul> <b>Employment and Economic Opportunities:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project will adhere to the NNI policy including employment and training opportunities.</li> <li>Future economic development opportunities are outside the scope of this Project but the community may wish to investigate future opportunities.</li> </ul> <b>Design Considerations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design will consider the input and needs of the community. The design presented during this open house incorporated recommendations from previous meetings. Additional recommendations and information will be incorporated or considered in the next version of the revised design.</li> <li>The design has resolved or addressed all issues and incorporated input into design and mitigations regarding the use of the existing ramp, the size of the new</li> </ul>

Group / Attendees	Method and Date	Topics Discussed	Overview and Feedback Received	Project Response and Mitigations
			<p>noise, vibration and dust from the trucks will be an issue because the graveyard is now slowly slipping down the slope (due to melting permafrost and slope instability). The community has already been in discussions to find solutions to repair the graveyard and perhaps move it, but most community members feel that it would be sad to move its location.</p> <p><b>Employment and Economic Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions related whether there would be job opportunities and training for Pond Inlet residents during construction.</li> <li>Noted that the SCH should provide safe shelter for the community but also work for fishing trawlers so the community can benefit with job creation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Design Considerations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the design is too small and will not accommodate the Hamlet's future needs as the population grows or if a commercial fishery is developed.</li> <li>The location of the east breakwater recommended to be moved further to the east which would provide easier access, could accommodate more boats and may also protect the beach.</li> <li>The size of the SCH should be designed to meet future needs and accommodate a fishery industry.</li> <li>The spur designed to protect the harbour entrance was necessary.</li> <li>The prevailing winds are from the northwest in the fall.</li> <li>Recommendation that gravel be placed over the beach to the east because it is a soft surface.</li> </ul> <p><b>Possible Impacts on Community Services:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to ensure that construction does not delay any of the community services trucks (e.g. water, fuel, sewage disposal).</li> </ul> <p><b>General Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An Inuit elder requested that a sculpture be erected at the dock when construction is done.</li> </ul>	<p>ramp, maintenance of the ramp, access to ice and harbour capacity.</p> <p><b>Possible Impacts on Community Services:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The contractor will adhere to the Construction Environmental Management Plan and traffic management plan to mitigate impacts to community services. The contractor will work with the Hamlet to ensure that residents and service delivery are not affected.</li> </ul> <p><b>General Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EDT and CGS will consider a sculpture however; the first priority of the project funding is to build the small craft harbor that meets the needs of the community.</li> </ul>
<b>Hamlet of Pond Inlet</b> Mayor and Council	Meeting, February 28, 2017	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meet newly elected Mayor and Council</li> <li>Provide project update and design verification</li> </ol>	<p>CGS, EDT and Advisian presented a Project update to the Mayor and Council and SAO. The meeting was cut short due to weather and air traffic constraints so the new Council was requested another meeting, either by conference call or in person. However, the following feedback and questions were received:</p> <p><b>New Road and Existing Haul Road:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions raised about haul road and whether funds available from CGS to build the new road from the quarry.</li> <li>The existing haul road shown using the main street through the community would need to be widened and powerlines would need to be raised.</li> </ul> <p><b>Employment and Economic Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Question regarding whether training and employment during construction will be available for community members.</li> </ul> <p><b>Geotechnical Works:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Question raised about timing of future geotechnical work so that hunters can be informed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Project Communications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CGS committed to hold another meeting with the newly elected Mayor and Council to inform them on the design options process, consultation to date, environmental and socio economic effects and mitigation. This could be done via conference call or in person. A follow up meeting was held in person on April 11 2017.</li> </ul> <p><b>New Road and Existing Haul Road:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An alternative haul road will be investigated to mitigate impacts to traffic safety and the community. Contractor will consider haul road alignment and potential erosion, width, grade and stability issues.</li> </ul> <p><b>Employment and Economic Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project will adhere to the NNI policy including employment and training opportunities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Geotechnical Works:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Geotechnical works took place in April 2017 with the support of two Nunavut Inuit wildlife monitors hired through HTO.</li> </ul>
<b>Active Inuit Land Users and Ikaarvik</b>  Six Ikaarvik youth members Five Inuit knowledge holders	IQ Workshop, February 27 to March 1, 2017	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To collect IQ input from land users.</li> </ol>	<p>Advisian and Ikaarvik held a workshop to gather IQ input and provide an overview of the Project. The following feedback and questions were provided concerning design and environmental effects:</p> <p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The northwest winds are the most important.</li> <li>Sand accumulates on the eastern beach during spring run-off from the creek.</li> <li>Freeze-up is later and break-up is earlier.</li> <li>Ice formation begins around November and end of hunting season is around October / November.</li> <li>Changes to climate noted – winds have become much stronger and it stays windy for longer and there is not as much rain in the summer.</li> <li>There are 200 boats now using the existing facility and the new one should not be too small.</li> <li>The community prefers to keep their boats in the water because it is expensive to haul them out.</li> <li>Moving breakwater further east will create a bigger gap at the top but that does not matter because the winds</li> </ul>	<p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information collected during the workshop and an associated map will be included in the NIRB Form 2 PSIR.</li> <li>Design considers and incorporates the input received and the needs of the community.</li> <li>Rock from the quarry will be used for the breakwater.</li> </ul> <p><b>Environmental Effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project will develop a Construction Environmental Management Plan to mitigate potential impacts to marine mammals during construction. The Contractor will adhere to those plans.</li> </ul>



Group / Attendees	Method and Date	Topics Discussed	Overview and Feedback Received	Project Response and Mitigations
			<p>come from the east and west and not from the Bylot Island direction. The community does not get waves from the north.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The west breakwater is adequate and the community does not want to lose the fixed dock.</li> <li>Could remove the old breakwater all together and use the material from that to build the new breakwater.</li> </ul> <p><b>Environmental Effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baffinland did a lot of blasting at Milne Inlet and the narwhal returned after the blasting stopped so noise impact identified as temporary only and not an issue.</li> <li>Seals and narwhal went away while Baffinland was building their port, but they came back once construction was complete. Participants consider construction noise to be temporary and do not consider it a concern.</li> <li>There are better places to fish than right off the beach area so construction will not be an issue for fishing.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (NTI)</b> Representatives</p> <p><b>Qikitani Inuit Association (QIA)</b> Representatives</p>	Meeting, March 3, 2017	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project update and design</li> <li>Consultation to date</li> <li>Budget and schedule</li> </ol>	<p>CGS met with NTI and QIA to provide an update on the Nunavut Marine Infrastructure Projects including the schematic design, schedule and budget of the SCH in Pond Inlet. Discussions also centred on consultations which have occurred and the regulatory process for the projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A majority of the discussion focused on the design of the Iqaluit marine projects and no major issues were noted for Pond Inlet during the meeting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CGS is committed to continued discussions and future meetings with NTI and QIA.</li> </ul>
<b>Hamlet of Pond Inlet</b>	Telephone discussion, March 29, 2017	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss alternate haul road location</li> </ol>	<p>Advisian discussed the Project construction haul road from the quarry to the SCH with the SAO and the following feedback was provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Hamlet's preference for an alternate haul road would be a permanent rather than temporary construction road.</li> <li>There are no specific permits required but the lands committee through Council will approve or disapproves any projects.</li> <li>The Hamlet's preference is to have haul road connect to the Water Lake Road as it will be important for future subdivision development.</li> <li>The road in the area of the cemetery is considered very unstable and is sloughing off into the ocean. It was built for light duty vehicle traffic only and that would need to have geotechnical investigations to deal with heavy truck haul road needs. The road was only shut down because the owner of the private property did not want the road running through their property.</li> <li>The Hamlet is investigating moving the cemetery.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An alternative haul road will be investigated to mitigate impacts to traffic safety and the community. Contractor will consider haul road alignment and potential erosion, width, grade and stability issues.</li> <li>The current design of the haul road is for construction vehicles. CGS or EDT will discuss with the Hamlet how the haul road might be used or maintained by the Hamlet for the benefit of the community.</li> </ul>
<b>Hamlet of Pond Inlet</b> Mayor and Council	Council Meeting, April 11, 2017	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project update and design verification</li> <li>Project effects</li> <li>Alternate haul road</li> </ol>	<p>CGS, EDT and Advisian presented a Project update and verified the concept design included input received from the community. In general, the Council is pleased with the design and very supportive of the project. They provided the following feedback and questions:</p> <p><b>Operations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions about what EDT office will lead discussions for operations.</li> <li>The Anglican Church property will be key for operations as well.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions concerning the cost of each of the proposed floats.</li> <li>The Hamlet does not want the cemeteries sliding in to the sea before they've had a chance to move them.</li> <li>The GN is supposed to be conducting studies on the stability of the area this coming summer. If possible, the Hamlet will share those results with the Project.</li> </ul> <p><b>Construction:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions about what component of the SCH would be built first.</li> <li>The road proposed leaving the sealift laydown area is very narrow and the turn for trucks would be very tight.</li> <li>The Hamlet inquired about the Anglican Church property for the construction laydown area. The Church would like to exchange their fee simple title for another parcel of fee simple land. The hamlet has no ability to offer fee simple title in exchange. Must look either at leasing the property or inquire with the GN for a way to make the land exchange.</li> <li>The process to acquire the Anglican Church property could take a long time.</li> <li>Questions about workforce housing and the ability of the hotel in town to accommodate.</li> </ul> <p><b>Employment and Economic Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions about whether the Project has looked in to training programs and funds like Kakivak.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Operations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EDT office in Iqaluit will lead consultation concerning operations</li> <li>CGS will follow up with the Anglican Church regarding the property.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Floats are relatively inexpensive compared to the project budget, Cost of maintaining floats during operations can be significant. EDT will have an operations plan and budget to maintain the floats.</li> </ul> <p><b>Construction:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team will inquire with GN about options for church land</li> <li>Project will develop a Construction Environmental Management Plan and traffic management plan to mitigate safety and traffic concerns during construction. The Contractor will adhere to those plans.</li> <li>Project currently in discussions with the hotel concerning accommodation. At this time, it is expected that a modular extension at the hotel will be required to house the workforce to ensure workers don't take hotel beds needed by the community.</li> </ul> <p><b>Employment and Economic Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project will look in to training programs such as Kakivak.</li> </ul> <p><b>Haul Road:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contractor will consider haul road alignment and potential erosion, width, grade and stability issues.</li> <li>Contractor will be responsible for safety of the haul road and will set the rules for use. Approximately only one truck every 15 minutes is expected so coordination for limited public use is feasible however; safety will be the first priority during the</li> </ul>

Group / Attendees	Method and Date	Topics Discussed	Overview and Feedback Received	Project Response and Mitigations
			<b>Haul Road:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The road by the cemeteries is very soft and slippery. Inquired whether there will be geotech studies to make sure the cemetery and ground remains stable.</li> <li>Questions concerning whether the public will be able to use the alternate haul road during construction. For example, an individual who would like to go out hunting.</li> <li>Questions concerning whether the haul road will be used in the winter.</li> </ul>	<p>active construction period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contractor is not expected to use or maintain the haul road past the end of the construction period, which could be in December or a bit later. The Project schedule allows the contractor two seasons to complete the work.</li> </ul>
<b>Community Members</b> Total of 45 in attendance	Open House, April 11, 2017	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project update and design</li> <li>Project Effects</li> <li>Alternate haul road</li> </ol>	<p>CGS, EDT, Advisian and Ikaarvik attended the Open House where the updated Project concept design and an alternative haul road was presented. There were no concerns about project effects. Community members provided the following feedback and questions:</p> <p><b>Project Delivery and Expectations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The community was glad to see this as boats will be safer. Noted that if the Project is done well, there will be no concerns.</li> <li>The community has waited a long time and are happy to see the design.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are lots of waves from the NW and strong currents. Questions about whether the design considered this.</li> <li>Questions concerning the possibility of icebergs getting in to the harbour.</li> <li>Questions about whether dredging will be conducted to the west side of the fixed wharf.</li> </ul> <p><b>Haul Road:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The alternate haul road route passes nearby an area where people go recreational camping.</li> <li>The alternate haul road passes right by the cemetery.</li> <li>Questions about the pros, cons and costs involved with using the proposed haul route through the community (using hamlet roads) compared to the alternate haul road route.</li> <li>Proposed other haul road routes through the community to consider.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Project Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design has considered wind, waves, and currents.</li> <li>Discussions with HTO and others in community has provided important information concerning local site conditions that has been considered in the design.</li> <li>Icebergs shouldn't be able to get in to the harbour. Ice sheets are more of a concern. Design of the breakwater includes large rocks that would keep the breakwater quite safe in the very unlikely event of an iceberg hit.</li> <li>There are no plans to dredge the west side of the fixed wharf and it is expected that a beach will form on the west side of the wharf.</li> </ul> <p><b>Haul Road:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contractor will consider haul road alignment and potential erosion, width, grade and stability issues.</li> <li>Project will develop a Construction Environmental Management Plan and traffic management plan to mitigate safety and traffic concerns during construction. The Contractor will adhere to those plans.</li> <li>Safety is the Project's primary concern. Hauling through the community would require the use of smaller trucks at much lower speed levels which could end up costing the Project the same as building a new haul road.</li> </ul>
<b>Nunavut Eastern Arctic Shipping (NEAS)</b>	Email, April 20, 2017	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project design</li> <li>NEAS Operations</li> </ol>	<p>An email request of operational needs was sent on December 13, 2017 by Advisian and the following information was received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Equipment, barges and vessel details and specifications were provided.</li> <li>Operational details were provided.</li> <li>Ramp design considerations including slope and surface material preferences were provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CGS will continue to discuss sealift operations with NEAS as the project design advances and for coordination of construction activities.</li> </ul>
<b>Qikitani Inuit Association (QIA)</b> Representatives	Meeting, May 3, 2017	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project overview</li> <li>Project design</li> </ol>	<p>CGS and Advisian met with QIA to provide an overview of the Nunavut Marine Infrastructure projects in both Pond Inlet and Iqaluit including project designs and potential effects and mitigation. Particular focus was on Inuit harvesting rights and access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues noted for Pond Inlet but recommended a meeting be held with the Community Lands and Resources Committee (CLARC) concerning the NIRB Screening review.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CGS will contact CLARC to organize a meeting.</li> </ul>