

Info

From: Chris Kanaan <chriskanaan@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 2:24 PM
To: Info
Cc: Emily Koide; Erin Reimer
Subject: NIRB "waterline" comments (11MN034)

Dear Nunavut Impact Review Board,

As noted near the end of the presentation uploaded to the NIRB registry welcoming feedback by e-mail, I would like to respectfully provide a comment.

Terminology matters. Until early 2020, at the request of Agnico Eagle's Jamie Quesnel to the Nunavut Impact Review Board during the initial submission for the pipeline project in March, the word used to describe the so-called "waterline" was pipeline; Mr. Quesnel stated his objection to this because the word 'pipeline' has a negative connotation of fuel conveyance. Mr. Quesnel and Agnico Eagle, in my view, appear to not want the people of Rankin Inlet to have full disclosure as they fear it may risk increased opposition to the project, which appears absolutely vital and imperative for the continuation of the Meliadine gold project.

In Agnico Eagle's technical environmental submission for the so-called waterline project under consideration at Meliadine, even Agnico Eagle's own consultant of choice, Golder Associates, references the so-called waterline as a pipeline. From an engineering perspective, the terminology to properly convey the true and accurate description would be to call it a pipeline. Even in domestic water applications, we would expect to hear 'copper pipeline' not waterline as an adequate description of how water is conveyed into our personal homes.

It appears evident Agnico Eagle has chosen the word waterline to avoid the negative association with oil or other hazardous substances which typically face intense scrutiny and often protests, delays, etc in modern Canada. In my view, the Nunavut Impact Review Board would be better serving Nunavut Inuit by calling the waterline a pipeline, as anything less is incredibly misleading and would unlikely be permitted in other jurisdictions throughout Canada.

From Agnico Eagle's own technical records, the so-called waterline carry's water that is a large volume amount of saline water that may be contaminated with trace metals and other stuff, such as ammonia, due to blasting activity. My observance is the Agnico Eagle community team has pitched the project to the community as a 'waterline' that is carrying ocean-like water, without noting the other potential substances in this saline water. To assume treatment is perfect and only the best water will always be discharged into Melvin Bay is not fair.

In conclusion, the project is undoubtedly a pipeline and not a waterline. To call it anything less than a pipeline carrying saline water is "watering down" and undermining the regulatory process and full disclosure to the community of Rankin Inlet and beyond. The water quality does not match the waters of Melvin Bay and there is always a risk of metal contamination and damage to the marine environment. To assume Agnico Eagle's treatment capabilities are as good as they state they will be, even in a best case scenario, seems far-fetched given their previous and substantial troubles at water management and water predictions.

Sincerely,

Chris Kanaan
chriskanaan@yahoo.com