

Questions for Parties to the NIRB Hearings on the Baffinland Phase 2 Proposal

The Hamlet of Pond Inlet

Joshua Arreak, Mayor

mayor@pondinlet.ca

Frank Tester, Technical Advisor

frank.test@ubc.ca

Baffinland:

1. In stating that the current operation at 6.0 (or if it were increased to 6.5) Mtpa is not sustainable, what is included in this calculation? Is money borrowed or credit extended and already spend in anticipation of the approval of Phase 2 included in looking at the profitability and viability of the *current* operation?
2. Why have no formal (formative or summative) evaluations have been undertaken of existing training programs for prospective mine employees, including, but not restricted to the Q-step program? Why have no interviews been done with employees who have left – for any reason – Baffinland’s employ, in order to better inform policies and practices affecting Inuit employees and to better understand the difficulties and challenges that Inuit employees face in working for Baffinland?
3. Seals are the primary country food consumed by Mittimatalingmiut. In assessing effects on the marine environment, given the importance of seal to the food security of Mittimatalingmiut, why did Baffinland not undertaken a more extensive and comprehensive assessment of the effects of shipping, and especially ice-breaking on ringed seals?
4. Baffinland has listed an Inuit training center as one of the benefits of the Phase 2 Proposal for the Hamlet of Pond Inlet. However, the \$10M contribution of Baffinland is only that – a contribution. Whether or not this is in fact, a benefit to the Hamlet depends on agreements yet to be reached with other parties that, as far as the Hamlet knows, have not been reached and are not certain at this time. Please clarify. What is the current state of these negotiations? Who, for example, will be providing accommodation and services for trainees and ongoing operating and maintenance costs for such a facility? What demands would such a training center place on services for which the Hamlet is responsible – power, water and sewer delivery and pick-up, fire protection, etc.? Why is this listed as a benefit when negotiations have presumably not been completed and such a facility, even if Phase 2 were approved, is not a certainty?

5. In its 2018 Addendum application for the Mary River Phase 2 Expansion Project, Baffinland claimed that the income received by Mittimatalingmiut and Inuit of other mine-involved communities would create a local market for goods and services. What was this prediction based upon, given the reality of the average annual income received by Inuit employees in mine-involved communities, and income that, on average, barely replaces what a family of 4 would have as disposable income if it were on social assistance?

Fisheries and Oceans Canada

1. A review of documents and reports submitted to NIRB by Fisheries and Oceans Canada, indicates that the monitoring of narwhal fat and cortisol levels is recommended as an important indicator of the population's health with respect for concerns related to both morbidity and mortality. Inuit hunters have reported that Narwhal caught as the season progresses have less body fat than was historically the case and sink rapidly, with implications for getting a float attached as soon as possible.

Yet Fisheries and Oceans, with a commitment to respecting and considering Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (along with the proponent, Baffinland) has not insisted that Baffinland undertaken such monitoring as a condition for going forward with Phase 2. Given the importance of this species in relation to the Marine Conservation Area and a species important to the health and economic well-being of the Hamlet, why has Fisheries and Oceans not been more declarative and insistent that this monitoring be a condition for Phase 2 Approval?

Government of Nunavut

1. The Department of Family Services had a mandate to “enhance the well-being and self-reliance of Nunavummiut through integrated and innovative services.” The Phase 2 Proposal, based on experience with the existing mine operation, has a long list of implications for the well-being and self-reliance of Mittimatalingmiut. Yet the Department of Family Services has been completely absent from these hearings.

Many Mittimatalingmiut have struggled in some cases with a two-week in, two-week out work schedule. This has implications for family well-being, for interpersonal relations and situations that can give rise to jealousies, family function and violence. Based on research conducted elsewhere, there are issues with earned income and substance use, difficulties transitioning from social assistance to paid employment with implications for changes in the cost of housing. There are issues with financial literacy that may result in food insecurity and difficulties for women and children when one or both parents are missing from the home for extended periods. The Department is responsible for career development, adult learning and training supports.

Why has the Department had no voice in these hearings, given its mandate and the social and family implications of mine employment for Mittimatalingmiut? Why has the Department submitted no assessment of the adequacy and effect of Baffinland's existing programs dealing with family impacts and an assessment of what the effects of the Phase 2 Proposal on Mittimatalingmiut?

01/03/2021