

**National Energy Board
June 2012 Community Engagement Report**

1. Introduction	2
2. Community Engagement Plan.....	3
3. General Observations	4
4. Community Summaries.....	6
4.1. Pangnirtung.....	6
4.2. Clyde River	8
4.3. Pond Inlet.....	9
4.4. Iqaluit	11
4.5. Qikiqtarjuaq and Kimmirut	13
5. Summary	14

1. Introduction

MKI (“the Proponent”) submitted an application to the National Energy Board (NEB) for approval to conduct a 2D seismic survey in Baffin Bay and Davis Strait, herein referred to as the Project. In compliance with the CEA Act, MKI has submitted an Environmental Assessment to the NEB and identified six Inuit communities for consultation. The six communities are: Pond Inlet, Clyde River, Qikiqtarjuaq, Pangnirtung, Iqaluit, and Kimmirut. The community consultation process began in 2011, when RPS Energy Canada Ltd (RPS) held meetings with the Hunters and Trappers Organizations and the public, as described in Response to the NEB Information Request #1 (Appendix 6).

RPS contracted NEXUS Coastal Resource Management (NEXUS Coastal) to develop a community engagement plan for consultation with the six communities and relevant organizations. To ensure effective consultation, NEXUS Coastal developed a community engagement strategy that provides the opportunity for meaningful dialogue between the community and the project proponent. The NEXUS Coastal consultation strategy ensures that significant stakeholders, relevant issues, and project experiences are included in the development of the community engagement plan. Information gathered in the consultation strategy was incorporated in the community engagement plan for the six Nunavut communities

The purpose of the community engagement sessions was to facilitate communication between the communities and the project proponents. Two of the community engagement sessions, in Kimmirut and Qikiqtarjuaq, were cancelled due to weather-related issues but have been rescheduled for mid-October. The community meetings held are show in Table 1; rescheduled consultations are shown in Table 2.

Table 1. Community Consultations

Community	Participants	Date	Time	Location
Pangnirtung	Community members	14 June 2012	7pm to 11:30pm	Community Hall
Clyde River	Cultural Centre	20 June 2012	11am to 12pm	Cultural Centre
Clyde River	Community members	20 June 2012	6pm to 9pm	Community Hall
Clyde River	Mayor and Council	21 June 2012	10am to 11:30am	Hamlet Office
Pond Inlet	Members of HTO, Hamlet administration	22 June 2012	1pm to 3pm	Hamlet Office
Pond Inlet	Community members	22 June 2012	6pm to 10pm	Community Hall
Iqaluit	Baffin Fisheries Coalition	25 June 2012	10am to 11am	Baffin Fisheries Coalition Office
Iqaluit	Government of Nunavut representative	25 June 2012	2pm to 3pm	QIA Office
Iqaluit	Community members	25 June 2012	6pm to 8pm	Baffin Fisheries Coalition Boardroom
Iqaluit	Mayor and Council	25 June 2012	Presentation (30 minutes)	City Hall
Iqaluit	Government of Nunavut and QIA representatives	26 June 2012	3:30pm to 5pm	Department of Executive and Intergovernmental Affairs

Table 2. Rescheduled Consultations

Community	Date	Time	Location
Qikiqtarjuaq	11 October 2012	6:00pm	Community Hall
Kimmirut	15 October 2012	6:00pm	Community Hall

2. Community Engagement Plan

The community engagement strategy ensures that relevant stakeholders are engaged at multiple stages throughout the consultation process. The following was considered when developing the community engagement strategy:

- The history of engagement with the community
- The culture of the community
- The demographic, social and economic landscape of the community
- Literacy and language barriers
- Project implications on the community

The community engagement plan for the Project's community consultation consisted of five steps:

1. Compiling background information on the communities
2. Communicating with the hamlet in each community via email and telephone to decide upon a time that the engagement sessions would be held
3. Placing an information notice in the Nunatsiaq News newspaper and online to inform community members of the engagement sessions. The notice was in both Inuktitut and English. A notice was also broadcasted on CBC radio in Iqaluit when the location of the meeting was changed
4. Arranging meetings with additional stakeholders after the community engagement sessions have been booked. These stakeholders included the Qikiqtani Inuit Association, the Baffin Fisheries Coalition, the Arctic College and the Government of Nunavut
5. Beginning the follow-up process after the meetings, and planning for the next stage of the community engagement

An informative PowerPoint presentation on the proposed Project was developed and presented at the community engagement sessions. The presentation materials were in both English and Inuktitut. The presentation included a summary of the Project, a description of 2D seismic surveys, the Environmental Assessment (EA) process, MKI Project commitments, and Project mitigation measures.

While in each community, in addition to the community presentations, the Engagement Team met with relevant stakeholders to ensure that a variety of stakeholders were consulted with throughout the trip. The meetings were held with hamlet councils, hunters and trappers organizations, industry and organizations. These meetings provided the opportunity to gather information from multiple stakeholders.

3. General Observations

Written observations of participants' comments were made throughout the stakeholder engagement meetings. It was noted that general widespread concerns about local offshore development activities were not specifically linked to the Project, but they were statements made regarding general concern about overall 'research' and 'development' in Nunavut. The concerns reflected a general feeling of disempowerment over the future fate of the resources upon which community residents have been dependent. This is an issue that is beyond the scope of responsibility of proponents of any single development project, but ultimately affects the decision-making processes.

In each of the communities there was a general concern about "southerners" (persons and corporations from South of 60°N) undertaking research in the North, oftentimes putting their interests ahead of Inuit interests. This perception of development has resulted in a general community distrust of extra-territorial development agents due to the uncertainty of the long-term project benefits for the Inuit.

Distrust was evident during the community engagement sessions, as community participants were reluctant to provide their names for a sign in sheet at the meeting. Several participants voiced their concerns as to how their names could be used and felt that it was unnecessary to provide their names at the meeting.

In each community meeting, there was, in general, opposition to seismic surveys on "principle". This opposition was not directed specifically at the current Project, but rather was based on a perception that any activity that could interrupt or disturb whale migration and animal wellbeing should not be permitted. Marine resource development activity is often seen as negatively impacting Inuit traditional harvesting activities and the Inuit way of life¹.

Within the communities, there is a general confidence that Inuit traditional knowledge is both accurate and broad and cannot be replaced with western science-based research. The unique relationship between the Inuit of Nunavut and their surrounding land and waterways is ecological, spiritual, and social in nature. *Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit (IQ) is a related body of knowledge, which is necessary to, and which Inuit shall bring to, responsible decision-making regarding the lands, waters, and marine waters*². It was evident in the meetings that the IQ system places value on "certainty" of information, while the science knowledge system includes a reliance on statistical probability in dealing with "uncertainty". This could be the result of living in a harsh environment where there is little room for error in resource harvesting efforts – hunters must be certain that effort expended on harvesting results in a yield or the family will not survive. The knowledge system will, therefore, build upon information on resource abundance and distribution that will ensure successful harvests. As a result, hunters are cautious of any development that cannot answer, with certainty, any questions regarding a projects impact on their traditional resources.

The IQ knowledge system is a robust system built on generations of experience and knowledge building. The effectiveness of this system has been recognized and protected in accordance with the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement. During the meeting Inuit community members identified that an Inuit Traditional Knowledge (IQ) Study should be put forward prior to the commencement of this Project. The IQ Study can provide an opportunity for effective knowledge sharing and engagement, which will benefit both the community and project.

During the community engagement sessions it was evident that translation of technical terms can be problematic. Direct translation from English to Inuktitut can be either inaccurate or unspecific translation, or the scientific

¹ An exception to this opposition appears to be evident in the commercialization of the turbot fishery. Inuit fishing effort has been increasing which can significantly affect whale populations through direct competition for foraging species.

² Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement for National Wildlife Areas and Migratory Bird Sanctuary in the Nunavut Settlement Area. 2006. Environment Canada.

“meaning” can be lost because of limited exposure to science terminology in some sectors of the community. More effort needs to be made in community engagement sessions to provide accurate and appropriate explanations of complex scientific terminology.

It was difficult for community participants to separate the proposed Seismic Survey Project from the long-term development activities that may result from the use of the survey data. Many community members believed that the Project is the only first short step towards oil and gas production. As a result, many of the community's concerns were beyond the scope of this Project, but tied to the larger environmental issues associated with oil development.

In addition, there was some misunderstanding regarding the role communities have in the decision making process for the project. Initially, communities were under the impression that this was an EA under Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) approvals procedures. It was explained that this Project would occur outside of Nunavut territorial waters, and therefore under National Energy Board regulatory review.

In each community, some participants clearly stated that they could not support any development project that could impact their traditional foods³. It was commonly noted that there is a general concern that there may be no benefits accruing to the communities from the seismic survey, but the traditional harvesters are assuming the risks associated with the project. This perception is based on their experience where southern researchers /developer have collected information for resource extraction projects (mines and community development, in particular) disregarding the impact these processes had on Inuit culture and traditional harvesting. Therefore, it is important that Project benefits be discussed with the communities and decided upon before the Project commences.

A number of comments were made about the scheduling of community engagement sessions. The Engagement Team was consistently informed that the timing of these sessions was inadequate as many people are out on the land in the spring and summer and, therefore, attendance would be low. These comments were based on the misperception that there would be a single meeting between the communities and project proponents, as is commonly their experience. However, it was explained that community engagement is a process (which may include additional meetings and communication via email, telephone and mail) that takes place before, during, and after a project. This explanation appeared to alleviate the concern individuals had about the timing of the community engagement sessions.

Furthermore, in some communities, participants were of the impression that a quorum of community members was required in the event that there would be a ‘vote’ on the project. Unlike projects under NIRB review, this Project adheres to the NEB requirements for community engagement. Participants were informed that the purpose of the presentations was to provide information about the Project and to begin to build a positive relationship between each community and the project proponent. Once this was explained the engagement sessions were productive and open dialogue ensued.

As noted above, the initial Kimmirut and Qikiqtarjuaq community engagement sessions were rescheduled for mid-October. It is recommended that follow-up meetings be held later in the fall with the communities, the Engagement Team, and project proponents. These follow-up meetings will provide the opportunity for many of the questions and comments documented in each community to be addressed. Furthermore, these follow-up meetings provide the opportunity to continue to build positive relationships with each community and gather information for an IQ study. The fall follow-up meetings with the communities are tentatively rescheduled for mid to late November.

³ It was however, noted that some of the participants who expressed this view were also actively involved in the commercialization of the turbot fishery.

4. Community Summaries

The following is a summary of the engagement sessions held in Pangnirtung, Clyde River, Pond Inlet, and Iqaluit. These summaries identify the community's concerns, comments, and questions, which will act as a guide for future community engagement activities.

4.1. Pangnirtung

The community engagement session in Pangnirtung was held at 7pm on 14th June 2012 in the hamlet community hall. The Engagement Team met with the hamlet manager to discuss the seating arrangement and refreshments for the community engagement session. The room was set up with a table at the front for the multimedia projector, with three rows of chairs set up in a semicircle facing the front. Coffee/tea refreshments and homemade bannock was set up on a table at the back of the room.

When facilitating a community engagement session it is essential to understand the context of the community's 'mood', or atmosphere, the facilitator might experience. Prior to arriving in Pangnirtung, the Engagement Team was informed that a meeting on an Ocean Tracking Network hosted by Government of Nunavut and Researchers from Waterloo University received an adverse reaction from the community two days previous. The community was under the impression that the project's underwater receivers were negatively affecting local arctic char and seal populations. As a result of heated opposition expressed in the community meeting, the project has been removed from Pangnirtung and will be reestablished in another community in the Qikiqtani region.

During the Project community engagement session there remained a mood of "opposition" to outside projects in Pangnirtung. Furthermore, participants may have felt that they had decision-making authority over other marine research projects, as they had with the Ocean Tracking Network project. As a result, the overall atmosphere of the meeting was one of frustration and confusion. A number of participants vocalized their concerns, questions, and general comments pertaining to the proposed 2D seismic survey in Baffin Bay and Davis Strait.

Twenty-three individuals from the community attended the meeting, with the general demographic being male between the age of 40 and 65. The Engagement Team encouraged participants to ask questions throughout the meeting as well as during the question period at the end of the presentation.

During the meeting it became clear that local Inuit hunters were concerned about the potential environmental impacts of conducting a 2D seismic survey in Baffin Bay and Davis Strait. These concerns revolved around the idea of uncertainty, which is a concept that does not translate in Inuit culture. Inuit live in a world in which "certainty" with respect to the communities traditional resources. The notion that the probability that an impact "might" or "might not" happen was not acceptable. They want to know what will happen, when it will happen, how often it will happen, and what it will do to marine mammals.

It was evident that community participants were looking for more certainty and hard facts pertaining to the potential impacts of seismic survey. The Engagement Team provided answers to these questions during the engagement information sessions; however, if a question required further research, the team informed the community that the answers would be provided to the Hamlet at a later date or during the next round of engagement sessions.

The following comments and questions were presented during the community session:

Question: Will the sound impact marine mammal migration?

Answer: The proponent will provide a response to the community. Information will be forwarded to the Hamlet contact for distribution to interested members of the community.

Question: How can you determine if you have harmed a marine mammal?

Answer: In the marine environment, it is difficult to determine if a project has an effect on marine mammals as marine mammals are constantly moving and other factors in the environment can affect marine mammals. These other factors can include ships, earthquakes, and icebergs breaking apart. To limit the potential effect of this project on marine mammals, the project will follow the 'Canadian Statement of Practice with respect to the Mitigation of Seismic Sound in the Marine Environment'.

Question: How far is the after affect going to carry?

Answer: Sound travels further in the water than in the air. Noise from other boats, and natural phenomenon, like earthquakes, can be heard throughout the oceans. This constant background noise is present throughout the oceans and whales have begun to adapt to this noise by communicating in higher frequencies.

The effect of the seismic survey in a distance, will contribute to this background noise, but only for a short period of time. It is impossible to determine how far such as 100km or 1000km the sound from the project will travel and be distinguishable from other noises in the environment.

Question: How much impact will it have?

Answer: The design of the 2D seismic survey includes mitigation measures to lessen the project's impact on the environment. These mitigation measures include a 30 minute ramp up procedure, marine mammal observers, fisheries liaison officers, pollution prevention protocols, and communicating with communities.

Question: If and when something goes wrong on the project, is the company held accountable? How?

Answer: Project Proponents are committed to protecting the environment. There are protocols in place to prevent and clean up environmental damage caused by the vessel. These protocols follow international standards and regulations. The Arctic Shipping Pollution Prevention Act (ASPPA) and the Arctic Shipping Pollution Prevention Regulators (ASPPR) developed the protocols for having a vessel in Arctic waters. Also, the vessel will avoid areas of ice, as the survey cannot be completed near ice. This will reduce the chance of collision with an iceberg or ice floe.

Question: Was it the company's strategy to do this last minute so not many people would show up to the meeting?

Answer: No, as was explained during the session, and in prior communications with the Hamlet, this information session is the first step of the engagement process. It was not the company's intention to have the meeting at the last minute. The purpose of this meeting is to explain the project and to gather community members' questions, concerns, and suggestions and bring those questions, concerns and suggestions to the company. Communication with your community will continue. This can be in the form of further meetings, newspaper ads, posters, radio announcements, mail, and email. Due to feedback about the meeting time, all future meetings will take into consideration that this is not an ideal time for public meetings.

Question: What happens with the information? Who has access?

Answer: The information collected from the 2D seismic survey will be collected and held by the project proponent.

During the meeting a number of suggestions/ requests were discussed by local Inuit community members. These requests included using Passive Acoustic Monitoring, completing an Inuit Knowledge Study, and an Impact Benefit Agreement.

4.2. Clyde River

The Team met with staff at the Cultural Centre to explore collaborative opportunities with the Centre for training and interests they may have in the project. Staff indicated they would attend the formal community meeting.

The community engagement session in Clyde River was held at 6pm on 20th June 2012 in the local community hall. The Engagement Team arrived at the hamlet to meet with the hamlet manager to discuss the location and seating arrangement for the upcoming community engagement session. The room was set up with a table at the front for the multimedia projector, with two rows of chairs set up in a semi-circle facing the front.

Twelve community members attended the meeting, which largely consisted of local hunters. The atmosphere of this community engagement session was significantly different than of the one held in Pangnirtung. Although similar concerns were presented, community members were more willing to discuss ways to move forward so that mutually beneficial relationship can be established.

A number of the hunters described the impacts that northern development has had on local marine mammals. Many stated that they have noticed that many seals have gone deaf and no longer are scared by gunshots. Many Inuit community members continue to be heavily dependent on country food (marine mammals and fish) as a main staple of their diet. The changes hunters have noticed in these animals have included the change in taste of polar bear meat and the taste and thickness of whale blubber.

Other statements made by the community included:

- Concerned that if this project leads to oil exploration that the oil companies will neglect the environment
- Local Inuit are the ones with all the risk (they have the most to lose)
- Concerned that Inuit are not adequately represented by Inuit
- 500m exclusive zone is too small, should be 2,000 to 3,000m

The following questions were asked during the meeting. It became clear that the community participants had a better understanding of the seismic survey process but still had concerns on the potential impact on the potential impact

Question: If I were beside the air gun in the water would I survive?

Answer: We are not aware of any studies that have looked at the effect of seismic surveys on a person right below the sound source. The proponent will look into this question and provide a response to the community. Information will be forwarded to the Hamlet contact for distribution to interested members of the community.

Question: What if they notice a lot of algae in the water during the survey? What will happen? Will the survey stop?

Answer: This has been researched in the past. Studies have shown that algae are not negatively affected by the sound produced from 2D seismic surveys.

Question: This information is for the benefit of an oil company? For oil exploration, correct?

Answer: The data and information documented throughout the survey can be used in a number of ways. In addition to learning about what's below the ocean floor, information about whales, fishery, and the marine environment will be collected. The information collected may influence decisions that are made in the community. For example, we can further our understanding about whale migratory paths. The information collected about what's below the ocean floor is property of the project proponent and as such, they can sell that information to other companies.

Community members of Clyde River voiced their concerns about the potential impacts of the seismic survey; however, they also suggested ways in which the project proponent can work alongside them so that the community has some of the benefits not simply the risks. For example, during the discussion the community indicated to the consultants that the community desires a wharf.

During discussion with the hamlet council the next day it was stated that the community was under the impression that Small Craft Harbours (DFO) had intended to construct wharfs in multiple communities; however, at this time the Government of Canada had funded only the Pangnirtung wharf. The hamlet suggested benefits of a wharf to a seismic survey project and offshore development since the Clyde River harbor is protected from the Baffin Bay. If the weather in the Baffin Bay gets too rough, the survey vessel can seek protection in Clyde River instead of being damaged in the rough seas.

4.3. Pond Inlet

The community engagement session in Pond Inlet was held at 6pm on 22nd June 2012 in the local community hall. The Engagement Team met with the hamlet manager to discuss the seating arrangement and refreshments. The hamlet manager then organized a preliminary meeting with six members of the Hunters and Trappers Organization (HTO). Those in attendance expressed their concerns regarding the timing of community engagement sessions. There was a concern that the community would not be adequately represented as many people are out on the land in the spring and summer and, therefore, attendance would be low. However, it was explained that community engagement is a process (which may include additional meetings and communication via email, telephone and mail) that takes place before, during and after a project. This explanation appeared to alleviate individual concerns about the community engagement schedule. This meeting also demonstrated the willingness of the HTO and hamlet to work with the project proponents to ensure that the project will reduce any risk of negative impacts. For example, the migratory movement and behaviour of narwhal was discussed and the HTO and hamlet suggested ways that the project could avoid areas when migrating pods of narwhal would be present. This type of information and constructive dialogue can be compiled through a Traditional Knowledge Study.

The larger public community engagement session was hosted in the Hamlet's community hall. The room was set up with a table at the front for the multimedia projector, with three rows of chairs set up in a semi-circle facing the front. Coffee/tea refreshments and snacks were set up on a table in the kitchen of the community hall.

Fifteen community members, including local hunters, and politicians, attended the meeting. The atmosphere of this community engagement session began with tension as many of the participants were confused and thought the Project was the Lancaster Sound, Jones Sound, and North Baffin Bay seismic survey Project (originally discussed in the community in 2010) that was the subject of an injunction from the Nunavut Court of Justice⁴.

In Pond Inlet, some participants at the meeting presumed this project was the Lancaster Sound, Jones Sound and North Baffin Bay seismic survey Project from 2010, and that it fell under the NIRB regulatory review. This was clarified and then discussion refocused on the project and potential impacts, as well as opportunities for the community.

⁴ Pond Inlet has considerable experience with economic development activities (Parks Canada, Baffinland mine) and consultation procedures from past projects. In 2010, a seismic survey project was proposed for Lancaster Sound by Natural Resources Canada as a part of a five-year Geo-mapping program. The Qikiqtani Inuit Association (QIA) sought and received an injunction as they felt the federal and territorial governments did not meaningfully consult and accommodate the interests of the Inuit, as per the NIRB. The Inuit argued there was a lack of adequate consultation measures and the negative impacts to their culture and livelihoods was too high and too unknown.

After clarification, participants voiced similar concerns regarding seismic surveys heard in the Pangnirtung and Clyde River community engagement sessions. As noted below, these concerns related to potential disturbance and impact on marine mammals.

During the meeting many participants voiced their concerns related to the potential negative impacts seismic surveys would have on their marine animals. The opposition that was voiced during the meeting was not directed specifically at this project, but rather, based on observations made during the public sessions on the previous Lancaster Sound, Jones Sound and North Baffin Bay Seismic Survey project.

The following questions were asked during the meeting. The comments and questions from Pond Inlet identified the communities concerns about the potential impact on marine mammals and the environment.

Question: What type of benefit could a seismic test have (to Pond Inlet residents)?

Answer: There will be opportunities for Pond Inlet residents to work on the project. As we have discussed, Marine Mammal Observers and Fisheries Liaison Officers will be hired from Nunavut communities. Community members that are trained to be Marine Mammal Observers and Fisheries Liaison Officers will bring new skills and knowledge back to their communities. RPS is currently scheduling MMO training at the Pond Inlet Arctic College. This training was provided in Iqaluit Arctic College to the Environmental students back in May of this year. However, the training scheduled in Pond Inlet was cancelled due to availability of the students. In correspondence with Arctic College it appears this will likely proceed in early 2013, based on student availability.

Question: What will the negative impacts be?

Answer: The potential impacts from the project may vary but a number of mitigation measures will be implemented to avoid or diminish these impacts. Possible effects of the project on whales include short term behavioural changes and temporary hearing loss. As we have mentioned, the project proponents will be taking precautionary steps to avoid the possible negative effect of the project. These measures include following the 'Canadian Statement of Practice with respect to the Mitigation of Seismic Sound in the Marine Environment', having a Fisheries Liaison Officer to communicate with the fishery, and following the protocols put in place by Arctic Shipping Pollution Prevention Act (ASPPA) and the Arctic Shipping Pollution Prevention Regulators (ASPPR).

Question: Is this not the same project as the other seismic survey in Lancaster Sound that got stopped in 2010?

Answer: No, this is not the Lancaster Sound project from 2010. This is a different project in a different area that is funded and operated by a different company.

Question: Will I have a say?

Answer: Yes, that is why we are here. We are here on behalf of the project proponents to discuss the project with your community and to document your questions, concerns, and ideas about this project. The project proponents would like to work with communities so that the project can be mutually beneficial.

Question: How deep does the survey read the rock?

Answer: The survey uses sound waves to give a picture of the bottom and what's below the bottom of the seafloor. The sound waves, produced by the air source, are directed down toward the ocean floor. Different rock types under the ocean floor reflect the sound waves back to the surface. We are not sure how deep the survey will go down to the ocean floor; however, we will find out and make sure the information is provided back your community. The proponent will provide a response to the community. Information will be forwarded to the Hamlet contact for distribution to interested members of the community.

Question: How would you know that whales are there if they are under water?

Answer: Some surveys use passive acoustic monitoring, which will allow the vessel to listen for the whales under water. Passive acoustic monitoring is a technique used to listen for whales under the water. A hydrophone, which is an underwater microphone, is placed in the water and people listen to the hydrophone for sounds that whales make. In addition, there will be Marine Mammal Observers onboard the survey vessel looking for whales at the surface of the water.

Question: What will happen if the animals are negatively impacted?

Answer: It is difficult to know if an animal is negatively impacted as a result of this project. As we have mentioned, the project will follow the “Canadian Statement of Practice with respect to the Mitigation of Seismic Sound in the Marine Environment”. The Canadian Statement of Practice was developed to lessen the potential for seismic survey to effect the marine environment.

Question: How far does the sound travel under water?

Answer: The sound source will be pointed at the bottom of the ocean. However, there will be some sound that travels outwards from the sound source and sound will bounce off the ocean floor to be reflected back to the survey equipment.

Sound travels further under water than in the air. Noise from other boats, and natural occurrences like earthquakes, can be heard throughout the oceans. This constant background noise is present throughout the oceans and whales have begun to adapt to this noise by communicating in higher frequencies. It would be difficult to determine how far outwards from the sound source that the sound will travel.

Question: Is there research from Greenland that says if whales were harmed?

Answer: Seismic surveys have occurred in the waters off Greenland. We will review studies published on seismic surveys in Greenland to see if they mention any impact on marine mammals. We will provide you with the information we find. The proponent will provide a response to the community. Information will be forwarded to the Hamlet contact for distribution to interested members of the community.

Throughout the meeting some suggestions were made by Inuit community members. These included:

- The creation of a committee to offer advisory support solely made up of Inuit.
- Increase the time for the Ramp Up Procedure (some felt that it should be longer than 30 minutes and that expanding the timing of the Ramp Up Procedure to a few hours would give the whales and other marine mammals adequate time to leave the area, limiting the potential impact on marine mammals).

4.4. Iqaluit

At the time of the community engagement activities, there were a number of other scheduled events, which occurred on the same day and time as the planned community engagement session, including a number of public events related to a meeting of the Northern Premiers. This limited the opportunity for residents to participate in the session.

The first meeting was with the Baffin Fisheries Coalition (BFC) on June 25th, 2012. In 2011, the BFC submitted a letter to the NEB expressing the company’s concerns around the impact on fish behavior and the potential decrease in catch per unit effort. Another concern noted was the timing of the seismic survey project as it occurs in prime fishing territory. However, in the meeting, it was stated that BFC does not oppose this project provided that seismic surveying is scheduled so as to not directly interfere with fishing activity. The BFC expressed a desire to work closely with the project proponents so that the fishing vessels and the seismic survey vessel are not in the

same area at the same time. It was explained that the survey would take place over four to five years and that there should be the opportunity to work together to identify means to mitigate the effect of the survey on the fishery.

The Engagement Team also had the opportunity to present a brief presentation to the Iqaluit City Council. The Baffin Bay and Davis Strait Seismic Survey project was presented to nine councilors including Mayor Madeleine Redfern. The councilors had a few questions about the background of the project:

Question: What is the research for?

Answer: The research is to better understand the ocean floor for potential resource development

Question: Who is funding the project?

Answer: TGS Nopec and Petroleum GeoServices.

Question: Who is buying the data collected?

Answer: At this point in time no one has purchased the data to be collected. However, potential buyers of such information may include commercial fishery organizations, the Government and industry.

After the presentation the Mayor and other councilors expressed their regret that they could not attend the community engagement session due to prior commitments; however, they hoped there would be future engagement sessions so they would be able to attend and learn more about the project.

The community engagement session for Iqaluit was scheduled for 25 June 2012 at 6pm at the Baffin Fisheries Coalition boardroom. The location and time for the community engagement session was broadcasted on CBC radio. Unfortunately the other events, and inclement weather, no community members attended. The following morning it was brought to the Engagement Teams attention that a few community members had waited outside of, but not entered the HTO building where the session was held.

A CBC North Radio/TV reporter-editor was present at the community engagement session.

Comment: The role of NEXUS Coastal (the Engagement Team) in the project?

Response: NEXUS Coastal was subcontracted by RPS Energy Canada Ltd. who was contracted by the project proponent to develop and complete the community engagement sessions with communities. Our role is to facilitate communication between the communities and the project proponents. NEXUS Coastal completed engagement sessions in Pangnirtung, Clyde River, Pond Inlet and Iqaluit, where we explained the project and gathered community members' questions, suggestions and concerns about the project. We will provide that information to the project proponent and continue the engagement process. Due to inclement weather conditions in Kimmirut and the airport runway being washed out in Qikiqtarjuaq, those engagement sessions have been rescheduled for the fall.

Comment: The concern about the timing of the engagement sessions

Response: We need to remember that effective community engagement is not a one-time event. The project proponent is aware of this and these engagement sessions are the start of the community engagement process. As I had mentioned, after we complete these engagement sessions, the project proponent will have the information necessary to inform further community engagement.

Comment: The reason for poor attendance at the Iqaluit meeting

Response: Unfortunately in Iqaluit there are a number of other meetings being held tonight, of which we were not aware of. However, community engagement is a process and this is not the last time that the Iqaluit community will be engaged. In addition, the NEXUS Team provided a presentation at the Iqaluit Council meeting and we have also met with a representative from Baffin Fisheries Coalition while in Iqaluit.

Comment: The community engagement strategy

Response: The community engagement strategy consists of information sessions with the communities (of which we are in the process of doing), and after that we will complete a report on these sessions and provide recommendations, based on input from the communities, for further engagement. Further engagement may consist of additional visits to each community, written correspondence and announcements on radio stations. In each community, we have also identified a person that will be used for further community engagement.

The interview resulted in an article written, and posted on the CBC News North website. Included in this article is a quote from the Baffin Fisheries Coalition CEO "My understanding is they've met with the QIA and with the city here and some other officials - the process is being done. I've certainly learned more today and yesterday, I guess, than what I knew before".

A joint meeting was also held with representatives from the GN and QIA This meeting was held to provide an update to the GN and QIA regarding the consultation sessions and to advance further dialogue respecting the project. The GN provided positive feedback on the community consultation process as undertaken and communicated by RPS and implemented by the Engagement Team. It was suggested that every effort be made to continue communication with the communities through correspondence to provide feedback on questions and concerns raised (public education materials) and through direct meetings with community representatives.

A meeting was also held with an interested resident (employed with the Government of Canada). The resident had made an attempt to be present at the community session. He provided comment on the project, suggesting that several media outlets be used to let people know more about the project and the economic opportunities that may be provided. A telephone meeting was also held with a representative of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency (CANNOR), regarding the project. It was suggested that a separate meeting be arranged to discuss the project with CANNOR when RPS representatives are next in the region.

4.5. Qikiqtarjuaq and Kimmirut

Unfortunately due to unfavorable weather and the flooding of the Qikiqtarjuaq runway, the community engagement sessions in Kimmirut and Qikiqtarjuaq were cancelled. These sessions have been rescheduled for mid-October (Qikiqtarjuaq October 10-11 and Kimmirut October 15-16).

5. Summary

The following summarizes general observations made during the meetings with community, governmental and industry representatives in Pangnirtung, Clyde River, Pond Inlet, and Iqaluit. Specific questions asked in each community are listed in the previous community summary sections.

1. Effective Communication

Communication is a key component of community engagement. It was important to not only provide information about the project but also to document the communities' comments, concerns, and understanding of the proposed project. Sharing knowledge and information is key to establishing positive long-term relationships between all acting participants.

2. Reluctance to voice support for the Project

The community participants who were either in favor of or, at a minimum, not opposed to offshore development were reluctant to offer their opinion publicly but did so after the meetings and individually with the Engagement Team. This may account for their reluctance to sign in at the beginning of the meeting. The reluctance to publicly offer their support of the Project may have resulted in the fear of being ostracized for publicly supporting a project that may impact community members' livelihoods and food sources.

Setting up a secure web-site where persons can provide comment, or pose questions to the Project proponents during the final planning stages and during project implementation may assist in this.

3. Long-term engagement strategy

Recommendations were made by communities, based on their past experience, to have a longer-term engagement strategy (for the duration of the project). This strategy will involve community meetings, email consultations and development of information packages (updates) for the communities.

While Kimmirut and Qikiqtarjuaq will be followed up in mid-October, follow up meetings will be held in all communities with the Engagement Team. This will provide more opportunity for meaningful pre-project engagement measures to be implemented, and a vehicle to resolve issues as they may arise during project implementation. Follow up meetings are planned mid-November 2012.

4. Lower the risk and increase the benefit to the communities

The communities concerns about the potential negative impact of seismic surveys have been identified throughout this report. It became clear that the communities do not want to hold all of the risk without receiving any of the benefit from the Project. It is obvious that mitigation measures require further discussion with communities and discussions on the content and focus of an appropriate benefits agreement.

5. Incorporate the *Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit* knowledge system into the Project

Each community requested that an IQ survey be included in the project design. An IQ study will require further discussion with the QIA, Nunavut Research Institute and Hamlet Councils. A research protocol will need to be developed and standard research application completed before an IQ study can be implemented.

6. Timely response of answers to questions in each community

In each of the community engagement sessions, the Engagement Team recorded questions posed by community members that could not be answered at the time. Each question will be responded to through the hamlet office,

so that there will be no uncertainty as to the commitment of the Proponent to open and transparent discourse. This will further develop the positive working relationship between the project proponent and each community.

7. The following is a list of the recommendations made during the communities information sessions for further internal discussion at MKI:

- Impact Benefits Agreement with the communities
- Continued consultation and engagement measures
- Use Passive Acoustic Monitoring
- Undertake an IQ Study

In conclusion, the community engagement sessions provided an excellent opportunity for the Project Proponents to acquire information from the communities (Pond Inlet, Clyde River, Iqaluit, and Pangnirtung) regarding the Project. This information can be summarized in accordance with four broad thematic categories:

- Concerns regarding the impact of the Project on traditional resources, hence their traditional livelihoods.
- Interest in economic opportunities for each community available from the Project
- Willingness to collaborate to ensure negative effects are mitigated
- Need for more study/public education on the effect of seismic surveys on fish and whales.