

Technical Report Preparation Meeting

MVEIRB Office, Yellowknife

February 17, 2017

In-Person Participants:

Monica Wendt, GNWT-ENR
Emily Nichol, ECCC
Bradley Summerfield, ECCC
Gabriel Bernard-Lacaille, ECCC
Catherine Fairbairn, MVEIRB
Chuck Hubert, MVEIRB (moderator)
Sarah Robertson, NPMO
Umar Hasamy, NPMO

Jeremy Dixon, GNWT-Lands
Paul Mercredi, GNWT-Lands
Lorraine Seale, GNWT-Lands
Mike Roesch, INAC
Jess Taylor, DFO
Kate Mansfield, MVEIRB
Mark Cliffe-Phillips, MVEIRB
Robyn Paddison, MVEIRB

Phone Participants:

Carrie Brenneman, DFN
Maureen Flagler, INAC
Kim Pawley, INAC
Yongshu Fan, INAC
David Harpley, CZN
Alan Taylor, CZN

Shannon Moore, CPAWS
Jacquie Bastick, PCO
Allison Stoddart, PCO
Audrey Steven, PCO
Tamika Mulder, GNWT lands
Arusa Shafi, GNWT lands

Meeting Notes (all information presented by Chuck Hubert, unless otherwise noted):

Brief introduction, welcome to participants. Direction for participants to follow along slideshow posted to the public registry [here](#).

Round table introductions for all participants on the phone and in the board room.

Overview of Agenda (slide 1) and meeting objectives (slide 2)

- Reminder to look at [document](#) posted to registry on February 10th for tips and tricks for technical report writing

Overview of parties to EA (slide 3)

- Overview of official parties

- Mention of Oboni Riskope as 3rd party independent consultant, who will only be present at the hearings to present a summary of findings within their technical report and to answer questions relevant to their report. They will not be cross examining parties. The initial scope of work produced in February indicated that they may also present a report after hearing, but this is not the case for reasons of procedural fairness.

Technical reports and hearing phase (slide 4)

- Parties who wish to participate fully in hearings must submit technical report and presentation of summary of technical report to the Review Board in person at the hearings
- Parties can question the developer and other parties after each of their presentations (exact order of presentations TBD)
- Parties must also be available to answer questions from the Review Board, other parties and the developer

Technical Reports and the Public Record (slide 5)

- Reminder that technical reports are the final submission prior to the hearings and represent the last chance to provide new information to the Review Board
- Developer has an opportunity to respond to technical reports
- Summary presentation must only contain information within the technical reports and no new information
- Approximately 1 week between developer's response to technical report and submission deadline for presentations for reasons of procedural fairness
- After submissions, the public record is closed, however may be opened under extreme cases through request for ruling procedure.

Purpose of Technical Report (slide 6)

- Statement of parties' views on significance for project as a whole or individual project components
- People are included in definition of the environment
- Must provide rationale and evidence to support position

Technical report format and content (slide 7)

- Please include one page executive summary written in plain language
- Include brief summary of your parties' mandate
- Overview of key issues from project that are important to your party

Structure of report (slide 8)

- Recommendation is to structure report by issue
- Overview of suggested 7-stage structure for each issue

- Any new evidence used to support your position must be submitted and placed on the public record

Summary (slide 9)

- Reiteration to state views clearly using supporting evidence. The more evidence and clear rationale provided, the better the Board can understand your position.
- Advise Board on whether or not your party believes the project will have significant adverse impacts on the environment or people.

Participants are asked if they have questions. No questions raised.

Next steps (slide 10)

- David Harpley, CZN confirms that April 7 deadline for developer responses to technical reports is fine.
- Alison Stoddart, PCO confirms that people can call in for pre-hearing conference
- Chuck Hubert, MVEIRB confirms that pre-hearing conference will discuss agenda for hearing including presentation timing
- Lorraine Seale, GNWT-Lands wants to confirm hearing dates asap
- Chuck Hubert, MVEIRB confirms hearing dates, April 24-28. April 24 community hearing in Nahanni Butte, a community hearing in Fort Simpson April 25 and formal technical hearings 26-28 in Fort Simpson.
- Chuck Hubert, MVEIRB also confirms that community hearing is geared for community members to speak to the board, not for parties to actively question on technical materials
- Mark Cliffe-Phillips, MVEIRB confirms that some meetings will be evening and afternoon
- CZN wishes to confirm that parties' deadline for presentations is April 11th, developer's deadline is April 13th.
- Shannon Moore, CPAWS asks if community hearings will have teleconference capabilities. Chuck Hubert, MVEIRB responds that they will be transcribed with transcription posted to the registry the following day but we cannot guarantee teleconference due to potential for technical difficulties
- Allison Stoddart, PCO asks if formal hearings will be in Fort Simpson, and can technical specialists call in via teleconference? Chuck Hubert, MVEIRB confirms that yes, teleconference will be available during formal hearings for technical specialists. Community hearings have different intent and so no specialists.
- Jacquie Bastick, PCO asks for guidance with presentations to accompany technical reports. Chuck Hubert, MVEIRB responds that yes, we can direct parties to past presentations. They are not intended to be lengthy, but these details will be discussed further in pre-hearing conference. Mark Cliffe-Phillips, MVEIRB indicates that the Review Board will produce draft framework agenda along with instructions for presentations available for parties prior to pre-hearing conference. Please also see guidance documentation for preparing Hearing Presentations on the Review Board's website [here](#).

- David Harpley, CZN asks about community hearing in Nahanni Butte; will board and staff fly in for this session? What is the timing? Chuck Hubert, MVEIRB responds that staff will fly in and set up in the morning, likely have hearing from 2-7pm or so, but will also coordinate with NBDB to make sure timing meets community's needs.
- David Harpley, CZN mentions that they can provide video coverage of road. CZN is doing final editing on video after discussions with NBDB and can set date for viewing sometime after next week. Chuck Hubert, MVEIRB confirms that board is still interested in this, and can help to set this up for board and parties. DH anticipates that since file is quite lengthy, they plan to run from Prince George as shared screen. No audio is included but will be narrated by engineer and can be stopped as needed for discussion or two answer questions. Total viewing time will be approx. 1 hr depending on how many questions need to be answered.
- Chuck Hubert, MVEIRB inquires about availability of people on morning of Feb 23rd for viewing and, for reasons of fairness, will also ensure that it will be available on the public registry. Mark Cliffe-Philips, MVEIRB follows up to make sure that Board can put the video on its website.
- Lorraine Seale, GNWT inquires if this is CZN's meeting, and will CZN provide minutes of the meeting? Chuck Hubert, MVEIRB confirms that yes, it will be CZN's meeting. Mark Cliffe-Phillips, MVEIRB confirms that notes will be taken and provided to the public registry (details to be worked out)
- Chuck Hubert, MVEIRB confirms that no specific referencing style is required for technical reports. If referencing documents already on the public registry use the public registry number. Any new references not on the registry must be accompanied by the referenced document itself so that they can be submitted as evidence on the record. Please also be clear if you're only referencing a specific part of a new document.