



NUNATSIAVUT
kavamanga Government

Nunaligninikmik amma Nunamiutanic
Ujaganik Imaniklu

Lands and Natural Resources

May 25th, 2012

Darren Hicks, MES
Environmental Analyst
Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Petroleum Board
140 Water St., 4th Floor
St. John's, NL A1C 6H6
709.778.1431 office
709.778.1432 fax
www.cnlopb.nl.ca

**Multi Klient Invest Offshore Labrador 2D Seismic Program 2011-2013
Environmental Assessment Amendment (CEAR # 11-01-59997)**

Dear Mr. Hicks,

Please find below our responses with respect to the environmental assessment amendment of Multi Klient Invest's Offshore Labrador 2D seismic program. All original comments have been included with follow-up responses below.

Response to MKI response #1

Original NG Comment:

The Nunatsiavut Government is adamant that seismic activities do not disrupt the fishery, irrespective of the seismic survey plan of MKI.

MKI Response:

MKI can confirm that they will adopt a seismic survey acquisition plan that will not interfere with any fishing vessels active in the project area.

As last year, MKI's primary mitigation plan is avoidance. As discussed at the recent seismic workshop, provision of the locations of the main fishing areas for crab, shrimp and turbot would enable MKI to incorporate these into our acquisition plan. This would

25 Ikajuktauvik Road, PO Box 70, Nain, NL, Canada A0P 1L0 ▶ Tel: 709.922.2942 Fax: 709.922.2931 ▶ Email: nain_reception@nunatsiavut.com

Makkovik
PO Box 92
Makkovik, NL A0P 1J0
Tel: 709.923.2365
Fax: 709.923.2366

Hopedale
PO Box 91
Hopedale, NL A0P 1G0
Tel: 709.933.3777
Fax: 709.933.3746

Rigolet
PO Box 47
Rigolet, NL A0P 1P0
Tel: 709.947.3383
Fax: 709.947.3371

Postville
General Delivery
Postville, NL A0P 1N0
Tel: 709.479.9880
Fax: 709.479.9891

Happy Valley - Goose Bay
1A Hillcrest Road, PO Box 909, Str. 'B'
Happy Valley - Goose Bay, NL A0P 1E0
Tel: 709.896.8582
Fax: 709.896.2610

North West River
7-13 River Road, PO Box 234
North West River, NL A0P 1M0
Tel: 709.497.8356
Fax: 709.497.8311

be used in conjunction with the VMS information supplied by FFAW.

All mitigation identified in the EA, will be followed during the course of the survey. As per the C-NLOPB letter dated Sept 8, 2011, during the operational stage(s) of the project, communication protocols will be in place via a combination of personnel resources, both onboard the vessel (Fisheries Liaison Observer, two Inuit Observers, the vessel Master/bridge crew and Party Chief) and onshore (Availability of a Single Point of Contact, supported by MKI project management personnel), all of which will form the basis of the communication program with Inuit fisheries to ensure no disruption to the Inuit fishery as a result of the seismic program.

All weekly status reports, including a description of all communications or interaction with fishers and their relevant organizations, including Inuit fishers and Nunatsiavut Government, in the preceding week will be provided to the C-NLOPB. This information can also be provided to a single point of contact within the Nunatsiavut Government.

NG Response to MKI:

The Nunatsiavut Government will provide MKI with a contact that has access to the maps identifying the locations of the main fishing areas of importance for crab, shrimp and turbot as well as the corresponding dates that those areas are to be avoided.

As discussed at the seismic workshop, the Inuit Fishers are not part of the FFAW and therefore, the location of our vessels will not be supplied by the FFAW. We recognize the importance of this communication for vessels under the FFAW, but for this same reason, having an Inuit Fisheries Liaison Officer is essential.

A single point contact for the weekly status reports will be Rodd Laing (rodd_laing@nunatsiavut.com).

Response to MKI response #2

Original NG Comment:

The Nunatsiavut Government requests that a thorough research effort be put forth to determine the impacts and effects of the seismic program on the Labrador Inuit Settlement Zone and Inuit fishery.

MKI Response:

The C-NLOPB noted in their letter to the Nunatsiavut Government dated Sept 8, 2011 that established research funds such as the Environmental Studies Research Funds (ESRF) is best suited to pursue environmental research that is not associated with a specific survey program. Some research of this type that was identified in the Labrador Shelf Strategic Environmental Assessment, was proposed to the ESRF, was funded, and

is awaiting startup, with a working group led by a Nunatsiavut Government staff member overseeing the research.

This topic was actively discussed at the recent seismic workshop with contributions from the Nunatsiavut Government, C-NLOPB, DFO, and Operating Companies that were present. It was highlighted and recognized that research programs take both time to develop, implement and depending on the nature and scale of the research require significant level of financial and resource commitment from multiple stakeholders over many years; hence, the focus on efforts through ESRF.

A review of available scientific knowledge was conducted as part of the EIA process. More practically it was highlighted that there were no known negative impacts as a result of the seismic program in 2011.

NG Response to MKI:

As discussed in the seismic workshop, the ESRF program is not the ideal research platform / program for the Nunatsiavut Government. While we do want to continue being a part of ESRF and future research programs with the fund, the program does not have Inuit priorities as the basis of the research. The Nunatsiavut Government will continue to work with all organizations (C-NLOPB, DFO and Operating Companies) to establish a research program that is more directly suited to our needs.

There has been no evidence highlighted by MKI to indicate a lack of negative impacts of the 2011 seismic program. The Nunatsiavut Government would like MKI to provide evidence to support the statement: "it was highlighted that there were no negative impacts as a result of the seismic program in 2011". As evidenced during the seismic workshop, some fishers from our region experienced a decrease in harvest immediately following the passing of the seismic vessel.

The Environmental Observations report does not show any evidence to support this claim. Quotas and landings are not a metric to account for effort. Therefore, a thorough study that includes Nunatsiavut fishers is necessary to attempt to determine the impacts of seismic on the fisheries within the region. There was discussion at the seismic workshop of an upcoming ESRF study to investigate catch per unit effort, but it was unclear if Nunatsiavut fishers would be included in the study. This is necessary, if the study takes place.

Finally, it is the proponent's responsibility to show, beyond reasonable doubt, that there are no negative impacts of seismic on the region. So far, there has been no scientific evidence presented to the Nunatsiavut Government to show this lack of impact.

Response to MKI response #3 and #5

Original NG Comment:

The Nunatsiavut Government recognizes the training of 4 Inuit marine mammal observers for the future seismic work as a positive step forward by MKI. However, integration of the Inuit observations into the marine mammal observation data did not occur during the 2011 seismic survey. This lack of integration of the Inuit data is unacceptable and moving forward it is essential that the Inuit observations are included in future surveys by MKI.

MKI Response:

MKI can confirm that trained Inuit marine mammal observers will be engaged during the 2012 survey and their observations along with those of the other onboard MMO's will be integrated into the marine mammal observation data.

Original NG Comment:

The Nunatsiavut Government state that best practices in relation to protection of marine mammals is expected.

MKI Response:

MKI can confirm that the requirements of the EA and the Canadian Statement of Practice will be followed in relation to protection of marine mammals.

NG Response to MKI:

The Nunatsiavut Government would like a commitment from MKI that along with standard Marine Mammal Observations, that distance to animal be collected. Also, the Nunatsiavut Government would like a commitment from MKI that when a marine mammal is unable to be clearly identified to the species level, and is within or on the edge of the mitigation zone, that the airguns will be shutdown.

Response to MKI response #4 and #6

Original NG Comment:

In the future, the Nunatsiavut Government recommends that the proponent consult with the Nunatsiavut Government about the appropriate temporal and geographic scale of the seismic program to mitigate the effects on the Inuit fishery, prior to the amendment of the environmental assessment.

MKI Response:

MKI will make best efforts to consult with the Nunatsiavut Government prior to the submission of an amendment to the environmental assessment to mitigate the effects on the Inuit fishery of any future temporal or geographic changes to the project area.

Original NG Comment:

The Nunatsiavut Government recommends increased communication and consultation to address the ongoing concerns of Inuit in the region.

MKI Response:

MKI will make every effort to increase and improve communications with the Nunatsiavut Government to address the ongoing concerns of Inuit in the region. The recent seismic workshop was a success in establishing links with members of the Nunatsiavut Government and this can form the basis for improved communications going forward.

In addition, MKI representatives travelled to Cartwright and Plum Point to hold additional Public Meetings with fisher's that were arranged by Sikimuit Environmental Management ahead of the 2012 survey.

Furthermore, following last year's Public Meetings MKI has made contact via email or post with all Stakeholders that attended the consultations in the communities in 2011 and sent them a copy of the Environmental Report produced from the survey last year.

NG Response to MKI:

This is an area of high importance for the Nunatsiavut Government. If MKI is serious about having open and productive discussions with the Nunatsiavut Government, continuous consultation is necessary. The Nunatsiavut Government would like to see MKI work towards implementing the recommendations we put forth, rather than this process being solely a necessary step to starting seismic in our region. The significant amount of time and effort invested in this process are wasted if the concerns of Labrador Inuit are not taken seriously.

Best Regards,



Rodd Laing
Environmental Assessment Manager
Nunatsiavut Government
P.O. Box 70
Nain, NL A0P 1L0
Phone: 709-922-2567
Fax: 709-922-2931
rodd_laing@nunatsiavut.com
www.nunatsiavut.com