









to have access to quality information with a view to making informed decisions in natural resource dossiers. Ms. Beaupré also specified that Makivik has complete confidence in the procedures in place at the KEQC, COFEX-North and the KEAC to prevent conflict of interest.

Mr. Philie indicated to Ms. Beaupré that the information to which Makivik seeks access is usually available online on the KEQC and the other committee websites.

Ms. Koperqualuk reiterated her disappointment at not being able to meet with Mr. Adamie Delisle-Alaku in person. She would have preferred an Inuk to speak on behalf of the Inuit regarding a request that is supposed to represent the Inuit, or at least someone with beneficiary status. Mr. Joseph Annahatak, board member of the KEQC, agreed, stating that he too would have preferred to speak with Mr. Delisle-Alaku directly.

Daniel Berrouard, board member of the KEQC, added that the KEQC's decisions are made by consensus and they aim to ensure the interests of the Inuit, in accordance with the organization's mission.

Ms. Koperqualuk said that she would like to receive clarifications on the possible role of a Makivik observer at the KEQC's meetings.

Ms. Beaupré presented the background of the Nunavik self-government consultations and explained that Makivik wants to learn more about the current environmental assessment program in place, in particular, the impact studies. Makivik would like to have a big-picture view to better negotiate in this context. Mr. Philie pointed out that if the KEQC were to open a permanent observer position to Makivik, other organizations might also want to send observers and that it would be difficult to establish criteria to determine which requests should be accepted or refused. Furthermore, Mr. Philie added that Makivik's first letter could be interpreted as calling into question the KEQC's legitimacy in representing Inuit interests. Ms. Beaupré answered that the letter should instead be understood as Makivik's desire to have quick access to quality information so as to better respond when consulted on natural resource issues, which is a regular occurrence.

Ms. Koperqualuk said that she would still like to meet with Mr. Delisle-Alaku in person to ask him what, in his opinion, is not working in the current environmental decision-making and co-governance processes in Nunavik.

Ms. Beaupré admitted that she is unable to answer this question in Mr. Delisle-Alaku's stead, but that she believes that it is not a question of operations, but rather of access to information, as she mentioned earlier. Ms. Cynthia Marchildon, board member of the KEQC, then asked Ms. Beaupré whether Makivik could obtain this information by other means and whether it had considered methods other than a permanent observer to obtain the big-picture view it seeks of the situation of the environmental assessment program in Nunavik.

Ms. Beaupré replied that Makivik is preparing a report on the overlap of the environmental program's various processes, but that she would like to be able to closely observe the decision-making processes, as well as the public consultation processes.

Mr. Philie indicated that Makivik is always invited to public consultations. Finally, because the time allotted to this issue was up, Mr. Philie thanked Ms. Beaupré, as a representative of Makivik, for her time.

After discussion, the members agreed to send another invitation to Mr. Delisle-Alaku to personally attend a future meeting of the KEQC and discuss the subject.

Action: The Executive Secretary will draft a letter to Mr. Delisle-Alaku to reiterate the chair and the KEQC's invitation to personally attend a future meeting of the KEQC.

## **5. Project to Increase the Salluit Thermal Generating Station Capacity (3215-10-013)**

### 5.1. Complementary information

*Task: For discussion, decision*

The proposed project consists of replacing existing generators 1 and 2 of the power station with two new units that would increase the installed capacity from 2,878 kW to somewhere between 4,768 and 5,168 kW. This increase would thus guarantee electricity from 1539 kW (current situation) to a firm power capacity of somewhere between 2,671 and 2851 kW. Work is expected to begin in summer 2021 and finish in summer 2022.

On April 1, 2020, the Commission received from the Administrator a copy of the preliminary information regarding the project to Increase the Salluit Thermal Generating Station Capacity

After discussion and review of the information provided, the KEQC had decided to address a first set of 14 questions and comments to the proponent, concerning, among other issues: the proponent's emergency preparedness plans; projected increases in electricity consumption; projected increases in greenhouse gas emissions; noise emissions from the operating power plant; accommodations for workers coming from the south to replace groups; the social, economic and public health impacts of the construction phase; and, the management of hazardous residual materials from the construction site.

On September 21, 2020 the Commission received from the Administrator the answer of the promoter to these questions and comments.

After discussion and review of the information provided, the Commission considers that the promoter answered these questions and comments in a satisfactory manner. However, the members of the Commission would like to have more details on the hypothesis used by the promoter for the projection of the augmentation of emissions of greenhouse gases of the new units. Thus, the Commission decided not to subject this project to the environmental and social impact assessment and review procedure, once these details obtained.

Action: Obtain details on the greenhouse gas emission projections and once these have been communicated to members for approval, send a letter to the Administrator - Non-registration.

## **6. Direct shipping ore project, project "2a" (Goodwood) by Tata Steel Minerals Canada (3215-14-014)**

### 6.1. Annual report 2019

*Task: For discussion, decision*

Due to the volume of this dossier and the lack of time, the Commission decides to postpone to the next meeting all discussions and decisions concerning this project.

**7. Raglan Mine Project, phases II and III by Glencore (3215-14-019).**

7.1. Answers to condition 4 of the certificate of authorization of July 11, 2017

*Task: For discussion, decision*

Condition 4 of the certificate of authorization of July 11, 2017 states that :

« Within three years of authorization, the proponent must re-assess its planned mitigation measures for caribou. This reassessment shall be carried in light of the results of the study conducted by the Research Chair of Caribou Ungava. The objective of their study is to determine the patterns of habitat selection on the summer and wintering grounds of migratory caribou and to determine the relationship between the habitat selection strategy and the survival of individuals. The proponent will indicate if mitigation measures need to be modified.”

On July 13, 2020, the proponent filed with the Administrator a reassessment of the caribou mitigation measures, based on the elements requested in condition 4 of the July 11, 2017, amendment of the CA. All the mitigation measures presented in the impact study are included, with the exception of road control through convoys that the company is considering discontinuing.

After discussion and review of the information provided, the Commission considers most of the proposed mitigation measures adequate. However, the Commission has a series of questions and comments regarding the following:

**QC 1.** Mitigation Measure 1 is a protocol vehicle drivers should apply when they spot caribou on or near the road, and it includes limiting speed or coming to a complete stop. These actions are determined by the distance between the road and the caribou and the animals' behaviour or activity (i.e. moving, direction of travel, feeding and resting).

Since telemetric caribou tracking information is available, since caribou presence is monitored by the “environmental monitorer” and all observations of caribou are recorded, it is suggested that the proponent adapt its transportation strategy to the presence or absence of caribou to further reduce their disturbance. For example, transport at night and by convoy could be favoured when caribou are present.

**QC 2.** Mitigation Measure 2 calls for Glencore chartered helicopters to fly at a height of 600 m. It should be noted that this minimum height of 600 m must be calculated from ground level.

**QC 3.** Mitigation Measure 5 consists of limiting, as much as possible, the construction of new access road sections, particularly toward the caribou's legal calving grounds. The location of the mine site in the critical caribou habitats (calving and summering grounds) makes it relevant for the proponent to prepare a road development plan that limits the expansion of the road network as much as possible.

**QC 4.** Glencore indicated that the measure limiting the frequency of vehicle traffic via convoy transport must be entirely abandoned because, based on the study by Lawhead et al. (2004), this measure is ineffective in reducing disturbance to female caribou with calves near gravel roads. However, transport in convoys appears to be a measure with high mitigation potential if the frequency of the disturbance is considerably reduced.

For herds of caribou, reducing the frequency of travel would logically reduce the number of disturbances and thus increase the road's permeability to caribou. The KEQC suggested that, instead, the proponent intensify this measure when caribou are observed in the sector. Finally, the KEQC also suggested that convoys be used when caribou daily travel rates are at their lowest.

Action : send a letter to the Administrator – questions and comments

## 7.2. Answers to condition 7 of the certificate of authorization of July 11, 2017

*Task: For discussion, decision*

Condition 7 of the certificate of authorization of July 11, 2017 states that :

- “The proponent will monitor final effluents as follows:
- Monitor final effluents for all contaminants subject to an effluent discharge objective (EDO) and test for toxicities, as well as for elements necessary for the interpretation of toxicity results, i.e. conductivity, hardness and total dissolved solids;
- The frequency of monitoring must be four times a year;
- The detection limits of the analytical methods used should make it possible to verify, as far as possible, compliance with effluent discharge objectives;
- Three years after the issuance of this amendment to the certificate of authorization, the proponent will submit to the Administrator an analysis report on effluent quality monitoring data. This report will present the comparison between the effluent discharge objectives and the results obtained according to the principles of the Lignes directrices pour l'utilisation des objectifs environnementaux de rejet relatifs aux rejets industriels dans le milieu aquatique, published by MDDELCC (2008). If exceedances of effluent discharge objectives are then observed, the proponent will present to the Administrator the cause of these exceedances and the means that he intends to implement to meet or come as close as possible to these objectives;
- In the event that acute or chronic toxicity is measured in the effluent, the proponent must, first of all, carry out closer monitoring of the effluents in order to verify if the problem persists. If this is the case, the causes of the exceedance must be investigated, and an approach must be taken to eliminate or reduce this toxicity as quickly as possible.”

The proponent filed a follow-up report on the environmental discharge objectives (EDO) on July 13, 2020, with the Administrator.

After discussion, the KEQC believed that the report the proponent submitted generally meets the requirements of condition 7 of the July 11, 2017, amendment to the certificate of authorization. However, in order to prepare the 2023 report, which will cover 2020 to 2022, the KEQC asked the proponent to provide corrective measures to reduce the discharge of contaminants in the effluents for each parameter exceeding the EDO, in particular for nickel.

To this end, the KEQC asked that the proponent evaluate the performance of its various mining wastewater treatment systems.

Corrective measures could include process optimization, re-evaluation of good practices or adoption of new technologies. The feasibility of these measures and their possible implementation will have to be explained. In addition, if acute or chronic toxicity persists, the report must list the causes and present new measures to reduce or eliminate it.

7.3. Answers to condition 8 of the certificate of authorization of July 11, 2017

*Task: For discussion, decision*

Condition 8 of the certificate of authorization of July 11, 2017 states that:

“The proponent will submit to the Administrator, for approval, three years after the issuance of this amendment to the certificate of authorization, an update of the Raglan Mine environmental and social monitoring program. The program must cover all monitoring activities required by the authorizations issued to date and show the changes made to environmental and social monitoring activities with phases II and III. The program will include a monitoring protocol for implemented means of communication with partners and communities. It will contain the method used to monitor each measurement and performance indicator. It will also target the qualitative component concerning the survey process with Inuit workers to verify their satisfaction with their working conditions and general well-being at work. *These protocols should be developed in collaboration with the Kativik Regional Government and the Nunavik Department of Public Health.*”

To meet the condition and update its environmental and social monitoring program, Glencore has submitted two documents, namely the Environmental Monitoring Program<sup>1</sup> and the Social Monitoring Plan.<sup>2</sup>

The KEQC was satisfied with the Environmental Monitoring Program; it considers that the changes made to the monitoring of ambient air quality are acceptable, given the distance of mining activities from inhabited areas and the presence of stations close to sensitive receptors.

The KEQC wished to point out, however, that dust emissions are an important issue for the Inuit and that it considers the sampling stations added in the Deception Bay, François Malherbe Lake and Duquette Lake sectors will make it possible to document emissions in these areas.

Regarding the Social Monitoring Program, Ms. Koperqualuk asked about the measures to assist Inuit employees in accessing housing in the communities. While it would appear that such a program exists for employees coming from outside Nunavik (although not mentioned in the documents submitted by the proponent), Ms. Koperqualuk noted the absence of a similar program targeting employees wishing to remain in Nunavik. She asked about the reasons for this lack.

In addition, the KEQC asked the proponent to respond to the following questions and comments:

---

<sup>1</sup>. GLENCORE CANADA CORPORATION. *Environmental Monitoring Program*, Version No. 2, Raglan Mine, July 2020, 31 pages and 3 appendices.

<sup>2</sup>. GLENCORE CANADA CORPORATION. *Social Monitoring Plan*, SNC-Lavalin, June 2020, 23 pages and 7 appendices.

1. The proponent should indicate the total duration of its social monitoring plan.
2. The Social Monitoring Plan was developed in 2020 using a participatory approach with local and regional Inuit stakeholders. Table 1-1 on page 6 summarizes the consultations carried out and lists participating parties, namely the Raglan Committee, the Kativik Regional Government (KRG) and the Nunavik Health and Social Services Board. The proponent must indicate whether workers, land users and community members in Salluit and Kangiqsujuaq were consulted with a view to validating the monitoring indicators and collecting comments to improve the social monitoring plan. These stakeholders' points of view are desirable to paint a complete picture of the community's expectations.
3. Table 1-1 indicates that many of the comments stakeholders made during the meetings to validate and improve the plan have since been included. In a spirit of feedback and transparency, Glencore must indicate which comments were integrated into the plan initially drafted in January 2020. As there seem to be more comments coming, Glencore should indicate when it expects to receive, consider and integrate these comments, if any, and then inform the MELCC.
4. In addition to the quantitative data, the Plan aims to obtain, via surveys, a qualitative portrait of Inuit employee satisfaction and Salluit and Kangiqsujuaq community member perceptions of the Raglan Mine. Glencore must specify how the surveys will be conducted (one-on-one, with a researcher, by telephone, mail, etc.).
5. On page 9, it is mentioned that a summary of the social monitoring results will be prepared and communicated to the communities of Salluit and Kangiqsujuaq. To foster the best possible access to information, Glencore must specify the means by which it intends to share the results with the two communities.
6. Table 2-2 on page 15 of the Plan provides an example of how the monitoring results will be presented. Consistent with the information provided in the introduction to section 2.2, namely the elements considered, a column for "proposed follow-up actions" should be added to Table 2-2.
7. The proponent intends to conduct a survey every two years to validate Inuit workers' satisfaction with their working conditions. To obtain a more complete picture of life on the job site, Glencore must indicate whether it intends to also survey non-Inuit workers regarding working conditions and employee relations, among other considerations.
8. The proponent must indicate whether the surveys it plans to conduct will be pre-tested before being conducted. If so, it must present the approach to these tests (number of participants, planned dates, adjustments to questionnaires, etc.).

Action : send a letter to the Administrator – questions and comments

## **8. Innalik Hydroelectric Project in Inukjuak (3215-10-005)**

### *8.1. Follow-up to Condition 3 of the August 23, 2019, Certificate of Authorization*

*Task: For discussion, decision*

Under condition 3 of the August 23, 2019, certificate of authorization, the proponent was required to file with the Administrator the modalities of its complaint management and social impact monitoring program, within six months after the authorization.

On May 7, 2020, the promoter informed the Commission that temporarily, due to restrictions for the prevention of COVID-19, it could not comply with condition 3 of the certificate of authorization.

On September 18, 2020, the proponent filed its complaint management and social impact monitoring program with the Administrator. Who in turn informed the Commission on September 28, 2020. This was presented and approved by the Monitoring and Consultation Committee formed for the project construction and operation phases.

After discussion and analysing the information received, the Commission concludes that with this program the proponent has complied with condition 3 of the August 23, 2019, certificate of authorization

**Action : send a letter to the Administrator – condition met**

## **9. Road to Puimajuq deposit—Nunavik Nickel project by Canadian royalties Inc. (3215-14-007)**

### *9.1. Answers to condition 2 and 3 concerning the watercourse crossing on the road to Puimajuq deposit*

*Task: For discussion, decision*

The KEQC attached four conditions to the amendment to the March 17, 2020, certificate of authorization for the exploitation of the Puimajuq deposit and the infrastructures related to this project, two of which were to be approved by the KEQC before the start of works. These conditions are in regards to the presentation of a variants analysis of the infrastructure for the crossing of a watercourse on the road linking the Allammaq and Puimajuq deposits (condition 2), and to a water quality monitoring program before, during and after the works, including monitoring of water quality and fish crossability (condition 3).

With respect to condition 2, the KEQC considered that the watercourse crossing proposed by the proponent is adequate and that the proponent has met the requirements laid out in Condition.

With respect to condition 3, the KEQC considered that the monitoring before, during and after the work is insufficient in terms of the monitoring of water quality and fish passage through culverts that has already been carried out as part of the Nunavik Nickel project.

The KEQC therefore asked the proponent to add the following elements to its program:

- Monitoring of the integrity of spawning grounds during the duration of the development work and over the five consecutive years following the completion date of the work. The proponent must present to the KEQC the remediation

measures it would implement if an impact on the spawning grounds is observed.

- A photographic, dated and geo-referenced report of the watercourse over 100 m upstream and 200 m downstream of the infrastructure, as well as the identification of potential spawning areas upstream and downstream of the infrastructure.

Action : send a letter to the Administrator – follow up of the condition of the CA, questions and comments

**10. Project to Dismantle, Clean up and Restore Mobile Camp Sites Request #2 by Club Chambeaux, Inc. (3215-21-014)**

- 10.1. *Second Report on the Dismantling of Mobile Camp Sites*  
*Task: For discussion, decision*

As part of the environmental and social impact assessment and review procedure set out in Title II of the *Environment Quality Act*, the Kativik Environmental Quality Commission (KEQC) has analyzed the report on the dismantling of the mobile camps for request #2, sent to it by the MELCC on March 13, 2020, concerning the project under consideration.

After analyzing the information obtained at that time, the KEQC considered that the proponent had not provided the information for all the camps to be dismantled, and therefore asked the proponent to monitor operations for the sites that had not yet been completely dismantled and restored, and to describe the work carried out, illustrated by photos, in a second dismantling report. The second report was sent to the KEQC on September 8, 2020.

After reading the second report, the KEQC considers that the proponent has provided the necessary monitoring, as requested, regarding the mobile camp sites that had not been completely dismantled and restored. The proponent mentioned that a new exemption request will be filed with the Provincial Administrator in mid-December 2020 for the dismantling, clean-up and restoration work on mobile camp sites over the 2021 season. The proponent therefore plans to carry out the final stages of the works on camp SCM 10508-26 at the same time as the work for the camps included in the new request for exemption. Should the KEQC grant this request, it would expect to receive a report on the dismantling of this camp within nine months of the works.

The KEQC will inform the Naskapi Nation, given that the six mobile camps that are the subject of this request are located in the Nation's area of interest.

Action: send a letter to the Administrator – condition met. C.c. Naskapi Nation of Kawawachikamach

## NEW DOSSIERS

### 11. Project of hydraulic Structure in Salluit to Cross the Kuuguluk River (3215-08-23)

#### 11.1. Preliminary information

*Task: For discussion, decision*

The project consists of designing a hydraulic structure to cross the Kuuguluk River to provide access to a cemetery. The existing structures are aging, maladapted to the hydraulic conditions and require annual corrective works to ensure user safety. The project would replace the culverts and facilitate water flow during spring flooding periods, provide safe access to the cemetery for the community and ensure the free passage of fish. The structure's footprint is planned to be 30 meters long and the right of way would measure 4.5 meters. The crossing will be a single lane and therefore traffic will be alternated. The new structure will be built on the same site as the old culverts without any additional encroachment onto the shoreline. The five existing culverts will be replaced by a new alignment of six circular culverts of two meters in diameter.

After analyzing the preliminary information received, the KEQC asked to receive more information from the proponent in order to continue analyzing this dossier and thus render its decision on whether or not to subject the project to the environmental and social impact assessment and review procedure. The KEQC therefore asked the proponent to answer the following questions and comments:

- QC-1.** In its preliminary information, the proponent stated that the storage of excavated materials must be off the shoreline of any lake, watercourse or wetland. Although the storage is temporary, the proponent must specify the minimum distance that will be maintained at all times from the natural high-water mark. In addition, the proponent must specify the location of the site used by the contractor, including the site trailers.
- QC-2.** The proponent must specify whether wetlands and water environments are found in or near the work site. If wetlands or water environments will be affected, the proponent must provide the types of environments affected and the corresponding surface areas.
- QC-3.** In its preliminary information, the proponent provided certain information about threatened or vulnerable wildlife species (or that are likely to be named so) in the area of the works. However, no information has been provided regarding the verification of occurrences of threatened, vulnerable or likely to be threatened plant species. The proponent must provide this information.
- QC-4.** The proponent mentioned that works to develop a diversion canal to replace culverts may be carried out. The proponent must provide information related to the possible development of the canal, including work methods, the refilling and the removal of the canal as well as protection measures.
- QC-5.** The proponent mentioned that granular material would have to be used in the various phases of the project. The proponent must specify the source, type and quantity of granular material used in the project. The proponent must also indicate how it will ensure that the materials be free of fine particles and contamination (including non-leachable metals).
- QC-6.** The proponent must indicate whether a site supervisor will be present over the various phases of the works, to ensure that the project is monitored and that mitigation

measures are applied.

Action : send a letter to the Administrator – questions and comments

**12. Project of installation of culverts in the Northern village of Kangirsuk, by Kativik regional Government (3215-05-005)**

12.1. Beginning of maintenance work

*Task: For information*

The proponent informed the KEQC of restoration and upgrading works on a project that received a certificate of exemption in June 2013. The KEQC considered that the works submitted come under the scope of the original certificate. Therefore, the KEQC made note of the information provided and considered that no further action or decision is required.

**Action: The KEQC acknowledges receipt of the information submitted by the proponent.**

**13. Varia**

**14. Next meetings**

The next KEQC meeting is planned for December 3, 2020.



- 8. Innavik Hydroelectric Project in Inukjuak (3215-10-005)**
  - 8.1. *Follow-up to Condition 3 of the August 23, 2019, Certificate of Authorization*  
*Task: For discussion, decision*
- 9. Road to Puimajuq deposit—Nunavik Nickel project by Canadian royalties Inc. (3215-14-007)**
  - 9.1. Answers to condition 2 and 3 concerning the watercourse crossing on the road to Puimajuq deposit  
*Task: For discussion, decision*
- 10. Project to Dismantle, Clean up and Restore Mobile Camp Sites Request #2 by Club Chambeaux, Inc. (3215-21-014)**
  - 10.1. *Second Report on the Dismantling of Mobile Camp Sites*  
*Task: For discussion, decision*

#### **NEW DOSSIERS**

- 11. Project of hydraulic Structure in Salluit to Cross the Kuuguluk River (3215-08-23)**
  - 11.1. Preliminary information  
*Task: For discussion, decision*
- 12. Project of installation of culverts in the Northern village of Kangirsuk, by Kativik regional Government (3215-05-005)**
  - 12.1. Beginning of maintenance work  
*Task: For information*
- 13. Varia**
- 14. Next meetings**





<b>Innavik Hydroelectric Power Project in Inukjuak, by Innavik Hydro Ltd.</b>	KEQC to MELCC	Follow-up on Condition 8 of the August 23, 2019, Certificate of Authorization	Sent September 17, 2020	A/R septembre 18, 2020	
<b>Construction of a new access road on the territory of the Northern Village of Inukjuak 3215-05-007</b>	KEQC to MELCC	Attestation of exemption	Sent September 15, 2020	A/R September 16, 2020	
	MELCC to proponent		Sent September 30, 2020		
<b>Raglan Mine Project—Increase of the Maximum Annual Ore Processing Capacity at Katinniq 3215-14-019</b>	KEQC to MELCC	Authorization of modification of the certificate of authorization	Sent September 15, 2020	A/R September 16, 2020	
<b>Nunavik Nickel Project by Canadian Royalties Inc. Underground exploitation at Expo west site (3215-14-007)</b>	MELCC to KEQC	Request of authorization of modification of the CA	Rec'd September 17, 2020		
	KEQC to MELCC	Authorization of modification of the certificate of authorization	Sent October 19, 2020	A/R October 19, 2020	
<b>Nunavik Nickel Project by Canadian Royalties Inc. (3215-14-007)</b>	KEQC to MELCC	Environmental monitoring report	Sent September 17, 2020	A/R September 18, 2020	Q&C concerning the 2019 monitoring report
<b>Project to dismantle, clean and refurbish mobile camp sites— Demand #2 by Club Chambeaux Inc. (3215-21-014)</b>	MELCC to KEQC	Dismantling report	Rec'd September 21, 2020		
<b>Salluit thermal generating station capacity increase project by Hydro-Quebec (3215-10-013)</b>	KEQC to MELCC	Complementary information (Responses to questions and comments)	Rec'd September 21, 2020		

<b>Direct shipping ore project, project “2a” (Goodwood) by Tata Steel Minerals Canada</b>	MELCC to KEQC	Annual report	Rec'd September 21, 2020		
<b>Request for a Makivik's permanent observer at KEQC's meetings</b>	Makivik corp. to KEQC		Rec'd September 23, 2020		
<b>Request for a Makivik's permanent observer at KEQC's meetings</b>	KEQC to Makivik corp.		Sent September 25, 2020		
<b>Request for a Makivik's permanent observer at KEQC's meetings</b>	Makivik corp. to KEQC	answer to the invitation to participate in KEQC 257th meeting	reçu le 29 septembre 2020		
<b>Innavik Hydroelectric Power Project in Inukjuak, by Innavik Hydro Ltd.</b>	MELCC to KEQC	Follow-up on Condition 3 of the August 23, 2019, Certificate of Authorization	Rec'd September 29 2020		
<b>Construction of a new thermic power generation station in the northern village of Puvirnituk</b>	KEQC to MELCC	Guidelines for environmental and social impact study	Sent September 29, 2020		
	MELCC to proponent		Sent October 14, 2020		
<b>Nunavik Nickel Project by Canadian Royalties Inc. (3215-14-007)</b>	MELCC to proponent	Environmental monitoring report	Sent September 30, 2020		Q&C concerning the 2019 monitoring report
<b>Hydraulic Structure in Salluit to Cross the Kuuguluk River (3215-08-23)</b>	MELCC to KEQC	Preliminary Information	rec'd October 5, 2020		
<b>Raglan Mine Project, phases II and III by Glencore (3215-14-019).</b>	MELCC to KEQC	answers to condition 8 of the certificate of authorization of July 2017	rec'd October 29, 2020.		