

PUBLIC INFORMATION SESSION MINUTES

Official Record of Community Input & Project Team Responses

1. Meeting Information

Project / Subject Name:	Ashram Project – rare earth and fluorspar project in Nunavik
Date & Time:	September 16, 2026 6:18 PM–8:59 PM
Location / Platform:	Townhall – public consultation; Facebook Live stream was also provided

2. Official Panel & Presenters

Record internal staff, facilitators, developers, or city officials present.

Name	Title / Role	Organization / Department
Mary Johanness	Welcome / opening remarks	Mayoress
Michael Gordon	Opening remarks / landholding perspective	Nayumivik
Cindy Valence	Project presentation / VP Government affairs & Sustainability / engagement	Mont Royal / project team
Nick Holthouse	Project presentation / Managing Director / technical responses	Mont Royal / project team
Akinisie Sivuraapik	Master of ceremonies	MC
Ida Saunders; Jimmy Johannes	Translation support	Translation

3. Public Questions & Answers (Q&A)

Protocol reminder: Log concerns factually. Group anonymous community entries neutrally (e.g., 'Resident', 'Business Owner') while preserving the exact responses given by official personnel.

Speaker / Affiliation	Public Question / Concern	Official Response / Action
Community / opening remarks	Community members were welcomed and encouraged to ask questions. Concerns were raised that camping grounds, harvesting areas, land, wildlife, water, and daily life could be affected by the project.	Mary Johanness and Michael Gordon welcomed participants, emphasized that the project was not being rejected outright, and stated that the community wanted more information and an open communication line.
Project history	Participants asked about the history and current stage of the Ashram Project.	Nick Holthouse stated that work began in 2007, with first drilling in 2011 and a first Preliminary Economic Assessment (PEA) in 2012. The project remains in a study and discussion stage.
Project location and scale	Questions concerned the project's location, the pit, Lac Lamoyne, dams, waste, and how the site may look over time.	The project was described as approximately 130 km south of Kuujjuaq. The presenters discussed an estimated 30-year pit life and a pit shell representing approximately 120 years of potential resource. Further studies are required.
Mining and processing	Participants asked what the rare earth elements would be used for and how processing would occur.	The presenters explained that the elements may be used in products such as vehicle components, wind turbines, refrigerators, and cellphone screens. The described process includes crushing and grinding, concentration, and later processing involving heat and acid at a southern facility.
Chemicals and waste	Questions were raised about chemicals, radioactive materials, waste, and potential environmental impacts.	Nick Holthouse described the proposed process as using a fatty acid collector (made from pine resin) and a series of processing steps, with an objective of minimizing waste. He stated that the project was expected to produce approximately two to three truckloads of concentrate per day. Radioactive-material licensing and further environmental work

Speaker / Affiliation	Public Question / Concern	Official Response / Action
		remain matters for study.
Water and river protection	Louisa Tuakkipik and others expressed concern about radioactive materials, water quality, cancer risks, food security, and the community's dependence on rivers and harvested foods.	The presenters said water sources under consideration include Fox Lake deep water during the first years, rainwater, and snow. They stated that approximately 95% of the water could be recycled. Participants requested studies identifying what could be affected and how water would be protected and treated.
Road, rail, and transportation	Participants asked about a southern road, the existing rail line to Schefferville, the effects of road construction, and whether rail could be less destructive.	The presenters stated that transportation options remain under discussion. The PEA identified movement south toward Schefferville and Saguenay, while road, rail, bridge, and port options continue to be evaluated with relevant parties, including the Naskapi and Quebec government.
Port and infrastructure	Questions concerned a possible port or landing facility, a bridge, shipping volumes, seasonality, ownership, costs, and impacts on Kuujuaq's daily life.	The presenters said a port remains a concept and that the current option identified in the PEA involves Schefferville. A possible landing port and other infrastructure options are still being discussed. The presenters indicated that logistics, costs, and shipping schedules require additional study.
Approval and decision-making	Participants asked whether the project was already approved or a 'done deal,' who would make the final decision, and whether an ethics board or consultation process had been involved.	The presenters stated that the project was not a done deal and that no approval agreement had been reached. They described the current meeting as an information session and part of a longer social and environmental assessment process. Participants emphasized the importance of the JBNQA and meaningful Inuit representation.
Community engagement	Participants requested more frequent meetings, clear timelines, access to studies, and continued involvement before decisions are made.	The project team stated that they intend to return in approximately three months and hold another information session after six months. Regular meetings with NV, KRG, and Makivik, potentially four times per year or more frequently, were discussed. A workshop committee and continued communication were also mentioned.
Jobs and training	Participants asked about the proposed 200 jobs, local hiring, training, professional positions, and benefits for future generations.	Cindy Valence stated that the project could involve approximately 200 jobs and training opportunities, including contracting and monitoring services. Participants requested more specific information about the types of jobs, local participation, and long-term benefits.
Impact and Benefits Agreement	Participants asked how the project could benefit Kuujuaq and whether an Impact and Benefits Agreement (IBA) could be considered, referencing Glencore as a model.	Participants expressed a desire to understand benefits compared with impacts, including jobs, infrastructure, environmental monitoring, and opportunities for local people. Michael Gordon noted that discussions with Makivik and others were continuing.
Baseline and environmental studies	Questions were raised about baseline studies, no-go areas, wildlife, climate, runoff, radioactive materials, and the need to understand cumulative impacts from possible roads and future projects.	The project team stated that baseline work and additional studies are required before the project can advance. They acknowledged that many questions remain unanswered and that the concept may change as studies and discussions continue.
Regional and cumulative concerns	Participants noted that the Lac Lamoyne area connects to watersheds used by Naskapi and Kuujuaq, and that a road could enable additional mining activity in the region.	Participants requested information about regional impacts, future mining possibilities, and how the project could affect harvesting and access to the land. The project team agreed that further study and dialogue are needed.
Project finances and economic estimates	A question was asked about the amount spent on the project and the potential revenue or value over the project's life.	Nick Holthouse stated that approximately \$50 million had been spent to date on camps, studies, exploration and test work. He referred to a PEA estimate of approximately \$1.2 billion CAD to build the project and a minelife of over 30 years.
Camp operations and drilling	Questions concerned whether the Lac Lamoyne camp would operate year-round, local hiring, and whether more drilling was planned.	The presenters stated that the camp had been unoccupied for a couple of years and that the next season might begin around June of the following year. They stated that no further drilling was planned for the next three to four years, subject to future decisions and

Speaker / Affiliation	Public Question / Concern	Official Response / Action
		permitting.
Shipping and transportation volumes	Participants asked about ore quantities, the number of trucks or ships, and how often transportation would occur.	Nick Holthouse referred to a relatively small quantity of ore for transport, approximately six 20-foot sea containers hauled on trucks in the context discussed, and said that trucking could potentially occur for about ten months per year. Further details remain subject to study.
Community concerns and continued participation	Participants emphasized that the community should not be left behind, that opinions differ, and that the project must be understood before any decision is made.	Community representatives and the project team agreed that communication should continue. The project team stated that it would keep participants informed through meetings, its website, and Facebook updates.

4. Formal Submissions & Exhibits

List any physical items submitted for the official record, such as physical letters, community petitions, map printouts, or pre-made slideshow files.

Item #	Submitted By	Description of Exhibit / Document
None recorded	Project team / presenters	Presentation materials and discussion regarding the Ashram Project; no separate physical exhibits were recorded in the notes.

5. Next Steps & Public Feedback Deadlines

NEXT STEPS & FOLLOW-UP

- Project team indicated it would return in approximately three months and hold another information session after six months.
- Continue discussions with NV, KRG, Makivvik, and other relevant organizations.
- Continue baseline, social, environmental, water, wildlife, infrastructure, and transportation studies.
- Provide further information on jobs, training, local benefits, road/rail/port options, water use, waste, and potential impacts.
- Maintain public communication through meetings, the project website, and Facebook updates.
- Written feedback deadline and official review portal: Not specified in the meeting notes.

6. Attendance Record

Staff / organizers recorded: Mary Johannes, Michael Gordon, Claude Gadbois, Cindy Valence, Nick Holthouse, Akinisie Sivuavapik (MC), Eileen Emudluk, and Bridget Saunders.

Public participants recorded: Diivi Dupuis, Qauyisaq Etitiq, Roselyne Dery, Jocelyn Benoit, Willie Gadbois, Senator Charlie Watt SR, Pita Atami, Alan York, Bryan York, Dave Forrest, Craig and Lizzie Lingard, Robie Kooktook, Bobby Tukkiapik, Emily Emudluk, Joe-Willie and Jana Saunders, Aqiki Kooktook and Qullik Sequaluk-Kooktook, Annie Popert and spouse, Shirley Dupuis, Veronique Cyr, Pauline Saunders, Alec Gordon, Norman Cooper, Lucy Abraham, Elena Mesher, Benjamin Arreak, and Jobie Peters.