

Review of Action Items

Kathy: Great. Thank you. Agenda Item 4 is to review the action items, so that's the last page of the minutes. I recognize that sometimes when we go through agenda items, or action items, especially from meetings that happened six months or a year ago, sometimes the action item just changes context. So as we're going through that, we can acknowledge that if they haven't been done, they may no longer be necessary. But let's go through them.

Number 1: The GNWT will report to the parties the outcome of their discussions with NWT Archives for a public registry option. I think this was Erika's.

Erika: Well and Aaron, I'm looking to you to step in here too. Yes, the discussions with utilizing GNWT options, a decision was made on the INAC side that they are working on data management and registry. So it was sort of put on hold until further notice whether we would need to utilize GNWT opportunities. I'll let Aaron give a status update on that.

Aaron: Thanks, Erika...I think. So in the last several months, what the Project has been doing is developing a full listing flash inventory of all the various reports and documents related to the Project that we've amassed since 1999 essentially. It has been a pretty significant undertaking to do that. Some of the initiatives that were done throughout this past year, like the HHERA, helped because those folks were developing their own list of reports for reference points. So that did help.

That list is a living document, because we still continue to generate reports on a regular basis. But I feel pretty confident that we've got a good handle at least of all the reports. In some cases, it has been a bit of a challenge to get a lot of the reports, because they are old, or they resided in the repositories of consultants when our records management wasn't as good as it is now. So we're gathering all those up.

The challenge for us, as I mentioned a little bit yesterday is we have to fall under the common look and feel, and follow the standard for the Government of Canada if we were to post things. At the moment, we're going to be taking that entire list. We're going to get all the titles of all the reports translated and make that available on our website, so that everybody is aware of all the reports. If there is a request for those reports, we will provide those reports.

We are still continuing to explore other options for a public registry. This is the quickest, easiest thing to do right now. We are in the process of getting a new data management system put in place for all of our environmental data. It's called EQUIS. One of my colleagues in Ottawa, Peter Rudin-Brown, has been working that process through the federal process over the last year and a bit. We're a couple of months away of purchasing that software to be able to track that, to be able to put all of our environmental data that is currently stored in a different system into a more user-friendly system that actually labs can directly input into, as opposed to the way we do it now.

So, there's lots of progress on the information management, data management front. All of the reports that will be in that list – as I said – that list will only be translated. Hopefully folks can appreciate the fact that if we start posting things onto our website, we do have to provide them in both English and French. Right now we're very reluctant to have all of our reports translated to French. We make them available to everybody upon request. If we did get a request for it to be translated into French, we would do that on a case-by-case basis. But this is the best path forward at this moment for that stuff.

Kathy: Are there any questions for Aaron? My only question was in terms – I have two questions. When: I didn't hear a 'when.' You've got a list together, but when is that being posted? Also, when you say you put up a list and then there's just an email address that people can click on and say, "I would like this report," that's how you can do things?

Aaron: Yes, that's right. So it'll be on our website, and there will be a contact point or a contact email. We have a generic Giant Mine email that people can request those reports, and we'll provide those. I hope to have that list up by the end of the fiscal year. We're going through a revamp of our website right now to bring it up to code I guess. The Government of Canada as a government has been changing their look and feel for the websites to make them a little bit better and more interactive. So our communications folks are in the process of doing that right now. Hopefully by the end of this fiscal year that will be done, as well as having that list attached to the website.

Natalie: I also wanted to just add on to Aaron. One of the other challenges is we don't have to have just English and French. We have to have HTML, so we can't just upload a PDF. That with technical documents is a huge challenge, getting them transcribed for officially impaired people in HTML. It's another challenge. We realize that's going to be a big hurdle for us to be able to post on our website. That's been a delay as well.

Tony: I'm just noting, obviously for the record as Aaron said, you're collecting reports that date back to 1999. We're in 2017, so we're 18 years in, and there still isn't a publically accessible registry of documents. Essentially for the record, that's a long time.

Last year we had a very similar discussion, and that's where this action came from, the idea of finding a workaround to some of the challenges that you're talking about. Why not go for the workaround?

Aaron: The Project, in particular INAC, doesn't want to do that. We want to follow what the requirements are for our information. Those reports were generated for the Giant Mine Project, and so when we proposed a workaround of going through the GNWT, that wasn't supported at the time. So we're just trying to follow the rules set aside by our Information Management folks.

Natalie: Since that time – and GNWT can corroborate this – they have a requirement for French translation as well. So that workaround too, is not really a workaround.

Tony: Thank you.

David: So information management really means managing information at this point by not releasing it.

Aaron: Yes, we're not, not releasing it. It's available upon request, so it can be released. I see your challenge in that. People don't know what they don't know, right? So they do have to comb through the rings of titles now, but the unfortunate thing is that's what we've got right now. I think it's a small victory to have that comprehensive list now and have it available for people to have a look at.

David: Yes, well I mean you can appreciate the frustration from inside as well as outside. In this day and age when information should be and is readily available, we have a situation where information can't be released because of internal bureaucracy. What would happen if GMOB requested all that information and made it available on the GMOB website, and pointed its finger toward you if people want to follow-up and get a copy?

Natalie: We would make that information available to GMOB.

David: Alright, so why don't we think about that, because this is silly. I mean it really is.

Kathy: Okay, then we'll record that as an action item? Yes? It is kind of ironic that making things accessible makes things inaccessible.

Erika: I will add that in my research to see about hosting reports, it was possible. And it would have been through the Discovery Portal that CIMP uses for housing research studies and all that. They said it would be possible to create a giant page within that, or a giant folder. So just reporting on my action that opportunity wasn't there. That's where it would have been housed.

David: Why wasn't that followed-up?

Erika: To actually house the reports? Because we were told INAC was taking a separate route.

Kathy: Finding a way to get them available... I think that is actually Action Item 1 and 2, so I'm going to skip ahead to 3. YKDFN will distribute the 2003 Dr. Chan Environmental Arsenic Level Study to all parties. Is that still required? I think last year you guys had a study, but you needed to remove the names I believe of the people that were in the study. We're going to distribute that.

Tony: This particular Chan study is more about environmental media. It wasn't human health monitoring data. This report was used in the HHERA. It is a document – I already have a copy of it myself, so it is out in the open. But I don't recall receiving it as an action follow-up from this prior meeting.

Kathy: So maybe the action item isn't required? This is one of those ones I think maybe we don't need anymore.

Erika: Sorry. I'm just confused. What is this one? 2003...Dr. Chan...

Tony: In their last meeting there was a request that this report that was done by Dr. Chan that looked into both traditional...There was some data on concentrations of arsenic in traditional foods and also some environmental media. It wasn't health study related, not human health study. I forget. Maybe it was William in our last meeting who asked that report be provided.

Kathy: Okay, I think we should move on. No one is apparently looking for it anymore. Action Item 4, if everyone's okay: The Project Team will continue to work on the role of provision and will keep all parties informed of the outcome of the upcoming Treasury Board submission. I think Tony in our AGM commented on that. The Project Team updated us yesterday that their Treasury Board submission is going in early December is what I heard. Hopefully if it goes through, the provision may be enacted as soon as April 2018, which is great. I think we're still waiting. We'll have to see the outcome. Is there anything the Project Team wants to add on that?

Natalie: Just that we'll report back to you when we have that grant authority, which all indications is that it will go through.

Kathy: Action Item 5: Lisa Dyer will forward the Tourist Awareness Issue to the Legacy Contaminants Committee and report back to the Parties. That was about the advisories and what not. Lisa?

Lisa: So I do not think that I officially reported back to the Parties, so I will use this forum to do so. We have, as I mentioned at the last meeting, a formal committee of all GNWT people. Our GNWT departments are represented so we make sure that all of the departments are aware of emerging issues. We have brought up the issue.

It's an Offsite Contamination Committee, so we look at all the information that is coming in. ITI sits on that committee, as do people representing tourism, so we have had discussions on this topic, but we work through... Any kind of advisories goes through Health and Social Services. So we've been working very closely with Health and Social Services to make sure that the most recent information is considered and part of any health advisories.

To further that, the Committee has been working on communications of how the GNWT should communicate out this information, and we're having a workshop in the next – December I guess it is – basically looking at, especially with new information coming in recently on soils, of how we communicate this information to the public effectively. That's something that we're continuing to work with, but anything to do with health-related concerns comes through Health and Social Services and the Chief Environmental Health Officer – or Chief Protection Health Office... Chief Public Health Officer. Thank you, Erika.

Erika: I just want to add to that. Recently there was signage that had gone up, and this was done with City support to put up signs at Range Lake, Frame, Grace, and Niven I believe, or Long Lake. I got confused. There were four lakes where signage has gone up to inform recreational walkers or tourists who might be out there. That's great, because that's something we heard actually from Johanne at the GMOB meeting asking how do you communicate to people out there. So hard signage was very much supported by the Minister of Health. That has been actioned. I just wanted to add to that.

Kathy: Johanne and then Mark.

Johanne: I guess I've got two questions, one for Erika and one for Lisa. I'll start off with Lisa. In terms of the committee that was activated to discuss those issues, and you did state that there were tourism people sitting on that committee, at which point in time would the Yellowknives be able to have a voice there?

Lisa: Right now this is a GNWT internal meeting. So this is just GNWT departments communicating with other departments, so it's not envisioned that this would be open to parties outside of the GNWT. It's really an information-sharing within the GNWT. However, I'm just going to follow-up that what I'm hearing from you – would you like an opportunity to talk to tourism people, or have more of an avenue into talking to people directly with the GNWT? We can arrange that, but right now this committee, this report is coming out just so everyone in the GNWT is aware and information is shared internally. But that doesn't prevent us if you feel there needs to be further avenues to chat with people in the GNWT. We can look at how to do that as well.

Johanne: Sorry, maybe in order for me to get a good handle of the work that is being done there, I'm wondering – and you probably have already provided it, a terms of reference for that committee. In the end, this is our traditional territory. As owners of a traditional territory, we'd like to know what is being planned for those areas to include us right from the get-go in terms of any discussions going forward on what is going to be planned for the lands and the environment. So just some inclusion into that process or just informing us would be nice. That's all I have to say.

Lisa: Thanks, Johanne. Right now, this committee is not a planning committee. It's just a committee that shares information so everyone is on the same page. I don't know of any planning committee in place, but again, that's something we can talk about more. Maybe

you and I can talk after or on the side. We can talk about how we can address your interests. I think we can easily share the terms of reference for the committee.

As I mentioned, again it's not a working committee in the sense that it is developing plans or undertaking initiatives. It's really sharing information among departments to make sure everyone is aware of the most recent research that has been done, being aware of what health advisories are coming out. So it's really a communication...The purpose of the committee is for communication. At this point, that is the primary purpose of it.

Johanne: My next question is for Erika. In terms of the messaging that's going out and advisory boards going out, I can't remember what it looks like in terms of the message and what language it is in or if it's a diagram, but I'm thinking about my Elders. First of all, the Elders in my community don't have the ability – they have constraints imposed upon themselves, so they don't have the ability to read and write in their local language. They understand syllabics, and sometimes they can understand certain English, but I'm just wondering whose responsibility is it to inform them?

Erika: It's definitely a concern that ENR had made aware to Health. I'm not pointing fingers, but I've heard that. With the work on Giant, we know that communicating, messaging, and not just relying on English is the best way. So that message has been brought forward to Health. Also from our Chief and Council Meeting, we heard one of the counselors saying, "We don't understand how these advisories were put in place. What was the rationale to make certain determinations?"

I have communicated that back. It actually was in the response back to you guys on our big table of what Health had said, saying we're happy to come into the community and talk about that. They did note that they did have a meeting with some leadership, but I'm not really clear on that. Dr. Corriveau is absolutely happy to come in and talk more about that.

I did flag this to their communications people, about a commitment I had made in the committee and to you saying, "Hey we're going to start talking about this," and then there were changes with who was leading that work. But it definitely has been highlighted. I will send you the information of who to contact, and I would directly request a meeting and say we want to talk about this more for consideration for future updates to their advisory.

And just an update on the advisory, there wasn't a big announcement about it, but now the advisory map on the Health website is interactive. So when you go over the lakes...because what they had before was a PDF, and it was really challenging to see, because the dot would sort of cover the lake, and you're like, "What lake is it?" or "Where's my lake?" This you can actually hover over the dot, and it tells you exactly the name of the lake and what the recommendations are and stuff. So that's just a FYI.

This is something that we have talked about in our committee, about how to communicate externally, not only to YKDFN but I've brought up how do we inform the City about the

studies that we're learning about, that we're sharing internally. We use that information to develop messaging and if there is media attention, but we're holding a lot of that data and sharing it amongst ourselves. Really we need to look at how we loop in even the regulatory boards. Because it's not information that everyone is privy to, but it's definitely something that we'll talk about at our discovery workshop next month, about okay, we're starting to figure out how we do this internally, but to the outside parties, is there opportunity for certain meetings for you to participate in or is there a representative? We haven't talked about that, but it is an issue of how do we inform others of the information we know and that we're sharing. Anyway, I just wanted to highlight that. But Johanne, I'll get you the information for Health, and I can also support them meeting with you.

Johanne: Thank you.

Kathy: I saw the signs myself. It was fun to see some progress on that. Okay, Action Item 6: The GNWT will look at N'Dilo Sampling Report and share the outcome of these discussions with YKDFN. I think that maybe goes along with Action Item 11, to check on the federal departments responsible for dealing with N'Dilo contamination. I don't know who wants to speak to that from the GNWT?

Natalie: I can speak to the federal department. N'Dilo is federal land, so it is our Lands Department led by Mike Roach, and I think I've shared that information previously, but he is the Lands Manager for N'Dilo – Lands from the federal perspective.

Erika: I'll just add to that. GNWT has been in touch with Mike Roach...Mike (*became tongue-tied*). How's that going to be transcribed?

(Laughter)

...Mike Roach and encourage that and identify that for YKDFN, this is a concern for them. So we support that. Johanne and William and I have talked a little bit about that gathering of information and the studies that exist, and now the results of the HHERA. So they will be putting something together and reaching out to Lands. There have been other conversations that have occurred on offsite legacy contaminants with Canada and GNWT, so it's on the radar. We're hoping for some action soon on that. So I'll hand it over to Johanne and William to update us on how they might approach Lands or submit that information.

Kathy: I'm just remembering. Craig Wells was on the phone yesterday with our Project Team meeting, and he said that the N'Dilo contamination hotspots have been brought to the attention of the new RDG of INAC, and that spans Craig's comment, because we did specifically ask about progress on that. Craig's comment was this was a priority for Matt. Matt felt this was a real priority to deal with, but that's the only update that we had, so I guess Matt's new. I guess we'll break him in I guess. Are there any other comments on that?

Johanne: I can...I guess I'm going to be forthright in terms of where we're at on that one. We're really aren't anywhere on that. We do have capacity issues that we're dealing with. I'll go back to stating again that William Lines is only one person. He has got to review all of the technical reports that come out of Giant. He's got to review the last submission that is still going to go out the door, the Baker Creek, and there are a lot of other submissions. He's only one person.

Unfortunately, that's one of the things that is starting to slip away from us in terms of trying to fix that issue for the Yellowknives. I believe that if capacity doesn't get dealt with in terms of our end, that's one of the things that is going to go to the wayside. That's a FYI to you folks in terms of, 'How can we get this injustice of living with this in the community rectified?' That's where I'm at.

Kathy: Are there any other comments on that right now? I imagine we're not done with this conversation overall, but just in terms of the action items.

Erika: I'll just say that we're happy to support you. However, you need to try to get that message across or get the information over further to Matt. And the commitment we heard from Craig, it is a priority, and all of us are trying to support from the Project side. It really is sort of separate people, but we are supportive and understand that this is an issue that needs to be dealt with. Hopefully it is something that can happen this season, in the spring-summer.

Johanne: I'll go back to stating that I want to be very, very clear in terms of getting an understanding from the Project that capacity really is an issue with us. Most of the work that gets done for the Giant Mine file for us is enormous. The workload is enormous. I'm thankful that William is still sitting here.

(Laughter)

He has grown a few gray hairs since he started working with the Yellowknives. That's a big load on someone's shoulders, someone as young as William, to ensure that contaminants are cleaned up in the community. And it's unfair for me to put that all on him. So I think that in terms of all of us here, we all have a responsibility in terms of the contamination that exists here. If we can all work together to at least achieve some sort of reconciliation with the past, then that would be great. Thank you.

Natalie: Absolutely, Johanne. We certainly support William, and we've got Bill Slater as well to utilize. We certainly as a Project Team want to talk about other ways we can support you in that regard.

Johanne: Thank you. One of the things too is, I keep forgetting about Bill Slater, not that he doesn't have a voice here, but I keep forgetting that he's under the Contribution Agreement of the

Yellowknives Dene, because there were constraints involved in terms of giving him a contract directly from INAC. So it was asked of us to put him under our Contribution Agreement, but it seems to me it is kind of being reflected that he is our technical advisor. Yes, he's our technical advisor as a whole, but in terms of technical advice, he provides technical advice on specific things, but he is not a jack-of-all-trades in terms of being a specialist on all the initiatives that are happening at Giant. In no way, shape, or form is he the guy to provide us technical advice in terms of the contamination within our community either, because that's not in his realm. Thank you.

Kathy: Okay, thank you. We too are thankful that William hasn't left, for the record. Okay, I think we should move on to Action Item 7: The GNWT will share the results of their discussions about the Economic Development Officer support information with the YKDFN and the NSMA. Erika?

Erika: So this action, I think, was to talk about currently what positions exist within ITI for community economic support. So in the last few months actually, we've met with Johanne and William and Margaret and Nora a couple of times or a few times, to talk more about the capacity issues and start working on how we can support and draft a job description for that. So in addition to that, having talked with ITI and getting a better sense of what that position does, I have shared with YKDFN.

In a nutshell, that position really doesn't capture the needs of the community. It is very much more of a lone officer type of thing and doesn't carry out the duties that the community really needs – that support – and they aren't an active participant in the community. They don't have a strong face or presence. So this has been communicated to ITI as well, and they recognize that. At this point, we're just sort of choosing to go in a direction together with YKDFN, and if that ITI officer can support, great. It's a bonus, but it is not a dependable way to address some of the capacity and resource issues that have been identified.

Kathy: Okay, thank you for that update. Action Item 8: Project Team's response to the GMOB's recommendations are to be posted on the GMOB's website, and I believe this one has been done.

Action Item 9: The GMOB Executive Director will have the web developer incorporate a feedback option for public commentary, and I believe that has been done. Our ED has abandoned us briefly.

Action Item 10: Lisa Dyer will provide the map of land tenure to the parties, and I think this had to do with understanding the lease boundaries, but I don't know if that's necessary anymore either. Lisa's looking puzzled, but I'll get her to respond.

Lisa: I like that Lisa's looking puzzled will be in the minutes. That's going to be awesome.

(Laughter)

I'm just looking to Erika to see whether we have provided that during GMAC or the other Giant meetings, and we have not officially done that. So that's something that I'm going to ask Erika to take on.

Erika: I will take it on. I also was looking puzzled there.

Meeting Organization & Appointment of Chair

Kathy: Okay, thanks. Thanks, Erika and Lisa. Okay, that was brutal but we got through it. It seems like a funny place in the meeting now to ask about appointing a chair, since I force myself on all of you. But let's just do that to confirm if you want me to continue as Chair, or if anybody else wants to volunteer, I will happily lend them the gavel.

(Pause)

Mark: It's Mark. I'll move that Kathy gets appointed Chair.

Lisa: I'll second that Motion.

David: All in favor...

Kathy: Thank you. The meeting records, again they will be transcribed. We'll take out the emojis for the funny noise symbols, and we'll provide that to everybody as soon as possible.

Roundtable Highlights from Each Party Successes & Challenges

Okay, I think we should move on to Item 6: The Roundtable, Highlights from each Party. So at our previous meetings, we've just approached this very casually and said talk about whatever you like that has happened since the last semi-annual meeting in May. This time, I think when Ben was communicating with everyone, he asked about focusing it a little bit more, as opposed to just activities that you've been up to, but more on successes and challenges, and your interpretation of successes and challenges.

GMOB requested this just because this is our way of trying to get a little bit of an evaluation. We're just trying to get a sense of not just what you did, but how you felt about things that happened in the last 6 months. It helps what we heard and our own evaluations to get a more rounded view of things. So, I thought we'd just go through everyone. Ultimately, you can talk about whatever you like during your section.

Yellowknives Dene First Nation

I noticed in the last agenda that the Yellowknives because they begin with 'Y' always went last, so this time we put you first. So go ahead.

Johanne: I guess this time I'll let William have a voice to talk about the good aspects.

(Laughter)

William: Okay, I'll start off with the good. First and foremost, I'll start with the Health Effects Monitoring Program. Recently we got money to hire a research coordinator for that position. Her name is Elizabeth Liske. This is a great example of hiring within the community, working within the community, and of why we should be funding positions from the community side. In the past, we've applied for a socioeconomic position, and we cannot put that position outside of the community, and this is a great example of why it should be in the community, because it works.

Right now, we are if not in the lead, we are very successful in getting participants in that program. We've overachieved almost, because we haven't even completed this round of sampling, and we're already almost at halfway. It's really a success. I think this is a clear example of why we need to fund the community and not outsiders coming into the community. Take that as you will for future funding.

Another good point that I was thinking about, not to discredit Sharon Lowe, but since her absence, I've noticed that there has been a rejuvenance in communication with the Project. I'd just like to point that out. Since she has been gone, communication has gone a lot easier with the Project. With that, I'll maybe pass it off to Johanne to talk about more challenges.

Johanne: In terms of the good work that was done, I'd like to say thank you to William. I'd like to say thank you to GMOB. I'd like to say thank you GNWT and INAC for trying to work with the Yellowknives and ensuring that our voice is heard and ensuring that some of the issues that we have are being addressed so going forward we have a good relationship. So I just want to thank everybody for that.

In terms of some of the challenges that the Yellowknives have going forward, it's reconciliation. That's the biggest challenge for us. Reconciliation can be done in numerous ways. Some of them can be done by dealing with our capacity issues, to have a social responsibility and to socioeconomics.

But also one of the things that is lacking I think on my end and the Project's end as well, is TK - the Traditional Knowledge aspect - and ensuring that the Project understands what Traditional Knowledge is, understands where it can fit in, and understands its usefulness in the Project. So going forward, I'm hoping in terms of those challenges that we face together

– capacity, socioeconomic, and Traditional Knowledge – we work together to achieve some of those things in a meaningful manner, and not just as a checkbox exercise.

That's one of the things I'd like to say is let's not do it where it's not just a checkbox exercise, how it has been done in the past. I don't mean to offend anybody on that, but that's just the way it was for the Project in the past. Going forward, I'm hoping that there is some real meaningfulness behind the things that we say here.

I'd like to address maybe some of the pressures that the Yellowknives have in terms of the burdens that we have. Some of those burdens – actually a lot of those burdens – rests on William's shoulders. We need to work together to address some of those burdens on him. If we can begin...I know we've begun to discuss it, and you've mentioned it here and there, but I think there is a real necessity to alleviate some of those burdens on the Yellowknives. Thank you.

David: Have you designed an office? What kind of positions would you need or would you like in a Giant office?

Johanne: In terms of a needs assessment, not in depth. I do know off the top of my head that in terms of the social responsibilities, there is a need for a person to ensure that gets done on behalf of the Yellowknives. We also need to ensure that there is a technical advisor. I know William is the community liaison technical advisor, but the majority of the work under that role, in reality that's a role for probably two people.

I guess you could say in terms of a needs assessment, a full one, no it hasn't been done. But I think there is a need for it, yes.

David: I think that would be really helpful. I think it would help INAC and help you to get the capacity you need. I mean reconciliation is a two-way or a multidirectional thing, but it's also acknowledging what happened in the past and acknowledging that appropriately, but it's also about moving forward. Capacity and economic development opportunities are some of the ways that reconciliation can move forward. It's an ongoing thing, but I would suggest it is difficult for INAC or the GNWT to help the Yellowknives with the capacity issues if they don't know specifically what kinds of needs you have.

I was just jotting down some notes as you were speaking. There is the Contaminants Officer if you like, an Economic Development Officer, general support to William, and a Social Needs Officer or something like that. So there are at least four positions right there that I can think of. So I think it would be useful to go through that exercise yourselves and then make a formal proposal. It can't hurt. And it's not just INAC that might be able to help out on that. There are foundations, for example, that if you've got a proposal, could look at that proposal and maybe take on one or two of the elements to help you out. It's just a suggestion.

Johanne: Thank you for that. I welcome that suggestion, and I'm thankful. Thank you.

Ginger: Johanne and William, one way to think about this might be in stages. Between now and when they go for the water license, it is one chunk of work. So it's building up capacity to actually be ready for the jobs that are going to come during the implementation phase, which is hopefully 2021 or somewhere in there. So you might have an interim ops strategy, and then it may shift or change when they actually move into the next phase. So that's just a suggestion and a way to look at it.

Lisa: Thank you, Johanne for bringing up your concerns and the issues you're facing, and also thank you for the Board members for bringing up their suggestions. Earlier today, Natalie and I committed to meeting with you to talk about reconciliation. I think that what may be helpful is that we add some of these issues that we've brought up, for example the capacity issue, the socioeconomic support, and for TK.

I know you've had initial discussions, and you've been working with Erika and Aaron on those issues, but I think maybe why don't we spend, take a couple of hours and really work through some of these together, and we can see where we can lend support and where we can maybe address some of these concerns. Natalie and I are committed to doing that with you. Hopefully we can meet with our busy schedules, but we'll commit to meet before Christmas.

Johanne: Thank you. It would have to be... Well, I'll make contact with you folks, and then we'll sit down and discuss. Thank you for that.

Kathy: One of the things we were thinking about this week when we were thinking about capacity, because it was a recommendation in last year's report, and we still see it's an issue – capacity overall. We were trying to brainstorm different ways that capacity arises. David has talked about some and Ginger as well, so we are starting to think about that as well.

One of the things that I've always been interested in: For the technical reviews and whatnot where possible, GMOB members have been weighing in and looking at the technical details, because we like that stuff – a lot of us do. Well some of us do. Certainly Bill Slater has been an excellent resource as well. We really came to the conclusion that whenever we see scientific stuff, we look for the soundness of it, and it's easy to comment on from our perspective and Bill's perspective.

But that doesn't always...In my work with the Board members, always my job was to review scientific stuff and then translate it to the Board and Board members who don't have a technical background and to tell them what it meant to them, what the implications were of the decisions that would be made based on what was arguably good science. Those kinds of value judgments and being comfortable with things going along, that translation of scientific stuff into something everyone could understand and feel comfortable with – I don't know if you have someone who can do that for you.

William is reading tons and tons of stuff, and it must be very challenging for you to pull out, okay so what does this mean to the Yellowknives Dene? It's not just, "Is this good science?" because you have other people who can tell you that, but what does this mean to you? I just was thinking in terms of another capacity issue. I'm not sure exactly how to address that, but I was just trying to think outside the box a bit as opposed to hiring another consultant to do a technical review. It seems like something more is required.

William: Yes, I'm happy that you brought that up, because it is a lot of reading. Really, in the band it's just me for pretty much all the technical reviews that happen. So it is very, very challenging to do that when you don't have the background that you'd like to have to be able to do a full, in-depth review. I think that's a really, really good suggestion to have somebody review things on our behalf.

Kathy: Review things technically, but then to share it with you to make sure that you guys all have a full understanding of the implications of what's going on. I'm not sure how to do that exactly, but I'd like to think and talk about that more.

Johanne: Yes, that's one of the big challenges that we have as well, because a lot of the technical reviews that have to get done for this Project are wide-ranging. You could talk about water. You could talk about fish. You could talk about contamination. You could talk about health effects. In terms of the technical advice that we could provide, it's very limited, because we don't have a wide scope in terms of the background and skills necessary to provide some very, very in-depth suggestions or input into that process.

So I believe in terms of the issues that the Yellowknives have, we have a very good ear. We know what those issues are, and we can clearly speak about those issues in terms of the concerns of the community. So that's what we excel in, is bringing that voice forward. That's what we can provide, but in terms of the technical piece, that's something that we struggle with. We'll continue to struggle with it, and when it comes to the water licensing that is going to be upon us here shortly, we need help. We need assistance in that. Yes.

Erika: If I can just add: Bill Slater is the technical advisor, but he is a technical advisor to the Working Group to sort of maintain that independence and just with contracting. Like Johanne explained, his contract is held within the Contribution Agreement for YKDFN, but he does support the rest of the Working Group.

I mean, it's probably worth a conversation to have with the Working Group to say what people's expectations are. Is there maybe opportunity for...I don't know. I mean, he's doing a fabulous job. He really is, and he's a smart guy. He knows a lot about many things, but yes, he's not an expert in everything. It's probably worth having a conversation with the Working Group to ask how much other parties are relying on Bill. Is there opportunity where maybe you utilize him more or he's just your guy, or there's another guy, or something like that? Anyway, the point is that technical issues are clearly something that you need support

with. It's probably just worth a conversation with the larger Working Group to talk about that.

David: I think what I'm hearing is that Yellowknives welcome the outside support, but they want in-house capacity. There is a world of difference. It is all very well to have the GMOB resources - Bill Slater, or any other kind of outside expertise providing whatever support they can - but there is nothing better than being able to turn around in your office and say, "Hey, what do you think about this?"

I'm sure everybody appreciates all that collective wisdom out there, but there's nothing better than having it in your own office where the context is very clear, the priorities are very clear, and there are no confounding messages.

Erika: Thanks for clarifying that, yes. So in-house, in the office, someone there on a daily basis...okay.

Natalie: Thanks, Kathy. So William and Johanne, we've just been jotting some notes on that exact issue. I suggest in the next month we meet. We're in a prime opportunity to prepare for next fiscal year and funding opportunities to iron this out and figure out how we can make that happen. We are certainly willing to do everything we can to assist in that, in the in-house.

Johanne: Thank you.

Tony: We've been talking about capacity primarily with respect to the ability of the YKDFN to contribute to the decision-making process and review to ensure that the decisions about what to do on the site are the most appropriate. Then there is the next stage, which Ginger was mentioning that there are really two big steps in the process. I'd like to hear a little bit from you about the status of efforts to ensure that the YKDFN are ready to participate, engage, and capitalize on the opportunity of the remediation project itself.

We've seen in last year's Annual Report from the Project Team that the participation rate of Indigenous people in the Project is quite low right now. Yesterday when we met with the Project Team, they described some of the initiatives that they are taking to try and change that, to make sure that the numbers increase, that there are more opportunities in their efforts to prepare for the remediation phase. I'd just like to hear your perspectives on where things stand. The YKDFN, as the Project moves towards remediation, how are you feeling in terms of your preparedness to capitalize on that as an economic opportunity with employees, businesses et cetera?

Johanne: I can say in terms of the Yellowknives being ready for that, there is no initiative that has started in terms of a readiness plan for the Yellowknives. We haven't been able to get anywhere with that at this moment. We don't have the capacity to deal with it. We don't

have the capacity to do a gap analysis in terms of what the skill level is within our community, what the training requirements are, and what business requirements are.

I know there was a socioeconomic study that Giant did – when was that, 2016 or 2015? But in terms of that, the Yellowknives' voice in that is very, very – I'm going to say at 1% in that. They interviewed William, and William doesn't have a clue in terms of....

(Laughter)

Sorry! Sorry, sorry, sorry...I'll backtrack. No, I apologize. I didn't mean it that way. But William doesn't have all the information necessary to provide fruitful input into that process, because he doesn't have the knowledge in terms of what skills are in the community. I don't have a clue as to how many heavy equipment operators you're going to need for that project. I don't know how many heavy equipment operators have that skillset in our community. That could be an example.

There has to be work done on our end in terms to identify what the skills are in our community and to identify who has businesses in our community that can possibly get some contracts there. There is a lot of work that has to be done in order to prepare us, and that hasn't started yet at all.

William: Just to make a point: We did request money to have community meetings to analyze the gaps that are present for socioeconomics, which was totally struck out of our Contribution Agreement.

Tony: Just through other channels, I understood that you have, in addition to William's role in the Project, within the YKDFN you also have...Do you have essentially a Community Economic Development Officer function? There is no such thing?

Johanne: So the Yellowknives don't have a Community Economic Development Officer. Erika did speak about that before in the past. ITI does provide an Economic Development Officer for each community, but for some reason in terms of the community for the Yellowknives, that Economic Officer doesn't do what other communities do in terms of ensuring that the needs of the communities are being met in economic development opportunities.

All they really do in our community is they are just a flow-through agency. I forgot how you title them, but they're just a loan officer. That's all they are. They don't provide...To tell you the truth, most of the community members don't even have a clue as to what services they provide, because they haven't even come and held a meeting in our community to tell us what they do.

Erika: Just to add to that: I don't really understand the behind-the-scenes of how that position is structured, but it sits under the Akaitcho Business Development Corporation. So it's not a direct report to ITI necessarily, and it's just sort of funny how they sit. Even the Akaitcho

Business Development Corporation is within the Det'on Cho building where the YKDFN office is. That relationship isn't there. It's just sort of an office in the dark.

So definitely we recognize that. We've communicated that to ITI, and ITI has constraints about that position and what they offer and all that. I will just add, because I was part of the conversations with the Contribution Agreement this year and their requests for the Socioeconomic Development Officer, at that time because of all the research that was going on that Aaron noted yesterday with Stratos and the labour study that is currently being revised, we just asked if we can just hold off until we have a better understanding of the environment out there, if there might be possible resources to fund a position that could benefit the community on a more broader scale rather than Giant-focused.

We've said this before. It wasn't like, "Forget it. We don't recognize that as an issue." It just was the timing right now. We weren't going to commit to that until we had a better understanding. So now with the recent discussions, the Project actually provided a job description for a Socioeconomic Development Officer focused on Giant to work with Johanne and William in their office.

This week was really busy, but whenever Aaron comes up, we try to have a meeting. We were looking for input from these guys to say, "We took our best guesstimate of what that position would do, and we want to refine it together," to reaffirm there is support for that. But for funding to go through – and Natalie said right now is a good time. A package...understanding what that person would do is really important, and we need to know those details. We will just continue working together and move on that. Really, at that time for meetings, it was like well who would lead the meetings? Who would organize the meetings? Because we knew William didn't have the capacity to do it, because he had to do other stuff.

I think once we can get that guy or girl on, they will coordinate those meetings, and we definitely need to do that. One of the duties would be to carry out a revision to the Community Readiness Assessment that YKDFN actually put on themselves and did get a sense of what skills are out there and what business. Like I mentioned yesterday, we have funded the training proposal that Margaret submitted, and that's really exciting. Within that, Margaret has asked for details of generally how many positions you need for this, but tell me what kind of education they need to have, what level of education, and how many hours of experience.

That is something that will come with this next labour study that will come next month. Again, we know we can always do better, but there very much is...this is a priority for us. We want to continue working with you for next year's Contribution Agreement. Let's start on that now. Like me personally, this is important. I just wanted to reiterate the work that we've been doing.

Ken F: From an outside perspective, I was just looking at the CanNor website. I hope that hasn't fallen off the radar screen. It just looks like a no-brainer from the outside as putting in a big proposal, or a proposal for a big chunk from them to say, "This is important here." With the horsepower that is behind there, maybe there is some leveraging that can be done.

Aaron: Yes, the CanNor linkage is there. CanNor is part of the team that is working on updating the labour study. They were the folks that facilitated most of the interviews that we conducted with various parties over the summer. You're right. They do have programs that do provide funding. The challenge there from the research that we've done as part of the labour study is knowing that those funds are available and knowing how to get at those funds, and when you don't know how to access those funds, knowing who to ask.

During the summer when we were conducting interviews with folks, somebody – I can't remember who it was – actually said, "Do we mind if we use your labour study internally, because it has a really good list of all the programs that are available?" There were programs in our labour study that they had never heard of. We were like, "Absolutely."

As much as the labour study is looking at what the needs of the Project will be in terms of skillsets and positions throughout the life of the Project for implementation, it has become a tool for people to use to know all the programs that are available and how to access money. The challenge will be, again as I said, getting at those funds. What often happens within some of those programs – we've heard this from Margaret Erasmus within the YKDFN community – those programs are great if you figure out how to work it. It's still a challenge for them in particular to budget and plan – just like yourselves, GMOB on an annual basis. Those programs are on an annual cycle, and you might have money one year and not the next year.

We're working to figure out how best to access those dollars and provide those supports. As Erika said, we've done things like provide job descriptions, which are similar things that people who are reviewing applications and proposals like to see as a support. One of the things that we'll see in the updated labour study as well, is a bit of a description or blowout of what requirements there are for different positions. That was something that Margaret mentioned to us as well during one of our meetings so that she can tailor her training courses to that. If she knows that there are some folks that already have 10,000 hours in the seat of operating heavy equipment, then that already meets what the requirements might need.

It has been a bit of a challenge, because there is quite a range of what the requirements are in combination of education and experience. We're trying to find a happy medium in the labour study. Similarly related, in our discussions with different companies, we have heard that they are preparing to participate in Giant. They do want to participate in Giant in terms of getting contracts. There are lots of good local opportunities here. Det'on Cho Corp, which is the economic arm of the YKDFN, are preparing to do partnerships and develop

opportunities internally with YKDFN members for internships and apprenticeships to help train people. They've got proposals in place to do that.

We just continue to push that the Project is on people's mind and a priority in their economic planning, which will help provide benefits to the community here into the future. Thank you.

Kathy: Okay. Thanks, everyone. Are there any other questions for the Yellowknives Dene before we move on?

Johanne: I'd like to say one last thing, which I think is always on my mind when I talk about Giant with community folks. A lot of the community folks are concerned that again, the Yellowknives will not be able to generate any profits out of Giant, which is so close to us and has had a lot of devastating impacts to the Yellowknives.

I guess what I'd like to say to the Project - and it's something that I've been thinking about for a while now - it's unwise and fraudulent to claim that wages and salaries will await us when you're not working towards that. That's what I want to say. Thank you. And it's patronizing too, if those needs aren't met. Thank you.

William: On a note of the labour study, I said this at the Chief and Council update that we had, and I'll say it now. Until the Project comes to the community and meets with the community as a whole, that labour study will be deemed incomplete in the YKDFN's eyes. That's something to keep in mind, because we're not going to accept it until you come to the community.

Aaron: No, it's an excellent point, William. I'd be happy to bring it up at a future GMAC meeting before it's finalized. The draft will be available in December, and by all means, let's talk about it at GMAC and wherever else you guys feel it's appropriate. I've kind of been touring it around this summer. I presented at the City Council back in, I think it was early October, so it's only fair that I come to your community and talk about it as well, beyond just our small group that has been talking about it. So absolutely, I will do that. Thank you.

William: Great.

Natalie: I know, in an effort of time, we probably want to move on, but we're absolutely committed to continuing this discussion from the Project. Absolutely.

Kathy: Well thank you. That was a good discussion. Thank you for all your points. You obviously put a lot of thought into it before coming. Appreciate that very much. Before we move on, we have a new participant to the meeting, so I'll get you to introduce yourself and where you're from.

Kerry: Kerry Penney. I'm with the City of Yellowknife.

- Kathy: Thanks, Kerry. Okay, next on the hit list, is the GNWT. Who would like to speak? Lisa?
- Lisa: Yes, and I'd like to make a suggestion that the Project Team has been working very closely together, so maybe we can give an update from the Project Team perspective. I don't know if this is the appropriate time to do it or whether it would be more beneficial to have the Parties speak, and then we can summarize what the Project Team has been working on. If there are any specific questions for either INAC or GNWT, we can entertain those. It's just a suggestion.
- Kathy: Okay, thanks Lisa. Yes, I'm thinking that might be good. The two other parties are the NSMA and the City. So you guys what to go together? Okay. Go ahead, David.
- David: I like the idea, but there are things that INAC does independently, and there are things that GNWT does independently like your own internal working groups and so on. So I don't want to lose track of that as well.
- Lisa: No, I totally appreciate it. So that's why I thought maybe if we can speak as a Project, and then if there are additional things we need to add as individual organizations, we could do that.

North Slave Métis Alliance

Kathy: Okay, that puts you to the top of the list. Nicole, if you want to speak on behalf of the North Slave Métis Alliance...

Nicole: Nicole here, NSMA. So back to the topic of capacity, the biggest thing that happened for us this year is that we doubled our number of staff by hiring me.

That's been really great. As William and Johanne alluded to, it's staggering amounts of reading, even with a technical background. Right now, 50% of my position and salary is covered by the Contribution Agreement, so I have about 50% of one position. So it sometimes still feels like a lot and a challenge, but it's definitely a lot more than we've had in the last several years. As you were saying, it is amazing to have more than one person in the office so you can say, "What do you think about this?"

We're still in the process of Shin handing the Project over to me, so I think it'll take a little bit longer to evaluate whether my half-position is going to be enough moving forward, but we're definitely noticing that it is suddenly a lot easier to read everything with two people. That's really great.

What else? We had a really successful engagement with the HHERA a while ago. People had some questions, but overall we were really happy with the results that seem surprisingly

positive. That was good. We're really looking forward to engaging with the labour study when it comes out in December. That'll be good.

One challenge that we're having, back to capacity again, has to do with the health effects monitoring. We don't have a community coordinator, so it's just me within my half-position for Giant. It's going a little bit slower than we we're hoping. Unfortunately, things like sending out an email, although fast and easy, that's not how you get people to participate in biological testing. So my phone calls are face-to-face talks and word-of-mouth with people. That brings them in, and I have a limited capacity to do that and also do everything else. But it's ramping up. I think it's spreading through word-of-mouth.

Some feedback that we've had from participants and from the research team is that fall is a very, very busy time of year, especially for families with kids, because it's back to school. It's hockey season, et cetera, so the research team is actually doing their sampling in the spring next year. I'm excited for that. Right now, we are very overrepresented in retired Elders who participated, and we're struggling to get youth and kids. I think a spring sampling will really help with that. I think that's it.

Kathy: Are there questions for Nicole? Yes please.

Ginger: Going forward, I would encourage everyone to think and look at their needs, if you can, and scope them out in the perspective of stages that I mentioned. You may get funding on an annual basis, but if you can, begin to wrap your head around the activities that are coming at you – like two years out. Because if the Project moves ahead at the rate that they are saying that they are going to, we ourselves are trying to figure out what we will face in order to address all of the information and meetings. So I could see for a small organization, like all the ones that are represented immediately around the table, that is going to be a probable growing issue for you. So start with the list now maybe in your head so that people can prepare. It's a lot easier to ramp up if you've forecasted that two years from now I need to double again – that kind of thing.

Nicole: Yes, thanks. That's definitely something that we are aware of and trying to start thinking about, although it's one more thing. Do all the things you're doing and strategically plan two years in advance.

(Laughter)

We are trying. Also related, I forgot to mention this. I wanted to say I personally do rely quite heavily on looking at Bill Slater's comments. I find him to be a super valuable resource.

Kathy: Are there any other questions for Nicole? Comments? No? Thanks very much. It's nice to see you at the table. We'll see you at future meetings. I thought it was a good point that capacity - to strategically plan so you can have capacity. That's something we need to keep

in mind. To do a needs assessment and to do strategic assessment requires its own capacity, which is challenging if you're already very busy.

Nicole: Yes, and that might be the kind of thing it would be nice to actually schedule into a meeting so it doesn't get pushed to the side. It gets pushed and pushed and pushed, and then it's too late.

City of Yellowknife

Kathy: Yes, that's what I was thinking as well. We'll keep that in mind. Okay, then let's move on to the City of Yellowknife. Go ahead, Mark.

Mark: Thanks, Kathy. Well Erika stole my thunder about the offsite signage, so I'll leave that one off. It's great that Kerry could be here today. I wanted to mention a bit of an internal reorg that we've done. We've taken our Communications and Economic Development Department and added the word 'Policy' to the start of that. Kerry, who was formerly our Manager of Legal Services, has moved over to become Director of that. Previously I think we had a number of different departments involved in the Giant Mine file, and now we've got a central repository with Kerry and her shops. I think that's going to be a big improvement. Welcome aboard, Kerry.

I talked a bit in the past about the water intake study that we were conducting this year. That is nearing completion, and we expect to have that in front of Council probably early 2018, possibly as soon as January if it all possible. That is the study that's taking a look at both Yellowknife Bay and the River as possible intakes for water source, and as part of that process bringing that in front of Council. That will be an opportunity for the public to weigh in to Council as well. We're looking forward to hopefully putting that issue to bed in the near future. We also have spoken to the federal government about possible investments that we would approach them for in the course of moving ahead with that project.

We were very grateful to have Aaron come to Council about a month and a half ago and present on the socioeconomic aspect of the Project. I think moving forward, and Ginger's suggestion about looking at this in stages of the planning versus the implementation, I think Kerry in her shop will be very instrumental in planning our approach to the Project itself, but also to the socioeconomic parts of the Project.

I think it would probably be worthwhile for the City, which doesn't have an economic development arm as YKDFN or North Slave Métis do, but for the City to sit down with those two organizations and take a higher-level view of the Project and the socioeconomic aspects that Aaron has been speaking to. We've got our work cut out for us. It's a capacity issue for us too, I think. Perhaps it's not to the degree that it is for YKDFN and the North Slave Métis, but I think we're looking forward to getting into that planning stage, now that

we have an overarching view of the Project. I'm also very keen to see the awarding of the contract, which we understand is going to happen in December.

I should also mention that since Sheila has come on board as our Senior Administrator, Giant Mine as a priority has really shot up the list for the City. Every time we talk about the top five things we need to be looking at as a municipal government, Giant Mine is always amongst that list. That's really positive for us as well. I think that's probably all I have at this point, unless Kerry has anything to add.

Kerry: I don't have too much more to add. Just with respect to the labour study, we did meet with Aaron and Erika. I think it might have been even as early as the summer, and one of the concerns the City expressed is that we're not just planning for the immediate term. Heavy equipment operators, while we might need them now, we've seen the way the future is going in five years, and we're not going to need heavy equipment operators, so what's the point in training a whole bunch of people in the GNWT for jobs that are going to be useless.

From our perspective, we wanted to look at the skilled labour force as well, and we had inquired about what kind of discussions were taking place with post-secondary institutions, aiming more at the skilled people or even just skills that are going to flow through, that they're not going to be senseless a year or two years out.

We were at Opportunities North in the fall, and already people in the United States, their delivery vehicles – there are not people driving them. So it's not the future that's coming. It's the future that's here. We've seen the mines. It is becoming more and more automated, so again, why make sure we have a whole bunch of people trained when they only have work for 6 or 12 months and that's it? From our perspective, we want to see people that are trained in skills that will flow through to the future and lead to long-term employment, not short-term employment.

With respect to capacity, the point of my new position was really to coordinate. We've seen a lot of Giant with the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing even at the City level, because we've got some people going to this meeting and some people going to that meeting. There are so many meetings happening in so many different areas. So I won't be attending all the meetings, but trying to keep all the information in one place so we do have a central knowledge base. However, I'm still doing two jobs, so we're not at that yet. As it does ramp up, it's going to get more and more difficult for the City, because we don't have a new position per se. It's just a new task under my position. Capacity is always an issue, but again not to the same extent as YKDFN or NSMA. I think that's all I have to add.

Mark: If I could just add one thing. One of the other things we've become cognizant of, and I think Aaron in his presentation really highlighted it, is as the authority for land use planning within the community in terms of the employment that will be created and the people that it will possibly bring into the community for many years, we need to start thinking about those people and what kind of accommodations that are going to be.

People might remember when the hospital project was getting underway, Clark Builders was talking about a temporary camp, and that's certainly not something we want to see. But we also recognize that despite some pretty rapid growth in the hotel room stock, that was taken up by tourists most of the time. So we want to start thinking about what models of housing could be introduced for those...and we recognize that we're not going to be able to meet every skilled position with the local population. So how can we house those people and perhaps leave a positive legacy in terms of housing post-Project many, many years down the road? We'll have to wrap our heads around that one too.

Ginger: I'm really pleased to hear that there is an initiative to work cooperatively on what we are calling socioeconomic, but that in my mind is a slice. Certainly the jobs and training are a piece of this, but you began to touch on the impacts that this development - which is what it really is - this development may have on your community, whether it's housing, schools, roads, medical services, social services.

Depending on how this initiative moves forward, it can touch almost every part of your collective communities. I'm no expert on this, but to continue to focus on just the socioeconomic side is kind of only getting at one piece. It's an important subset, but the secondary and third-level impacts that could result, whether it's done well or if it's not done well could be felt for a long time.

Looking at it in a holistic fashion and working through the leadership across all organizations, whether it's governmental, municipal, territorial or whatever, it can be a big apple. It's kind of daunting when you think about it. Starting off with the labour study is certainly an element of it, but I hope that next year when we sit around the table, we are also talking about how the education piece is going to start to wrap in long-term, and all the other community-based issues.

Mark: Just on those points – thanks for making that point, Ginger. I think Yellowknife has a fair bit of experience with this kind of quick ramp up and major investment with diamond mine construction or other construction projects that have happened, so it's a really good point that we need to take that holistic view of things, because we have seen the impacts, both positive and negative of those big, big mega-developments in the past. I think that's really important.

One of the things I've been really encouraged by: I was at the Mining and Exploration Awards dinner gala last night sitting with Joe Campbell who is the CEO of TerraX Minerals, which is doing some exploration around Giant and around Con actually. I'm hearing from a lot more people, both in the private sector and the public sector, about the need to ramp up our educational infrastructure here. So whether it's the type of jobs that are associated with a mining project – a coming potential mining project like TerraX is, or on the remediation side of things like Giant and Con and all the other contaminated sites across

the North – there seems to be a building consensus that we should be trying to make investments in that type of educational infrastructure.

Aurora College is undergoing a major review right now as well, so I think we're gaining some momentum towards something. The City itself is looking to budget some money next year to do a postsecondary feasibility study to look at what that model might look like in Yellowknife and all the unique attributes for this region and what could feed in to the programming for something like that.

Ken F: That's encouraging to hear. As I expressed earlier in the AGM, we look for this remediation project to be not only a contaminated site cleanup, but a building tool for the community as a whole.

One of the other concerns that we've had as a Board is the communication from the City to the Yellowknife residents with regard to Giant Mine. I think the YKDFN has done a remarkable job of communicating with their people on what the Giant Mine is all about and what is going on. NSMA has a smaller community to work with, and they do have good discussions with their people. We don't see that within the City itself to the same extent.

We're wondering if you do have a plan for further communication, reaching out to people, pulling people into your public meetings on Yellowknife resident concerns about the Giant Mine site. We don't want to get to a point in the water license hearings where suddenly somebody jumps up and says, "Well, hey I haven't had any input into this."

Mark: I think I would say that for the most part, we're trying not to duplicate what other organizations or agencies are doing. INAC and the Project Team itself, they sort of communicate on a fairly regular basis with the community at large. Whether it's GMOB or the Project Team itself that are holding these public meetings, we will usually try to participate in one form or another.

I guess we're a little different from YKDFN and North Slave Métis in that it isn't a distinct community. Some of it relates to capacity and what our expertise is in. We don't have Public Health Officers, for example, so we're not experts in that. We rely on the GNWT's Chief Public Health Officer for things like that. I think if there is a desire for the City to more actively communicate, we're willing to listen to that, but I think for the most part thus far, we've said, "Okay the Project Team has their communications plan. GMOB has its communications plan, and we're there to help disseminate," but not be the primary communicator in that regard. Is that fair?

Ken H: My question was along the same lines, but it's just a little bit of a loose end for me. So through the Surface Design Engagement process, there was in essence a concept or a vision that was reached, and that's now being built-in to the decision-making process for the next iteration of the design, particularly for the surface. Would you say that the residents, the citizens of Yellowknife, are supportive of that concept? Are you in a position to say they

agree? You're never going to get consensus. There's a diverse set of perspectives in a community out there, but if there were a plebiscite for example, hypothetically would the community say, "Yes, we collectively support that vision?"

Mark: Well yes, as you said, you're never going to get a complete consensus, but I believe the community is keen to see the remediation move ahead. I think the primary concern right now is how it relates to the water body and source of drinking water. It was I think made clear to us quite some time ago the standards to which the surface was going to be remediated, but I think for most of the people I've spoken to, they want it done right. They were pleased even though it took a long time that the City actually triggered the environmental assessment in the first place, and we have a much better plan going forward as a result of that. But I suspect that most of what I've heard – and a lot of it relates to offsite contamination, which is outside the boundaries of the Project itself. I think most people just want to see it proceed.

David: Just a couple of observations and then a follow-up to the offsite stuff: First of all, I'm delighted to hear that the City is engaging in hopefully serious discussions about a post-secondary "university of the NWT". I think the study that I was engaged in about 10 years ago now with the previous mayor, is still on your website. It's way, way overdue. If you need a catalyst, perhaps this is it.

The knowledge economy is huge, and I think that the City...I'd encourage the City to take an active lead in driving that forward. I mean we've got Wilfrid Laurier across the street. We're just starting to create building blocks at least. There are plenty of examples elsewhere. The University of Svalbard is in a town of 2000 people, and it's got a university. Tromsø has got a university and the Norwegian Polar Institute, co-located. If they can do it, I cannot and never been able to understand why we in the NWT can't do it except for the lack of vision and the lack of political champions.

So I'd encourage you – strongly encourage you – to pursue that, because I think it would be excellent. If Yellowknife is looking post-mining or even as some mines close and are remediated, that knowledge economy can fill a huge gap as the tourist economy is starting to as well.

The Labour Needs Survey: Your comments about the complexity of this just makes me think – and I look at the Yellowknives and the North Slave Métis and think – how can they possibly deal with the strategic thinking that really could benefit their organizations if they had the capacity to engage in strategic planning? So I look at the Project Team and I have to wonder if there isn't more that you guys can do to enable the other organizations to get their own capacity to engage more effectively with you.

It's great to do the Labour Needs Assessment, but to then – and I'm overstating it, but to just put it out there – then say, "Okay, then this is what we're going to need," isn't enough. Given the capacity limitations in the organizations and even in the City, it's a real challenge.

I think some investment, some real financial investment to enable those organizations to have their own capacity to help you help them – or help them help you – it just seems to me that’s a reasonable cost of doing business in the North, and in this context in particular.

A billion dollar-plus project and a few hundred thousand dollars as part of the capacity building, economic development, opportunity building seems a relatively small investment. And I know from my past life in government, it ain’t that easy, but I also know that it can be done. It can be done. It just requires that vision and that drive to make it happen.

So those are two observations. The third question I have though is the off-lease stuff. What is the status of the discussions between the feds and the GNWT and I’m assuming the City, in dealing with the off-lease contamination?

Mark: So if I recall correctly from the Semi-Annual six months ago, there was an update that the federal government and the GNWT were going to start talking to one another, but the City had not been pulled into the discussions at that point.

Natalie: So I can provide an update from INAC’s perspective, not the Project, so I’m putting on a slightly different hat. This is from INAC as a whole as land managers of the North. We have been working with the GNWT. They have developed a scope of work on a plan forward to address the offsite contamination, which we’re just working on finalizing.

So the scope of work I think is not quite final. I also don’t know if we can say what’s in it, but we’re looking at starting with a risk assessment and then evaluating what other gaps need to be filled going forward. That should be finalized in the next month or two. This winter is the plan. The lead from INAC is Matt Spence, as Kathy indicated earlier. Matt Spence is the RDG for our office and is the lead, along with Lisa’s ADM or Lisa herself. So I can let her fill in any other gaps with that. Thank you.

Lisa: So to directly answer your question, no we have not approached the City and worked with them yet, because we are still working between GNWT and INAC on a proposal of how we’re going to work together. As I said, we have made some movement, and there is a proposal about how the two governments can work together and what work needs to be done. That’s what we’re working on finalizing.

The intent is once we come to agreement amongst the two governments, we will engage with the other Aboriginal governments and the City of Yellowknife to discuss the approach forward. Really what we’re looking at is the ultimate goal – to develop a management approach to dealing with offsite contamination jointly with those affected together. So that’s the long-term goal.

It’s going to take a little while to get us all on the same page, but I am encouraged by the progress we have made in the last few months.

David: Well, we'll continue to monitor the incredibly slow progress that's apparently being made. Again, I guess my perspective from the outside of government and coloured by my experience inside government, is that the sooner you engage, the better.

Despite the internal challenges and bureaucracy, there is nothing worse, as you and I both know, than cooking up a plan in-house and then going outside and saying, "What do you think of our plan?" and getting blown out of the water because you didn't engage soon enough, and there were some flaws, or just the perception that this is another plan that you're not going to engage on fully. You're going out to tell people what you're going to do and how they're going to be involved.

It actually – I guess the last part is, the sooner you engage often, the quicker you'll make progress, because everybody will be pushing that stone up the hill instead of you guys doing it yourselves and then the stone sort of being kicked back downhill by some folks who aren't happy with what you've come up with.

Natalie: Very valid points, David. I just wanted to address the slow progress. I think a lot of people are waiting for the Giant Mine Human Health Ecological Risk Assessment before taking that next step, because that is going to form a cornerstone, or a lot of the information that will feed into a broader perspective. So we are planning to finalize that in December. I don't think people were dragging their feet intentionally. They were purposefully waiting for the Human Health Ecological Risk Assessment. Now that we have the draft out, I think everyone here has seen the draft. That can inform a lot of decisions on the next steps.

William: Before we break for lunch, I just had a quick question for the Mayor. The Water Intake Study is going to Council in early 2018. When do you estimate it to be public for people to review it?

Mark: At the same time, so likely sometime first quarter. Yes, it'll be out by then.

William: Great. Okay.

Johanne: Also, I have a question for the City regarding this post-secondary feasibility study. If you're going to be going down that path to do that study, one of the things I've always noticed with research that gets conducted for First Nations is that research gets conducted by universities. If a university is going to be popped up here, I know there is a storefront right now, but if there are discussions being had around that, I believe that the impact on First Nations should be a part of that.

The reason why I say that is because in working with research and noticing how research gets conducted, it's still done in a colonial manner. It's still thriving. Colonialism in research is thriving, and it doesn't go away. The reason why I say that is because as an example, researchers think they know what First Nations want. They don't come to us and ask us,

“Okay, what kind of research do you want?” They tell us, “This is the research that’s going to happen. What do you want to see in it?”

At that point in the stage, they’ve already planned the research. They’ve already proposed it. They’ve already got the funding for it. Then they come to the Yellowknives and say, “This is the research we’re going to do...on you.” It’s not right. It’s not.

So when I go back to saying that colonialism is still thriving in modern day societies, it still is. It’s still thriving and well. It’s still living and breathing in research and post-secondary education. Nobody has come to the Yellowknives to ask them, “Okay, what kind of education do you want for your folks?” When does that happen?

So I guess in terms of that post-secondary feasibility study, I guess I’m asking the City of Yellowknife if there’s an opportunity for the Yellowknives to ensure that those types of colonial tactics don’t exist in terms of education, because I’ll go and say it again: It’s thriving.

In terms of Wilfrid Laurier setting up a storefront here and conducting...I don’t know what kind of research is going to be conducted out of that branch of university, but they haven’t come to the Yellowknives and told us they were even going to open up a storefront here. I guess they don’t need the permission of the Yellowknives. I’m not asking for that, but some discussions with us would have been very, very welcome because I don’t have a clue as to what they’re going to be teaching people and what my folks and my community members should be taught. That’s what I want to get at. Thank you.

Mark: I’ll just add quickly to that point. I think you raised some valid concerns, Johanne. I think that’s one of the things about looking to build an institution that has roots in the community. Every application for research in this region that goes through the Aurora Research Institute comes across my desk for comment. There are dozens of them. I got four applications yesterday alone.

So the ability with the community in cooperation with YKDFN and the North Slave Métis, and other First Nations in the region, the opportunity I think is to look at what would a post-secondary institution look at in Yellowknife and really build it from the ground up. So that’s really the intention here I think.

Johanne: Thank you. One of the things is that the Yellowknives really, really want the ability to be able to teach our own folks what we think they should know, based on what they think they need. So in terms of developing any relationships with universities to develop a university here, I believe that the Yellowknives should have a big part to play in that in terms of maybe partnering up on that initiative. Thank you.

David: Johanne, you and William and I can talk after, but I chair the Wilfrid Laurier-GNWT Science Committee, so I have a pretty good idea of what this is all about. So we can talk. But they’re

not here to teach directly at least or to conduct university level courses. It's a support office for the research they're doing across the NWT. So we can talk about that.

Johanne: Thank you.

Kathy: Okay, make it quick.

Lisa: I smiled very nicely to get in my last comment. Building on what David said, Bruce Hanna coordinates work between the GNWT and the Wilfrid Laurier University, and he has been bringing around people in the office to meet with different organizations so people are more aware. So I'll go back, and I will volun-tell Bruce to connect with you so maybe you can be introduced to the team that is up here. David and I can talk about that a little bit more.

Just to make a quick comment before lunch, I just don't want the lasting impression in the room being – just building upon what you were saying, David, and I know you didn't mean this - but I don't want the lasting impression to be that the GNWT and INAC are cooking up our own approach to offsite. We've had some initial meetings. We needed to look at what work has been done to date and have an understanding of what resources were available.

We're not just trying to work between GNWT and INAC. We're also engaging with how we can have Health Canada more involved with the offsite work as well as Environment Canada. We've also had discussions with DFO. So we're really looking at how does government need to work to see what resources can be committed. There is no intention to come up with a plan that's cooked. It's really about getting ourselves organized and in agreement and getting the right people at the table talking.

With that, I acknowledge that government seems to move very slowly at times, but we are committed and working. I appreciate the outside opinions, but there is work. The goal is to come out and engage with people in the public before we move forward with offsite. It's just to clarify that.

Kathy: Okay everyone. Let us have a break for lunch and start again at 1:30. Thanks.

LUNCH BREAK

INAC & GNWT:

Kathy: (*Recording started mid-sentence*): ...but before we move on to INAC and the GNWT, I just want to make sure there are no more questions for the City, or comments...or is everyone's mouth full?

(*Laughter*)

It's okay with Mark. He says thumbs up, no problem. Alright then, we'll move on. We'll move on to INAC and GNWT, so you can tell us what are the Project bits, and what are INAC bits, and what are GNWT bits. That would be great. I'll just let you take it away.

Natalie: Great, I'll start and then Lisa will come in after me. We planned that. So I will give updates, successes, challenges and an overall update for this year. I'm hoping none of it is new or a surprise to anyone, since we've been talking at working group and GMAC and public forums, so none of this should be new. I'll try to give a summary of where we're at in the past year and where we're going in the next couple of months, if that's okay with everyone.

So in terms of some of our procurements, successes, the Main Construction Manager has gone out for tender. It's closed. We've done the evaluation. We hope to award that in December. We're just waiting on a few internal processes to award that, so we're ready to go. So there will be an award and an announcement in the next month. So everyone knows, the MCM is the Main Construction Manager who will take over management of the site.

Okay, the other procurement we've got ongoing is our 509 Slope Stability Program. It is out on the street right now as we speak, so it's out for tender. We had a bidder's tour this week. It went well, so that will be awarded in the coming months with work to begin this fiscal.

In terms of some of the regulatory updates, we're working on the completion of our Closure and Reclamation Plan, which we're hoping to bring the scope contents to start engaging on that at the next working group meeting, which is December 7th, laying out all the decisions and the scope going forward from the SDE engagement, and changes to the order from 2007. So that will be coming in the next couple of weeks where we start engaging on that.

Following through the overall Closure and Reclamation Plan, once we've started that engagement, we'll be coming – our target is May 2018 to have that out for the water license pre-engagement, which I think at no surprise we are aiming to submit our whole post-EA package in January 2019. So coming, that will be an element we just want to make sure the Parties are aware of, that we will be doing the engagement on that in the coming year.

Other items we've done: We've launched the Health Effects Monitoring Program. We've discussed that. So that's ongoing. We're in the midst of the first round of sampling. They aim to finish up the sampling in December, and there was a slight change. They were going to do the second round of sampling next fall, but based on feedback we received, fall might not be the most optimal time to do sampling, so we're going to advance the second round of sampling for spring of 2018 to try to catch the spring wave, so we don't miss people that are tied up, as Nicole said, with kids, family, hunting or whatever to make sure we can get the broad spectrum of participation.

We are just in the final stages of our HHERA, Human Health Environmental Risk Assessment. We have a draft report out right now for comments. We're just receiving comments on that

and want to have that finalized for the end of this calendar year. We have just submitted our annual report to GMOB. We discussed it yesterday. Unfortunately, I wasn't able to attend, but Aaron, Lisa, and Erika were there along with Craig. So that will be circulated shortly, so that will be our annual report from '16-'17...sorry, I need to make sure I get my years right.

We're also working on a Treasury Board submission, which will be going in in December, which among other things includes a provision for grant funding for GMOB, as well as the carryover provisions and works on some of our project authorities and funding for us taking us forward into the Project. I think Craig probably spoke to that yesterday.

In terms of on-site care maintenance and site stabilization, we're working on infrastructure, utility upgrades to obviously keep the site functional. A couple of those items are the UBC Bridge, which is still not fixed. We are working on the design. It is out for permitting and licensing right now. We will be getting a Type B water license for that work. That was at the direction of the Board saying we required a Type B to do that work. We want to do that this winter while under frozen conditions – some of the drilling work – and then have the bridge completed for spring.

We are also doing some work at the Akaitcho headframe in terms of looking at installing some submersible pumps at Akaitcho. We're doing some design work now. We've engaged the regulators on what would be required there and submitted a pre-engagement package on that work. We will be in Ottawa next week discussing that further on how we go forward on putting those pumps in. But the current plan is to put submersible pumps that are accessible from surface so we don't have to access the underground for our pumping needs. It's a health and safety issue of getting the workers down to those pumps. It's the north end of the mine. We don't go there all the time. I think one of the recommendations from IPRP was we should look at surface pumps. Also that's something that's ongoing work right now.

In terms of other successes we've had this year, we were at the spring tradeshow. We had really great interaction with the public. We had our booth at that spring tradeshow and heard a lot of questions, comments and did a lot of promotion for the HEMP program there.

We've also this year presented at the RPIC: Real Property...oh gosh....

Erika: Institute of Canada.

Natalie: Thank you. Federal Contaminated Site Workshop – we presented some presentations on Giant Mine there as well as RemTech recently. We had our public forum in February-March of this year as well, as well as our forum in N'Dilo. I guess one of the big wins we've been working on is our socio-ec strategy that Aaron has been speaking to, and I think we've covered that in some detail. But the labour study will be updated and coming out shortly. Did I miss anything from our end?

Aaron: I think the UBC bridgework has received its license. We just have to submit the final construction plan, so that license is in place. Then the Akaitcho pumping work – the package that Natalie was speaking to – requires an amendment to the previous license that we already had for, I believe the Site Stabilization Plan. So we've been working with the Board staff on putting that together.

Natalie: Great. Thank you, Aaron, and with that, I guess I will either take questions or hand it over to Lisa to update from GNWT.

Hearing no questions...

Lisa: Thank you. As you all are aware, Erika is full-time on the Project Team, so she has been working very closely throughout the year. She has been focusing on assisting with the engagement and some of the human health work that has been going on. As I said, we're really engaged with the project that way, but I think when David was asking, he was interested in some of the other initiatives that may touch upon or complement the work that is happening at Giant, so I'll just focus on those now.

We talked a little bit this morning about how INAC and GNWT are in discussions about management of offsite or legacy contamination, which we call it. One of the things that the GNWT is currently doing is looking at the guidelines for contaminated sites. So we're currently looking at the standards for arsenic that are in the current guidelines, and we're doing an assessment of whether those guidelines are still applicable based upon the new information.

There has been a lot of additional soil data that has been collected, and there is some new information out about what is the appropriate background level in the Yellowknife area. We are taking all that information and looking at whether the guidelines we've set are appropriate or not. It's not just for the Yellowknife area. We also have been doing some work in Inuvik, because there have been some issues with arsenic levels in Inuvik as well. So we're looking at what are appropriate arsenic levels for the Yellowknife area as well as the rest of the NWT. That work is currently underway, and we're hoping to be able to release an upgraded guideline in the summer of 2018.

We talked a little bit about the Legacy Contaminants Committee, and for the GNWT, this has been very successful because there are several different departments working on, touching upon issues with arsenic. For example, Geoscience is doing some work. We have some work going under the Cumulative Impacts Monitoring Program, and we have work that is happening – agricultural strategy within ITI, as well as a recreational strategy within Lands. So it's really important that among the GNWT, there's an understanding of what initiatives are out there and to make sure that everyone has the latest information as they develop their strategies going forward.

So I think as an internal communication it has been very successful. We found that everyone is now aware of all the different initiatives that people are working on, and there's that sharing of information that is the purpose of the committee, so it has been successful that way. It has also helped us work closely with Health and Social Services to make sure that they have the latest information to revise or update their health advisories.

The last thing I wanted to touch upon is the socioeconomic work that is being done by the Giant. It is one of the things that has been really key, and Erika has been working on it. It is bringing together the different departments within the GNWT so that the GNWT and its program delivery understands what the major milestones are in the Giant Mine Project, so that projects that are put out by education, culture...can build upon the opportunity. So we really are working on making sure that within the GNWT, there's an understanding so it can shape how programs are delivered, and maybe where resources are allocated in the future. So that's an important aspect of what Erika is doing.

We are still ongoing in having those discussions. I think that's very successful that people are now thinking within the GNWT, "How can we complement?" "How can we build upon those opportunities that are coming?" and "How can we maximize benefits for residents and businesses within the NWT?"

Ginger: When you were talking about the socioeconomic – I'm sorry, that's kind of my hobbyhorse these days. One of the things Aaron mentioned - and from my limited experience, I believe it is a challenge – it's that some of the programs and the vehicles that were listed in the labour study that can provide either training or training money. You have to know how to get at them. They're not necessarily easy. Like Aaron was saying, CanNor didn't even know some of these things existed.

Applying for some of these things is a skillset in and of itself, being able to put an application together and then provide all the justification and follow-up. They usually want follow-up, right? They want reports, and they have certain financial requirements. So is there any thought given that maybe some core funding might be made available, to have an expertise available to the different community organizations or governments that could help people put those applications together? You know, it's almost like until you write your first resume or CV, you don't realize how hard it is. But if you go to a resume writer, it's so simple. You talk to the person. You tell them what you did, and they do it for you. So is there any idea about core funding like that?

Aaron: Yes, you're correct Ginger. We have heard from people through our labour study, as I said this morning I think it was, the challenge is how to do applications and how to access all that stuff. One of the ideas during our summer program of talking to people – a concept that we floated with everybody and there was unanimous support – was what we called a Capacity Builder's Workshop/Convention.

The concept behind this is to alleviate the concerns that you're raising, short of providing all the funding for helping to fill those gaps. But we're looking to try and work with multiple partners, multiple government groups, including municipal, territorial, Chamber of Commerce, and local businesses, to develop a convention-conference type of thing where it is a one-stop-shop procurement programs, as well as training programs and support.

So I can share with the GMOB the note that we actually prepared for everybody during those interview processes. That kind of gives a high level of what we're trying to do, but it really is...it really is in the preliminary stages. We're generating ideas, so when I share the note with you, I'd certainly love to hear back from GMOB on some direction as well, and some input.

We want to try and create some type of an event where everybody can come and find out about programs, find out about potential job opportunities with individual companies, find out how to participate in a federal procurement process on buy-and-sell, and also have the main construction manager there available to talk about what the programs are looking like for Giant in the coming future.

But the Project also recognizes that we're not the center of the North. We're a big project, but there are lots of other projects that are happening in the City and the rest of the Northwest Territories. What we've tried to do over the last year is just to make sure that in the list of all the projects that are taking place, that Giant is present and on those lists, so that people are using Giant, or considering Giant, as they plan for their own economic development and their own opportunities to participate in our project.

So we've been playing around with the idea that a conference would not be Giant-focused. It would be focused on potentially projects that the City would be undergoing for infrastructure improvements or other things, if there are other exploration companies or other mines that are looking to draw on the resources. The reality is the type of resources we need for Giant to do it in terms of labour are very similar to lots of other projects that are going to be happening.

We have to be aware of that and try and coordinate with all the different players, including municipal, territorial, and others in order to maximize everybody's ability to get their work done. So, we're heading to try and do a type of a conference or convention like that where we can get people to provide all this information to the public, to other people, potentially a plenary session on very simple things, like maybe resume writing or putting together a proposal.

Public Works, I think their Office of Small and Medium Sized Businesses used to put on workshops as well for smaller businesses to help with procurement in how to do business planning as well. The possibilities are endless on how to do that. What is encouraging to me is that there was support to do something like that. Even folks with the Yellowknife Chamber of Commerce said they'd be keen in supporting that initiative as well, and that

there wasn't anything like that. There are lots of tradeshow and other things, but there wasn't anything that was targeting a wide swath of programs and access to programs and access to dollars.

We are aware of the challenges there are, but we're trying to help break down those barriers, keeping in mind that we need support and help from other people to do that ourselves.

Ginger: Just a follow-up: I think that would be a really interesting initiative. One of the questions I have is it's almost a cart-and-horse concern. If the communities are stretched now to deal with all of the consultation and engagement activities and report reviews, giving them another task to go out and make this initiative available and actively get people participating – as far as timing, if the communities put forward their requests for capacity assistance, and I don't mean to speak for you all, but would the capacity, the additional bodies, come fast enough to have them in place so that they could actively participate in this kind of workshop?

Aaron: Well, first of all, we're not asking the communities to – I mean, we would continue to work with William and Margaret and Nora and Johanne, as well as NSMA and others to help plan it and develop it. I don't think there's a requirement for additional resources for that. There might be a case, as we talked already about this morning, for additional resources or capacity support for other things.

I think, as Natalie and Lisa talked about earlier this morning, those discussions around providing the support to NSMA or YKDFN, we're going to have those discussions. I think even this morning they said before Christmas. So we're looking at capacity, and I think what will end up happening is after those discussions, the intention would be to build that stuff into the Contribution Agreement or some other funding mechanism before next fiscal year, so those people could help support this.

We also recognize that with a type of event like this, with the size of it. But the flip side of that is not just the governmentese or the bureaucracy of putting it together, but there is also the cultural aspect of it. So we've already talked with Johanne and William and Margaret and Nora about we'd be having it in Yellowknife on their traditional territory. There would be some requests from us to have the YKDFN participate and let people get an understanding of where this work is taking place on their territory. We've even talked down in the weeds about having the drummers from their community come and open up this type of an event and have those kinds of things, so people are aware that we're working on their traditional territory.

It's something that I think is important to keep in mind as we're trying to move forward with this. Keep that in mind, because it is important. It is kind of the other side of what we're trying to develop there, to make people aware of those things, in particular the Main

Construction Manager as well, making them aware of where you're working and be aware of the importance of the work that you're doing.

David: Yes, it's along the lines of Ginger's follow-up question. There's no point in my view, of holding an event like this, however well intentioned, if the organizations that are sitting around this table aren't equipped to engage effectively. There's no point. It's not a question of providing support. It's a question of enabling the capacity in those organizations so they can engage with the outside groups.

You can throw consultants at the communities. You can throw technical expertise at the communities, and that's not going to help the community grow and build and capture the opportunities. An event like this, yes it's great. But it's going to go right over the heads of the people in the communities, because they don't have the capacity to engage effectively to take advantage of the opportunities.

So I would suggest that until there is that capacity in the communities, don't be even thinking about holding an event like this, because it's not going to be helpful. That's just my opinion.

Aaron: Yes, it's a fair point, but understand that the development of this convention is not done in isolation of other activities that we're doing in trying to build capacity. The capacity that we're trying to build is not about hiring consultants or others to come in and help the YKDFN or the NSMA. It is about building capacity within the community and finding folks that are community members that can be there for support and backup for William, for Nicole, or for others. That is our intention, and I think we've committed to working on that together with all the parties over the coming months.

Again, I reiterate for the record that through the process, there was support for this type of idea. It initially did come from all of the affected First Nation groups when we had an engagement session with them, in particular the Main Construction Manager. They had requested we do something like this. This was back in December of 2015 when we introduced the Main Construction Manager to all the affected First Nation groups and talked to them about how it would roll out and how they could potentially benefit from participating in subcontracts, as opposed to participating in the Main Construction Manager process.

David: And that's fine, and you've made your case. The case that I'm going to make on behalf of the communities – and William and others can do it better than I – is that for the well.... past 2015, 2014, back to 19-something, the communities have been asking for the capacity to engage effectively.

We've heard that before, and I know you guys are well intentioned, but it's time to enable the communities to get to where they want to be. All the good intentions in the world aren't doing that. The thing that's going to help these communities most effectively is to

enable them to hire the people they need to work with in their organization so they can reach out and engage effectively. So I get it, but it's not happening.

William: Yes, I was just going to say that I completely agree with David that until you give us the tools to effectively engage, it's not going to happen. In the socioeconomic work, yes community members will be supporting myself, but I'm only one person. I cannot – the socioeconomic work is a job in itself. Sure, community members will be supporting and working to fulfill those measures, but until we get somebody in that position that can work specifically on socioeconomics, it's not going to happen. Exactly what David said: If you do the workshop before that happens, it's useless. It's a waste of time.

Mark: I guess a question for David: You mentioned Colomac and the Tlîchô earlier. What do you see as the differences, that capacity apparently existed within the Tlîchô communities at the time, or was it something that had to be built as that project got underway?

David: Yes, we built it. It didn't exist in the community. Lisa, you can weigh in on this. The fundamental difference was a difference in attitude. We took a different path than the Giant team did in the early days of engaging. Giant, quite frankly, was done old school. It was done within the government, and periodically government folks would go to the Yellowknives and others and say, "This is what we're doing."

We took a different route. We took some risks too in doing that. We didn't ask permission to engage. We just did it. We drew on contribution agreements, enabled the Tlîchô to hire the people they wanted to work with them, and we made the deliberate decision to engage at every stage of the project. It's quite a different route than the Giant Project was done. It was done largely in-house. Decisions were made and then brought to the public after-the-fact. That was just not the way we did it. So it was a fundamental difference from the outset.

Lisa: I was just going to come back to capacity. I just want to thank everyone for their input today. We have heard what you've said. William, David, and also from the NSMA – sorry I don't remember your name.

Nicole: Nicole.

Lisa: We've heard that, and I just want to make sure that everyone is aware that we've heard that. We are committed to working with people to build capacity, and we want to make the programs that the Team has been working on to complement – We want that capacity to be able to complement the work that is happening on the Project Team. So we have heard you. We will meet with people, and we will build on that. I just wanted to make sure that everyone is aware that we do appreciate and understand the points that are being made.

Mark: Just to make a point on Aaron's comments: I certainly think the idea has merit. I think that capacity issue has to be addressed, as others have said, in advance. But I've just been

thinking in the course of this discussion that around the time implementation starts on Giant Mine, we're probably going to be building a \$45 million aquatic center. We are going to be replacing a \$20 million submarine pipeline quite likely. So there are going to be a lot of things. There's about to be an avalanche of infrastructure dollars coming from the federal government, so it's going to be pretty important I think, for all parties to try and coordinate what's happening and who is doing the work.

Ginger: Mark, based on that, how would you see that coordination happening with all of these big projects that are going to come at you at the same time? Does that go through the city? Do you have a city coordinator?

Mark: You mean for projects that are beyond the municipal realm?

Ginger: Not ones that you are necessarily initiating, but the ones that are going to happen within the city that will impact negatively or positively on everything else that's going on.

Mark: There is currently no overarching umbrella that keeps track of those sorts of things. So I think that's one of the reasons a workshop like that would have merit. It gives us the opportunity to go out to the broader community and say, "What do you have planned?" "What's on the books?" This isn't even considering what the GNWT might be doing at that time with federal infrastructure dollars. So I think it would be worthwhile starting that conversation at least now, and addressing concurrently that capacity issue that has been mentioned.

We've gotten better at coordinating our road rehabilitation with the GNWT, so that if we're shutting down some roads in the downtown and they're doing it on the highway on the other loop on the other side of the city, then we try to coordinate the timing of that a little bit better. Beyond that, there's no sort-of overview of everything that's happening.

Tony: Just to add a little bit of force to some of the other comments about capacity and how to enhance it: Before you asked the question about Colomac, I was just thinking along those lines of how it had its bumps, but it's done. It was successful, both in terms of remediation, and it was an opportunity for growth and addressing some other intangible issues. It did provide those benefits.

I'll bet you didn't help anyone write a resume. I bet you didn't help anybody figure out how to write grants and proposals or anything like that. It was much more because a different paradigm was used. It was – and maybe this is the wrong term, but as an outsider looking in, it seemed to me to be more of a partnership model than a proponent-and-potentially-affected-parties model.

I do think a lot of what the Project Team has described, it is in a conventional sense quite innovative. You're pushing the limits within a conventional framework. I just think that in the context of looking at the Colomac case, it is a success story. It is because of that different

paradigm, I believe, that was used. It wasn't because of pushing innovation within the conventional model. It was about stepping out of the conventional model and making it more of a partnership arrangement.

My two cents, I think that was the differentiator there. I think there probably could be some lessons learned as applicable to this case. I think an argument could be made – going back to that particular project – and saying, “What are the lessons learned from that particular construct?” and doing it very deliberately. Pat yourselves on that back. That was a government-led project in partnership with the Tl̓ich̓. I think there could be some really important lessons there that hopefully would be applicable to Giant. Thank you.

Kathy: Are there any comments or questions for the GNWT or INAC from anyone else?

Mark: Can I just confirm that I think you said January of 2019 for the water license application?

Natalie: That is currently our hard deadline.

Mark: Very good. Thanks.

Kathy: I think that's a submission – I kept getting confused – a submission to the Board, but you're beginning the pre-engagement on the package, the water license application package in May 2018. Yes?

Natalie: I will have our Closure and Reclamation Plan ready. I think some of the pre-engagement will start – it could potentially start even sooner than May 2018 on some of the packages. We've heard from the parties that earlier is better, along with smaller chunks, so we're aiming to do that sooner, as early as January of 2017 – sorry, 2018. Sorry, got my years mixed up.

Erika: Just to add to that: We have a living engagement timeline that we plan, and we haven't sent out a revised one too recently, but our hope is monthly with the working group agenda, that we would send that out, and within that we would identify when certain components would be engaged on for the Closure Plan and larger water license submission. So Kerry's on our list, and that's something that we'd like to make sure that we get out monthly and keep on top of that.

Kathy: Are there any other questions or comments for the Project Team?

(Pause)

Giant Mine Oversight Board Review of Annual Reports

Kathy: No? Alright, thank you very much. Okay, Alternatives North is not here, so we'll move on to it all being about us again, about the Giant Mine Oversight Board. Agenda Item 7: We just wrote down a few highlights of things to talk about. We already gave you a rundown of

our activities over the last year. So maybe we'll just jump into that. The Project Team's Annual Report came out at just the end of October. They sent it to us, as per the Environmental Agreement.

We had a discussion with the Project Team yesterday, that we weren't sure...it's kind of unclear in the Environmental Agreement. It says the Annual Report from the Project Team is to go to GMOB and be available to the public, so we weren't sure who was supposed to send it to whom. We agreed yesterday. The Project Team is going to send it to the Parties, and I think it will go up on our website eventually. It is being translated and will go up on their website as well, so I don't think the Parties in the room have seen the Annual Report yet.

It has only been a couple of weeks. We haven't done a complete read of it, or we've all read it but not in complete detail. We looked at it. It has all the components that are spelled out in the Environmental Agreement that it is supposed to have, with a couple of exceptions that are noted in the report. A plain language summary is still outstanding, and there wasn't as much trend analysis as we were expecting. But that's also something that was acknowledged in the report.

Last year we did a really thorough review, and we had a bunch of recommendations about what this year's report should contain or shouldn't contain. We decided this year that we probably won't be doing that. We thought maybe the Annual Report, it wasn't quite giving us what we as GMOB thought we needed to do – an evaluation of the progress of the Project, but maybe it wasn't supposed to. Maybe it's meant as a reference document of a year's work, and it's perfectly valid if that's what it is.

We talked to the Project Team about the kind of products we were looking for in terms of Project plans and performance measures and stuff like that. We're going to continue to ask for those elements that we want, but you probably won't see from us a big long review of the Annual Report, because it's a report. It's data, and you can't really criticize data. Data is what it is.

Having said that, we were kind of curious if any of the other Parties used the Annual Report. Did you use last year's Annual Report? How do the other parties see that Annual Report as fitting in, given that there are also Working Group meetings and there are regular communications? There are lots of other venues. That's clearly not the only venue for knowing about the Project. We just were curious how the other parties used or didn't use the Annual Report. To be clear, this is the Project Team's Annual Report, not GMOBs.

Okay, enough said I think. William, did you want to weigh in at all?

William: Well I like that GMOB did review the Annual Report. It was very helpful in pointing out the good and the bad. Myself, I didn't have the time or capacity to review last year's so I'm not quite sure. But I did have a question on this year's when it does reach the Parties. Is it going

to be the final - after you guys take a look at it, and it hits our desk – is that going to be the final version, or are we going to see the first crack at a draft edition?

Kathy: I think we agreed that it is already finalized, because we're not going to edit it. There's no need for us to edit it either. So what you'll see is the final version. It captures a summary of all the things that happened on the site in the fiscal year of 2016-2017. Like I said, there are a few things we wanted to see about Project plans in a five-year window and that kind of thing that were not in the Annual Report, but we've talked to the Project Team about getting that separately. So that's fine with us. Okay, just checking in. Is there anything else on that from the Board? No?

Our Annual Report: So it's easy to criticize someone else's, and then you've got to write your own. I think I mentioned we had two days this week of trying to figure out what our Annual Report will look like next year. We're going to incorporate some of the elements that were in last year's report: the "What We've Heard" section, the "Observations and Recommendations." There will be more of an update on our research point, et cetera. We're trying to keep it even slimmer than last year so it's an easy, tight read that's focused. We will comment on progress on the measures from last year and various other things. But yes, we're trying to keep it pretty slim.

The timeline is about the same as last year to release it sometime in April and to have a public meeting in May. We have only just started thinking about what to highlight in the report. Like I said, we want to keep it punchy and readable, so we'll be refining those ideas for the next couple of months, writing a report, and we look forward to your input on that. I don't know if anyone has any questions. Yes, go ahead Aaron.

Aaron: It wasn't a question, but just a point of clarification from our meetings yesterday. I believe there was an action to set up another meeting with the Parties before the official release of that report so that the Parties could react to that report and prepare responses for that report for your Annual Report before you get it released. Because you did mention yesterday that the Report – I don't want to say far-reaching, but it will be outside of the Project, and there may be other people that need to prepare responses for, so I just wanted to clarify that is still the intent, to have that meeting before the release of the Report.

Kathy: Yes, so what Aaron's referring to is when our Report came out in April, it was challenging for the Project Team to respond. We had a lot of recommendations to the Project Team. It was challenging for them to both write the responses, and get them approved, and get them out so that by the time we had a public meeting they could respond to questions from the public, which was fair.

We talked about trying not to surprise anyone too much on anything, but also recognizing that if we have recommendations, we can make recommendations to the Project Team, but also to the other Parties, and also to various levels of government, et cetera, or the public

even. But we thought we don't want anyone to be caught unaware. The idea is not to surprise people and embarrass anyone. That's not the idea behind the recommendations.

We're looking for a mechanism where we can share some of our preliminary ideas and recommendations with everybody, but not share them in a way...We also need to maintain our independence. So we make a recommendation, and then you talk us off the ledge. We're trying to gain information. We've gained a lot over this week's meeting with the Project Team and ourselves, and even in this meeting here that certainly influences what we have to say. So we're still looking for that perfect mechanism that will allow everyone to not be caught unaware – the parties – but also to keep our independence. We haven't settled on the exact mechanism of what that will be, but that's our intention in the early and the new year.

We also heard from people last year for the public meeting that they would appreciate if other parties could – like the Project Team – could answer questions the public had at our public meetings. We're looking into that as well. Last year, we tried to really distinguish GMOB from the Project Team, because a lot of people – the public – was getting us confused. But then we had specific requests from the public: "It would be nice if we could go to your meeting, and if we have questions from the Project Team, that we be able to ask them." So I think that's the route we're going with for that public meeting as well.

Are there any questions from anyone about our Annual Report? Also if you have suggestions or thoughts about the Annual Report or what was helpful in it, what was good, or what was bad, you can tell us now, or you can tell us anytime. We didn't get a lot of specific feedback, which could be good, but if you do have anything, please let us know. Oh, Ken. Do you have a complaint about our Annual Report?

(Laughter)

Ken H: Yes, I'd like to raise something with the Chair. It's Ken. No, I'd actually like to ask for some feedback from William. Without prejudicing your answer, I just want to make a comment on my observation about our public meeting last year when we released the Report, and the fact that it was a bit of a highlight for me to have people from all three communities together at that meeting listening to each other, acknowledging each other, and hearing different perspectives. For me, I thought that was really time well spent. I, for one, would like to see that more often, but I haven't been able to determine from the other communities who are attending how they viewed that. Do you have any observations on that? Thank you.

William: Yes, I thought it was really well done as well. I think everybody was there collectively. There were no sides between each other. I thought it was handled really well. I commemorate the Board for a job well done. It kind of reminded me of the SDE meetings, because there were a lot of questions of whether everybody could really sit down in a room and hash everything out, but it went well. We could sit down later and talk further about it, but yes.

Giant Mine Oversight Board Research Program

Kathy: Okay, any other questions or comments about our Annual Report or annual meeting? I don't have a lot of details right now anyway. Alright. Okay, and then we just wanted to spend a bit more time just letting you know what we're up to with the research program. I believe Dr. Froese is going to update us on that.

Ken F: Mister Doctor, as the Germans would say. Yes, we've embarked on a strategy towards developing our research program. Is that vague enough?

(Laughter)

Ginger: You sound like you're in government.

Ken F: Oh yes. I'm practicing.

(Laughter)

We received the State of Knowledge Report earlier this year, and that was rolled out or communicated to the community in October, I believe it was, early October, about a month ago. That was our first step in understanding where the state of knowledge is with treating arsenic trioxide. It was not meant as a status of where our research would go. It's simply a knowledge base for what's there.

Last month at the end of the month, we also had a workshop in Ottawa among academic people, among the National Research Council, the Saskatchewan Research Council, and industry – an industry person. We invited a few brains into the room to brainstorm with us on what could a research program look like from a high-level perspective for GMOB. We had a lot of ideas amongst ourselves and realized that we needed to have external input and simply a discussion, a dialogue on this. So we did have that.

To use the analogy of making sausage, it's not always pretty at the beginning, but you get a pretty good result at the end. There's a lot of stuff that goes into it. We did have a wide-ranging discussion that was a bit frustrating at first, and it coalesced into something that was really very useful, and we will continue with that vein.

We are having a discussion with a group in Waterloo that is part of a broad consortium of university research facilities or groups, and to step forward with that and find out if they are the right partner for us to use their platform as our initial research platform so we can benefit from their expertise, benefit from their network, and benefit from their understanding of how to leverage funds. We have a certain amount of funds every year for research. In one sense, it's extremely good, because we have essentially a guaranteed funding source for the foreseeable future. In another sense, it's not an awful lot of money, but it does provide a really gold really good leveraging tool for getting more funds.

So that's where we're starting off. We'll continue the discussion, and we hope to see if we fit into this other group, or fit with them. The reality of research in this country is that it's funded on shorter-term time periods: three years, five years, or whatever it is. So no matter what we decide on at the beginning now, it will be an evolving thing and always evolving, which is part of the strategy.

David: Yes, just to be clear, the workshop that we had was more intended to talk about how we can leverage the funds we have in the most effective way rather than to get into a detailed discussion about remediation technologies. The folks that we met with are experts in leveraging funding, because we're not. They live in the academic world – most of them – and they know about the funding opportunities. They know how to prepare a proposal. They know who else is working in the field, so the networks are what we're trying to tap into.

It took a while for the folks that we were talking with to understand what we were driving toward. For them it was obvious, right? They know about their networks, so they wanted to talk about technologies. We wanted to talk about networking and try to figure out the best way to examine feasibility of certain technologies. We were sort of out of phase for a while.

But in the course of that, not only did we get onto this Terre-net potential, a network that could be very helpful because it has a subnetwork already established that is relevant to the work that we're proposing, but we also got some hints about technologies that might be actually more promising than we thought.

In the end, we agreed that the target was not 100 years to solve this problem, but 20 years. I personally am quite optimistic that in 20 years time, we can come up with a technology or technologies that will solve this problem for the betterment of everybody involved. What that technology is going to look like, I can't predict now, but we already know of some that are promising.

Kathy's suggestion, I think, has got the most promise, which is an army of nanobots with laser guns...was it Ken's? The only thing we have to worry about is these nanobots getting free after their job is done.

(Laughter)

In all seriousness, there are biotechnologies, for example, that aren't as farfetched as we might have thought prior to the meeting, let alone ten years ago. There's good promise out there. The idea is to leverage the network to enable us to throw our relatively small amount of money into a larger pot and see where it takes us.

Erika: Just more so from curiosity, who were some of the experts or researchers that you invited to participate in those talks?

Tony: I'll take the first crack. I don't have the list here with me either, but we had from the academic sphere without naming individual names but the universities that were there – well, one name: Heather Jameson that everybody here would know of from Queens. We had representation from Wilfrid Laurier, UofA, University of Waterloo, UBC, National Research Council, Saskatchewan Research Council, and NRCAN. I think we're getting close to the end of the list. It gives a representation of who we had. We might be missing one or two, but we did have a fairly broad cross section.

As David indicated, we deliberately weren't targeting experts in arsenic research. We are focusing on individuals who have expertise in research programs primarily that could provide that type of an insight. It did generally come from the scientific realm, from the applied science realm, but we did have a broad cross-section.

Ginger: The guy from UBC, he was a mining specialist, wasn't he?

Tony: Yes, Dr. Scott Dunbar. He is a metallurgist focusing on biomethods.

Ken F: Tony and I were the ones who targeted or chose the people that we invited for this. We very deliberately looked for people who could provide a broad perspective and wouldn't necessarily or quite deliberately wouldn't have any skin in the game, to say that directly. So there were not people who have any interest in developing a research program in arsenic trioxide, but rather people who are willing to tackle tough problems from a holistic perspective and to brainstorm with us, to really look at this from outside any kind of research box or government box that we might be self-biased towards. I think we were successful in that. We had some really good discussion and very good ideas. It was a very useful exercise for us. Oh yes, sorry. Bill Slater was there as well, so he was a voice – an independent voice – for the Project Team so to speak.

Tony: We did invite – and unfortunately they weren't there – the Canadian Institute of Mining, which would have been really nice to have industry there, not only for their input but to hear about this initiative. We'll perhaps look in the future on how we can involve them.

Erika: I'm just curious about your public communication approach to update people on where you're at. When the State of Knowledge Report came out, I think a lot of people sort of struggled with what your objective was and all of that. You tried your best to clarify that at the meeting. This is just step one. This is not saying this is what the Project should do now. So yes, I'm just curious about how you plan to roll this out and update people on timelines, because I know people are asking. Friends of mine are asking me about what you guys and the research, and what's up with vitrification. How do you plan to communicate that?

Tony: We learned some lessons in early October, and I suppose we should have known that we would have had some...What we took away from that is that we hadn't done an adequate job communicating the context of what we were doing. We went into that particular meeting in October thinking that this, as Ken indicated, we were simply collecting information. We weren't making decisions. We didn't adequately convey that.

So going forward in terms of how we'll approach it, exactly as you've indicated, we're going to have to better describe where we are, what we're doing, our timelines, and how all the pieces fit together. In terms of when we might next be coming out to the public, we don't have anything scheduled at this stage. Certainly there will be a summary in our Annual Report describing where we are, but the next real milestone for us, we don't know what that is yet. We are initiating discussions with Terre-net, but we're also going to keep our mind open to other options for what to do. Once we've progressed a little bit further down that line, we'll be in a better position to reach out again and communicate, not just to this group but the broader public, about where we're going.

It doesn't fully answer your question. Part of it is that we don't know yet, based on where we are. We really are in the initial planning stage. Maybe if anybody asks you then that is actually the answer. We don't know yet. We're on a track, but we're in the really early days now. I know it's not always satisfying to hear, but the message is 'stay tuned.'

Kathy: I guess and the message is too – you just said what about vitrification. We're not at this. We're not focusing right now on remediation technologies at all. We're focusing on ways to use our money effectively and how to set up the bigger program of how to spend that money, leverage other funds, and set up some sort of...what the researchers at the meeting called a portfolio of options so that we may invest a little in some high risk great ticket items, and some in some sure bets, to place our bets in different ways.

So we're focusing on building the structure, and not at all at this point in time on the actual technologies or what we're following up on.

Kerry: I sat around the table for hours and hours while we negotiated the Agreement to set up the Giant Mine Oversight Body. Erika was there. Lisa's left, and Todd was there for YKDFN, and Shane. So there are not that many people around this table that were at those tables. We talked a lot about the research money, and that's exactly what the group wanted to see.

We didn't want to see the little bit of money thrown on little projects. The intent of the Parties at that time in all the hours of negotiation about rolling money over, was specifically with that intent, that at some point, there would be bigger research projects that you'd be able to leverage money and they'd be long-term and not "Let's throw money at this one-year program," or "Let's waste money here just to get rid of it." That's why we were so keen on rolling the money over.

That was one of the biggest sticking points during the negotiations of the Agreement was the research section and the money. So I'm quite happy having sat through all those, that's what's happening. That was what we all wanted at the time, so I'm glad that's what's happening.

Tony: And this particular research consortium that we were talking about earlier, it's just preliminary discussions right now, but they're very excited as well incidentally. They already have a significant amount of funding secured for their own research initiatives, but there is great alignment between the types of research that are being done. If we do end up going down this path, we're already leveraging very efficiently. Thus far, it's looking promising.

Natalie: I'm not sure if you were going to talk more on the next steps, what comes out of this, and the path forward on the research program. If not, could you comment on that?

Ken F: The next step is that on December 14th, Tony and I are meeting with the Terre-net folks in Waterloo, and we'll have a face-to-face and do a little more real discussion on how does our vision of GMOB – or how does our evolving vision of GMOB's research program and our wants and needs from an administrative and program perspective fit with the existing Terre-net?

If we do see a really good fit, then what are the mechanisms to get formally involved with the Terre-net? We're starting to look at what does the next 18 months look like then? Do we need to take on some sort of administrative portion or role, or can they handle that for us? What do research proposals look like as they come into Terre-net for the Giant Mine type of stuff? We need to have those discussions, and we need to understand how that might work. So that's where we're going.

I guess the next milestone would be do we sign up with Terre-net? That's not certain right now. If we do that, then that's a milestone. I think what we're focusing on right now is what is our trajectory for the next 12 to 18 months? In terms of leveraging our funds, it's really understanding how we would fit into that network and then begin to do that. So I think we're, again, a little ways away from tackling technical research projects. We're trying to get our ducks in a row before we go down that road.

Erika: I'm just curious. So you're meeting with Terre-net. Is the hope that they would be the manager or the administrator of the program? Is it an option, or you're actually going to discuss whether it is an option?

Ken F: We will discuss whether that is an option, but we are in control of the research that GMOB supports. We're not handing over the reigns to anyone, even though some people say that academic researchers don't like to be told what to do. But I've been an academic researcher. As GMOB sitting as a partner with Terre-net, we won't release money without understanding what that's being used for.

The other advantages of Terre-net are that they do have oversight through NSERC: Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council. There are a couple of levels of oversight that they have, which is also good news for us. It keeps that level of scrutiny on what the research funds are being used for, and if they are viable projects. Is the money being used appropriately?

There are numerous questions that Tony and I need to talk to them about on various things. There are a bunch of unknowns that we have still.

Erika: Thank you. At the meeting, and then Natalie followed-up with media, there was the question about whether the Project Team has a protocol in place for requests for arsenic. You guys know what is up, but maybe the other Parties don't. Maybe I can hand it off to you, Natalie, just to talk about that.

Natalie: So we have finalized – oh gee, I don't have the name in front of me – Arsenic Trioxide Sample Requests Protocol. We've gotten I think four requests for trioxide samples that we provide to them, which requires documentation on safety procedures, what you're using it for, what your research is for and those sort of things before we just willy-nilly hand off arsenic trioxide. So that's final.

Of course it is a living document. If we find it's not working, we'll update it. But we do have that. I think we shared it with GMOB.

Ben: *(In background)* There's a version approximately a year ago, so whatever you have now would be helpful.

Natalie: Okay. That might have been it, but as well we have an internal review checklist that we go through in terms of a procedure to make sure we received all the documentation. We do have that. We'll share that. We have had four requests for arsenic trioxide samples. We have not provided any samples recently, and when I say recently, I mean within the past five years. We provided that protocol to all those sample requesters, and they have yet to come back with the required information.

So we expect that will happen soon. There was a couple of them that seemed quite keen. That also brings up we have a supply of arsenic trioxide at an outside facility that we're looking to manage. So it's not imminent, but that was a request to GMOB as well as ongoing sample inventory, because we intend to get on with the freeze in a few years. So once the arsenic trioxide is frozen, there will be limited access for samples. It will be very difficult to get it. We need to come up with an amount to make sure we have on hand for the research program should they require it, which I assume they will, and work out where that will be located, who manages the request, and that sort of thing. It's still to be resolved.

Tony: If I recall correctly, you had a stockpile – if that’s the right word – at Lakefield. That’s where you’re main repository – not suppository – of arsenic trioxide is right now. We had a spelling mistake the other day.

(Laughter)

And you’re looking to close out that relationship with Lakefield. Have I got that straight?

Natalie: Perhaps. They originally came back to us, and they asked us to remove it from their site. They did not want to handle it, but they’ve since reconsidered. So it’s still there. We’re currently storing it there until the end of this fiscal. That’s been agreed to. What we would like to do is work with our Main Construction Manager on a mechanism to have it on site where somebody can administer samples, requests, because we assume they are probably going to increase in the requests. Outside agencies aren’t too keen to do this, so our current care maintenance contractor won’t do it as well. So it’s a little bit of a challenge.

Tony: How much roughly is in inventory in Lakefield? Roughly.

Natalie: I can tell you exactly, Tony. It’s 44 kilograms. And just to note, there are varying degrees to where the arsenic trioxide came from, so it’s not all the same quality.

Kathy: I was going to say goodbye to Ginger who has to leave us, but she left. She’ll be back in a second I suppose. Are there any other questions? Yes, go ahead William.

William: Have you looked at keeping a stockpile of tailings on hand, because if you’re going to be covering over the tailings, it would be a darn shame to ruin a cap if need be – if somebody comes along and says, “I have the technology available to completely get rid of every tailing on site.”

Natalie: No, we haven’t. We hadn’t envisioned looking at research into tailings. We assumed once they were covered, they would be covered and remain that way. It was the arsenic trioxide dust that was the research focus. And I don’t believe GMOB is looking into research on tailings.

William: Okay.

Kathy: Can I just take a moment to say goodbye to Ginger who has been here for a whole week now?

Ginger: *(Inaudible)*

Kathy: We’ve got to go hug it out.

(Pause)

Okay, thanks. Are there any other questions for the Board? William, go ahead.

William: Would that be possible, I mean if it's not too much effort to include it? If you're going through all the trouble to have arsenic trioxide there, I'd imagine it wouldn't be too much to go the extra inch and include tailings with it.

Natalie: Sorry, was that to me or to GMOB?

Well, we could certainly consider samples of tailings in storage, but GMOB's in charge of the research project or the research component.

Ken F: Our understanding of the research mandate is that it's very focused on the arsenic trioxide that's underground. Tony, you can correct me if I'm wrong, but the amount of arsenic trioxide in the tailings is really quite minimal in any real sense.

Tony: That's accurate. Our research right now is definitely focused on arsenic trioxide. That's what the Environmental Agreement directs us to do. But you're right. In the future, there may be some need to look at the tailings again and assess it. With respect to it being accessible, it is likely to be fairly accessible in the future, even after the remediation project has been implemented. If you picture approximately a meter of cover on top, an excavator in 10 minutes would strip that layer off. If needed, someone could go in and sample that tailing. So the current remediation strategy wouldn't prevent someone from relatively easily accessing tailings in the future should it be needed.

William: Okay. That's good to know. I just wanted to make sure that was looked at, because once it's permanent then, yes.

Erika: I just wanted to add, there was a talk at Geoscience by Heather Jameson's student who looked at the tailings dust and looked at the tailings. Out of all the samples, there were three particles of arsenic trioxide in that dust, so it definitely validated the point that sure, there's arsenic in those tailings, but in terms of arsenic trioxide, it was so minimal that under the microscope it was a small little particle.

That's encouraging, and that's something that from a community perspective is important to be able to confidently say the dust from the tailing isn't arsenic trioxide. You don't want to be breathing it in, because it's dust and there are contaminants in there. Anyway, that said, that was a presentation, and we do have a copy of that. I know there were some changes, but if people were interested, we can connect you with Heather or get that information to you.

Kathy: Okay, any other questions for the Board right now? Yes, Mark.

Mark: I have a quick technical question on the research funding. Are we able to stack that with other federal dollars?

Ken F: That was a question that has come up on a number of occasions when working with...For example, Terre-net is funded by NSERC federal dollars. In that particular instance, it's their understanding because they've dealt with similar situations, it would not be a problem. There wouldn't be anything preventing them from combining our money with theirs, but it is a consideration that has come up in other contexts. It wasn't always as clear-cut an answer as it has been with NSERC, or with Terre-net. That will be something that we think about definitely is whether or not there is any prohibition on combining funds.

Mark: One of the things Terre-net has mentioned through their agreement is NSERC, they cannot provide funding to for-profit industries to do research. So that creates some thinking that we need to do if there's a private company that says, "Hey, we need \$50 thousand dollars to prove that our nanobots will work." Through Terre-net, through the NSERC funding, if our funding becomes a part of that, then we can't do that.

Additional Agenda Items & Next Steps

Kathy: Okay, well then I think we'll move on to additional agenda items. The one we discussed earlier was just the idea of talking about reconciliation as a standing agenda item on the Semi-Annual Meeting. I mean there are other considerations we can have too for changing the agenda, but I don't know if we want to talk about those at this time. If anyone has any ideas, I'm happy to hear them. Otherwise, we seem to have general support for including that as a regular agenda item so that we have a common discussion about that every time we get together. I don't know if we need a motion to do that or we just do it. I'll ask Ben.

Ben: We can just do it.

Kathy: We can just do it. So we're just going to do it.

(Laughter)

Yes, Mark, go ahead.

Mark: I was thinking following the conversation this morning whether it might be appropriate to suggest that GMOB staff review the 94 calls to action in the TRC's report to see if there are any direct linkages between any of those, and I imagine there would be. I can't recall them all. We went through a similar exercise at the City a couple of years ago, and Council endorsed six of the calls to action that seemed particularly relevant to a municipal government. So perhaps that could give us a concrete starting point to discuss at the next Semi-Annual.

Ken H: You've indicated that would be a valuable exercise for GMOB to undertake, and I agree. But I think for everybody that would be a valuable exercise, the Project Team as well, to systematically go through and look at those recommendations and evaluate their applicability.

Kathy: Okay, are there any other items for discussion today? Friday at 3:00....finally the bar is open.
(Laughter)

David: It's right here.
(Laughter)

Kathy: Okay, if there's nothing, then we'll talk about the next meeting. I just assume that it will be in May. I think we'll try to – it works for us, especially since we have Board members out of town, to have these meetings the same week that we have our public annual meeting, which will be sometime in May. We'll let you know. Please.

Natalie: I would just request that the November meeting next year is not held the same week as Geoscience. I request that please. Thank you.

Kathy: Yes, sorry about that, Natalie. That was unfortunate. It was the only week our Board could get together, but yes, I completely agree. We missed some good talks as well and some free beers at the tradeshow. We missed a lot of things. Okay, are there any other items or last thoughts before we adjourn? No? William? No? Okay, could I get a motion to adjourn the meeting then.

William: I motion to adjourn.

Mark: I'll second that.

Kathy: Thanks everyone. Thank you very, very much. Great discussions.

MEETING ADJOURNED



Dr. Kathy Racher
Chair, Giant Mine Oversight Board

May 15, 2018
Date

Action items; GMOB Semi-Annual Meeting, November 17, 2017

- 1. Action item:** The GMRPT to provide to GMOB a full reference list or inventory of all the various reports and documents related to the Project since 1999. (page 3-5)
- 2. Action item:** GNWT to provide the Offsite Contamination Committee Terms of Reference to the YKDFN. (pages 6-8)
- 3. Action item:** GNWT to send public health advisory contact info to YKDFN, for health advisory procedural information and consideration for future updates on public health advisories. (page 8-9)
- 4. Action item:** GNWT to provide a land tenure map of the Giant Mine area to all of the Parties, as well as a list of who has responsibility for the tenured lands. (page 12)
- 5. Action item:** YKDFN, INAC and GNWT to meet before the end of December 2017, to discuss next steps regarding reconciliation, capacity issues, socio-economics, and incorporating traditional knowledge. (page 13-15)
- 6. Action item:** Parties shall, at their discretion, assess their capacity issues regarding the Giant Mine Remediation Project and communicate their findings and identified needs to the Project Team. (page 23)
- 7. Action item:** Lisa, GNWT, will ask Bruce Hanna to organize a meet and greet between the Wilfrid Laurier University group located downtown and the YKDFN. (page 31-32)
- 8. Action item:** Aaron Braumberger, INAC, will provide GMOB the note, prepared over the summer of 2017, regarding high level goals and other information on the potential Capacity Builder's Workshop/Convention. (page 37)
- 9. Action item:** INAC will provide GMOB with the updated Arsenic Trioxide Sample Requests protocol, as well as the internal checklist used for arsenic trioxide sample requests. (page 51-52)
- 10. Action item:** The Parties will voluntarily review and share the linkages between their own organizational mandate and operations and the Calls to Action, as laid out in the National Truth and Reconciliation (TRC) Report. (page 55)