

**GIANT MINE OVERSIGHT BOARD (GMOB)  
SEMI ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PARTIES  
May 1, 2019, 1:00 pm (MT)  
Northern United Place, Yellowknife, NT**

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

<b>Present</b>	<p><u>Giant Mine Oversight Board</u> Kathy Racher – Chair Ben Nind – Executive Director Tony Brown - Director Ken Froese – Director Ken Hall – Director Ginger Stones – Director Paul Green – Technical Advisor</p> <p><u>North Slave Métis Alliance</u> Jessica Hurtubise</p> <p><u>Yellowknives Dene First Nation</u> Johanne Black William Lines</p> <p><u>City of Yellowknife</u> Rebecca Alty, Mayor, City of Yellowknife Kerry Penney, Manager, Legal Services, City of Yellowknife Todd Slack, Contractor, City of Yellowknife</p> <p><u>Government of Canada (INAC)</u> Natalie Plato Deputy Director, Giant Mine Remediation Project Katherine Ross Manager , Giant Mine Remediation Project</p> <p><u>Government of the Northwest Territories</u> Erika Nyssonen Senior Advisor, Giant Mine Remediation Project, ENR Diep Duong, A/Director, Waste Reduction &amp; Management, ENR</p> <p><u>Alternatives North</u> Michael Nabert Gordon Hamre Katharine Thomas</p>
<b>Regrets</b>	<p><u>Giant Mine Oversight Board</u> David Livingstone – Director, GMOB</p>

## Welcome and Introductions

Kathy: Okay folks. Kathy Racher here. We'll get started for the meeting today. Hopefully, you've all got meeting materials in front of you. Today we're here for the Giant Mine Remediation Project Environmental Agreement Semi-Annual Meeting. You all look familiar. I think we haven't met before, Ms. Mayor, nice to meet you.

We don't have anyone phoning in for today, but we're still using the mics so that we can transcribe the minutes to get verbatim notes. We found these to be super helpful in our deliberations. So whenever you speak up, I'll get you to speak into the mic. These are new mics, and you have to press the face of the guy who looks like he's talking on the front of your mic phone there so everyone can be recorded. It's also helpful if you say your name first before you speak so that the transcriber can get the right comment with the right name.

Before we dive into anything, let's just do a roundtable to make sure everybody knows each other. We'll start over here.

Ken F: Ken Froese, Giant Mine Oversight Board Director.

Ken H: Good afternoon. Ken Hall, Director on the Giant Mine Oversight Board.

Natalie: Hello. Natalie Plato, Deputy Director, Giant Mine Remediation Project.

Katherine: Katherine Ross, Manager with the Giant Mine Remediation Project.

Michael: Michael Nabert. I'm here with Alternatives North.

Katharine: Katharine Thomas, also with Alternatives North.

Jessica: Jessica Hurtubise with North Slave Métis Alliance.

Paul: Paul Green. I'm a contractor with the Giant Mine Oversight Board.

Ben: Ben Nind, Giant Mine Oversight Board.

Johanne: Johanne Black, Yellowknives Dene First Nation.

William: William Lines, Yellowknives Dene.

Erika: Erika Nyssonen, Senior Advisor, GNWT on the Project.

Diep: Good afternoon. My name is Diep Duong, and I'm with the Project Team on the GNWT side.

Ginger: Ginger Stones, Director with the Giant Mine Oversight Board.

Rebecca: Rebecca Alty, Mayor of Yellowknife.  
Tony: Tony Brown with the Giant Mine Oversight Board  
Kerry: Kerry Penney, City of Yellowknife.  
Todd: Todd Slack. I'm a contractor with the City.

### **Approval of the Agenda**

Kathy: Okay, great. The first thing we're going to do is look at the agenda for the meeting. It looks similar to previous years in basic form. You'll notice that the last agenda item is an in-camera meeting of the Parties to discuss GMOB nominations and GMOB mandate and organizational review. That is so all of us directors will leave the room for that discussion. I believe we hope to get to that discussion by 4:00, so wherever we are, we'll try to stop for 4:00 so you guys can have a good discussion.

Does anyone have anything they want to change about the agenda or any questions about the agenda, or any additions?

*(Pause)*

Quiet bunch so far. Okay, so then I will ask for a motion to approve the agenda.

Kerry Penney from the City motions. And a second?

A second from Ken Froese. Okay, great.

### **Approval of Semi-Annual Meeting Minutes of November 15, 2018**

Kathy: Item 3 on the agenda is approval of the minutes from the semi-annual meeting on November 15, 2018. It's just a few pages long, so I hope you've all read them in detail. Does anyone have any changes or any issues with the minutes from November 2018?

Kerry: I just have one tiny thing. My last name should have an 'ey'.

Kathy: Fair enough. Anyone else?

Natalie: We had one. I'm just trying to locate it. The comment I'm looking at is on page 37, and it's after Katherine Ross talks about how we had our one-day reconciliation session.

"I spent most of the day crying." After that it says "Laughter." I just wanted to know if we want to delete that.

Kathy: Maybe we did laugh. I'm not sure.

Natalie: It is just a suggestion. On my copy of 37, maybe it printed out a bit differently.

Kathy: We'll find it. Okay, if there is nothing else, we'll make a motion to approve the minutes based on we'll take out the laughter, or we can take out most of the day crying. I don't know what she'd prefer.

Natalie: It's the laughter.

Kathy: Okay, we'll take out the laughter, and we'll fix Kerry's last name. Can I get a motion to approve the minutes with those two corrections made?

Female?: Where was the other correction?

Kathy: For Kerry's name?

Female?: No the other one.

Kathy: Well we're on different...We couldn't figure out exactly the page.

Natalie: On mine it's 37 in the minutes. That's not what's coming up for you? Might have printed slightly different.

Kathy: For some reason it's not the same...because I'm looking at the wrong set of minutes. That would be why. Ah yes. So it's page 37? At some point I'm going to get this correct. Ah yes, I see it specifically. Okay, can I get a motion to approve the minutes with those two changes?

A motion from Katherine.

Natalie: I'll second it.

Kathy: And a second from Natalie. Okay great.

### **Review of Action Items**

#### **Action Item 1: Corrections to Minutes of May 2018**

Kathy: We had some action items from that meeting, and I think I've got the right ones this time. Action Item 1 was for GMOB to make corrections to the meetings of last May. I

remember William had some corrections there, and that was completed before the minutes were finalized.

## **Action Item 2: GMOB, Interested Parties and CIRNAC to Coordinate Efforts for development of Educational Module**

Kathy: Action Item 2 was GMOB, interested Parties and CIRNAC to meet to coordinate efforts in regards to the Educational Module. I don't believe we all met together, but I think from the meeting with the Project Team yesterday, it feels like some of this has gone forward. Erika, you were talking about the Educational Module. I think work has been done on this, but I think we ended up not being involved yet. Is that correct?

Erika: Sort of involved? We have been chatting a little bit with Ben on that. Should I update the group with what was updated yesterday or what is best?

Okay so on the Education Module front, the plain language Closure Plan document was submitted with the water license submission, so the intent of the Project was to wait until a final draft of the Closure Plan was created to help provide that background on this module piece on behalf of the Project. So that would be the Project's contribution to this module. I'll explain what this module means in a second.

The second piece is work that YKDFN is working on. Last fiscal year, Randy Freeman had put together a write-up on YKDFN history. Also the Traditional Knowledge study has just been finalized now, and I know that Johanne and Randy are working on some other historical pieces of work. Maybe I'll ask Johanne to update on that afterwards. So that's their piece that needs to be consolidated.

Then also there are the toxic legacies folks. For those of you who don't know who those guys are, it's professors from Memorial University. A few years ago, they were doing a bunch of work up here working with YKDFN, also Alternatives North. They created a committee about communicating to future generations and held a workshop. Their workup here was really capturing a number of different aspects about Giant, both on a historical level and also a cultural, Indigenous community level. So they have prepared a bit of a write-up as well. These are short write-ups. There are a number of links to different websites and different articles that have been compiled.

The intent is, in conversations with the Department of Education, Culture, and Employment with Mindy Willett was how can we incorporate this into any kind of high school curriculum. The window into that is it's not so much like a unit, but it's a student-led inquiry exercise. What that means is they have a number of choices that they can select and write like an essay piece. This would be incorporated into the Northern Studies, Grade 10 program or class.

It's just on hold until all these pieces have come together, so that's that Education Module. Actually Ben and I spoke yesterday, and William and I have briefly talked

about it. Once everyone gets their busy time over with right now, we can all regroup and find out where all those pieces are, and meet with the ECE. That's that piece.

On other education pieces, GNWT realizes the importance of community outreach on arsenic in general. We have a Legacy Committee that's made up of a bunch of GNWT departments. So a priority has been school outreach, looking at a website, and just educating people on arsenic.

The Health Department has done a bunch of work. They have a website that has their health advisory about various lakes and how to use the land and the area. But in addition to that, they have Q&As, and they have other plain language brochures about arsenic in general.

So it's just building upon that and being a little bit more proactive by going into schools to give presentations. Maybe there's a workbook or something. So we're looking at that. The reason actually Alex isn't here today is he's working on all of this stuff to help fill content for a one-stop shop website about arsenic and links to appropriate other division, departments, or things like that.

That's happening. Sorry I'm rambling here. One more is the HEMP. The Health Effects Monitoring Program is looking at involving youth also in arsenic communication. That's in the very preliminary stages. We recently have just funded this fiscal year proposal for work and supported having youth involved. We're not entirely sure exactly how that would look, but having youth communicate to other youth about arsenic, the Program, and things like that, and also having a link to the Project and providing input into that Project. That is in design stages, and I know Renata from that team has reached out to William and Liz and Ben. So we also need to work on that.

So there are new things happening. There is work that has happened, and I'll leave it at that. I don't know if Johanne wants to update on the work that you and Randy are doing.

Johanne: As part of the work that we're going to do in terms of the Yellowknives Dene, there is going to be some components of our history being brought forward into two different forums, the first one being through a book. Then the second one is a documentary based on that book. That's the update I have right now.

We're just in the early stages of this work. So the planning of it currently, we haven't really initiated the work as of yet, but we're planning that work right now. In the future, you'll be able to see the history of Yellowknives Dene with Giant Mine in those two forums.

William: Just to speak on the work that Randy did in the past: Randy did do an accurate statement that was funded through GNWT. It was a statement of past use that was with all accuracy with the resources available to us. That has been completed, and it

is yet to be shared. There are a couple of little changes that we need to make before we share it, and so I've been in discussions with Randy and Ben as well. We're just a hair away from sharing it. You'll be seeing that in the near future.

Natalie: Thank you. I have a question for you, Johanne. You mentioned the book and the documentary. Can you confirm that's the work that is being done to advance the Apology and Compensation piece through the CIRNAC Yellowknife Office? Thank you.

Johanne: It's part of the legacy work that we're working on. In terms of the reconciliation piece, there is a component of that to fulfill it. Yes.

Todd: Erika, I'm wondering. It sounds like the Yellowknives aspect of this is well in hand, and that part has got wheels under it. I'm just wondering is there work on...I don't even know how to frame it. On the town side, people who are coming here... One of the great things I learned about Giant, or one of the interesting things I learned about Giant is that they would have drifts of all Italian workers or all Hungarian workers. So you have this immigration story that goes along with that. I know essentially nothing about this other than this seems like a very interesting story for people coming to the region.

I know Ryan Silke has all this in his head, right on the top of it. So I think there are two stories here. There are the folks that have always been here, and there are the folks that have come. I think both of those are valuable to go along with the environmental picture here.

Erika: Great suggestion. I know Ken sits on the Yellowknife Heritage Society. Maybe not anymore? Anyway, that's a great suggestion, and absolutely can reach out to them. What we can do is take out what Toxic Legacy folks have done and then also look at what the Project has for our history review and see if we can add that story. So I'll reach out to Ryan.

Todd: And Ken can frame that question better, because he actually knows what he's talking about.

Erika: Absolutely. We can tell that story. We don't have a final draft. We're working on it, so great suggestion.

Johanne: The other thing too is in terms of how to showcase the history. I know the Mining Heritage Society has a facility to showcase that history. But in terms of the Yellowknives Dene and First Nation, that is missing from the design aspect of that. Keep that in mind that there probably should be our history being of equal value to the mining heritage history and having the ability to showcase our history and to never forget about the legacies, and the history of the Yellowknives Dene with the mine site as well.

### **Action Item 3: Parties to Coordinate on Inclusive History of Yellowknives Initiative**

Kathy: That kind of leads to the third action item we have, Parties to coordinate on inclusive history of Yellowknives Initiative. I feel like we've been talking around that a little bit. When I look back in the notes from the last meeting, it was about a discussion between the City and the Yellowknives on this more inclusive history. It sounds like things are...I don't know if the City is involved in this at all or if it's just the GNWT with the Yellowknives.

Erika: I'll just pipe in and suggest a bit of a...I don't want to formalize a new working group but maybe we can just put together people who are working on this and just regroup. William is nodding his head, and I look at Todd. We can reach out to the Historical Society and also North Slave Métis. So yeah, let's plan to...Ben, maybe that's something that you can help coordinate, or you and me can tag team on that. But yeah, regroup on that and get the right people in the room and make some progress.

### **Action Item 4: Update on Progress of Senior Project & Advisory Committee About Socioeconomic Planning**

Kathy: Sounds like a great plan. Thanks, Erika. Action Item 4: Matt Spence to update the Parties on progress of the Senior Project and Advisory Committee regarding socioeconomic planning. I think we received an update on that. It went out to all the Parties here. Okay. Done.

### **Action Item 5: Respond to Questions from Alternatives North & Disseminate**

Kathy: Five is GMOB to respond to questions for Alternatives North and share them with all the Parties. Alternatives North was not able to attend the November meetings. They sent questions, so we sent answers. We did distribute that last December.

### **Action Item 6: CIRNAC and YKDFN Sharing of Ndilq Soil Testing Report**

Kathy: Action Item 6 is CIRNAC and YKDFN to share recent Ndilq soil testing report with GMOB, and that was done as well.

### **Action Item 7: GNWT to Speak to Con Mine to Discuss Public Information About Offsite Contamination**

Kathy: Seven is GNWT to speak to Newmont Con Mine to discuss public information regarding offsite contamination. We talked a little bit about that yesterday with the Project Team. Erika, you said that was sort of a work in progress.

Erika: That's correct.



### **Action Item 8: How to Present Performance Indicators for Project Progress Into a Public Document**

Kathy: Eight: Project Team to look at how to present performance indicators for project progress into a public document. Where were we at with that, Natalie?

Natalie: We did present our draft of KPIs or key performance indicators at our last Working Group. It wasn't specifically to this group, but it can be distributed to all for consultation. We're working on finalizing them, and they will be shared with the public this spring. I believe it's spring.

### **Action Item 9: Project Team to Explore Opportunities for Reconciliation Awareness**

Kathy: It snowed this morning, so it doesn't feel like spring. And lastly, Project Team to explore in the coming year opportunities to work on reconciliation awareness with the local community. We heard that yesterday, but if you would like you can comment on that.

Natalie: I was thinking I would cover that in Agenda Item 9. Can we do that perhaps? Thanks.

### **Action Item 10: Project Team Delay of Officially Submitting Water License Application**

Kathy: Sure we can do that. The last action item – sorry there was one more on the other side of the page – about the Project Team delaying officially submitting the water license application to give the parties more time to review, which was done. We're good on all of that.

That's sort of the preliminary stuff, although we've already got into some discussions, which is great. Because this is a meeting of all the Parties, Ben you need to lead me through this. We have to appoint a Chair for this meeting. So who would like to be Chair for this meeting? Nobody's volunteering

Female: I think you know...

*(Laughter)*

Kathy: This always happens, and I feel so foolish. I'm willing to share the gavel with anybody.

Alright, okay, so we have a motion to appoint me as Chair.

Todd: I'll move to appoint Kathy Racher as Chair.

Kathy: Diep seconded it. Alright. With respect to the meeting records, obviously we're having this transcribed, and the minutes will be available to everybody. We get them transcribed pretty fast. So let's get into the meat of things.

The GMOB 2018 report, we just sent that out on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of April to everyone. At tonight's public meeting, we'll be going through some of the recommendations and brief as well. We've had it printed as well. There will be some copies available tonight. We had 11 recommendations this time, and we had a bit of a discussion yesterday with the Project Team when we met with them on some of the recommendations. I'm not going to go through them here right now, but if anybody has any questions about anything that we've said or want to discuss anything in particular, we're open.

Rebecca: I had a question regarding the recommendation that is directed at the City. I'm just wondering why it wasn't directed to Council of the YKDFN as well as the Executive of the North Slave Métis Alliance as well?

Kathy: I guess last year, to some extent we said it this year, I guess our finding was that both the North Slave Métis Alliance and the Yellowknives Dene First Nation have done a very good at reaching out to their constituents. They regularly involve their constituents in updates, in workshops, and in processes. So we felt like both those parties have really brought forward the concerns of their community to meetings, but we just hadn't seen that as much from the City.

We kind of hinted at that last year, and then we decided to be a bit more direct this year. This is partly, you know, what we're hearing from residents from Yellowknife who come to our office. They feel like they really don't understand what's happening or what their opportunities are to be involved in the Giant Mine process or the water licensing process. I don't know if the Board members have anything they want to say.

Rebecca I do find it a peculiar recommendation, because I'm not quite sure if we...I see the proponent being required to do that stuff, but to be the community that does that, where does it end? Do we also have to do this for Diavik? Do we have to do this for Ekati? Do we have to do this for Gahcho Kué? Do we have to do it for the territorial's mega projects like Stanton? That recommendation we haven't discussed as a Council, but personally I do have some concerns with it.

Ken H: I think our perspective on this from what we hear as directors and what comes into the office is there is much less known about Giant and the Remediation Project within the City. The Ndilq and Dettah communities and the NSMA community have more avenues of education perhaps, or mechanisms of their constituents being more informed.

I think what we're trying to avoid is getting into the water licensing and other processes here when people from the City come up and say, "We weren't aware of this," or "What about this, and this, and this?" Yes, they've had anywhere between 4 years and 20 years to be involved if they want to be. At the same time, there is a lot of turnover in the City population, so there are those who are simply unaware of the Giant Mine Remediation Project.

So we're trying to direct the City to help us out in making people aware using the tools that the City has available to say this is going on. If people have concerns, then please make them known.

Kathy: I'd follow-up on that. Does the proponent have a responsibility? Yes, they do. They had been having public meetings, and they attend endless meetings really in different places and different times. But it feels like the City Council, the City government is best placed to talk to its residents to make sure that things are working for its residents.

When you're talking about the other mines, they're not in our backyard. They're not next door to the City of Yellowknife. Would I expect the City of Yellowknife to be talking about the Diavik project? Maybe not, and I don't know how other residents feel about other infrastructure projects. That's not part of our purview.

It is right next door, and this Project will have direct impacts on the residents of this town, but I don't know if they understand it. I can say as the Project Team, we feel – and we've talked to them before about communication engagement – and I feel they are doing it. But there's something missing, and we're just hoping that the City of Yellowknife could find a way to better communicate with residents.

Kerry: We did have some concerns with this recommendation with respect to jurisdiction. For example, quoting it says, "The new location of the City water source will be, in part, influenced by the remediation activities," including the Baker Creek discharge point and discharge water standards.

Everybody is well aware that the City pushed very hard during the EA to have this scoped in. It was quite clear from what came as a result that it was not scoped in. Everybody is also probably aware that the City actively searched out ways to find the pipeline so taxpayers wouldn't be on the hook for this. We were successful in getting funding of almost \$26 million dollars.

So it's just a little concerning that these types of things are included in the recommendation, because one, it's outside of our jurisdiction. We did push really hard to have it scoped in. We were quite clearly told 'no,' it's not being scoped in. We're taking other avenues. We just had a water source discussion on Monday.

From our perspective, this recommendation doesn't really accurately affect the things the City has done to date on some of the things that are noted here. As I indicated, some of these are outside our jurisdiction. A change in City boundary: That's not something the City can do. It's something GNWT has to agree to, or grant extra land. It's also a discussion with or about bordering communities, like YKDFN.

So again, if someone looks at this recommendation in two years and says, "Did the City do these things?" Well, the City can't just do these things. While I understand the desire to see the City involved, some of the sentences in here, I think are a little...not

inaccurate, but maybe a little misleading about what the City can actually do with respect to these things.

The boat launch: Again, anybody that has paid attention to City Council, they've had the discussion. We've approached the Project. We're working cooperatively with the GNWT and the Project to try and form a solution, but the City is a lessee of the land. We don't even have tenure out there. If we refuse, hold up access, or delay, all the GNWT has to do is say, "We're terminating your lease," and we have nothing to say about that.

So while I understand the desire to see the City involved, some of the things noted here are outside of our jurisdiction, and we have been actively pushing for them in the public realm. That, I think, is where some of our concern lay. Some of it is accurate. Yeah, this can significantly affect the residents, but our ability to increase or decrease that effect is very limited, as we are not a co-proponent. We don't own the land, and we're not the head government. So we're not really any different than any other parties with that respect. I don't know if Mayor Alty or Todd have anything to add.

Rebecca: No, we haven't had an opportunity to discuss this as a Council, so we can't formally put our position, but we will review it and have a letter come to the Board.

Kathy: Sure. Keep in mind, too, that we get a lot of people come to the GMOB office and talking to us. Take this also as you may be doing things, and you may be feeling your intention of things, but maybe it's not coming across the way you think it is. So some of the stuff isn't quite accurate or doesn't reflect what you're trying to do, or what you should be doing, keep in mind it's not just us Board members. It's more than us. We're trying to reflect also what people have said to us, because they want their concerns voiced. Take it as information for you going forward as well.

Ken H: We're just trying to ensure we're getting as much feedback as we can. We're getting good feedback from YKDFN and North Slave Métis, but we just sense that we're not getting a collective feedback from the residents of Yellowknife. We're looking to the City to help us get that feedback. It doesn't necessarily have to be items that are directly within your jurisdiction or over which you have responsibility, but we'd like to hear more of what residents collectively feel about aspects of the Project and proposed remediation plans, and so forth. So we'd like your help essentially with that.

Johanne: I think it's necessary in terms of this recommendation from GMOB... It's true. In terms of the Yellowknives Dene First Nation, we are the filter for community members, so we have a sense in terms of the perspective of the community members of the Yellowknives Dene. So we bring that forward. We push on issues on behalf of them, and we look after them because that's our job.

Now when it comes to the City of Yellowknife, there has been a little bit of that lack of that filter coming through. We're wondering where that filter is and who does it rest with. Who speaks on behalf of your residents on behalf of the Giant Mine process? It's

maybe a question that has to be asked and clarified in terms of who in the City is responsible for bringing up issues on behalf of the Yellowknife residents and ensuring that their input is heard into this process.

Ken H: Thank you, Johanne. I think that puts into better words what I was trying to say. We want the City to advocate for its residents. With what you and Kerry said, Mayor Alty, the activities and the initiatives that you're pushing are good. Keep doing it. Then come here and listen to the citizens. Listen to the people and what they're telling you about this and what their concerns are, and then come here and tell us.

That's what we want to know. That's what we want to hear. Are people upset about this? Then in our report, we can push our recommendations to the Ministers who ultimately have the ability to do something about it.

Rebecca: It's not how I interpreted the recommendation, so I think that's the challenge with the way it was worded. Now that we have a staff person or funding, and we've got a contractor, and the water license process has begun, I think now we're in a better position.

But again, our mandate as a City is roads, water, and sewer. We're only funded to do that stuff. We never had the capacity before to go out and pull the 20,000 residents here. Now with some funding, we've got somebody on staff who will be able to go through the water license process and provide some feedback on behalf of the City. We'll be in a better position I think.

Again, I think we'll have a response to the recommendation on what we see our role, and what we're capable of doing within our authority and within our mandate. I think it's important to have it on the record, on side of your report.

Erika: With my GNWT hat on of the Project, I'll share how GNWT is helping to communicate information out from the GMRP. We obviously don't have a website that is the Giant Mine Project, because that's housed within CIRNAC, but we provide links to arsenic in general. For health, we provide links to the GMRP website on different areas.

So even just a suggestion of "Hey, do you want to know about Giant? Go here." That's just a suggestion of something easy and basic where the City could really help share that kind of information and things like upcoming Industry Day. "This is happening within our City. Giant is hosting this." Things like that, because I know that pulling together information and doing surveys and understanding concerns about residents, that's much more of a monumental task. Yeah, that's just some suggestions of small-scale comms that you can do.

Kathy: Okay great, and thanks for bringing that up. We're glad you're here to talk about this. Todd, I look forward to you coming to my doorstep to poll me on your opinions about the Giant Mine. I'm not going to give him the mic to respond.

*(Laughter)*

Okay, does anyone else have anything they want to talk about in terms of our recommendations in our 2018 report? As I said, we did talk to the Project Team a lot yesterday. Anybody else? Go ahead, Natalie.

Natalie: I'll just let the other Parties know as well that we will be making a formal response as well once we've had time to review it and form them like we have done every other year. Then that will be sent to GMOB and posted on our website.

Kathy: Okay, anything else on that? Yes, you may.

Todd: I'm just going to reflect back Ken's and Johanne's point here. People are showing up, and they don't have the information, or the communications effort isn't working. Whether the City acts as an echo chamber or not, this needs to be improved full stop.

As a collective, unfortunately the responsibility lies with the GNWT and the Project. But I think what you're saying is there needs to be more here, and the idea that the City can help echo the efforts in the same way that the GNWT does, the fundamental issue remains. That issue needs to be a matter of focus in the next year. Hopefully the changes that are going to come or the response to that from the Project is going to help address that underlying concern that you're raising - the observations that you're seeing from the storefront and roles as directors.

Kathy: That's a good point. Sometimes we bring up these issues. We shoot an arrow over here and shoot an arrow over there. At least it starts a conversation that this is happening. Like you said, whatever is right and whatever is wrong, it's not happening the way we would want it to. We need to keep it on our radar of what to do.

If the City has ideas and GMOB can aid in some way, we're always available to be talked to. Go ahead, Ginger.

Ginger: I was just wondering. Does the City capture the interventions that it makes with the Project and record those?

Rebecca: Anything that is filed as a part of the Mackenzie Valley process is captured on their website. We do not put that type of correspondence for any project that we're involved in or comment on, on our website, the City website.

Kathy: Ginger, do you mean the minutes from meetings?

Ginger: Well, if we were trying to find out what positions the City has taken in relation to various aspects of the Giant Mine Remediation - whether it's the boat launch or the water intake, or any of those things - is there a record of those activities so we could say the City has intervened on these six items?

Kathy: Go ahead.

Natalie: In terms of the Project and the City meet approximately monthly, and we keep detailed agendas and minutes that are available from the Project. The Project is the one who keeps them. So I wouldn't say the City has them, but the Project has them. Thank you.

Kerry: Again, during the EA, we asked to have the water pipelines scoped in. It was in our written submissions. It was done in oral, and it was addressed in the outcome. So that's quite clearly on the public record. The public boat launch, that was in Committee, so that is available on our website as well, because there are minutes and an agenda about the public boat launch.

A lot of negotiations and discussions we have are not for the public realm, so this stuff is confidential until we're ready to bring it forward publically. We're members on many of the Giant Mine committees – the Human Health Effects Monitoring Program, the Socio-ec group, the Giant Mine Oversight Body. The list goes on and on.

We don't have a list of all that on our website, but we are members in all the committees. In a similar fashion, I don't believe other Parties have listed on their website every Giant Mine committee that they sit on. We have copies of minutes, just like anybody that participates in the meetings, but again we don't post them on our website. Because it's on a City committee, we post minutes of our City committee meetings, not outside committees. We sit on many different committees, and we don't post those on our website either.

Ginger: I was wondering. What would be the best avenue to get the synopsis of the City's position on the Giant Mine Project so we could accurately reflect those in future reports? Would it be to go back through the minutes of your meetings with the Project, or would it be a call letter to the City saying, "Would you like to provide us with an update of key aspects of your involvement with the Project?"

Kerry: You could definitely get it if you went back through minutes. That would probably be a longer, more cumbersome process. It would be best if the Project has any questions to either request something in writing or to have a conversation to say this is what we're doing. We're more than happy to say how many committees we sit on and how many hours a month we spend at Giant.

If copies of minutes are required, the Project has them readily available, but we can in a short period of time sum up what we've worked on with respect to Giant for the previous 12 months.

Erika: Just a reminder about the upcoming regulatory process milestones: The Board submission date is May 16<sup>th</sup>. That's when all the parties will be submitting, as you know Ginger, their concerns. So I would suspect that would be a nice capture of what the remaining concerns the City has on the Project.

Kerry: Yes, we're working towards the May 16<sup>th</sup> deadline. We will be providing a written submission, and that submission will sum up our concerns related to the Project heading into the EA.

Johanne: I guess I've got some questions in terms of the City. I'm a City resident. I live in Ndilo. Ndilo is part of the City. I worry about tourists that come into our community, even people that are not tourists but people from other small communities that come here. When it comes to those folks, where do they look in terms of what the City's role and responsibility is with regard to Giant Mine? What are the issues that they are seeking, and how involved are they with Giant? Where can they find that?

Kerry: Again, we don't have a specific spot on our website related to Giant. We've worked with different aspects of Giant, when posting some information we did. But we don't have a specific place on our website dedicated to Giant. If you do a search on our website, you're going to find numerous documents related to Giant Mine, including our written submissions and Council minutes.

This Project has been ongoing for years. I wrote the letter that sent Giant to EA, so that's how far back I go with this Project. There are numerous documents on the City website that can be accessed if someone does a search. We don't have a Giant Mine Department at the City of Yellowknife. Council has discussed Giant Mine numerous times, so again you can go back through minutes, and we're happy to speak to anybody. Again, we are responding to Giant Mine, but this is not a City project.

Johanne: I get that, but I guess that explains why we get those phone calls. In terms of what the City is doing in terms of Giant Mine and how involved are they, where do they find what the City is working on with that file?

I guess there is a little bit of a gap in terms of the responsibility the City has to protect the interest of the residents. Where do you see that? Only because it's nice if folks from outside these communities come in and want some information on the City's role with Giant, I would like to actually direct them to a place to find that information. That would be good. Also too, we have YKDFN residents that live in the City as well. It's nice to actually point them to that as well.

Rebecca: With Todd being hired as the contractor a month?

Todd: 31 days ago.

Rebecca: 31 days ago? So this is the first time, 31 days ago, we had somebody in our regulatory process. Before that, the City had nobody to review or comment. Stuff would come to Council. The Giant Project Team comes to Council once a year, and we ask questions, but we haven't done a position paper on Giant.



I think it would have also been a little premature without the actual water license application. Now that we're in the regulatory process, we have somebody on staff who will be able to put something a bit more succinct together.

As a City, though, we don't have a mandate or authority. We're just one of the affected parties. So if people have questions about arsenic or the Project, we always point them to the sources. So if you have any questions about arsenic in the lakes, there is the Department of Health. If you have a Project question, go to the proponent, and the same thing when it comes to other items out of scope. When it comes to the Sobering Shelter and Day Shelter, when folks have questions about that, it's a GNWT facility, and we try to point them to the GNWT to ask questions. We are trying to stay within our mandate.

We can get sucked into a lot of projects and a lot of stuff that goes beyond our scope when it comes to social issues or the mining projects. We're just not funded, and we don't have the expertise on staff to provide that adequately, so we want to make sure that we're directing people to those experts, which we see as the proponents as well as the other GNWT and federal departments.

Todd: Hopefully I'm not going to get fired on Day 32 here.

*(Laughter)*

I'm just reflecting. Both you and Ginger have the same question around where does the City stand here? What are you all doing about this? The Council, you guys have more resources for Giant than the City has had. They were cutting positions. I think they cut one position last budget. So adding a Giant person, absent the provision of resources from INAC, it just wasn't going to happen. That happened. There is a person on. The City position will come by May 16<sup>th</sup>, which we just heard.

So in the short-term, at least that's the short-term answer. That question around what has been done over history or how you're advocating for the interests of people over time, that's a bigger question and will require research, which I don't have time to do or pull together.

But we're hearing that question has been asked to the Board, to you guys. If you guys are getting that question, you should be sending them on to Kerry. Yeah, all these things are being heard. A little more time to respond... This is just a crappy answer to say, "Hey I just need more time," but it's all getting locked away.

Johanne: And I get that in terms of the resources you had were limited, but you also have to reflect that you do have revenue that you can draw on. The Yellowknives Dene don't have revenue to draw on in terms of having resources.

Rebecca: As a result of not having the dedicated resource, we have just been reactive. We haven't been able to proactively say, "As a whole, this is what we are doing." So the

boat launch issue comes, and we've got to respond to that. This is our position. Socio-economic comes, and we say, "You're not doing enough. We want to see this or that." We haven't been able to have this broad overview, which I do think during the regulatory process, we'll be able to formulate that. In the meantime, we've just been position by position having our say.

Kathy: One thing we talked to the Project Team about yesterday, because we've been saying we have people coming in and talking about this problem or that problem. We talked yesterday about having regular communications with them. Like if we hear something about a GNWT concern, or the Project Team, we would pass it on, on a monthly basis instead of once a year. So we can do that with you. Just so you know, if we're hearing things then you know what they are. I think that would be fair. Ben and I talked about that last night as a possibility.

Todd: Or directing people on the fly. They walk in and they're like, "What's the City doing?" Contact the City. Here are the right people.

Kathy: Yeah. Yeah.

Todd: In the same way when the Project goes to Ndilo or Dettah and they want to talk compensation. Well there should be a big sign on the wall that says, "Here's the person to contact about compensation." If they want to talk about the City's position, well the City has more ability to respond to these things now.

Kathy: Okay great. That was really a helpful discussion. Anything else on the annual report at this stage? Are there any concerns or questions?

*(Pause)*

### **GMOB Activity Report**

Kathy: No? Okay then. The next agenda item is the GMOB Activity Report and what we've been up to over the past six months. We passed out a little summary, our usual summary.

We've received our budget. It's just shy of \$1 million dollars. Most of that is for core operations. About 72% of the budget is for core operations, and about 30% of the budget is dedicated to the Research Program. Because of our ability to roll over money from year to year now, the amount of money we have in our research account is \$641,000.00.

Our work plan for 2019-2020, we've got this colorful chart. Basically it just lists the kind of things that we do on a regular basis. Obviously, a big focus of this year is going to be the water license process. We're planning on participating in all of it. We have brought on a new person, Paul Green, who has tons of experience with the water

licensing process. He used to work for the Waters Division at GNWT, so he is reviewing everything for us.

But as Board members, we're also actively involved in reviewing all the submissions and will be making comments on May 16<sup>th</sup>, and participating in the technical sessions and the hearings, etcetera. So that will definitely be a big part of this coming year.

In the last six months, since November, on the first page there it lists the number of things we've been involved in. There has been a lot of involvement in the reviewing of the Yellowknife HEMP, the Health Effects Monitoring Program. We've been involved in the various working groups. We've been keeping track of the Quantitative Risk Assessment process. We've been participating in discussion on Measure 6 and long-term funding options. We've been looking at the various socio-economic factors and what's happening with the Socio-economic Advisory Body and have been making comments on that in the last six months. And of course, we've been writing our annual report and getting ready for our public meeting, which is tomorrow.

We've met with and continue to meet with parties as they come up. We've met with the Sailing Club and the Historical Society. They have contacted us as groups. We've also tried to help people a little bit with the water licensing process, trying to describe how it works and how to be involved so people can be involved. That's kind of what we've been up to the last six months as far as meetings go.

A lot of our work is the GMOB Office with Ben there. We get a lot of walk-in traffic, a lot of people interested in the Project and what has been going on with a lot of questions. So Ben has a lot of conversations through the day with various people.

Also, our website has launched an online library of resources that Ben has been collecting. There are different documents – historical documents – on the Giant Mine. Our website has various things about our activities and remediation activities, and those kinds of reports. But in addition, we're developing this library of studies and articles. We have stuff going back 50 years now that Ben has found to put on the record. We've gotten some information I think from the Yellowknives Dene. I think William provided us some stuff to put on there. So we're trying to pull information together in one spot and have it in a library system that is accessible and searchable. That's our goal there.

That's sort of the highlights of our activities, and the backlist shows a number of the meetings we have attended. It's a fascinating list of meetings. I won't go through them all.

The other thing that we've been working on, of course, has to do with our research mandate. Maybe I'll get Tony to give us an update on that.

Tony: Thanks, Kathy. Most people here would be familiar with the general arc of the development of our Research Program, but I'll give a very quick synopsis of the timeline so far.

Obviously we were established in 2015. In 2016, we commissioned Arcadis to develop an updated state-of-knowledge review of technologies that may be appropriate for managing arsenic trioxide in a permanent fashion.

Then following up on that, in 2017, we convened a group of researchers from across Canada that are really more responsible for the management of research programs to seek input on how we might design our Research Program and get the most bang for the buck, so to speak, in delivering our mandate. Through that process, we identified that it was best that we partner with a preexisting organization that focused on mine site reclamation that would have the expertise that we could draw on. We would be able to leverage their preexisting organizational structure.

Thankfully there is an organization in Canada that is very well suited to that. It's called TERRE-NET. This is a consortium of Canadian universities that focus on mine site reclamation. We have just recently this last week after a lot of back-and-forth – I don't think it was as challenging as those of you that were here during the development of the Environmental Agreement – but it was a lot of work for us to develop our agreement with TERRE-NET. This is basically our partnership master agreement for conducting the research program over the coming years.

We have also received from TERRE-NET a proposal to conduct research, a three-year research program in which they working with us collectively identified some research targets for consideration over a three-year program. We're getting very close to entering into an agreement to implement that research program for a three-year timeframe. So I'll pause there and see if there are any specific questions about what where we are and what we've been doing to get here.

*(Pause)*

Todd: Thanks. Tony, I have two sets of questions or two lines there. The first is the challenging nature of the agreement. Can you tell us a little bit more about that? I'll give you both questions at the same time. You guys had identified some research targets working with TERRE-NET. I can only imagine. You guys are sitting on a pretty big pot of money at this point that researchers must want to work with you guys. How are you guys dealing with that, and where is the research program going I guess?

Tony: I'm probably being too dramatic when I suggested it was a challenge to develop that agreement. For many of us...

Todd: *(off mic)* Administrative.

Tony: Well, administrative but there were some things that we didn't anticipate. An example would be intellectual property. We have here people that are professional researchers and academic researchers. I think most of us, maybe the Ph.Ds excluded, didn't appreciate how sensitive the question of intellectual property was.

So we had to work through that with TERRE-NET to make it clear that the Giant Project or the question of Giant in arsenic trioxide there would be able to benefit from any research that's done, new technologies that might be developed wouldn't be inaccessible in the future by virtue of the researchers holding the intellectual properties.

This is just one example of the many hoops we had to jump through in order to get an agreement that was workable for both GMOB and TERRE-NET. I was too dramatic when I said it was really difficult. It was a little bit of work. But when I say it was a little bit of work, I need to clarify it was a lot of work for Ben...

Todd: So where is it going? What are the targets?

Ben: Just to let you know, the master research agreement is between the Giant Mine Oversight Board and the University of Waterloo. The University of Waterloo is the coordinator of the association of TERRE-NET. So they are the ones who will administer... When the research proposal is accepted, they will do all of the administration of that and report to us on a quarterly basis actually.

Tony: It's an administrative requirement, but formally our agreement – GMOB's agreement – is with the University of Waterloo, not with TERRE-NET.

With respect to the second part of your question of where is this going in terms of what might be coming in the near future, we have I mentioned received a proposal from TERRE-NET. Within that proposal, there are very specific research projects identified. I'll very briefly describe them. We haven't approved the proposal, but it is consistent with our expectations. In the coming weeks and perhaps month, we will be making some final decisions on this.

The scope of that work is there are four projects. The first is further characterization work of arsenic trioxide. There was some very solid work done by the Project Team in the early 2000s related to this, but TERRE-NET has identified some additional information they feel they need to have available in order to advance with the research initiative.

The other research projects, one is titled sulphidisation. It's really creating a stable mineral – sulfide mineral – out of the arsenic trioxide. The second research program is looking at cementation of arsenic trioxide into a cement matrix. The third alternative we're looking at is vitrification of arsenic trioxide into basically glass. Some of you would have heard about this proposed treatment technology.

In terms of work that would be done, the research proposal covers three fiscal years, including this one. None of this work can be done in a single fiscal year, so each of those research projects straddles multiple years. Then towards the end of that initiative, we would be looking at how we readjust our targets. Do we look at some new technologies? Are we ready to zero-in on promising technologies and eliminate some?

In addition to that, some of you will be aware that both the Project Team and GMOB continue to receive unsolicited proposals from technology providers. We will be working with TERRE-NET to evaluate those periodically, either twice annually or annually as they come in to determine whether they should go into the hopper for future consideration.

Todd: One quick follow-up: So you've got your three-year setup. Is there another track to be considered next year, or is this it for the next three years?

Tony: This is a three-year block, so it's a reality of just the length of time it takes to initiate the research, conduct the studies, report, and so on. I'm sure as research results come out perhaps hypothetically in the second year, we may be doing some adjusting along the way. It's conceivable that we will make a mid-stream decision to readjust the program, but we're entering into it with the expectation that it is a three-year commitment to focus on those targets.

Todd S: Thank you.

Natalie: Just a follow-up on some of the conversations yesterday: Do you maybe want to speak to the distinction between the focus on stabilization versus extraction?

Tony: Yes, thanks for queuing that up. As everybody that has been involved with the Project is fully aware, there are two primary components to managing arsenic trioxide. You have to stabilize the dust and convert it to something else that is less prone towards getting into the environment, whether it be through solubilisation in the water or otherwise. That's a very important piece of the puzzle of this problem is stabilizing the arsenic trioxide, so converting it to something else.

There's a separate really challenging piece. In most instances, you need to also extract the dust out of the ground in order to stabilize it, in most instances. So those are the two big pieces of the arsenic trioxide puzzle.

We have elected, after lots of consideration and we debated extensively with TERRE-NET – we decided that we couldn't realistically...It wasn't appropriate or a good use of our resources to focus on both of those technical challenges in parallel. We elected to focus on the stabilization piece, recognizing full well that if we find promising technologies for stabilization, then that would need to in the future be coupled with an extraction technology most likely. There would need to be further research done

in order to identify the preferred extraction technology in order to have an integrated package.

So right now we're focusing on stabilization. In the future, we would need to also shift the focus towards extraction.

Ben: So the other piece, Tony, I don't know if you want to talk about the transfer of the arsenic samples from CIRNAC.

Tony: Thanks, Ben. There was an inventory of arsenic trioxide sample that was originally procured by DIAND back then – I was going to CIRNAC, but it didn't exist then. It was held in Lakefield Laboratories in Ontario. Just recently in order for us to conduct the Research Program, obviously we need arsenic trioxide sample. We went through a process with CIRNAC to essentially legally transfer those samples over to the possession of GMOB. The samples are still contained at the Lakefield Labs in Peterborough. They are going to continue to manage that inventory on our behalf, but we now have an agreement with Lakefield in order to manage that arsenic trioxide and disperse it to TERRE-NET on an as-needed basis as we conduct the research program.

Erika: I brought this up yesterday, and just to poke you, Tony, now that we're all in the same room. I know you don't have all the details, but when all of us parties get solicited proposals regardless of what those companies are saying, how do you want it to come over? Does it go to Ben? Does it go to you? Is there some wording that we can have? I know that CIRNAC and GNWT would get that, but seeing the last letter from YKDFN, you guys also get those companies. So could you just get us all on the same page or let us know when some guidance might come from you guys?

Tony: Thanks, Erika. That's right. We have all been receiving these proposals. What we discussed yesterday is that in many cases, it is appropriate to direct them to GMOB, certainly all of those proposals that deal with management of arsenic trioxide. Those absolutely fall within our responsibility. So please forward those to us.

But then there are also situations where for the Project Team there could be some technologies that have application to other aspects of the Project. What we talked about yesterday is, as those proposals come in please direct them to GMOB. Bring them to our attention. It's on us to field those proposals. We will enter into a discussion with the Project Team.

Certainly if a proposal were to come via the YKDFN for example, if you wanted to be included in that discussion, we could keep you in the loop about that dialogue. But from that point, our understanding was that it was really about a bilateral discussion between the Project Team and GMOB about who is best suited to proceed with managing that type of unsolicited proposal.

Johanne: YKDFN does get approached from folks that have a proposed method to deal with stabilizing the arsenic. It would be nice if GMOB can provide some type of...like a one-pager that I can hand off to these folks and say, "This is the process on research."

Tony: I think that's a great idea. I wouldn't say talking points, but a quick reference that you could use, and other parties as well, could use to make sure these proposals follow the right path and people are well informed. There is a consistent message. I think that's a great idea. I don't know out of place to suggest we will act on that. Ben's nodding. That's an action on us. Thanks, Johanne.

Johanne: Yeah, thank you.

William: I was just saying to Johanne, it would also be helpful for our Chiefs as well, because they are always traveling around the country, and they do get a lot of requests that then get directed at us. So maybe a smaller format that is easily accessible for them would be great.

Tony: Okay.

Erika: Just to echo, that would be great for us, because I'm usually rewriting something every time. It would be great to, well ease my work, but to have something consistent that all of us can just hand off or put in an email. Thanks.

Tony: Thank you. Just something that we would maybe in return appreciate – and we can put this in the few bullets that we provide on the card or the summary sheet – what we find often is that these unsolicited proposals come in, and they are extremely confident in what they have is the right answer. We find we need to temper their enthusiasm. Like it's great they are enthusiastic, but very often they are not fully informed about what the problem is. We try to put the reigns on them a little bit to not get too carried away.

That includes saying, "Just because we spoke to you doesn't mean that we're endorsing you." It's making sure there aren't technology providers out there making press releases saying, "We're working with the Giant Mine Project Team," or "The YKDFN endorses us to be the technology provider." I think we all have to be cautious about that.

Johanne: And that is exactly what happens with our Chiefs as well as our CEO. They come to us and they say, "Oh we got this huge..."

William: "We have the solution."

Johanne: "We have the solution," and they pull our Chiefs in. Then they try to...anyway....

It gets quite disappointing. I just don't want our Chiefs to completely get hit in the heart here when somebody says, "Oh I got a solution for Giant Mine." Then they



propose they have it, and all of a sudden that solution hasn't firmed up. It happens quite a bit every year. So it's just another...I just don't want in terms of the feelings that come out of that we get hit by that, and our feelings get hurt when all of a sudden that dream has been shot down.

Ben: Yes, and if I could get a little bit of feedback. I'll give you an example. I had a recent company come and ask for everybody's emails, because they said, "Community consultation is really important. We look at the partnership of GMOB with all the Parties. Can we get all those Parties' email addresses and contact numbers," And who do we talk to, because we want to start a community activation side to our proposal? Are you interested in me distributing your information to possible research proposals that are coming to us? I'm asking for some feedback on that. Or should I just say, "Not at this time. Put your proposal together. Send it to us, and then we'll go from there." How is it best to handle that?

William: I can talk for Yellowknives Dene. I would say at least my initial perspective would be for GMOB to handle the research components, and for GMOB to work directly with the researchers. When you get to the point that you guys are comfortable with whatever research method you're developing, that's when GMOB can come to us and have discussions with us about it, and leave it at that until that happens.

Ben: Thank you, William.

Erika: GNWT, ditto.

Gordon: I don't want to make work for you Ben, but if you were to say, "Yeah, we'll send information out," and they can get back in touch with you. I'll just leave it at that.

Ben: Okay.

Kathy: The other thing I was going to say to the Yellowknives was that I'd be happy to come and speak to your Chiefs and your Council to give a rundown of why these silver bullet things can't possibly be silver bullets, just so they are armed with a bit more knowledge. I can totally imagine how you could get your hopes up, because these guys are great salespeople. That's what they do, and they're so aggressive. So they could be armed with a bit more knowledge to say, "No, no. I know that can't be true." Anyway, I'd be happy to come speak to your group.

Johanne: We'll take you up on that offer. Thank you.

Kathy: Okay, great discussion. Any more discussions about our activities and research update?

Todd: Tony, I'm seeing a nod. You're done? Okay, because it's not research related. I should have said this before we went into Tony's. In hearing what you and Ben were talking about, people coming in and giving information away, the value of the storefront

office, these are all things that came up during the negotiations, and it validates a lot of the points that found their way into the Environmental Agreement. I just wanted to say that's really good to hear. I'm sure all the folks that were involved with that would be pleased that's the case.

The question I had for just general GMOB, you guys have \$700,000.00 give or take for operations. Can you give a little more break down? I know that there is the audit at the end of the year, but for this coming year what are the spending priorities? I know meetings and paying honorariums is a significant part of that, but are there specific choices that were made in February or whatever in terms of how you are spending money to reflect what you guys think were priorities?

Kathy: Well, one concern we had, like everyone else in the room, is just that we would have enough budget to participate fully in the water licensing process. When we had the Semi-Annual Meeting in November and asked people what they thought our role should be in that process, the general consensus was, "We'd really like you to take a strong and active role in the process," which we've taken seriously.

So our focus...In previous years, we've always had a surplus. We've been able to work within our budget and have a bit of a surplus. This year when we did some math on what the time would be, we got a little concerned. But there are a lot of assumptions that go into that, so we're not really sure what our budget is going to be like this year. We do want to have a very strong presence and participation in the water licensing process.

So we've hired Paul Green, which that's a new expense. He's not quite full-time, but he's 30 hours a week on the Project now. That's a major expense. Plus, there is a lot of extra time for Board members to review materials. Tony and I, for example, have done a lot on the application.

What we've started to do this year is we always track our times in terms of honoraria, what we spend on meetings, what we spend on administrative stuff, technical views, and now we have a separate category for anything to do with the water licensing process. We're just sort of keeping track now of how much we're spending on that aspect, because that's different than previous years for sure.

So we're keeping track. At midpoint in the year and it's not looking good, we'll bring it up. But at this stage, we decided that we didn't know enough about what our budget requirements would be this year to ask for an increase at all. So we're going to keep trying to work within our core budget. You were just asking about the core budget, right?

Todd: Yeah. The research is research.

Kathy: Yeah. That's where we're at there.

Tony: Can I give a clarification? Just to clarify, we have core administration. We also have the research side of it, and of course we put in a lot of time so far with that. Now we have the water license process. So those three things through our monthly bookkeeping are all tracked. We have promised Natalie that we will feed back to her those allocations and percentages on a quarterly basis, so we are aware, and then she's aware of where that spending is going and how that is going to be forecasted. Once we get about halfway through, maybe three-quarters of the way through, we'll know what the forecasting is to the end of the year. Then we'll see where we sit. But right now it's a management situation.

Natalie: Just to be clear, we didn't ask for that. They offered it. Yeah, it's not something we require.

Tony: And the rationale for us offering it was recognizing that we may get in a situation midyear, or three-quarter point of the year where we may be having issues in terms of fulfilling our responsibilities to the end of the year. We wanted to ensure that the Project Team was aware well in advance, and there were no surprises late in the game, should we get into a situation where there are insufficient resources.

Todd: Thanks, Tony. This is all excellent for this next question or this next point I'm going to make, which I'm sure everyone has reached by now. I wasn't thinking so much in terms of the feds, but is that a possibility of asking for more resources within the Agreement?

My thinking is the Parties are going to be relying on GMOB an awful lot more than was anticipated during the Environmental Agreement negotiations. GNWT's absence from the process, like it or not, GMOB is ultimately the next best thing, especially because you all hired Paul Green. So it's like we have Waters here anyhow. So that's a very convenient allocation of your resources.

I think that's great, but we also have things, in particular climate change and climate predictions, and whether it's Environment Canada folks who are going to be contributing to that or your colleagues at Environment...what's the division? That division...Environmental Stewardship?

Female: *(Response off mic. Inaudible)*

Todd: They're not contributing. I know we don't have a climate change person here, but looking for you guys to help however you can, and if you don't have the resources because of this bigger ask from the Parties, I think that's a condition in which greater resources may be warranted. So great.

Tony: And that's precisely why...

Male: *(Comment off mic. Inaudible)*

Tony: I could put that hat on. It wouldn't be very credible. So yeah, that's exactly why we've taken the approach we have in terms of tracking where we're going. But we didn't want to prematurely come out of the gate and put in an ask that we couldn't yet justify. We're definitely watching it. It's important to us to ensure that sufficient resources are there, and we'll keep everyone appraised.

One other point though to mention is that discussion is about core budget. With respect to the research budget – and this won't be happening right away definitely – it's true that we've accumulated a reasonable nest egg of funding from our prior surpluses that we have available to conduct a Research Program over the next several years. However, everybody knew from the very beginning when you're doing the negotiation – and Terre-net has reinforced this to us – although it sounds like a lot of money, it's a huge problem and it's not a lot of money when you consider the complexity of the problem.

It is not inconceivable that at some point in the future – particularly if some of these technologies we're looking at are showing promise – that we would be coming forward with an effort to procure more funding to do more detailed comprehensive research should it be required. We're not there now, but I guess everybody knows that. I'll reiterate that point that there may very well in the future be a need to up the available funds.

Kathy: Are there any more questions for us with respect to mandate and resources? Did you have any other questions? Are there any questions for us on activities, what we're up to, or should be up to? This is your time to make recommendations to us instead of this all being one way.

Male: I thought that was going to be Part 8.

Kathy: Part 8? Oh yeah, that's true. Okay, the roundtable. Well this is our opportunity right now. It's just the other parties going. Sorry. Okay, well then we can get on to the roundtable, but maybe we want to take a little break for some more coffee and tea, and then come back in 10 minutes.

## **Break**

### **Roundtable Party Updates**

Kathy: Let's get started again. Luckily this is a section where I don't have to do most of the talking. So we're going to go to Item 8 on the agenda, which is a roundtable update. We ask this time as status of the review of the submitted water license application, as well as an update on any successes and challenges over the past six months. We're going to start with the City of Yellowknife update.

## **City of Yellowknife**

Kerry: I'm just going to say a few general comments about successes and challenges, and then I'll pass it over to Todd, because he's got a lot more detail than me.

Successes over the last six months: As everyone is well aware, it has been hard to keep up with Giant Mine Project, just like every other Party struggling to keep up, knowing we are heading into the water license process that there was going to be an increased demand. Just keeping up with the meetings and materials is a challenge in itself. We requested from the Project, and were successful and got some funding in the form a contribution agreement to hire someone to help us out. We were lucky enough to get Todd Slack to join us at the City, so that was a huge success.

Another success from our perspective is we have been working cooperatively with the Project Team, the GNWT, and the feds in different aspects with respect to you, despite all the public information. Questions about access and the Giant Mine boat dock, the land questions, alternative arrangements, we've got things in the works, because we're working cooperatively and trying to be proactive in trying to address the problem before it's actually an issue. So we see it as a success, the relationship with both the territorial and federal governments.

Then a challenge is, as I've indicated, is keeping up with the workload of the Project, just because there are so many meetings and materials on top of what we're going to be writing in response. The water license itself is a huge piece of the Project.

Then a couple of things related to the Project – the access with respect to the boat dock. That is a challenge, which we're trying to overcome, but it will be a challenge if we don't come up with a solution before access is restricted. Again, we're working really cooperatively with the Project Team, and hopefully we'll be able to make that a success. Now I will hand it over to Todd from there.

Todd: Thanks, Kerry. Kathy, cut me off if I overdo it on time. So GMOB specifically asked about the status of the water license review. They're going to get half a draft tomorrow with the rest of the draft early next week. It's coming along. Everything is read except for the Giant HHERA, and maybe the EQC appendices I didn't print. Something like that. Anyway, it's coming along, and I think we're in a pretty good state to get that review in on time.

The one thing for your guys' knowledge is that we're really counting on GMOB on like effluent sampling. That's one of the items. The AEMP and the EQC, like the water kind of stuff, I'm looking to the engineer and the chemist...well, and the water guy at GNWT Waters for that.

Then in terms of picking up on successes versus challenges or failures, or however you want to frame it, first off I want to say on a personal level, the extra month for review was for me, a personal godsend. I'm a part-timer, and to have to do this in a shorter time period would have meant an upending of my life. While yes, my own

personal things don't really matter that much, on that level I want to say thanks for that. I don't know whose idea it was. If it was yours, Natalie, great. If not, take the credit.

In terms of specific successes, I think the QRA itself is working well. I don't know what the other parties think on this, but I feel this is a real collaborative approach to something that is very difficult and obtuse is perhaps the right word on that, to translate that into things that the parties can get involved with and participate in.

The challenge that I see is long-term funding. This has been a mess. It's still a mess. Everything about it is conflict. When we go back – and I wrote this down here – the idea behind this was to ensure the ideas put forth by the parties received due consideration in a way that engages stakeholders and thoroughly investigates long-term funding mechanisms that match the cycle of the Project.

Again personal opinion here, I certainly don't think that's the case. So for all the great things in the QRA, unfortunately, this is like the Force in Star Wars, and it is balanced out by the Measure 6. The reality is that it's not going to go away. The QRA – I don't know what it was – there were 40-some scenarios that are going to go through. The majority is all long-term. It's all funding related. Whether we want to look at changing priorities in Ontario that just happened with their government, whether we look at the budget dispute here, it's kind of a big deal.

I also looked at...The intent to me of this particular section was always the review of the operational aspects of the Agreement. I also have a thought for the Board here. From a City perspective, there is Section 31B3 about you guys offering recommendations on the Project's integration of short, medium, and long-term land use constraints. Land use still ought to be the driver of this. Sorry, this is a repeat from two years ago.

Whether it's the Yellowknives' version of dirty and gray, or whether it's adopting the City's 2008 – no it was before that – 2006 land use plan, or something in between, who knows. Just get that conversation going and start to look at the values and the interests that people want to pull out of this site. I think we all arrive at a point that would have been useful in terms of driving the considerations around what the reclamation standard is going to be. So, highlighting that need for the GMOB, we're there.

The last most significant one is about the implementation of the Agreement. I'm going to point out that GNWT is absent from the field. I had the fortune, good fortune, of being one of the negotiators on this. When you look at Section 12 – Kathy just happens to have this open – it talks about duplication. At the time, the conflict there was about GMOB potentially duplicating the roles and responsibilities of the federal government and GNWT.

Erika: I missed...were absent from what?

Todd: The field. Sorry. Absent from the process.

Erika: ...what process?

Todd: GNWT is not participating...sorry, not Erika GNWT but GNWT's expert divisions.

Erika: .... intervening in the regulatory process?

Todd: Or contributing to the management plan. Either GNWT stands behind this Project as a whole and they review it as a whole, that they are the authors of this Plan, or contributing authors, or they are reviewing it.

Just to skip ahead here to a little bit of the issues, during the EA, there was Suggestion 6, and again I'm going to say AANDC at the time, because it was pre-devo, to reduce public concern about the multiple roles of AANDC in this Project and to increase public confidence, AANDC should produce guidelines that clarify reporting structures and ensure that project inspectors, advisors, managers, employed by the federal government can perform their duties objectively and without undue pressure. Yadda, yadda, yadda, and then we have the firewalling.

Waters didn't really take the field in this case either, but they have in other things. Again the Review Board provides a written response to the GNWT process there. As the Review Board, those departments are not typical. Their lack of participation limits the availability of evidence and expertise from GNWT departments about potential impacts, concerns, and mitigations on issues within the respective mandates and jurisdictions.

Guys like Paul before he quit and left us, are very important to the regulatory process, are important to safeguarding the citizens of Yellowknife. To not have them there and to review the proponent or review the developer, even if it is just to say, "This is good, no worries," that provides citizen's confidence. To not have those expert departments weigh in imperils some of the work you guys have done. So we really hope that will change, and the GMOB can advocate for that in the future, whether through the Agreement, or just as a recommendation.

And if it's not going to happen, as we've said before, ensuring that there is the right kind of resources for that, if...Unfortunately, we created this Agreement, and now you guys have a mandate to cover these things. If it falls to you guys, ensuring that you are able to do it. That's my 2 cents, more like 5 cents, but there you have it.

Erika: Kathy, I'm not sure if this is the process, or do you want to wait? I just wanted to respond to Todd's comments... Okay.

Okay, Erika from GNWT: I guess I feel slightly confused with some of your comments about GNWT's role in reviewing the material. I just want to clarify for the table, the

original Agreement was sent out to the Working Group clarifying our role. Then if I could just explore a little bit with you still what those concerns are...

Yes, typically after devolution, the major intervener that used to sit with DIAND was the Water Resource Department, so that has come over to GNWT. They continue to play a large intervener role in water license application processes. So those folks used to be Paul. Because this is a Project that is a GNWT project as well, we internally talked about what GNWT's role is, specifically Water having that expertise, but in addition to other expert divisions like our Wildlife Group, our Air Quality, our Waste Management guys, how do we participate in the process, because it's our Project? Intervening doesn't seem to make sense in that we can provide the expertise review on the planning side of things.

So we issued a letter that was drafted by our ADM, Robert Jenkins, that went out to the Working Group saying the role will be that expert divisions or departments – so we thought about Lands might be involved or ECE or other ones, but it just ended up at the end of the day being ENR – that they would review relevant plans and provide their comments. These comments would be shared with the Working Group and also provided with the water license package so they would be made public on the public registry.

At that time, that process was agreed to by the stakeholders. So that was done. How it worked was once a draft plan was drafted by the Project Team, it was sent over to the ENR guys. "Hey, what do you guys think about this plan? Provide us with your comments." Those comments were provided in writing, and a response from the Project Team was made. Whether there were changes in the Plan or not, that was noted in the Response Table. The Response Table then went out, and everyone has seen that.

The ENR departments did not review the CRP in its entirety, so that is an area that there wasn't that internal review. However, all the relevant plans, management and monitoring plans, all the water plans were reviewed by the Water Guys. The Wildlife Plan, Air, Waste Plan, Spill Contingency Plan, all of those were.

Then there was another letter that was sent out recently. Well, it wasn't a letter. It was an email by me. It had review from all these divisions and our ADM stating that once the GMRP provided their responses to the comments from ENR experts, there wasn't another follow-up from Rick at Waters saying, "Okay, we're cool with your response."

It was left as there was rationale provided by the Project Team. In some cases, the Project Team said, "Yep, we heard your comment, but this is our rationale for not changing it." It was left as if other stakeholders wanted to – the word 'latch on' comes to mind, but that's not the right word. If another stakeholder would like to use that information and still support that recommendation feeling that the rationale



provided by the Project was not adequate, that was up to that stakeholder. That was part of the intent of those comments. So that is where it has been left.

We talked about that back and forth. What if we come to a point where we don't agree? It was discussed where that's not something that's going to happen on the public registry. We have committed to this process. We're not going to have a back-and-forth publically. Folks can decide how to use it how they want.

So that's our understanding of the process. So I just heard you say GNWT wasn't involved, or they didn't review certain plans. So I just want to understand a little bit more from you with that process. If you can reiterate again, I mean you said a lot. With what I've said, what still remains? What's lacking there, or what do you really feel that with this process...Like I understand not having someone like Rick in the room to have back-and-forth at a hearing or technical sessions. We realize that people will not be there in present, and there is value in that, but this is the policy decision of how GNWT would participate in their own projects. I get on that side of things, but could you tell me a little bit more what you feel is not there with that process?

Diep: Sorry, before you answer that Todd, if I could add a couple of more things to that. So when our folks from ENR reviewed all the management plans, they did it with the lens of as if it was a project they were basically intervening on. So they're doing it with the same lens that they would any other project.

It's not like as if they're saying we're going to do it differently because it's a GNWT project. They're doing it with the same lens they would for any other project. So yeah, we would like to get clarification from the City in terms of what is lacking in this process or the back-and-forth that you see that could potentially help this process and make it better.

Kathy: I know you're looking at clarification from Todd, and he will definitely give it to you, but I'm going to provide it. He's just going to work the puppet behind. It's quite a vision now, isn't it?

When a read over, I did look at the comments that Waters made, for example, and the AEMP and that. A lot of the comments were questions. Because at the beginning of the process at this first phase of the comment process, a lot of what you have are questions. You just don't understand. Then as we get into the water licensing process, we go in the technical sessions, and then that's the opportunity to really have a back-and-forth and really pull things apart to understand them.

As you go through this process, you get to a point where okay, now I really understand what the proponent is saying, and I know what other parties are saying. Now I know what I want to recommend to the Project Team, to the Board, or whatever.

So the initial review that Waters did, for example, because that was the predominant one I looked at, yeah I have no doubt they've done it like every other project. I know

everybody in the GNWT, all the staff is very keen to do things the right way. I have no question about that whatsoever. But you know, a lot of them were just questions, because they didn't understand. So what did you get? What did the Project Team get from that? You got almost nothing, I think, from that – not as much as you would get if people participated all the way along.

Now I can totally see how you don't want Waters to come to a technical session and get into a fight with your regulatory person about something. That would be weird. I get that. But maybe there's a way those guys could still come, listen, and participate, and be part of your team basically, to come around the back.

I guess the thing is those guys – and maybe Todd will back me up on this – those guys and gals in the Wildlife Division and the Waters Division – have been through so many of these processes that we've been through, that Todd's been through, that the Yellowknives been through, and the NSMA's have been through, that they will be able to help the Project Team go, "You know, when so-and-so said this, this is what they meant. This is what they were looking for," because we haven't been through a regulatory process together with the Giant team. We don't have that kind of rhythm that we have with these other experts.

So maybe they don't come out with another set of comments publically, but maybe they are involved so that they can continue to feed you what would be valuable information from you. This is just a suggestion to get around this problem. I don't know if you have more to say on that, Todd.

Todd: I would concur, and thanks for the kind of open question here. No, it's not kind of open. It's an entirely open question. It was a preliminary review. There were simple, straightforward questions of, "Hey, does this exist?" The Project response of "Yes it does exist, and it does in this location..." I don't know the nature of that question and the causal reason for asking the question isn't addressed by saying, "Yes, it is."

The second aspect is for me, is the Project consultants on this are the same consultants who prepare these plans for other venues, or other projects in the same venue. Waters often has concerns and comments that extend, not just with their initial review, but from that initial review to the end to the process where they submit to the Board their expert opinion on how it can be improved.

Those are opinions that, yes GMOB has in some themes or some topics, but if we use something non-confrontational like Wildlife... On this one, there are pretty straightforward issues. They're asking questions about if you talked to the Yellowknives. If they read the plan and they don't understand that, then there is more for them to read there to be able to understand the whole plan in context.

These things support the CRP. Waters often has comments on objective criteria on how to best frame them, how to ensure they are clear and applicable... Those folks add a lot of value throughout the process. The facts that you laid out are the facts.

But on that one preliminary review and then to say, "Done?" That's insufficient for what the citizens of the territory, and I think the citizens of Yellowknife expect of those folks that are not chartered to protect their interest, but are responsible for protecting their interest.

I don't think that's enough. I don't look at the Project, and as the GNWT part of that Project, I don't think you're out to do a bad job, but you're the developer on this. You're not there to safeguard...that's not quite true. That's not what I want to say either.

There is a broader set of concerns there that aren't just from a Project point of view.

Erika: Okay, thanks. That's very helpful. I mean this is the first time where we've really formalized a process of where we are a proponent. There have been other proponent projects that GNWT has been involved in. I mean I'm kind of looking at Paul like how did you guys participate in some of those? This helps clarify, and it's something for us to take back and talk about again with folks. On the first pass, it's like yeah that sound great. But then once you get into it, you realize maybe there are some holes. So I completely appreciate what you're saying. Those are good suggestions, Kathy. Diep and I will take that back to our folks, and we can talk about it more. Thanks.

Todd: Can we go back, the Board weighed in on the same approach there. The concern is mentioned in the Giant EA for AANDC, and in particular the inspectors in that case, as there had been an issue between inspectors and the senior leadership there, or senior management. I don't know about leadership. Sorry, I didn't mean for that to come off quite that way either. I'll just shut-up.

*(Laughter)*

Kathy: I think Johanne was next, and then Tony.

Johanne: It is quite alarming to hear that when it comes to GNWT's role within this Project, it is double pronged. They are a developer, but they are also responsible for residents as well in terms of ensuring that the risks to them are not as great.

I'm glad you brought that up Todd, because when you look at past responses from GNWT in terms of other licensing issues or other environmental assessments versus the voice being heard in terms of the commenting for this process, it's completely different. I think you really need to go back and review your role within this Project and ensure that in terms of your past voice in other processes, it should be equal to this process, and this not this process being of lesser value to those other ones. After all, this is a huge project that a lot of people are watching.

Tony: I believe that the involvement so far of Waters, you indicated that it's focused on the management plan, so basically how the Project would be regulated. That's a simplification, but then I think...

Female: And monitored

Tony: And monitored. But there is another element that I thought would have been of interest too. This is a unique Project in that what the Project is, is of interest. That's where this CRP comes in, the description of how the site is going to be after it is remediated, and the end state of that site. I think you indicated that Waters hasn't reviewed the CRP. Is that correct?

Erika: That's correct. However, that is part of my role in the Project is to bring forward GNWT interests and review. I mean I do have a technical background, so in the past, we would provide updates to ADM committees and talk to different folks about the CRP plans. So my contribution being on the Closure Plan Drafting Committee would be to provide that input. So when it was decided where we could best utilize expert divisions within GNWT, it was more on the management plans and the monitoring, because that's the weedy bits they get into. I guess I held that responsibility on GNWT's part for the Closure Plan.

Tony: Thanks, Erika. Again, I haven't worked within this process like everybody else has. But the review of a closure and reclamation plan, usually that would be done by Waters. They would be a participant in that process, and they're input on say, the thickness of tailings covers and whether or not a spillway was adequately designed, they would have at least been at the table to contribute to those decisions in indicating whether or not it was adequately protective of the environment.

You are the...I don't know if conduit is the right word, but you are the participant on behalf of the GNWT for all of those topics now. Do you feel...I'm sorry to put you on the spot, but do you feel that you...It would be beyond me to provide that level of expertise in such a broad area that's required for remediation of a site. So do you feel that you can adequately represent the expertise of all the other staff within Waters and elsewhere related to mine closure decisions?

Erika: I hear ya. No. I wouldn't say that I'm the expert of all things. That was how it was laid out. I think this conversation is useful and important and definitely noted for Diep and I to take this back and talk with the Project Team. I mean there has always been a commitment to revise the Closure Plan. This is a draft.

So we know that after licensing, the Closure Plan will be revised. Maybe it's something that we can discuss internally again and see if we can have more eyes. I mean internally working on...The Project would be making revisions anyways. Again, I don't think it's something where it's the public where GNWT would intervene, but we'll talk about that internally, those concerns. Definitely we can involve those expert folks to look at the Plan. In no way do I want to say I'm the...I'm not comfortable saying, "Yes," but that's how it was set up. So all these comments are very useful and appreciated.

Tony: Thanks, Erika. In a sense, I'm sorry I had to ask that question. For the record, I want to make it clear that Erika's participation in this process...She adds a ton of value, and I respect your expertise and everything you give to the Project. It's just recognizing there are many resources within the GNWT that could also add some further value.

In particular for a Closure Plan like this, it's going to be there forever, and you've got to get the answers right now. So it's worth it to explore how to bring those other resources in. Thank you for your response.

Female: (*Name not stated*) I just had a question on this for the federal side. Is ECC and DFO participating as interveners in this process, or are you following a similar model to the GNWT where they did the pre-review and won't be participating in the process?

Natalie: I believe ECC and DFO will be interveners. The one, I know was Health Canada, but we've said if there are comments...Because Ashish on our Working Group works for the Federal Contaminated Site Action Plan. He's not the regulator, so I know he was still having internal conversations with the Health Canada regulatory side to see how they will participate. I don't think he's gotten back to me on that.

Female: (*Name not stated*). Just to look at the same – well not the same – but if the federal government is able to participate as an intervener in the Project then the GNWT could hopefully look at a similar model. I know you all will discuss it further internally.

Todd: Forgive. I'm jumping ahead. Certainly, Johanne I see you. Natalie, if we went back to the hearing, the feds adopted that same sort of family – sorry at the EA – they were one group. DFO did not participate. Health Canada...Those folks weren't participants in that at least in the room. I'd have to go back to the report. I'm almost sure in the report they got raked pretty good. I know that the DFO staff was very uncomfortable with how it all turned out, as they and NorCan...

Kathy: CanNor...

Todd: Thank you. Oh my God, I'm the worst, but the bosses are here, so I'm pretty good.

*(Laughter)*

CanNor was the conduit in which DFO talked to CanNor. CanNor was supposed to bring their views to the Project, I think that's how it went. Except CanNor wasn't able to do that in the hearing, so DFO got a lot of grief that they may or may not have deserved. Sorry.

Female: (*Name not stated*) Can I just add, we have had some preliminary discussions with CanNor, and they have expressed that they may be taking on that role, but we have yet to hear from them.

Todd: Okay.

Johanne: I just want to make sure that GNWT understands what their role is within this. It's appreciated if they actually can have some interveners involved with this process. In terms of the value you have on this Project, I'm hoping that it's not reflected in your participation into this process. Your value into this Project, it's not of lesser value than other projects that have gone to the regulatory system.

Possibly you might want to pull up some old EAs or licensing submissions that were done on behalf of GNWT to figure out how you made your comments in the past and compare that to how you're currently reviewing or putting in your comments now.

Erika: Thanks, Johanne. If I can ask since everyone is in the room, seeing that we have provided comments and recognizing they are preliminary, just hypothetically here if we go back and talk with folks and there is agreement that Waters group for example, does review the CRP and makes those comments public and perhaps participate with the Project Team behind the team lines there and are able to support questions and things like that – would that be something that other parties would support?

Kathy: Maybe this is something we need to think about. Sorry, do you want to talk?

Kerry: I think we'd want to talk internally about what kind of position we would take on that and how we would like to see the GNWT participate. I don't think we're prepared to give you a blanket answer today. I see William and Johanne nodding the same. So I don't know if Alternatives North feels the same, or NSMA, but yeah, we're not prepared to answer that today.

Kathy: I'd say the same thing and point out that Johanne has a really good point. One thing that a review by these folks of the materials can help the GNWT with is it can help not be inconsistent with things that GNWT has said in the past. Certainly, you know, I'm aware of everything GNWT has said over the years, and I'll remind you if you're part of a project that takes a position that is contrary to positions that you've taken before. And these guys can just read it over and say we didn't do that last time. It's just so you know or are prepared for it at a minimum.

Erika: Sorry, just to clarify, you're saying that at least as a minimum we should review how previously GNWT intervene on projects? That's what you're saying?

Kathy: I just mean that by having these...Your current GNWT experts review things. They have been the primary interveners on behalf of the GNWT in many proceedings before. I think the GNWT would want to know that whatever you're putting forward as your position as a proponent is consistent with the positions that GNWT has put forward when they were speaking on the other side of the table from the proponent.

Erika: Absolutely. That was the biggest recommendation, flag, or point to think about from our ADM when we decided that this was the process that we would present to the

Working Group. We need to make sure we are consistent and that we are reviewing with the same lens as we would do on anything.

We even talked about, our ADM had said, "Oh I think on this one project we had said this. Let's double check that." So I know that Waters Director was involved in that to make sure we were consistent. So recognize that was our biggest issue to make sure we don't look silly later down the road.

Kathy: Are there any other questions for the City of Yellowknife? Actually nobody asked you a question. You raised them all in fact.

Todd: I'm sorry I took a half-hour of the hour. Sorry.

Kathy: That's okay. It was a good discussion, but are there any other questions for the City of Yellowknife or from the City of Yellowknife?

Todd: From? No.

Kathy: Erika?

Erika: I'm sure people are getting sick of me. But just on this, I really appreciate this conversation. We never said that we have it all planned, and it's going to go perfect. But just on that point, that question that I asked, is there perhaps a date that we could have some feedback on people? I mean we're definitely going to take it back internally and talk with the Project Team, but that could be something that we could entertain, proposing to all our folks that GNWT is going to intervene.

That's a big shift from our original thinking, but having something that we could propose to say, hey, folks are supportive of this. What's reasonable to get some feedback from folks? Like a couple of weeks or something like that so people can think about? What's the suggestion? What do we do? I mean we're happy to hear from you. We definitely want to follow-up on this.

Todd: Having starting this off, I think I have an obligation to answer that question. The reality is it's got to be quick. I think that you've got a solid understanding of what the ask is, and we're all going to be scrambling to get water license comments ourselves. So in the next two weeks or 15 days, I think the answer comes to you guys, what you're willing to do.

Then after the 16<sup>th</sup>, I think we really would be open to talking about what the bosses say you can do versus what we think provides the most value to the Land and Water Board and the parties as they continue on through the process.

Kathy: Does anyone else have a comment on that? Ken, sorry.

- Ken H: Quick question on another topic that's for the City, but I guess it's indirectly related to the remediation project, and that's a question on the water pipeline. I was thinking about it earlier today. Do the plans to replace the water pipeline include a spur to Giant for future land use considerations, or is it just the existing line?
- Kerry: The detailed design for the water pipeline is not even started. I don't believe at this point there is any indication to add spurs to the line, but there is no detailed engineering currently commenced. We just were advised in March that we were successful in receiving funding, and Council has not yet decided that the water pipeline will be replaced. If you watched Committee on Monday, the discussion was started, and the decision will be before Council on May 13<sup>th</sup>. We'll be in no position to comment on even replacing the pipeline until after Council makes that decision. I don't know if Mayor Alty has anything to add.
- Rebecca: Just to add, if the Project Team was interested in paying for the spur, that would be something, but the City wouldn't be looking to fund that ourselves.
- Natalie: We don't require the spur. No thank you.
- Ken H: It's Ken again. Part of my point is that are people aware there was a spur when that line was put in in 1972 to Giant to supply the town site and mine with water. That's all. Thanks.
- Kerry: We have the mapping of the old pipeline and all that entailed. But like I said, there has been no detailed design for the new pipeline. It in fact, hasn't been approved yet.
- Kathy: I think we should move on to an update from the City of Yellowknife. Wait, no. We just heard a lot from them. The Yellowknives Dene First Nations, please.

### **Update from YKDFN**

- William: I'll start off with our successes and challenges. Johanne can join in if she wants. I'd say you know, mimicking Todd's comments, the QRA is going pretty good. There has been a lot of inclusion, especially on YKDFN's part for the QRA. That's definitely a success right now in our books.

The TK and Randy's work, that's another success. We've gotten word that the funding for my position and the other positions that we get, we've gotten agreement on that. That's definitely a success, compared to last fiscal years where we've had to negotiate heavily on that. With that is some regulatory support, so that's some good successes.

Going on to the challenges, I'd say right now the biggest challenge that the YKDFN face is by far the visual design component of the Giant Mine. By that, I mean having some way to show our membership how Giant will look when it's remediated. How will the site be 20 years from now?



It's really hard to describe the Plan without something to look at, right? So for us, that's something that really should be focused heavily on. Even if it's just a small model, sketches, or even just general art. Something to show membership that they can see and say, "Yes, I agree with that. That's a good plan. Let's go with it."

Then there is just the general...Membership is still uncomfortable with certain things, so that will be provided in my comments from May 16<sup>th</sup>. Then there have been comments on membership that the water license process seems very and very quick. But again, I realize that nobody here at the table can change that. It's just a challenge that we have to go through.

So yeah, just going on to the water license process, we are under review and we've got the money to do so. It's pretty good right now. We will be submitting comments by May 16<sup>th</sup>, and we look forward to going through the process.

Johanne: I just wanted to add one last thing. In terms of challenges, the other challenge is that William did mention the design aspect and not much focus being on that. The other challenge that we have is on socio-economics as well. Because the Board doesn't review socio-economic conditions like the Yukon Board does, there is a gap in that.

Tony: Just a quick one: When you're reviewing the Closure and Reclamation Plan and the application more generally, you've got resources for your positions, but are you seeking external technical support as well to back up your review?

William: Yes, we are. We are seeking expertise from several different organizations.

Johanne: And we will be drawing on expertise of GMOB as well for certain matters. The other thing that we wanted to do is we wanted to have a meeting with the City as well as Alternatives North before the licensing submission. I just want to put that out there.

Kerry: Yeah, we're definitely open to a meeting. That's actually one success of this Project, is the Parties have worked really well together throughout the whole process. I would echo Johanne's sentiments about the socio-economic. The City does have some concerns or reservations. We are a member of the Working Group. However, we do have concerns and are waiting to see how the contracts are split up.

There is concern if they are too large then local companies aren't going to have capacity to build on them or the resources to obtain the proper security or bonding that larger companies require. The contracts aren't being issued by the Project. They are being issued by Public Works.

I don't want to say it's wait-and-see, because we are part of the Committee, and we are working towards and pushing for the most benefit for residents. However, echoing Johanne, we do have some reservations or concerns about how much economic advantage residents, local people, are going to get as a result of the Project.

We're keen to work with everybody on that, and we are actively pushing, but I just wanted to echo her comments.

Johanne: Also the additional concern that we have on socio-economics has to do with Parsons as well in terms of their role and responsibility. Because in terms of consultation and engagement, that can't be dispelled to a third party. In the past, when it came to contracts, that was done by Public Works and Government Services Canada, which is an arm of the Canada, but Parsons is not. You might want to take a look at that. We're going to definitely take a look at that too, as well.

Natalie: So Parsons, in fact, work for us, for the federal government. So we tell them the scope and what we want contracting. They are just the experts in terms of timing and feasibility, etcetera. But just note that before they came on last year, they were actually our interim Construction Manager, so they actually have been on the Project for a number of years. It wasn't done by PWGSC. It was done by Parsons previously as well. I just wanted to put that out there. Thank you.

Kathy: Any questions for Johanne or William right now?

(Pause)

No? I was glad to hear you're going to be submitting comments on May 16<sup>th</sup>. We look forward to seeing the big reveal of all of our comments. I can't wait. It will be a long list of comments. I bet you guys can't wait for sure. You get to read them all in detail.

### **Update from Alternatives North**

Kathy: Unless you have anything further, we'll go on to Alternatives North. Who is presenting for you guys?

Gordon: Thanks. There's a little déjà-vu here. I feel I've said the same thing about once a year, and that's the issue of recruiting and retaining people to work on this Project on behalf of Alternatives North. My good friend here, when she spoke of the success of having recruited Todd...

*(Laughter)*

You know, Todd having gone from the Yellowknives Dene and then we retained him at Alternatives North that contributed substantially to his domestication.

*(Laughter)*

Then to find...So anyway more seriously and not surprisingly, much of the City said are similar concerns of ours in respect of QRA and Measure 6. We're very pleased to join the Socio-economic Advisory Board and look forward to that. But speaking for

Alternatives North, we regard the QRA as a process that is succeeding or positive. Don't feel quite so happy about Measure 6, but as I say, we're looking forward to the Socio-economic Advisory Board. I'll end it with that. Thank you.

Michael: I'm glad to be here with Alternatives North. I can't personally speak so much to what our successes have been over the past six months, because Katherine and I have only been attached to the Project for two months. I am personally a new Yellowknifer, so while I have some background myself with environmental science and climate change, and I worked on submissions to a water review process in Ontario, etcetera, I came in knowing close to nothing.

So my first big challenge, which turned into a success is that I've had the opportunity to read every word of the water license and a ton of back material, etcetera, to get a handle on what I'm talking about. But I feel I have something significant to bring to the table.

The second major challenge that I've encountered as I've gotten this far is seeing how large the shoes that Todd left for me to fill are, as I go back in all of the previous correspondence and comments on other things, etcetera. It has been a great help to me to have Katherine as an expert set of eyes to bounce things off of. We can tag team a little bit on different parts of this vast amount of data, but I'm appreciative that Todd has been willing to let me bounce questions off him, and of course Gordon has been here longer than I have as well, so he can speak more to what things we were doing six months ago.

I'll repeat what other people have said and say yes, I see a lot of good work and some very constructive dialogue and growth coming out of the QRA process. That's working much better than I expected. As we move forward, I'm quite sure that Measure 6 is going to be our primary challenge going forward.

Alternatives North will definitely be submitting questions on the water license review. As I said, I went through the entire thing once, and I'm going through it a second time with my scribbled, disorganized notes. We'll be coordinating our efforts to build what our submission is going to look that, but that will definitely happen before the 16<sup>th</sup>.

On the socio-economic side, I'm glad to see there is some movement in terms of setting what are reasonably effective key performance indicators. But it's going to be very interesting to see how we turn those into a tangible set of targets, numbers, requirements, measures...What happens if we fail to meet them, and so on.

Clearly there is a huge amount of work to do. I'm very aware that as a representative for Alternatives North here that we don't have quite the breadth of resources, particularly in terms of collective expertise that we can bring to bear, that some of the other parties do. So I hope that we will at the very least be able to offer some intelligence questions where something fails to make sense to us, so hopefully other

people with more expertise will be able to turn their lens towards to give us more clarity at the end of the process. Do you have anything you want to add?

Katharine: You both said a good amount. I don't want to take up too much time. Just in appendix, I'd also like to say that the water license presentation that you offered earlier a few weeks ago was really helpful to me. I appreciated it. Thanks.

Kathy: Great. Thank you for the triple tag-team here. Does anyone have any questions for Alternatives North?

*(Pause)*

Not right now? Okay. Oh yeah, go ahead.

William: I just have one quick question. Who will be the primary representative between the three of you working on the water license process?

Gordon: For the water license, it will be my call.

### **NSMA Update**

Kathy: Okay, thanks. Well then we'll move on to the North Slave Métis Alliance.

Jessica: Hello everyone. I'm with the North Slave Métis Alliance. Thank you for having us here. So for those of you have been wondering – I've been getting this question a lot – Shin is still around. He's still here. He still works at NSMA. He has just been very, very busy, so I've been taking over a lot of the files since starting in January. I've sat down with him and gotten a little bit of scope on what we've been up to for the last six months in regards to GMOB.

Our three main priorities or files in terms of this that we've been focusing on were mainly the Health Effects Monitoring, QRA, and a bit of the Stress Study. So still chugging along with Health Effects. We'll be having our meeting on May 15<sup>th</sup> with the team coming up from Ottawa. Our members are really interested in hearing about the results, whether they were participants or not.

QRA: I'll kind of reiterate what Todd and some of the others have said so far. I've attended two of the meetings, and the first one was really difficult and abstract, but I feel like we've been getting a lot of progress and more tangible examples in what the outcomes of QRA are going to be. So that's a good feeling to have.

The Stress Study itself has petered out a little bit for us, but we had some work in October asking our members what the Stress Study should be looking at, whether it be social determinants of health, displacement of Indigenous groups, degradation of land. We haven't heard back in a little while, but we're hoping get some scope on that.

Otherwise, in terms of successes, one of the biggest thing NSMA is recognizing has been how beneficial it is to have the regulatory analyst position funded for Giant Mine work. That has made a really big difference for us in allocating more time to this Giant file, pun intended.

Also, we have found we have had really good engagement with our members for the QRA. We've had about five members now follow through this Project in the last year or so. Some of them are really, really invested. I had one member call me this week very distraught that they couldn't make it to the last meeting. They really wanted to make sure that someone was replacing them. So we're getting engagement and interest, and they really appreciate the involvement through that.

Also, kind of what Katherine said, I really appreciate GMOB for having the water license presentation that you guys held a week and a half ago. That was good to reiterate some topics and process in general for water license.

Our biggest challenge has been similar to Michael, the staff turnover. So me taking over Nicole Goodman's position meant that I had to get up to speed very, very quickly on all of these topics that I've mentioned already. That's meant that unfortunately we weren't able to take advantage of the earlier application or submission of the water license, but we did want to acknowledge that was really, really appreciated. We acknowledge the hard work that the Giant Team put into making sure there was that extended time. It was completely on us for not taking advantage.

That being said, though, we will have our written comments by May 16<sup>th</sup>. We're looking forward to what other folks have presented for our thinking of this for now. I think that's about it. Let me just double-check that I didn't miss anything. No, that's it for North Slave Métis. Thank you.

Kathy: Thanks a lot. That was a great update, and good to hear you also will be submitting comments on May 16<sup>th</sup>. That's awesome. Are there any questions for the NSMA?

### **Government of Canada Update**

Kathy: No? Alright then. Then it's the Government of Canada.

Natalie: The first question was status of the water license application, and we haven't begun. No, just kidding.

*(Laughter)*

So that is one of our biggest successes was getting the water license submitted on April 1<sup>st</sup>. It is also a challenge as well, because we know it's going to take up a lot of our time as well as everyone in this room's time. So making sure everyone is able to

participate, and the other activities that need to carry on with the Project in terms of some engagement activities and updates need to be scheduled accordingly. So that's going to be a challenge over the course of this year.

We also lost our regulatory manager. Katherine Harris resigned from the Project, so that's a bit of a challenge. We do have a plan to replace her, but she has gone over to the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board, not on Giant.

Male: *(Question off mic regarding the file; marginally audible)*

Natalie: No she has to take a 12-month hiatus or cooling off period. That was a condition. A success on this Project is a funding success. Most of you know that Giant's funding was running out this year. This was our last year of the Federal Contaminated Site Action Plan. It was approved back in 2005 for 15 years. This was the final year.

Behind the scenes we've been working quite closely with our friends at the FCSAP Secretariat, as well as Treasury Board and CFO to renew the funding. So we did at the last budget in April got a budget announcement. We are no longer part of FCSAP. That was what we had been working on was to remove Giant from FCSAP. We partnered I guess, or conglomerated with them - eight other large mine sites in Canada.

We're calling it the Big 8. I don't think that's the official title, but we did get a budget announcement for the full implementation ask of Giant for the next 15 years. It was \$2.2 billion. That included all the other sites as well and over 15 years. So we have a bit of breathing room from the Project's perspective, to address Measure 6 and long-term funding. That's a very large success for us. Even though we're tight on budget this year, going into 2020, one implementation there is the budget there.

Echoing everyone else, the QRA has been very successful, although it has been a challenge as well, because this is a process that has never been done before. We're breaking new ground, so the scoping was the challenge. Adapting to everyone's needs and requests has been a challenge, and it has lengthened our original plan. But of course, hearing how everyone is saying it's so successful it is obviously working. We're obviously taking that as a success. We're not done. We hope it continues.

The YK HEMP has been a success as well. The first two years of sampling are completed, so that's a success that we managed to get the number of participants we wanted. We've got some results and some baseline work. Of course, there are some challenges with some of the results that we'll hear about in two weeks. It's also a challenge. I'll leave it at that. Did you have anything to add, Katherine? No, you're good? Okay, thank you.

Kathy: Any questions for Natalie?

Todd: Recognizing that I've used so much time already, I'll just point out - and I think I said this two years ago as well - this is an opportunity. The governments are equal parties

with the Board in the Agreement, so the Board functions when we're all active and involved. So if you guys have concerns with the implementation or the way things are going, here's an opportunity. This isn't just a bash on government kind of thing.

Natalie: I appreciate that Todd. Thank you. I don't have anything in my pocket, but maybe we'll think about that.

Ken F: I don't have a question. I just wanted to follow-up on a comment that you made on the QRA. I'd just like to echo that from my involvement with the QRA over the past...I guess it was August when I started into that. It has been very positive. The efforts that Team has made have been noted obviously by everyone in the room, and by myself as well. It's a very challenging process. I've been impressed with the Team that's doing it, and they are tackling those challenges in the best way they possibly could probably.

Johanne: I just want to also say that in terms of Giant Mine's role meeting with the community members, the City at large members, I think you guys did a good job. That's probably the first time you hear me say that.

*(Laughter)*

So I do want to thank the folks there for all the hard work you put into the process. It was a very well thought out process. When I first started on the Giant Mine file, I always said it was like a black hole. You didn't actually see the end in sight. Then when we got the surface design engagement process in place, I finally saw the end.

So I'm thankful for that. I would say that the process you implemented for Giant Mine Project in terms of closure and remediation and getting comments in on that and getting input on that from community members – I guess that would be the measure for all future projects in terms of how processes get done for Closure and Reclamation. I want to thank you for that. Mahsi.

Tony: Natalie, you mentioned about funding. That's great news about having the long-term funding in place or for Project implementation I should say. But you also mentioned that this year is tight. In what respects, if any, did you need to adjust your plans to reflect that tighter budget?

Natalie: That's a great question, because this was the last year of the FCSAP, so it was a locked-in envelope that we got locked in five years ago. So we didn't know ultimately what the cost would be. So in terms of cuts, our original...what we call a DWP or Detailed Work Plan that went in was \$65 million dollars. We got funded for \$45 million, so we took a \$20 million dollar cut. So we adjusted. We have no zero operational allowance for any on-site activities right now. That's contingency basically – contingency or cost overruns, or things come in it costs more.

That was the big cut. We cut some programs. I had it open, but it shut down. We cut some of our fieldwork for this summer. We cut back on some of our design. What we

cut back was the bare minimum. We also have a 20% holdback that we don't have in our budget right now. So there is a risk we will not get that come midterm Sups B I think they called it. If we don't get those, all design will halt this year.

Tony: I'm going to ask a cheeky question. Measure 6 is about stability of funding, and here we have evidence of a budget that by necessity, other circumstances at play, needed to be cut by a third. Not quite there, but getting pretty close. It's a substantial haircut. So I may be won't ask a question but note that compromise potentially compromises the ability of the Project to implement what it previously deemed to be necessary. I'll just make that observation.

That serves as evidence of the value of having permanent long-term funding in place that can't be year-to-year adjusted due to other factors. This particular instance is clearly just something that perhaps could have or could not have been anticipated. We appreciate that. But there was a need to reduce what was otherwise going to be done by virtue of the fact that money just wasn't available. Thank you.

Natalie: You're right. It does give some of that evidence, but I will also say the Project Team five years ago, we didn't anticipate a lot of the costs that we are now incurring, for instance. The destabilization of the underground, we've had to spend a great deal to keep the underground safe. So at least in my mind, when we're done implementation, the unknowns should go down. So our yearly predictions should be more accurate, which would at least help.

Katherine: I also want to point out that we're not...We haven't eliminated a lot of that work. It's work that can proceed later on as well in terms of design and what not. We took a really hard look. We spent a couple of days in work planning to say we have a lot of work this year. We always put plans a couple of years in advance going, "Let's do all of this." And with this year being in the water licensing process as well, it was an opportunity for the Team to sit back and go, "Realistically, what can we get done this year with the resources, the capacity, the human resources that we have in place?"

I think we actually have a much better, realistic look at what we can achieve over the coming year and get the design we will put in place, and things like that, to do so in a way that doesn't create a lot of people absolutely burning out. It was an opportunity for the Team to put a more realistic lens on things.

Kathy: Are there any more questions or comments? Go ahead, William.

William: I just have a quick question on the Engagement Manager position, Aaron Braumberger's position. As I understand it, his position is up for grabs right now. I'm just curious if he doesn't get that position, does the Project have any plans? Have you guys taken this into consideration of how you'll handle someone brand new on the Project to handle all the engagement, etcetera, etcetera. Can you just talk on that for a minute? That'd be great.



Natalie: Thanks, William. I meant to mention that, and I forgot. So thank you for the reminder. Aaron Braumberger, our Engagement Manager was only acting, and they would not let me extend him anymore. So an open process nationally across Canada was run a couple of months ago. All the resumes are sitting with me to screen them and do interviews to find an Engagement Manager, which could be Aaron.

Obviously the process has to run its course, so we may get someone new. If we do, we will follow the same processes we always do when we have a new person. You know, Aaron was new at one point. We'll have to cross that bridge when we come to it, but it's possible. In terms of timing, it's sitting with me, and it is just timing. I'm hoping to get it done as soon as possible.

Rebecca: I guess on that point, I think the question was asked at the Council meeting, would the role locate to Yellowknife now that it's out for competition?

Natalie: The position does reside in Yellowknife. It was advertised as located in Yellowknife. If there was no successful Canada that is in Yellowknife or would relocate to Yellowknife, there is the potential I could look at alternatives. But that is not the intent.

Rebecca: But the candidate has the choice of locating to Yellowknife or not?

Natalie: Yes. The job is in Yellowknife. They are expected to live here or relocate here.

Rebecca: Okay, they are expected to, though?

Natalie: Yes.

Rebecca: Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

Natalie: But I was saying if it was an unsuccessful competition, I could look at other avenues.

Rebecca: Yeah, because Council had some concerns that the Engagement Manager wasn't located in Yellowknife, so we're happy to hear they will be required to move here.

Natalie: Yeah. Absolutely.

William: Just to follow-up on that, I would suggest that we stay in close communication when you get word that somebody new will be coming on board, because that seems like that's the likely approach. It would be wise to have that new person participate in say the healing ceremony that we do, Aboriginal Day ceremony, you know all the different things that we do that are culturally appropriate to ready them for the process in front of us.

Natalie: I will also add that it was open to everyone, so I believe we have some applications from all groups potentially.

Kathy: Are there any further questions or comments for CIRNAC? If not we'll move to the GNWT.

## **GNWT Update**

Erika: Successes for us include getting Alex Lynch on board as our Technical Specialist. He's a wonderful guy and also very smart and hardworking. That really has contributed a lot to my work life balance, on a personal note. But also he has contributed a lot to the Project, especially in the preparation of management plans, the water license application, and really being a wonderful liaison between different departments. He really has become the go-to guy of "Hey, can you help the Project figure this out with this department?" Alex makes it happen, so his contributions have been really great. So Ben, tell him I said this, and it's on the record.

Also the TK Study, the GNWT was able to provide a lot of resources for that on behalf of the Project Team. But we are just about to get the final report coming in. So that's exciting for YKDFN to finally have that done with the scope that they wanted. That's great.

I will pat CIRNAC on the shoulder a little bit. Even though they had \$25 million dollar cuts and tight budgets, they were able to fund the contribution agreement proposals that came in. So that was an area they really pushed back on to say, "No you're not cutting this." Great job there.

Another success that isn't really in the GNWT shop, but compensation discussions have started with the Chiefs and the Regional Director General, Matt Spence. That's great, and I know that William and Johanne are planning a community meeting before their water license comments. They shared with us last week about how they want to have leadership there and give updates to membership. That's great news, and that's a lot for you guys to report back on to membership on all sorts of things.

Another success is our communications. We're looking at other ways to engage, so we've done a video with GMOB drone footage. We're looking at doing a video for the HEMP results. We have the VR stuff that we have had at various public forums, and that's a great source for YKDFN and others to see what the site will look like at the end of the day. I know that our guys are looking at getting actual – because we would actually have to bring people up – now we're looking at actually buying the goggles and can use it more frequently.

So we're looking at ways to do a better job with VR stuff, visuals, videos, and plain language handouts. We have some of that stuff. We have some rendered drawing. The plan is when we come to engage on borrow and Baker to have more of the future site – what it looks like. That has begun. This is all new, and we're looking at better engagement on that. So that's a success, because we're thinking outside of the typical box.

Challenges: Clearly after getting grilled on GNWT's role in reviewing water license materials, that's a challenge on how we remain transparent but be involved. Then yesterday we talked a lot about the socio-economic side of things and how the Project isn't really seeing the big picture, the holistic view of indirect tourism, for example. Ginger gave a presentation on that- tourism, restaurants, and all sorts of things. We're doing what the Project can do and has control over. That's a challenge to really get GNWT partners who have that mandate on board and engaged. They are a little bit, and it will continue to be a challenge for us to get the right people doing the things that they need to.

A challenge is Aaron leaving, but we have an Engagement Team, and I'm not going anywhere for the next year. I've been pretty heavily involved, so you're stuck with me. You know, on the Engagement Team are Natalie, Alex, Geneva, and myself. So there is consistency even though we've lost Aaron for now. We'll just roll with the punches. That's it for me.

Todd: Maybe you brought this up, but the extension of the HEMPAC is another success for you guys as well.

Female: Extension?

Todd: Laser ablation, blah, blah, blah. I don't really understand. You got to the end part of one and moving on to the next stage and getting it funded. Thumbs up.

Kathy: Are there any questions or comments for Erika, the GNWT? I will pass on that yesterday – all the days run together. It might have been Monday. Meeting just internally, David Livingstone also attended the last QRA session and also wanted to pass on that good job to the Team. Also he noted as someone who has had a role as a Senior Manager for many years at INAC – Erika you were there, and Natalie – You go to all these meetings, and you're listening to people firsthand. A lot of leaders of projects don't do that, because you have work piling up on your desk as well. Anyway, he just noted that he was impressed that you guys attend all these sessions as well. You don't just leave it to consultants or whatever. You're there. Is there anything else for Erika?

Erika: I will note that we will...If the offer is still there for tonight's meeting for GNWT to provide an update on a couple of your recommendations that were directed to us on the Legacy, arsenic, what is happening offsite, and also the education piece. We have been approved to speak to that at the meeting tonight. I don't know if you'll open it up to us or if there are questions we can answer, but I will be there. Alex will be there, and Diep might be. Anyway, we can provide a public update on that.

Kathy: Great, thanks. I'll speak to you later about how to make that happen. Okay, we're at the end of this part of the agenda. I noticed we're past the 4:00 period, but Todd assured me you guys wouldn't need an hour. That's what he said anyway.

Todd: I'm not so confident anymore.

### **Reconciliation Issues & Actions**

Kathy: The next agenda item, we don't have much left on our agenda anyway, but the next agenda item is our standing item on reconciliation issues and actions. We did talk about this with the Project Team yesterday. In our annual report, we sort of made the comment that we weren't sure that the spirit of reconciliation had been fully embraced by the Project. They were listing the ways that they are making real efforts. They increased our awareness of those efforts.

From our perspective, we just want to continue to keep this on the table and encourage people to continue to think about this in all aspects of the Project. We don't want to lose site of that, so we keep bringing it up. As we were talking about, reconciliation is a process, not an event. It doesn't happen once and then it's done. We just have to keep on speaking about it.

So I just wanted to see...We don't have a formal structure for this part of the agenda, if anyone wants to speak up about any new thoughts or activities in the realm of reconciliation?

Natalie: We did talk quite a bit with GMOB yesterday. I will let people know that we did express a bit of disappointment on the annual report and how it was mentioned numerous times that the Project Team hasn't embraced reconciliation.

We called to GMOB to help guide us in this if that is the case, because we think we really have embraced it, and we have done quite a bit. We did go through that with GMOB yesterday in terms of starting off with the blanket exercise and the Residential School Day that we brought every single member of our team – and I don't mean just INAC. I mean consultants, Golder from Vancouver, Dave Colburn from Halifax. I mean we brought the whole team for this, and it was mandatory.

As you say, it wasn't a one-time event, but we did that. David had asked us how we brought that into our Project, and at that time we didn't have an answer. It was so fresh. But we carry it with us every day, the knowledge we've gained. It was a knowledge. It was a learning and an understanding, and we bring that now to everything we do in our day-to-day activities. So that was invaluable.

But we've also responded to increased funding for the YKDFN. We now fund three full-time positions to assist, and the same for the City and the North Slave Métis. So we are responding to those requests. We haven't turned many away. Obviously some of our funding is tight, so we can't do everything. But we've done a lot.

The contracts that have been awarded to date, there have been four to Det'on Cho. They are joint ventures, but four of the big contracts being the surface care and maintenance, and the underground care and maintenance. Contracts can go a long way toward reconciliation.

We did the Archeological Impact Study. We got consent from the Elders, both YKDFN and with the North Slave Métis. We brought them on site to walk the site and to guide us in the Traditional Knowledge component of that. We're working with Erika. We've funded a Traditional Knowledge study for the YKDFN.

These are just some of the things I've listed. We have a socio-ec position, as I mentioned, both at Parsons and our team as well, and at YKDFN, so we can address the recommendations and concerns on the socio-ec. So it's not something we feel like we're not trying to do.

We put the call out to GMOB, but I'll put it out to the rest of the parties as well. If there are things or suggestions on how we can better address that, we are certainly open to it. I take that personally and seriously. I don't want to see that we're not taking it seriously, because we are. Thank you.

Johanne: I'm appreciative that Giant Mine is taking steps towards reconciliation, but I think when it comes to that topic, which is a very, very sensitive topic for the Yellowknives Dene, we're thinking about two different ways of reconciling with the past.

You're working and strengthening up the reconciliation aspects in terms of processes that you're delivering, which is actually different from addressing the past impacts. Those are two different reconciliations. I just want to mention that. And I'm not too sure if you understand that, but in terms of reconciliation, by process-driven reconciliation I meant in terms of how you include the Yellowknives in terms of their voice into your processes. This is different than when you go to a community meeting and you hear Elders talk about compensation. That is a different reconciliation aspect.

Erika: Thanks, Johanne. Yeah, that's important to think about. Thanks. That kind of made a light go off in my head. I guess one of the things I wonder is...I know another success is we reported back to the community on the CRP last week, and it was great. There was a lot of great feedback. But within that, some of the questions that we heard were, "Hey, why don't you have the history of our...Why don't you present on our history, or what life was like before?" I mean my response was we've been sensitive about speaking on behalf of the YKDFN, and I know that you're preparing work.

Moving forward, I think one way that we could think about recognizing the past is to have handouts that you have prepared at our meetings, or including it on our website, things that are associated with the Project. I mean I'm happy to explore that kind of stuff where we help share your story and recognize that it's part of the mine site and part of the whole big picture. That might be one way. I don't know.

I mean I don't know what you're thinking about. Like Natalie said, happy to hear input on how we can still be in the past and reconciliation for that, rather than just moving forward. That's one way that came to my mind of just helping share your story and including it in our materials.

Just on that: I know that the North Slave Métis Alliance are working on some Traditional Knowledge materials as well. People have been impacted by colonization. Members of the Métis Alliance are also residential school survivors and all that, so we look to you for input as well if there are meaningful, tangible ways that we can do that with North Slave Métis. Let us know.

Kathy: Do you want to speak? Go ahead, William.

William: I was just going to say I do have to agree with Natalie that the Project has made significant changes from where it was in 2015 to where it is today. So you know, I do have to say thank you for that, because there are some significant changes, especially in accommodation and inclusion in certain things.

Going back to Johanne, the process right now is good. Including us in things and taking us seriously leads to reconciliation, but at the end of the day, there is still the great big elephant in the room of the legacy and the history of Giant. You kind of can't have one without the other. So not to discredit our thank you, but it's just that at the end of the day, that still needs to be addressed for it come full circle.

I guess I would say in terms of continuing these reconciliation activities, just continue general engagement with the community. You know, people really appreciate coming into the community and engaging, even if you talked about it three months ago. To the Project and to myself, we're fully engaged in this and we see it every day, but to community members they might not see it every day. So to come every three months, that to me is real strides to reconciliation. Not only that, just healing ceremonies and sharing circles and different activities like that are other great opportunities for the Project to take.

Erika: Thanks, William. That's really useful. One thing I will mention is I've been chatting with Liz Liske, and I gave an update on the Stress, and yesterday to GMOB. We are working on that, but we are working now very closely with YKDFN for them to be more involved. So Liz has been hired to help drive the Stress Study on behalf of the YKDFN, but she also will be involved in other aspects of the Project.

One thing I've learned from Liz is that she really has wisdom on cultural knowledge or sensitivities for us to consider. One of the things she suggested was providing some terminology and learning how to say important words in Weledeh, their definition, and being able to speak that in meetings or have it in reports. That's something that I have engaged Mary-Rose Sundberg with, and we're working on that.

So that advice was really tangible, and Liz said that would go a long with the Elders to pay a little bit of attention to how they communicate. A little thing can go a really long way. That's one way that we're exploring that. With videos, we're having that translated. Just, we're open to learning more about how to do that.

Kathy: From GMOB's side too, speaking to some of what Natalie was talking about and the distinction you made about moving forward, the reconciliation piece, the legacy piece, and how we've been trying to distinguish more and get better at figuring out who we should direct recommendations to. Apology and compensation is really at a higher level than the Project Team. There are all these different levels of government and different kinds of government, and we're trying to find the best path to make our recommendations to so we can address both those aspects of reconciliation. We'll keep that up for sure.

William: Sorry, Tony. I just want to also note on that. I can't speak directly on the progress of the compensation and apology, but I can say that over the past year or two, there has been a lot of work put into that, and I'm sure the Project Team is pushing to get that on the DG side. There has been a lot of progress put towards that. That right there is definitely a good news story from the Project side of things. There has been significant progress over the past year or two.

Tony: I'm just trying to get a better understanding. For reconciliation to work, I think there would need to be a common understanding of what the expectation is in terms of the actions that you take and the involvement of the YKDFN, the NSMA, and the processes. Do you ever sit down together and talk specifically about this topic, and develop a common understanding of what the expectation is, and maybe an action plan of what to do to address it to say, "What if we did this? Would that be of value?" Is there any sort of roll-up-your-sleeves and talk about what would work? Do you do that?

Erika: Not directly. It comes up, but we haven't done a sit-down-and-roll-up-your-sleeves and actually say what would work if we did this. That could be an action or a suggestion. We could think about how we could do that. Thank you.

Tony: I'm just thinking that William and Johanne, you both acknowledge that there are some positive steps being taken, but then there is a degree of missing the mark, right? I'm wondering if there was more sitting down periodically. Not to talk about all the other topics that you have to talk about, but actually this question of reconciliation to say "How can we calibrate it so that we bring it closer?" You might find you continue to miss if you are not actually talking specifically about that topic. It's just a thought for the future maybe.

Johanne: I just want to say thank you for that, for those thoughts. I'm very thankful that when it comes to Yellowknives Dene First Nation - and I'm sure everybody here is aware in terms of the losses we have had as a result of Giant - I'm very thankful the folks here understand what those losses are and are speaking on reconciliation issues. For both of us, we're very thankful for all of you folks to do that. Mahsi.

Kathy: Thanks. Yeah, go ahead, Jessica.

Jessica: I'll be quick. I know in terms for North Slave, I think one of our main expectations or hopes moving forward in terms of reconciliation is just a continued conversation. Just from what I have heard from members, it is very varied what the expectations are in terms of what reconciliation looks like with Giant Mine.

Our members' relationship to the mine and their experience in history is unique, as many groups have had. It is different from YKDFN, so the expectations might be similar. They might overlap, but they might be completely different as well. I appreciate the point you made, Tony, about it being a point of conversation just to see what the expectations versus the assumptions meet, or if they are running parallel. I would definitely support the consideration of such a conversation moving forward.

### **Additional Agenda Items, Next Steps, and Next Meeting**

Kathy: Thanks for that contribution as well. Anything else on this topic before we move on?

*(Pause)*

Okay. Additional agenda items: I don't think anyone identified anything in particular, other than us getting out of the room so you guys can talk.

Female: *(Name not stated)* Just on that note, however, I poked you and David yesterday to ask on the director, when you're getting out of the room, if we could have some guidance or a reminder of how things are. Is that what you're talking about, or are you saying we're closing the meeting? What are we doing?

So unless you're prepared, Todd, to brief everyone of what was done in the past, who signs what letters, the terms, because I think, or Kerry, I think we can all just be on the same page that we know what we're doing, because clearly I don't.

Kerry: Todd and I had spoken about this. Thankfully he contacted Ben to have it added as an agenda item. For anyone that participated as part of the Environmental Agreement negotiations, each party had the authority to appoint one director to the Giant Mine Oversight Body. Those appointments were only for a specified period of time. We're nearing the expiration date, which seems kind of crazy.

Part of that negotiation, for anyone that was present, also included discussion and commitment amongst the parties to have a discussion amongst ourselves about any possible reappointments. We all recognize at the time that it didn't make sense to have five engineers sit, or four lawyers. It was that as a group, we would have discussion about if there were any gaps. Also as Todd indicated when he emailed, it is helpful if GMOB let us know if they were experiencing any gaps or noticed anything



that was missing, just so we could keep that in the back of our mind when we are looking at possible reappointments.

Another item for us to discuss is possible staggering, because it doesn't make sense for all director position to expire at the exact same time. Then we get no overlap and no continuity of knowledge. So that's why we requested this to be added. We don't often get together as parties, and Todd just thought this would be great if we tag it on at the end. We don't want to get into a position where all the directors positions have expired and we are scrambling to fill.

As far as I'm aware, all directors have indicated that they are willing to stay on GMOB. You can correct me if I'm wrong.

Ben: The only clarification I have is the list – I gave the list of expiry dates to Todd, but all the GMOB members at the last meeting agreed to stay for the year until their term is completed. That's the only commitment you have from the directors.

Todd: Two things to add: There is nothing to prevent reappointment. So our appointee is Tony. If Tony doesn't screw it up in the next couple of weeks, he may get reappointed.

*(Laughter)*

Kathy replaced me as the Yellowknives rep., so you have an extra 140 days on your term. Ken, you replaced Stephan Gabos so you have an extra 6 months, 8 months something like that... so there is a tiny bit of staggering. In the bylaws, it says we're going to try to stagger so that no more than two directors have the same appointment date.

Female? When is the expiry date?

Ben: August the 31<sup>st</sup>.

Kathy: I think at that stage, we should take ourselves out then. In terms of next meeting and next steps, it's always in November-ish. We don't have a specific date yet. We wanted to look at the water licensing schedule and the Geoscience schedule. Ben's going to have a good think about it and then we'll put it out to ask people for possible dates.

Rebecca: I just have one question. It would be really helpful if in the next two minutes, if GMOB Directors have any insight or comments on if there has been any glaring omission in the makeup of GMOB? Because potentially not all four directors who expire in August are going to want to stay on, so if we're looking at a reappointment, is there anything that GMOB would give us as an indication of if it was a good makeup. Was there something missing? Just so we can have that in the back of our mind if we're in the situation where we have to go seek new appointments.

Ginger: I don't know what people thought they were getting when they got me, but I came with a background of managing bigger cleanups within the federal government. So I came with a background of understanding the processes and policies that would be in place for a big federal contract. If you were looking for a replacement, you have to decide if you think that skillset is still applicable.

Understanding the federal government and how its federal bureaucracy works was also something that I hopefully brought. Just coincidentally, I had an interest in socio-economic issues and community aspects related to socio-economic participation. That was kind of tangential, and it wasn't really required in the first couple of years, because primarily I was involved with looking at the Project plans and Project management, how it was structured, and all of that kind of stuff. But more recently, that is one of the things that has come up as being a potential issue. Again, depending on what you're looking for going forward, that I think was the skillset that I brought, for what it's worth. Thank you.

Kathy: Yeah, I was going to say I think as Board we've always felt we had very complementary skillsets that we just happened to hit...You pulled the wheel, and you got a good combination. Tony's experience on the engineering side has been invaluable. Ginger's experience with understanding federal government workings and also the socio-economic has been incredible. Ken's our man on the street. He's the guy that everyone on the street actually talks to and they tell things to. He has the experience and knowledge.

Ken Froese with his Human Health Risk Assessment stuff, David with contaminated sites in general, and myself I just talk a lot. That works. I think the skillsets that we've had have been really good. I don't think we've felt we were missing anything in particular. It has never felt like we've been missing something. Oh apparently I'm wrong.

Ginger: But if we found we were missing something, we were able to go out and get that resource. So when it came to legal issues, we were able to engage that. Again, having more expertise than any one particular technical area, we were able to find it and hire it.

Kathy: Yeah, so I guess that's the answer to the question. We didn't see any glaring errors. I guess in my experience in regulatory, and David's experience in regulatory have also been helpful I think, and water in general. Did you have any other questions for us?

Todd: No, procedurally we have to ask you that.

Kathy: Oh, right. It wasn't just because.

Todd: This whole process is just....This is mandated under either the Environmental Agreement or the bylaws. They are blending together in my mind. I think the bylaws for this one. So that's why it is getting triggered.

Kathy: Okay. Yeah, that's great, and we're glad you're doing it now, especially with the water licensing process coming up. Do we adjourn the meeting now and you guys carry on, or are you going to adjourn it when you're done?

Rebecca: You'd adjourn it now, because the meeting is ending. This is just the Parties getting together. It's not a GMOB meeting.

Kathy: Okay, I want to thank everyone. I thought this was a really great discussion. These discussions are getting more and more interesting with every meeting. We get to a lot of different topics. Thanks for everyone bringing your best game to the table. Hopefully we'll see you all later on this evening. With that, unless anyone has another comment, I'll ask for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

There's a motion from Ginger, and it is seconded by William.

William: I'll second it.

Kathy: Okay, great. Well we'll see you later. Thank you.

**MEETING ADJOURNED**



---

Dr. Kathy Racher  
Chair  
Giant Mine Oversight Board

January 16, 2020

Date

## **Motions; GMOB and the Semi-Annual Parties Meeting, May 1, 2019**

**Motion: Moved:** Kerry Penney moved to approve the agenda. (page3)

**Seconded:** Ken Froese

**Motion carried.**

**Motion: Moved:** Katherine Ross moved to approve the minutes from November 15, 2018 with noted changes. (page 4)

**Seconded:** Natalie Plato

**Motion carried.**

**Motion: Moved:** Todd Slack move for Kathy Racher to Chair the meeting. (page 9)

**Seconded:** Diep Duong.

**Motion carried.**

**Motion: Moved:** Ginger Stones moved to adjourn the meeting. (page 59)

**Seconded:** William Lines.

**Motion carried.**

## **Action items; GMOB and the Semi-Annual Parties Meeting, May 1, 2019**

- 1. Action item:** GNWT to contact the YK Historical Society for historical immigration information involving the establishment of Giant Mine for the educational module. (page 7)
- 2. Action item:** GMOB to work with the Parties to coordinate a meeting to report progress on the educational module. (page 8)
- 3. Action item:** GNWT to report next meeting on the progress of GNWT discussions with Newmont (Con Mine) regarding information needs for the offsite contamination initiative. (page 8)
- 4. Action item:** GMRP to share the draft key performance indicators with the Parties when completed. (page 9)
- 5. Action item:** GMOB ED to share public concerns with the relevant Parties on a scheduled basis (page 18)
- 5. Action item:** GMOB to develop an information sheet and communications protocol for the GMOB research program to be shared with all Parties (page 23)

- 6. Action item:** GMOB and YKDFN to arrange a meeting with the YKDFN leadership update them on the status of the GMOB Research Program. (page 25)
- 7. Action item:** Parties to share their thoughts on how the departmental expertise in the GNWT can be actively involved in the water licencing process going forward. (page 39)
- 8. Action item:** Project Team to arrange a meeting with YKDFN and NSMA to discuss how to continue build upon reconciliation initiatives going forward. (page 56)