

**Verbatim Minutes**  
**GIANT MINE REMEDIATION PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENT**  
**SEMI ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PARTIES**  
**December 16, 2020**  
**Via Zoom Conference Call**

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| <b>Present</b>  | <p><b><u>Giant Mine Oversight Board</u></b><br/>Ben Nind – Executive Director<br/>Tony Brown - Director<br/>Ken Froese – Director<br/>Ken Hall – Director<br/>Mark Palmer - Director<br/>Paul Green – Contractor</p> <p><b><u>North Slave Métis Alliance</u></b><br/>Jessica Hurtubise</p> <p><b><u>Yellowknives Dene First Nation</u></b><br/>William Lines</p> <p><b><u>City of Yellowknife</u></b><br/>Todd Slack</p> <p><b><u>Government of Canada (CIRNAC)</u></b><br/>Chris MacInnis<br/>Natalie Plato<br/>Katherine Ross<br/>Jessica Mace</p> <p><b><u>Government of the Northwest Territories</u></b><br/>Diep Duong<br/>Alex Lynch</p> <p><b><u>Alternatives North</u></b><br/>Katharine Thomas<br/>Gordon Hamre</p> |
| <b>Regrets:</b> | <p><b><u>Giant Mine Oversight Board</u></b><br/>David Livingstone<br/>Kathy Racher</p>  |

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

**Agenda Item 1: Welcome & Introductions**

Tony: Hi everybody. Welcome back. We will just wait another couple of minutes to make sure everybody's here, and then we'll get rolling. Thanks.

*(Pause)*

I think we are just waiting for Gordon and Jessica Mace?

William: I don't have a camera to turn on, but just wanted to let you know I'm here.

Tony: Thanks, William.

Tony: Okay, we've got everybody. Thanks for coming back. You could have run away, but you came back. We are now transitioning into the Semi-Annual Meeting. This is less formal than the last one, not that the last one was terribly formal. There is full flexibility here in terms of the approach we take. Yes, you've got in front of you the agenda for the meeting, but we can shift things around more this time. We can add items as you wish. However, it is a totally separate meeting.

Like the last time, there will be a separate set of transcripts prepared for this. As a result, in order to have a full record of the Semi-Annual Meeting, we need to do a quick roundtable for the record of who is participating in the call. To begin, I'll just summarize on behalf of GMOB, I'm Tony Brown, Director. We also have Ken Hall, a Director; Ken Froese, a Director; and Mark Palmer, a Director. On the staff side of GMOB, we have Ben Nind and Paul Green. Just because I offended you last time, GNWT, you get to lead off.

Diep: Hi, this is Diep Duong with the GNWT.

Alex: Hi everyone. Alex Lynch with GNWT on the Project Team.

Tony: YKDFN? William, are you on here?

William: Oh sorry, yeah. It's William Lines with the Yellowknives Dene.

Tony: Thank you. NSMA?

Jess: Hi, it's Jessica Hurtubise with NSMA.

Tony: Alternatives North?

Katharine T: Hi, Katharine Thomas with Alternatives North.

Gordon: Gordon Hamre with Alternatives North.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

Tony: And CIRNAC?

Chris: Everyone, Chris MacInnis, Director with CIRNAC on the Project.

Natalie: Hi everyone. Natalie Plato, Deputy Director on the Project.

Katherine R: Hi everyone. It's Katherine Ross, Manager on the Project.

Jessica M: Hi, all. It's Jessica Mace with the Engagement Manager on the Project.

Tony: And that's it for CIRNAC. City of Yellowknife?

Todd: Todd with the City.

**Agenda Item 2: Approval of the Agenda**

Tony: Okay, thanks for doing that all one more time. With respect to the agenda, are there any proposed changes that people would like to see?

Natalie: Hi, I would like to propose that during the roundtable that Government of Canada goes last or closer to the end. Thank you.

Tony: Is there any party that doesn't support that change?

*(Pause)*

Okay, great. We will rearrange to suit that then. Thanks, Natalie. Are there any other comments on the agenda?

*(Pause)*

Just a note, prior to the meeting, or set of meetings, the City of Yellowknife – Todd Slack – you provided an email with a number of questions that you wanted to have discussed through this process. We're suggesting that those be addressed under "Other Business" if that's acceptable to you? You would still go through the roundtable item on the agenda. You will do your City of Yellowknife roundtable, and then we would address those comments you provided by email in additional business at the end, if that's workable for you.

Todd: Sure, no problem.

Tony: Alright, one last call to ask if there any changes to the agenda. Otherwise, we'll approve. No requests. Can I have a motion to approve the agenda, please?

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

Natalie: I'll move that.

Todd: I'll second.

Tony: Todd seconds.

**Agenda Item 3: Review of Action Items**

Tony: Moving on to Item 3. From the minutes of the last Semi-Annual Meeting, which was on the 27<sup>th</sup> of August 2020, there were several action items there. We will just briefly go through them. The first item was the Chair of GMOB will submit a final draft of the RFP for the five-year review of the Environmental Agreement to the Parties, RFP Evaluation Committee.

The next item is the RFP Evaluation Committee will produce the final RFP version and send it to GMOB administration for posting. The third and final action was GMOB Administration will post the RFP on MERX, GMOB website, and distribute to appropriate community consultants.

The view of GMOB is that all of these actions have been completed. Is there anybody that has information contrary to that conclusion?

**Agenda Item 4: Approval of Minutes Previous Meeting**

Tony: Thank you. In addition, just like the AGM, we did distribute verbatim minutes. Are there any recommended changes to those minutes? We did hear earlier some comments of requests for name changes, and we weren't sure which set of minutes they belong in, but certainly if they belong to this set, those will be corrected. Aside from that type of thing, does anybody else have requested changes to the last set of verbatim minutes for the Semi-Annual and General Meeting?

Gordon: I can live with the words attributed to me, but I can't live with the punctuation. I...  
*(Inaudible...Voice garbled)*

Tony: Yes, absolutely. If you will extend a note to Ben with the specific changes that you would like to make, that would be fine. I'm presuming that although grammar often changes intent, that in this case the overall meaning won't be changed to the extent that we wouldn't be able to approve the minutes today.

Gordon: I would agree with your suggestion *(inaudible)*...issue.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

Tony: Well then, any other last comments on those minutes? If not, I will request a motion to approve the minutes, conditional on the limitation on the grammatical corrections that Gordon will send to Ben Nind. Can I have a motion please?

**Action Item 1:** Alternatives North to send proposed punctuation corrections for the Semi-Annual Minutes 2020 08 27 to the GMOB ED for correction.

Gordon moves. A seconder? Diep seconds. Thank you.

**Agenda Item 5: Update on the Five-Year Review of the Environmental Agreement**

Tony: Alright, so the minutes are approved. Next is an update on the five-year review of the Environmental Agreement. Everybody on the phone, I assume anyway that all of you, certainly your organizations are familiar with the review that is ongoing. All of that information has been shared with you previously. A point of note that you may not be aware of is that ARKTIS has asked for an extension to the end of January 2021 to complete their review. GMOB has agreed to this extension.

In terms of this process, are there any questions or comments about what is happening on the five-year review?

Todd: I would just say that the timeline, as proposed – I know that you just said, we’re giving them an extension. The timeline was extremely tight, and I don’t understand why that was the case. I am happy to hear that there is an extension so this can be done with the appropriate amount of time and not rushed.

Tony: Noted. Thank you, Todd. Are there any other comments or questions about the five-year review?

Diep: I think the intent initially was to wrap it up before 2020, because it was the five-year review, but we are fine with the extension.

Tony: Thank you, Diep.

William: I got disconnected. I just wanted to say I’m back on.

Tony: Hey, William. We hear you.

**Agenda Item 6: Roundtable Highlights from Each Party**

Tony: Okay, we will move into the roundtable with the highlights from each party. GMOB has already given a fairly lengthy summary of our activities over the last year during the AGM. We are proposing to not duplicate that now so you don’t have to sit through

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

it all. Certainly, if any Party requests us to repeat some of what we said or expand upon it, we are happy to do so.

This roundtable is primarily for the other Parties of the Environmental Agreement. What we are hoping to hear from you, and by all means expand to the greatest degree that you want and talk about other topics that are not on this brief list of ideas of what you might speak to, is perhaps the Pre-engagement Management Plan reviews that all parties have been participating in and Early Works in the case of the Project Team. That is something that you are actively engaged in. There is the MCM Socio-Economic Action Plan update that the Project Team may want to speak to, and then the Community Wellness process that is also ongoing. Don't limit yourselves to those topics. By all means, use this as your opportunity to provide a synopsis of what has happened over the last year, highlighting your success, concerns, and priorities.

As Natalie said, we moved Government of Canada. They will wrap up the session. Otherwise, we have the Government of Northwest Territories first on the list if you would like to go ahead.

**Summary by the GNWT**

Alex: Hello, everyone. Maybe I'll start with the Community Wellness Study, Katherine, if you're okay with that, and jump in as well if we're missing anything. There were some delays with that work, primarily around COVID, so the submission to the Research and Ethics Board required there to be some COVID protocols because of the face-to-face component in the implementation of that research.

The study team has developed those COVID protocols, and the package for the Research and Ethics Board is ready to go. They are waiting for one health and safety piece, because there will be, as I mentioned, an in-person face-to-face person where there will also be an office rented for that purpose. The Ethics Board also requires some health and safety details. That's the last thing, but the Study Team is looking to submit the package without that, because they don't want to hold it up any further.

They are hoping to start implementation in March, but this is really dependent upon the NWT relaxing their COVID restrictions through the next phase of...I forget which phase it is, but essentially the next phase where face-to-face can happen. This is really dependent, I think, on how COVID plays out in the rest of Canada as to how and when the Public Health Office here will go into that next phase. We are aiming for March. We will see what happens, but that is essentially where the Project is. There are some pieces that they are still working on with Community Wellness with the YKDFN. However, work is moving along, and we are looking forward to seeing what comes out of the Research and Ethics Board submission.

I don't know if there are any questions. Feel free to jump in if there are questions, or Katherine if I'm missing anything.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

Tony: Alex, I missed right at the beginning when you said Ethics. Are they submitting now before Christmas, or what is the timeline?

Alex: They have just reached out to the Ethics Board to get approval if they can submit the package with both this health and safety piece, which they think they will be able to. That is the plan, and if that's the case, they will submit the package, and then the health and safety piece will go in after.

Tony: Okay.

Todd: Alex, will there be other individuals contributing on the GNWT summary?

Alex: I have a couple of other things that I can touch on too. I was just pausing to see if there were any questions on the Wellness study. If there are no other questions I can move on.

*(Pause)*

Okay, so as you are aware, Erika is off on deferred leave, so we are working to backfill my position. We will have someone else in the GNWT hopefully in the New Year. I wanted to touch on the Offsite Risk Assessment work.

We have been talking about this for some time. We went back to the YKDFN this spring to engage on the traditional land use area that is being looked at within that risk assessment. With that area, there were suggestions to expand. Because of that, there were a few lakes that were identified that are used traditionally by the Yellowknives Dene, so there are some water and fish samples that were required. This is Mason, Stuart, Duck, and Hay Lake.

Further to that, there were some data gaps for small mammals within that traditional land use area as well. Those were collected this summer, and the risk assessment has a draft. We have reviewed it. We are hoping to engage on that probably in February of the New Year.

As part of that, I just wanted to mention, there is also a separate grayling memo that will be included with the Risk Assessment, because we heard from the Yellowknives as well that there are concerns about the risk to eating grayling if they are caught in a net that comes from Baker Creek. We worked with YKDFN, to conduct some sampling this summer, so we were able to collect eight additional grayling samples. There will be a separate memo that looks at the risk of consuming grayling.

Further to that, and I think Erika mentioned this before but I just wanted to mention it just in case, there was also a separate memo that looked at worker exposure to arsenic along the Ingraham Trail passing past Giant Mine. This was a request, I believe

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

from the NWT Federation of Labour. That work is completed, so we will be engaging on that as well with folks. I just need to confirm, and I was thinking about this before the call, but I think we are just waiting to get some internal approval before it gets sent out. That Risk Assessment is ready to go. We have shared that with, I think Health Canada has looked at that and provided some comments as well through our Legacy Arsenic separate communications group that we work with. A number of the folks on this call sit on that committee as well.

I also just wanted to note as well that Claire McAuley, who is an engineer, a risk assessor, and a specialist in risk communications, is supporting GNWT on various projects. For the Offsite Risk Assessment, she is helping with developing some communication tools. She also is supporting that Health Effects Monitoring Program, assisting a bit with the quantitative risk assessment communication tools as well, because we are adapting engagement tools for the Risk Assessment because of COVID. Claire is supporting us. We have had some good feedback from various rights and stakeholders on Claire's involvement, so she will continue to support GNWT on various initiatives.

I think the last thing is the Perpetual Care Plan submission. That went to GMOB, as we are all aware, in November, so we are looking forward to next steps on that work, which we will send to the people who have on-boarded to help draft the RFP for the next stage of work where the bulk of that plan's development will take place. Diep, I don't know if there is anything else you want to add, but that was all I had.

Diep: I don't have anything else to add. Thanks, Alex.

Tony: Okay, thanks very much, Alex and Diep. Okay, Alternatives North, please.

**Update from Alternatives North**

Katharine: Since the last Semi-Annual meeting in August, Gordon Hamre, Michael Nabert, and I continued to work on Giant Mine-related projects for Alternatives North. We also brought on Pamela Naylor to review the Hoèla weteèts'eèdè Project we have at Alternatives North. The review and comments on the management and monitoring are going well, and we appreciate that the Project is willing to adjust the timelines there. It will give us a bit more time to review those.

The Aquatics Advisory Committee has started up and I think it's going really well. The breakout group feature on Zoom is quite excellent. I guess Gordon has also been quite involved in the five-year review RFP. I don't know if you want to talk a bit about that at all.

Gordon: I don't think I want to talk about it particularly. We did recommend a contractor who is acceptable to GMOB to work the contract accordingly. There were pretty impressive submissions, I've got to say.



**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

Katharine: I think that's it for us. Thanks.

Tony: Just to the point you just made, Gordon, indicating that the contractor was acceptable to GMOB. Since we did not participate in the selection process, could you clarify what you mean by that statement?

Gordon: Well, you awarded the contract on the basis of our recommendation, so we would presume that the contractor was acceptable to you.

Tony: Okay, I follow what your intent was there. Noted. Thank you. Alright, so I presume Alternatives North that is your synopsis. Thank you for that. North Slave Métis Alliance? Jess?

**NMSA Update**

Jess H: Hello. In terms of our updates, we have a lot of similarities with Alternatives North, what they have touched upon. Since June, we have definitely enjoyed the ramping back of work. I found there was a lot of dead time in the spring and summer, which actually allowed me to catch up on a lot of things, but I have been happy that the committees have started back up again for the Stress Study, as well as Aquatics. I have personally really enjoying the Aquatic Advisory Committee just because that's my venue, my jam.

In terms of the Stress Study, I think we have had some really interesting discussions that have come up in regards to Traditional Knowledge and proper storing, protection and recognition of it. It has brought out a few data sharing agreements, which now we are moving in. I'm working with Alex and Jessica Mace on how to broaden that in all Giant files, like what do we do with TK and how we make sure we are tracking where it is being implanted in design plans, management plans, and any kind of reports. That has been an interesting discussion going on.

There is a lot going on in terms of Early Works and Socio-Economics, but that has been more of a board of directors venue for NSMA and less so about me. However, if GMOB needs any more details, I'm happy to reach out to our president and vice president for updates on that one.

What else? I think NSMA, at least its Environmental Team, me and Adele, the Environmental Manager, we have definitely enjoyed a little bit of stability with the two of us taking on some of the Giant files. I'm still primarily the go-to for anything Giant, but she has taken on the Health Effects Monitoring file, because her background is in health and sciences. Then she does a little bit of a socio-ec with our board of directors. I think that has really provided some great stability between the two of us in ensuring capacity and participation based on the strengths of our team.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

We are feeling a little bit of lack in capacity and experience in properly engaging with the Project on upcoming bids or contracts that will be coming out for the remediation, but we have had discussions with the Project on what socio-ec could look like for us. Would there be a possibility of a part-time resource or a part-time from NSMA targeting specifically socio-economics? We're still very, very early on in the discussions, so I'm looking forward to furthering those chats and seeing what works best for NSMA.

Otherwise, the MMP reviews went well for me. I did find it a little bit challenging, as these were the first types of reviews that I did. Some of the documents were very, very technical in nature, but that's why I look to Slater Consulting as well as GMOB for any of your recommendations. I very much appreciated the early submissions of those comments, because they really helped shape the direction of whether or not I was on the right track for comments. Thank you again for doing that work, directors. Yeah, I think that is pretty much it for updates from us since June.

**YKDFN Update**

Tony: Thanks, Jess. Yellowknives Dene First Nation? William?

William: Not to echo what Jess said and Alternatives North mentioned, but there are very, very similar things on our end. With the Management and Monitoring Plans, we are very appreciative for the Project to provide the funding for us to have expertise for that process. We are comfortable with where we are thus far.

We are also happy with how the Aquatics Advisory Committee is going. We're very appreciative to have meetings prior to the actual AAC meetings with community members so that we can address concerns in a forum that is project to YKDFN specifically, so it is very helpful for us for things like that.

Then there are all the other things that are going on with YKDFN. As you probably all have seen, we did a media release that had news outlets and community members, and it gave light to our process in our attempts for an apology and compensation from the federal government for Giant Mine. That is happening at a separate table with the chiefs, Jason, and the feds. It was a good media release, because we felt it was strategic in getting it on the news so people were aware of what is going on. I'm sure many of you have questions on that.

Then there are just general concerns, the dust from the tailings pond. I thought it was disappointing that happened. I felt that it could have been preventable, and we are hoping that come spring and fall of next year, it won't be repeated, and we can fix that in the future.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

Then there are benefits back to the community at large regarding socio-ec, the status of contracting, and just how we can guarantee some benefits back to our community. That is still unclear, at least to myself it is unclear. What else?

I mean, there are a few little other things. I was happy to see that finally the Department of Transportation put the sign up that I suggested three to four years ago to put an "Entering Giant Mine" sign on the highway. That is one major success that I can cross off my list. Yeah, it's the same-old, same-old on our end. I'll leave it at that.

Tony: Thanks for that summary, William. City of Yellowknife? Todd, please.

**City of Yellowknife Update**

Todd: Thanks, Tony. I have a bit of a different thing, a different response here. It goes back to the implementation of the Agreement rather than the highlights of the City. I have just a couple of suggestions, simple ones, and then a response to the annual report. The Board and the City have had chats on our response to that, but the other parties haven't heard it.

The simple hopes and concerns: We know that GMOB is an observer at the socio-economic table. Our observation is that it might be more productive if you guys were more involved. You all have a lot of experience, not entirely in terms of economics, but you can aid this process at the frontend rather than simply commenting on its effectiveness at the backend. This is the City's number one concern at this point.

We are no longer at a point where we can wait a year to try to improve things. Big shovels are going in the ground this year over and beyond the Site Stability Program. Every effective voice or every smart voice at the table is welcome. If it is possible to have a greater involvement, the City would sure be happy with that.

I had a number of questions on the TERRE-NET report. Now I understand it's from last year. That is good as a starting point to put a date on it. It just arrived. I read it a little over lunch. It's just a first glance, but some of the overhead costs are, to me, not adequately understanding them, are astonishingly high. The U Ottawa is charging 40%, so four out of every 10 dollars is disappearing.

When I was in William's role in the same process, it was a different government back then, but when we had an admin of 15%, Canada would push back pretty severely on that. I don't know if this is a real concern, but further information as to whether it is would be welcome, particularly as some of the other ones are 15%, 25%, and so on. I'll leave that there.

The last hope or concern is getting the reviews out a little earlier and in a more predictable sense. To us, this is a key aspect of GMOB in the future. We are hopeful that the role of GMOB in review is ascended, that you guys in conjunction with Slater

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

provide a much larger objective amount of review relative to the City. There are a lot of taxpayer dollars going into this, so the hope is the City's role is reduced to one of triage over time. We are triaging your products and Slater's products, so getting them a week in advance or whatever timeline is established allows for a good review that would allow better choices on how resources get used. I'm supported by the Project. I don't know that this would need to continue. We think that would be an easy fix going forward. Listen, we all face the timeline demands. The Project is tired of hearing me complain about the timelines to them, so I'm sure they are happy to see it go to the Project, or to GMOB.

Then in terms of the annual report, the City picked up three recommendations. I looked at this the other day. I think they are 3, 8, and 9. I will describe them in context. The first was to increase the City's involvement. I welcome the Project, and GMOB already knows that we pushed back a little bit on this. It did not feel like it was consistent with the level of effort that we were putting in. The City is involved in pretty much everything here. You can argue as to whether we are doing a good job or a bad job, but that is separate from the recommendation.

We pushed back, and then GMOB reissued the recommendation and asked the City to be more proactive in making sure residents know about the implications of the Giant Mine recommendation and that the City take on some of the engagement associated with the Project Team, or that is traditionally associated with the Project.

There are a couple of nuances here. The first is, make people more aware of what the City has actually done. To this, we are building a pretty simple webpage. It is going to be available or public pretty soon. It goes back to the EA and all the things the City has submitted. It focuses on the City actions. We are currently conducting our internal review and doing an alpha build on that, and we have asked GMOB to again be part of the review. I am sure there are good reasons for not coming in to help to improve this. It is unfortunate, because we don't want to read about it at the next annual report. We would rather fix them now and avoid any of the issues that could be avoided.

Ultimately, the implication that the City is responsible for providing information to its residents regarding this project is a Project responsibility. We disagree with GMOB's assertion that it is also the City's role. We are working with the Project in terms of echoing some of the concerns where there is overlap. I have been talking to Alex a couple of weeks ago, and it sat on my desk for quite a while, but the health concerns and getting that kind of risk information out, the City is happy to help echo that. However, we are not going to take on any of the responsibility or accountability for ensuring that citizens are informed. That is a Project responsibility.

Now there is a City process coming out. This is the development permit process in which the City does have statutory requirements, and that process will involve the kind of public dissemination associated with it. That is going to go ahead through all the standard City meetings. There is a newsletter, public notices, and the email

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

distribution list for city residents. In that regard, the City does have a direct and indisputable role on that.

That is the wrap up on that recommendation. Listen, if you have questions, I'm happy to take them. The goal to have informed citizens is everybody's goal here, but we are not going to do the Project's job.

Recommendation 7 is offsite contamination, and I think Alex spoke a little bit about this. They advocated for the City to take a more aggressive role. I think that was the language that was used. The City is not sure what you want here. We have raised this issue with GNWT. They are the landowner. The City is not going take...we can't get any land out of GNWT, much less land that is perhaps contaminated.

We have raised this issue a number of times and participated in the Risk Assessment forum. The GNWT is an order of government that deserves some space and time in order to do this work, and it feels like there are wheels under it, that there is progress being made. Again, the question that goes back is what do you want with land that the City does not control that represents reasonable, yet meets that aggressive note? Again, the City is just not sure what to do there.

The last recommendation was land use planning. The City has been out front on this issue. Here is the quote. The recommendation is to be more proactive in moving the planning process forward. Again, what do you want? It's not clear how this can be moved forward in a more aggressive sense. We agree that there is no common agreement on what the site should look like after remediation. We agree that no one is going to be more affected by this than residents that live here, but again, the City is not the landowner, not the Project.

We sought this. We fought for this at the water license hearing on our own, so it is good that this recommendation is going out to folks, but it has got to be precise. You can't ask things that we can't deliver. Otherwise, it is an unfulfilled recommendation.

To wrap it up, it is good the GMOB is advocating for this now, because it is still very important, and it is unresolved. It is very much part of GMOB's role. It says right in your agreement that you are evaluating how the Project is integrating land use constraints and objectives. The absence of those is GMOB's concern. Together, we can perhaps be the better advocates that you are hoping for. Especially on this one, GMOB has got skin in the game in terms of advocating for something here.

Reflection from the corner, it is a very ivory tower thing. We are happy to help, and this is something that we are really committed to. I have fought knowing that we probably were not going to be successful but fought on our own to get it done. We are happy to help, but on this and the Offsite, there has to be more precision in what the hope is. That wraps up the response, because I don't want to take too much time. I

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

know Chris has already moved. It's after 5:00 lighting over there. I am sure he will be happy to have me shut up here. Thank for the opportunity to say it.

Tony: Thanks, Todd. There was a lot there. I'm just trying to think strategically about how we deal with that. Were you wanting to have a discussion on each of these points or were you just summarizing?

Todd: No. It is for the other parties. Were the roles reversed, I would be looking at this as information for the next time you sit down to write, which is in a couple of months here.

Tony: Okay.

Todd: These recommendations matter to the City, but if we can't do them, then they are really not recommendations.

Tony: Right. Just for the benefit of the others, there has already been a degree of dialogue on these topics previously with the City, and in some instances, there is just an agreement to disagree. Some of the points made, we definitely respect that perspective but also have to note that in some circumstances, we have a different perspective on the situation.

There were a number of fairly meaty topics in what Todd has discussed here that would really require the Board in its entirety to be speaking, so we would need to get together ourselves and identify whether or not some of the suggestions that Todd has made, just as an example the idea that in the socio-economic strategy there is merit in GMOB being more of a participant than an observer, is a topic that we have given a lot of thought to already. It is one that we think is potentially a very slippery slope for an oversight board to be actively at the table contributing to decision making. I mention that just as an example to illustrate that some of these questions on the surface seem like good ideas, but we have given a fair bit of thought to some of the actions that we have taken already and our plans going forward.

Jess: Can you hear me okay?

Tony: I can hear you now.

Jess: Okay. Sorry, it was just because I was thinking about that point exactly, how GMOB are observers on our Socio-Economic Working Group for example. It would be great to hear from Mark specifically of course, because he has so much experience. I don't know that would mean that he is making any decisions. I don't know. I feel like providing input based on experience is not really...and it would aid us rather than having a comment in the GMOB report at the end saying we would like to see more done. It would be a lot more helpful for us to have that input at those meetings and have other people hear them and think about them.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

Tony: The point is taken, and it is something that we, ourselves have wrestled with over our five years of where the sweet spot is. It is a work in progress, and I presume that type of perspective has come up in your participation of the five-year review. As that type of input is provided, then whatever comes out of that process, we will consider. With all the varying evidence that we have to make our decisions on, we will make that decision of what the best route is for us, but the point is taken. Thank you for providing that one.

I brought that issue up just as an example of how complex many of these issues are. Probably today is not the day to get into all of them, but to consider as we go forward. I have taken some notes on all the points that Todd has raised here, but as you move forward, we will keep reflecting on the inputs you provided.

Also, as we are coming up to the annual report period for us, we would encourage people to submit unsolicited statements to us about your review of exactly the type of issues that you were just describing, Todd. We do not have a formal process where we solicit those statements, but clearly there are a number of items that in the case of the City of Yellowknife and perhaps others, things that you want to be on the table and considered as we move forward, in addition to a forum like this where we just can't get into all the details that you just presented, Todd. We would love to receive additional feedback from you through in the form of submission. We get you have a lot of time to write these things down and draft longwinded submissions to provide us input. We have heard what you said, but if you would like to provide input through other forms, then that is absolutely welcome as well, and it will all be considered as we move forward.

Todd: There is no need for that. You understand the point that we are getting at here. I'll add one last response here. On socio-economic, it is better to be wrong soon and change it than to be wrong later. We have time for the environmental monitoring aspects of this, lots of time. The shovels-in-the-ground aspect, if we can benefit from Mark's experience, the majority of the work is going out for contract in the next year or two, so we don't have time.

You do have the opportunity to make recommendations, and if they are not taken, to point out how they are not taken. You don't have to wait until afterwards to try to remedy things after the fact. You and I had this conversation. I don't know if you remember, but it might have been the first time we ever met when I was working for the Yellowknives. You asked me, well wouldn't you rather be inside the tents. At that time, I said, "No, I don't want to be inside the tent," the tent being the Project as a whole, providing advice that way. Today is different for this aspect. It is get inside the tent and provide suggestions. If they don't take it and they don't make the improvements then say so after the fact, because the billion dollars is going to be gone pretty soon. Anyway, I've said too much already. Thanks for the opportunity.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

Tony: Thanks, Todd. Just for the record, the recommendations related at a macro level to treating socio-economic issues seriously have been a recurring theme, certainly in the reporting from GMOB for multiple years now. It has been at a macro level. It has been high level. We weren't there to prescribe or dictate, but in terms of identifying this as a critical priority for the Project, suffice it say that GMOB gets it. We recognize that and have been a strong advocate for exactly that since our inception.

Okay, thank you for the summaries. As I said at the beginning, we will hear from the Project Team, but before we go there, we will have a quick check-in from others in case they want to present any additional details related to their summaries before we hear from the Project Team.

*(Pause)*

No? Okay. Alright, I'll hand it over to CIRNAC. Go ahead, guys.

**Update from CIRANC**

Natalie: Thanks for letting us go last. There was certainly a method to madness for going last. It was more because of the items that we are asked to touch on. I wasn't so sure I wanted to touch on them, and I wanted to just gauge what everyone else had to say. The Early Works and the Socio-Ec Action Plan: We spent three hours talking about that this morning with all of these parties at the Socio-Ec Advisory Board, so we did not think it would be useful to redo any of that. It was more so we could address any questions, concerns, or any inaccuracies. Thank you for indulging me there.

We are similarly going to take Todd's approach and lay out Environmental Agreement items. The first one that we are happy to report on is we did submit our annual report to GMOB yesterday, so thank you very much for that extension. It was much needed, so we think you have a great report. You will notice as well that we had it redesigned this year so it look really good. Many thanks to Katherine and her team there.

I would note that we did provide GMOB with a draft, I think in October. It was. Thanks, Katherine. We would be interested to know if that process was helpful, and we are more than happy to continue to do that. I think Katherine you had a comment to make that the draft did change in one aspect only. I think there was an edit to the financials.

Katherine: Yeah, there were just some minor edits to the rollup of the financials. I can't give you the section right not, but it is the expenditures table. There were very small edits, and just fixed that up a little bit.

Natalie: Great, but otherwise the draft pretty much stayed. We hope that was helpful to submit that early, and it was certainly helpful for us to have that extension. We are challenged with that October 1<sup>st</sup> deadline. I don't think we have met it once. That's not for lack of trying. It is more, as we have said, the outcome of contracts don't end until March 31<sup>st</sup>.



**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

Then we have to get the reporting from the contractors, and sometimes that take time. Then rolling that up into our statistics takes time. We also have Government of Canada requirements to have French translations. All these things take time no matter how much we push them. Again, thank you.

The next item we worked on, Canada participated as Gordon mentioned, on the five-year review RFP evaluation with the Yellowknives Dene. That was something that we were happy to complete. We are also working on the arsenic trioxide dust samples. Chris, if you would like to pipe in on how that's going?

Chris: Thanks, Natalie. It is actually going quite well, and we are pleased to continue to work with GMOB on that. As Tony alluded to earlier, we do have another meeting this Friday where we hope to present to GMOB the type of drilling method that we think will work to get the samples that GMOB is looking for. That is just one next-step in the process. There are many more hurdles to blow over for sure. We are continuing on with that effort to try to get those samples for future research. Thanks.

Natalie: Great. Thanks, Chris. Those were the main items I wanted to report on, but I had a couple of things I would like to comment on from the other parties and correct. The first one was the dust event in October, November...Gosh, the date is already gone. I think William had said it was preventable, but we did a thorough analysis, and there is not one thing we could have done to prevent that, short of getting the permanent cover on the tailings, which is what we have been trying to do since 2007.

While I take dust and the Team takes dust incredibly seriously and we do everything within my power and others to prevent it, that event in the fall was just a trifecta of events happening with the high water year and our water treatment just finishing. There were some exposed tailings. We couldn't get soil tech on it, because the water had just come off it. We did call in helicopters to mitigate it. I guess I just wanted for the record to note that we don't feel that was preventable.

The other one was Todd's comment on the majority of the work coming out in the next year. I just want to correct that. While we are starting to let contracts coming up in the New Year, the majority of the work is not in the next year. We have some stats, and we presented them this morning at the Advisory Body. For the Early Works Program, which is the next 2 to 2½ years, we believe the person hours is around 160,000 person hours.

To put that in perspective, because that obviously doesn't mean anything on its own, but since 2013, the Project's onsite activities have been 162,000 person hours. We have done the roaster in there. We have done all the site stabilization, so we are slowly getting started in the next years. The big years will not be until...well, we don't have the final plan, but probably 2024, 2025, 2026. So, we still have some runway left, Todd, and I just don't want that perception to be that we are going to miss the plane, because we do have runway.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

With that, I will look to the rest of my team members to chime in if there is anything they would like to add that I did not touch on.

Chris: Natalie, as always you provide everybody a great summary. Just quickly, I wanted to just update GMOB and the Parties on the Project's response this year with the pandemic and how we have been able to continue to move forward. I'm amazed at our team and how we were able to adapt in this new environment. We saw very little by the way of slippage in any of our design work and preparations for next year, and even the regulatory submittals that we have to prepare.

I just wanted to let you guys know that we have really done the best we can, certainly with this pandemic. There is certainly no script or playbook that you go by on this, so we are very pleased with how the Project has reacted. We will see next year with some of these Early Works out of the gate. We are still in the midst of COVID. You can see that vaccines are certainly on the way, but we have empowered the MCM to make sure that within any of the contracts and any of the work we are doing that they have taken advantage of and tried to work in the potential slippages that could happen there. We think we are confident that what is going out next year should work. I just wanted to touch on that. It has been a very challenging year, but the team has really risen to that, so thanks.

Tony: Natalie, so that is the summary?

Natalie: Yes unless there are any questions.

Tony: Okay. Thanks. Just to follow-up on a couple of the corrections that you noted, with the dust event, did you indicate that you did an internal analysis and concluded that you really did what you needed to do? Is that documented somewhere? Could or maybe it already has been provided?

Natalie: I think everyone from the working group got the summary report on all our actions taken and how we followed our Dust Management Plan and the decisions made. I'm not sure. Perhaps GMOB was not included in that?

Tony: I'm not aware, but it sounds like you have already done exactly what I was going to suggest you might do. Yeah, it's just in the event there has been an analysis that concluded you took all the steps that were necessary, then there is the documentation to support that position.

The second part was related to the emerging socio-economic opportunities that are coming with Early Works and subsequent contracts. The concern with some of the parties but also with GMOB, and you said we are not running out of runway yet, is just things are moving fast. That has always been the argument is that yes, it's true the work will not really get going until a couple of years out. It is just that the concern is

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

related to the time it takes to develop a strategy and implement it. Meanwhile, contracts are getting let, even though the work will not be implemented until later.

That's just some context from GMOB's angle. The concern is coming from that the clock is ticking, to use another metaphor.

Natalie: We fully understand that, Tony.

Tony: Just a last point responding to what Chris was describing about the COVID pandemic scenario, I can certainly say from my view, the word 'nimble' comes to mind and how adaptive everybody has been. It is not actually unique only to the Project Team, but I have seen this everywhere. People are figuring out a way to make it work. It has been very challenging, but certainly I can second that one. There has been a lot of effort, and it is amazing what has been accomplished even under those circumstances. It has been impressive.

If there are no other comments from other parties with respect to the Summary of the Parties, we can move on to the remaining items, and I don't think it will take...

Ken H: I have a question.

Tony: Go ahead, Ken.

Ken H: Thanks. I'm going back to Chris and Natalie about your comment about being able to function in the current pandemic environment that we are in. I have a bit of contingency planning in my background, and I was thinking about that. I am thinking in this case related to employees where you have a relatively small team of expertise, who provide pretty critical expertise when it comes to the actual infrastructure out at the site. Do you feel that the current contingency planning that you and MCM have in place to provide backup and replace some critical folks in your team is sufficient, or have you had to ramp that up in light of the pandemic?

Chris: What I can say to that, Ken, is when the pandemic started and we were figuring out how to go forward, part of the MCM's job back in March and April was to provide an onsite protocol and plan. I'm not sure if you have seen it or not, but it goes into things like what you are talking about there on contingency planning.

Part of what they put forth was like if we lost, let's say the underground supervisor because he got COVID and had to be off for a little while. They presented to us a two-to-three person deep level of backup that could be put in there. We are pretty confident on what the MCM certainly has in place there. If you look at the Project Team in and of itself, we are fairly robust in that perspective too. I think from that perspective, I think we are okay if that answers what you are looking at.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

Ben: Natalie, Ben here. I have a question on the delay for the MMP for the tailings. Could you maybe just explain the reason for that and how the process has gone for the Pre-Engagement to this point with the Project?

Natalie: Sure. Sorry, just to clarify, when you say pre-engagement on the MMP, are you specifically referring just to the tailings or for all of them?

Ben: For all of them.

Natalie: Great. I'll start with that one, because that has pretty much ramped up. We did the pre-engagement through the working group and presented our schedule. We came and presented on all of the MMPs and then took comments, and we received a lot of comments. It was rivaling the water license comments selection from our Regulatory Team. Certainly we got a lot of comments, but we have worked to address them all and revise our plans accordingly.

When you see the next plans, hopefully the workload should be a lot less, because you have seen them all. Your comments will be there, and there will be a response table to say how we have or haven't addressed your comments and why, similar to the water license process. I think it will cut down the work for everyone once they are formerly submitted to the Board, or at least that's our hope. It has gone well. It was a lot of work for our team to do that, but we think it will be very useful in the end.

With the Tailings Management Plan, we have asked for an extension because frankly, we are not ready to submit it. What was submitted with the water license stays the same until we get to the tailings. We don't have that plan ready to go. That's the short answer to why we requested it. The tailings work is a number of years off. It's not in the early stages, so we are just not ready to do that. We did go to working group to ask if anyone had any concerns with us asking for an extension, and we heard none, so we proceeded with that.

Ben: Thank you. Related to that, Natalie, the situation where you are looking to postpone the submission, what was the root cause of doing that? Was it that you don't need to do it now or that something happened and you are not able to do it at this point? Originally it was scheduled to be done earlier.

Natalie: It's a combination of all of the above, I guess. We don't feel it is needed now, and we are concentrating on getting the design plans done. We are just full on out. We are at capacity, so we did not want to take people off work that we felt was critical to do now. I look to the rest of my team. I haven't been intimately involved in the Tailings Plan.

Chris: I can just add a little bit briefly to that. The tailings design in and of itself is one of the latter ones that is not as advanced as most of the other major design packages. Along

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

with that, that needs to catch up a little bit before we can put much into that Tailings Management Monitoring Plan. We knew we were able to sequence it like that.

Natalie: I guess just to add this: the Tailings Plan is not for current condition. It would be for post-conditions. I don't know if that is the concern or maybe it's not clear. It is not how we manage them today. It is the Post-Remediation Management and Monitoring Plan.

Ben: Something that I have raised in the past, if that's word, is the idea of integration of the components and how critical it is on a complex site like Giant that all the puzzle pieces fit together. Has there been an analysis to see how that delay affects other aspects of the design process? For example, whether it's borrow or otherwise, are there some effects of that postponement?

Natalie: I don't think so. We are working on the design now. It's not like we have stopped, because the tailings is integrated with borrow and what goes into it with the material balances, so that is not stopping. That integration is still happening. It's just actually the Managing and Monitoring Plan that we are not focusing on. The design is still being integrated in terms of the material balance, for instance.

Ben: Okay. Thank you.

Ken H: Can I ask a very short question? I apologize. This is probably already covered in your Tailings Plan or your draft plan, but it is sometimes easier to ask a question than it is to read a report. Dam 1 at the Polishing Pond, are those thermosiphons that have been installed along there?

Natalie: Good catch, Ken. I totally forgot to report on that. I reported to Working Group last week. That's probably why it was gone. We did install a number of thermosiphons on the Dam 1 at the polishing pond. The work is just wrapping up. I think it just wrapped up a few days ago, but apparently William told us it is visible from the highway.

In the past, Dam 1 was our highest risk at site. It was identified that it did need some work that couldn't wait. We did quite a bit of analysis, geo-tech analysis, and the solution was to install thermistors to restore freezing to that dam, so that happened. It was just completed late last week or early this week.

Ken H: Okay, so it's not necessarily for future use per sé, but to ensure that current conditions are stable?

Natalie: Yeah, exactly. We know we are getting rid of the polishing pond, but our current timeline is 2026, and it was too risky to leave it for that number of years. We couldn't do that. The risk is if that dam failed, the water would go directly into the 138 portal into the underground. It wasn't necessarily an environmental risk, but a health and safety risk if there were any workers in there.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties**  
**December 16, 2020**

Ken H: Thanks.

Tony: Alright, I think that wraps up Item 6. Number 7...yes, Jess go ahead.

Jessica M: All I wanted to say, Tony, was I just wanted to thank the rest of the participants like Katharine, Jess, Todd, and William for sharing their thoughts on the work that has been happening. I don't think we do give you guys a chance to do that, so that was really nice to hear from you that certain things are working, like the Aquatic Engagement and other things that you mentioned. That is really helpful for me as the Engagement Manager to hear that and to understand that. I just wanted to thank you guys for those comments.

The only other thing is that I just found at this meeting, I kind of found out about it a little while ago, but I didn't receive the invite. Ben, I was just hoping you could maybe add me on the initial invite. Then I would maybe have time to speak with Natalie about presenting something on the socio-economics and the engagements. Like Natalie said, we did just give a presentation this morning to most of the people on this call, so of course, we don't want to do it again. If we just had a bit more notice with the agenda, maybe even a couple of weeks...I don't know if that's possible or of that is asking too much, but it's so we do have time to work together and prepare something. That would be great.

**Action Item 2:** GMOB ED to include Jessica Mace on the invite list for the Semi-Annual Meeting and GMOB AGM.

Ben: I will put you on the invite list. Usually the agenda goes out at least two weeks to three weeks before, so we will just keep you informed.

Jessica M: Okay, thank you. Also, I think there might have been an oversight where we have not invited GMOB to the Socio-Economic Advisory Body meetings. Mark, did you ever receive an invite for that, or anyone else?

Mark: I never received anything, no.

Jessica M: So from now on, we can start inviting you to that meeting as well.

Ben: When I get an invitation I'll pass it to the Board, but for socio-ec, Mark is the lead.

Jessica M: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Tony.

Tony: No problem. Thanks, Jessica. The point about giving positive feedback is taken though too. These processes do tend to migrate towards the things that you don't like, but there are lots of good things too.

**Item 7: Reconciliation Issues and Actions**

Tony: Alright, Item 7 is Reconciliation Issues and Actions. This is an item that we have added to the agenda the last several meetings just to explicitly address this important topic and make sure it's on our minds and that we are thinking about how to build this into the work that we all do. We will just do a bit of a roundtable about where we see this fitting in with our work for the last year, or the last half-year I guess.

Beginning with GMOB, at a very high level, where you see it for us is reflected in our recommendations. If you look at the fact that over the last three years now the topic of an apology and/or compensation be front and center in the process of moving forward with the Project and Canada's relationship with First Nations is an example of where GMOB has been endeavouring to ensure that reconciliation is a part of the work that we are doing. We will just go around the table in the same order as last time for each of the parties.

Certainly talk for as long as you would like to, but just briefly touch on this issue at minimum to talk about how reconciliation is part of your process going forward. Since we started with GNWT in the list and CIRNAC was last, we will do the same thing this time. We'll start with GNWT again.

Alex: I wanted to highlight a few things from the Wellness Study that I think are really rooted in reconciliation. The Project Team has heard from the Yellowknives that this is an important study for the Yellowknives Dene. The Project Team brought on Sue Moody to help with the process and the study design and ensuring that work is culturally appropriate.

The Project Team works really closely with the YKDFN Wellness Department to make sure that this stays objective, to make sure that we are mitigating any stress that could be caused by Giant. I just wanted to highlight that study, because I think that study in itself is really rooted in reconciliation. It is focused for the wider population in Yellowknife and the North Slave Métis as well, but is really hearing the Yellowknives and centering that study around their membership.

Tony: Thanks, Alex. Alternatives North?

Gordon: I am sure you know that Alternatives North is a social action, social justice coalition. I don't know that there is too much more that I want to say about reconciliation on behalf of Alternatives North. It is a difficult thing to speak to, so I think maybe I will just leave it.

Tony: Thanks, Gordon. North Slave Métis Alliance? It might seem odd that this is part of the topic that is being forwarded to you, but do you have any comments about this?

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

Jess H: I have been trying to think of what I can contribute in terms of comments for this. Reconciliation is always a big topic, and proper representation of our members through the Giant Mine process, while also balancing our capacity. That balance of proper representation and recognition at these tables and then our capacity to sit on them have always been a big struggle for NSMA in general, be it staff or members.

I think we still manage to make do with what we have. We have had a lot of success in the last year with the various committees that have come through, be it the Stress Study, be it the Aquatics, or the QRA. We are always just trying to evaluate what it is we can get on, be more vocal, and be more participatory but without taking more than we can handle, because that is just as damaging if we make recommendations and want commitments but on our part we can't follow through with them.

If there is one specific example for the next year that we are looking into, it is under the Aquatics for the community-based monitoring projects. We really, really want to be a big part of developing that, because we are part of that community, but we recognize that we might have some limitations on running a program specifically by us for us. It is challenges like that we continuously face. I think that is the main one that I will comment on. Typically our Board is quite vocal, at least in recommending what reconciliation actions are needed for members. I typically speak a little bit more on the environmental side.

Tony: Thanks, Jess. Maybe we will just pass it to the City of Yellowknife to give your perspectives on reconciliation and as it relates specifically to the Giant Mine Remediation Project.

Todd: Sure. In this one, it would have been great to have some of the City folks here, because I'm ill at ease because the contractor. The Yellowknives don't need the City to speak on their behalf. I know that there are a lot of joint initiatives at this point, so I think that is one way that the City is...I don't know if that's promoting reconciliation, but providing the space and the treatment that sees everyone participating and benefiting from whatever initiatives and whatever bounty that the land can provide us in reasonable ways, of course.

Me, in particular with the reconciliation, with William, he is very capable of handling his own business. Sometimes, it is simply an awareness thing. When I see a reference to TK that may be buried, I'll note that. He will probably see it on his own, but just to make sure that he does for both Jess and William. When I see areas of overlap from different perspectives where the interest is still the same, then that is another way to promote reconciliation. The City has a perspective, but the underlying interest might still achieve both purposes. I think that is a good way forward as well.

We will leave it there. I can say that it is really quite different than even just a few years ago, like the prominence of YKDFN and NSMA, not just City considerations and collaborations but consistently throughout every venue. I feel that there is, again,



**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

wheels under this process under reconciliation, at least in the North. There is a lot of work left to do, but I feel better about it than even five years ago, ten years ago. I'll leave it there.

Tony: Thanks, Todd. William, you were actually next on the list before the City of Yellowknife. That was me misspeaking and getting my, after I don't know how many decades talking about these things, getting my names messed up. I meant to say Yellowknives Dene First Nation. Apologies for that, but William, if you could give us your perspectives on this that would be appreciated.

William: No worries on that, Tony. That's what I figured happened. No worries. Reconciliation with this Project means a lot to the community members. It means a lot. It goes beyond words of what it means. I mean this Project has devastated our community. It has devastated our way of life. It has devastated things that you would not realize it has affected, but it has. Reconciliation, an apology, and compensation are things that our community is hopeful will happen, among other things, as I'm sure you know.

From our perspective, we are still plugging away. We are still working for these things to progress, but it is challenging. It is very challenging, because most of the time it's just me, or whoever is the staff from our end. Capacity is an issue, as I am sure many of the parties can agree with. We have come a long way since I've started. One of them could be the land acknowledgement that the Project gives. I appreciate that just on a personal note, and addressing community concerns as they come up.

There are still many concerns that community members have that are continuing outstanding like harvesting around the bay or legacy arsenic. There are numerous things. I look at a lot of that as this Project will never be done, so we always have to be working to fix what eighty years of contamination and eighty years of destruction has caused. So we are here or I am here at least, to keep working on that.

Tony: Thanks, William. It was an accident, but I am glad we left that to the last. It is a good synopsis, and it's good to hear. Item 8 is Additional Agenda Items. At the inception of the meeting, I indicated that there were some items that the City of Yellowknife, through Todd, identified. Jessica, yes, go ahead.

Ben: Tony, we missed CIRNAC.

Jessica M: It was actually Natalie that had her hand up. I just wanted you to see that. Maybe you can't see that.

Tony: Please accept my apologies. Go ahead, CIRNAC.

Natalie: Thank you very much. Certainly working with Alex at the GNWT, the Stress Study has been one that has changed quite a bit since its inception and certainly at the request of the Yellowknives. We are certainly supporting the full study with Yellowknives and

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties**  
**December 16, 2020**

the mental health work as well. That is one item that we think certainly goes towards the reconciliation agenda.

We are planning and working with all levels of Indigenous government to do the Social Impacts Focus Groups to look at the social impacts.

As well, I guess I will just touch on the apology and compensation piece. As William said, the mind and the Project are still so intertwined within the Yellowknives community, whereas from our perspective they are separate. I continue to work with our RDG, who is the lead on the apology and compensation. I think Jason Snaggs pointed out that he hopes we promote this and push it. That is something that I do personally to encourage our RDG to continue advancing this file.

I think there have been some good successes this year on that file through his office. They have funded the Yellowknives to complete their research on the apology and compensation, and they finalized the research this year. They submitted that research to the Minister of CIRNAC just recently. I think it was in the fall. Sorry, I don't have the date in my head.

It was a very well-thought out submission where they requested Canada to come to the table and negotiate an apology and compensation. That, I think, was a great success of the Yellowknives to get that official request in, because that was something that was lacking really from the bureaucratic process where we heard it at the community level. You need to get something into the Minister to say you are requesting that and why. That happened that fall, so great work on the Yellowknives. William, I'm not sure how much you had to do with that, but that is going to go a long way. That sits with our Minister right now. I don't have a timing on the response, but I think the request seems very reasonable in my opinion. It is only my opinion I'm speaking of right now. That would certainly be my recommendation to accept that, but of course the Minister will make that call on her own.

That is outside of my realm, but back in the Project realm, as Jess H. mentioned with the community-based monitoring, we have put that out there to both the Yellowknives and North Slave. We want to advance community-based monitoring, but we think it should be led by the community. We don't want to push it, but we are willing to fund that, so whenever they are ready to come to the table, we are ready. We can start it tomorrow. We could have started it last week. Whenever they are ready and whatever support they want from us, we will be will to do as well. There will be that technical guidance and financial.

We think it is time to start that work. We are ready, and we think that will go a long way as well. That is something that when Williams says there are outstanding concerns from the Yellowknives like harvesting around the bay, we think that community-based monitoring could go a long way to answering some of those questions, because the community can choose what to monitor. If they are concerned

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

with fish around the bay, let's monitor. Anyway, we are open and ready to have that discussion whenever you're ready.

Then the last big one I would like to touch on is that the Yellowknives have requested a community-based benefits agreement for a number of years. As a Project, we have struggled with what that means and what that looks like. I think we made some progress on that this year when Jason Snaggs came to our Socio-Ec Advisory Body and proposed something similar to the Sydney Tar Ponds Agreement. It was a tangible example that we could take, and we are working on that. We are doing quite a bit of research, for one what the background is and how that was implemented. We have our colleagues at PSPC along with ourselves doing that research, and we met with Jason Snaggs last month to talk about it and make sure we were all in agreement of what that was and share information. So now we are just doing a bit of evaluation, and we plan to meet with the Yellowknives again in January to further pursue what that could look like. I think there was some great progress on that front. I think we are moving on it, which is from my perspective, really good news.

Then I'll look to my Team to see if there is anything else I might have skipped over or missed.

Chris: Nothing from me, Natalie. That was all the things I could think of.

Natalie: Thank you.

Jessica M: I was going to say that was a great summary as well, Natalie. Then just from my perspective as being pretty new on this Project and back to Yellowknife, as the Engagement Manager, I definitely keep reconciliation in the back of my mind when I'm thinking about the work that we do on this Project and how important it is. I try to remember that in each aspect that I start working on and thinking about how to do things. I'm just committed to working in that way.

Tony: Thank you, everybody for those summaries. One item related to the CIRNAC summary was that you gave on behalf of others within the Department, an indication of where things stand on the apology and compensation topic. It would be great through this or some of other forum if we heard directly from the individuals that are leading that charge within the Department in the future. It would not necessarily have to be through this forum. We would be looking to CIRNAC, the representatives of the Project Team here, but also CIRNAC employees to take that message away and ideally identify who might in the future be available to provide those updates to everybody directly. You have done a good job of summarizing it, but like anything, it is not the work you are on directly, Natalie and others, so if we were able to hear from those that are engaged in that process, that would be very helpful in the future.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

Natalie: We can take that away and see what we can do in the future. I know in the past, we have brought Matt Spence to a few meetings. Depending on where the response comes from, we will evaluate there if that's okay with you.

Tony: Okay, thank you. I think it is important for everybody. We don't have a lot of actions that we've discussed today, but I would suggest that perhaps that is an action for follow-up for the next semi-annual meeting that we provide some form of an update on whether or not a representative directly involved with that topic would be available to give an update to the parties. That would be my recommendation if there is not opposition to that action being tabled.

**Action Item 3:** Leads of initiatives related to the Project are invited to participate in the Semi-Annual Meetings.

**Item 8: Additional Agenda Items**

Tony: Back to the next item on our agenda, if I haven't forgotten someone else on the list of Item 6. Additional Agenda Items: The ones that we have so far were the questions that the City of Yellowknife, Todd Slack, had identified. Todd, are you still on the line?

I see that he is muted.

Todd: I am. I am double-duty, but I am still here.

Tony: Okay, okay. Todd, we have a couple of options here. We could discuss those topics that you identified in your email, or we could provide you with a summary response, a brief written response to those topics, whichever you prefer.

Todd: I know a number of folks around different time zones. Their day is done, and they have things to do, so I'm happy to take a summary after the fact, yourself included.

Tony: Okay, so I think that with that, I interpret that to mean that we will give you a follow-up email responding to those comments. We have given some thought to what you asked us, and we could discuss it, but based on what you said, we will follow-up with an email if that's good with you.

Todd: Yeah, that's fine by me.

Tony: Great. Are there any other additional items that people would like to bring to the table today?

Katharine: Michael asked us to bring a question about the Research Program and extraction of the arsenic to the table, but if we are doing questions by email, I might ask him to do that.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

Tony: The difference is that Michael's question sounds like a fairly narrow, single question. Todd had five or six. That's what I was thinking with Todd's questions that maybe a written response might be more appropriate. He has agreed to that, but I can give a fairly rapid response to this one, and we can follow-up if needed with a written response if required.

Where things stand on that, and Chris touched on this earlier, approximately a year ago, we started working with CIRANC, GMOB, to identify first that we have a need for more arsenic trioxide, and we need a reasonable amount.

Katharine: Sorry. It wasn't that. It was about research into the extraction of the arsenic once there is a solution to it.

Tony: Great. Thank you.

Katharine: Sorry.

Tony: No, they both involve extraction, and that is where I got confused. On that particular topic then, for the background of everybody quickly, all the work that we are doing with TERRE-NET right now relates to stabilizing arsenic trioxide somehow, either converting it to a different more stable form of arsenic, like a mineral, or encasing it in some other long-lived matrix, whether it be cement or vitrified into glass. That is a stabilization piece.

The big question that we have not looked at yet is how to extract arsenic if indeed any stabilization technique requires extraction of the bulk of that material. What we have started on, and it is just the first step in what we expect will be a long process, is we have engaged an expert related to materials handling in the UK at a research institute there to basically do a preliminary screening of potential extraction technologies.

We are in no way ignoring all of the technology reviews that were previously done by the Project Team, dating back as early as 1999. Also when they went through the selection of the frozen core for technology, they looked at options for extracting. We are just basically doing an update in 2020 to ask if anything has changed in the last decade or so that might suggest there are other emerging technologies that would be effective with extraction of arsenic trioxide from the underground.

That work, that initial technology screening, is ongoing for us. Once we get the feedback from that, we will identify potential priorities for next steps and potentially for research funding as well that we would apply as funds become available to GMOB in the future. You can kind of think of it as we have two tracks that we have to move down. The one track is significantly advanced relative to the other. We are just getting started on the extraction piece. We expect to have more to report by the next semi-

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties  
December 16, 2020**

annual meeting. We will certainly have that screening report at that point and have thought a little bit about where we might be going in the future.

Katharine: I think that answers it really well. Thank you.

Tony: You're welcome. Are there other questions that people have or topics that go into the additional discussion category?

**Item 9: Next Meeting and Next Steps**

Tony: I'm not seeing any hands. So with that, we are getting very near the end here. We are getting into Item 9: Next Meeting and Next Steps. Just like we discussed with the AGM, the semi-annual meeting, we will be scheduling it as we have in prior meetings with some advance notice and schedule it with you. GMOB, again, will be the organizer of that event. Stay tuned is the message, and we will get back and consult with you on appropriate dates for that next meeting.

Unless there are other topics that people would want to bring forward, I will put forward a motion to adjourn the meeting if I could have somebody move that motion.

I see Ken Froese's hand to move the motion. Do we have a second?

Chris: I move.

Tony: Chris moves.

Thank you, everybody. That adjourns the meeting. There are a few additional meetings over the next few days. Some of us will see each other in those meetings. For those of you that we don't see, happy holidays. It has been great working with everybody, not around the table physically this year, but virtually. We are all sick of Zoom. I'm sick of Zoom for sure, but it is always good to see all of you on these calls and to participate in these meetings. I also have to say that I feel the meetings are always constructive. People have good intent, and they are bringing their ideas and their positive attitudes to the table. I have certainly enjoyed that over the last year and am looking forward to it going forward. Happy holidays to everybody and stay safe.

**Meeting Adjourned**



---

**David Livingstone  
Chair, Giant Mine Oversight Board**

May 17, 2021

**Date**

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties**  
**December 16, 2020**

**Action Items**

**Action Item 1:** Alternatives North to send noted punctuation corrections for the Semi-Annual Minutes 2020 08 27 to the GMOB ED for consideration.

**Action Item 2:** GMOB ED to include Jessica Mace on the invite list for the Semi-Annual Meeting and GMOB AGM.

**Action Item 3:** Noted that leads of initiatives related to the Project are invited to report progress in the Semi-Annual Meetings.