

Verbatim Minutes
GIANT MINE REMEDIATION PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENT
SEMI-ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PARTIES
May 26, 2022, 1:00 to 5:00 p.m.
Explorer Hotel, Yellowknife and Zoom

IN ATTENDANCE:

Giant Mine Oversight Board

David Livingstone – Chair
Ken Froese – Director
Ken Hall - Director
Mark Palmer – Director
Graham Clinton - Director
Ben Nind – Executive Director
Paul Green – GMOB Contractor

North Slave Métis Alliance

Jessica Hurtubise

Yellowknives Dene First Nation

Johanne Black
Michael Rudkin

City of Yellowknife

Kerry Thistle
Todd Slack

Government of Canada (CIRNAC)

Natalie Plato
Katherine Ross
Jessica Mace
Andrei Torianski
Candace DeCoste

Government of the Northwest Territories

Erika Nyssonen

Alternatives North

Katharine Thomas

Regrets:

Chris MacInnis - CIRNAC
Diep Duong - GNWT
Gord Hamre – Alternatives North
Michael Nabert – Alternatives North

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

Welcome and Introductions
Approval of Agenda & Meeting Minutes

David: Welcome to, by our calculation, the 12th Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties and GMOB. I promise since it is such a wonderful day out there that we are going to scoot through the agenda. Folks, take notice. Short and sweet will be best.

I am assuming there will be no volunteers to chair the meeting, but I am going to look around anyhow. Nobody is making eye contact really, so I will do that. Can I get somebody to approve the agenda unless there are comments about the agenda? It's a pretty standard approach. There are a couple of new items. Approval, somebody?

Ken F: I approve

David: And a seconder?

Natalie: Yes

David: All right then. All in favor? Great. The minutes from the Semi-Annual Meeting of November 30, 2021: Does anybody have any comments on the minutes? They are essentially verbatim.

No comments? All right. I love when we are moving along so quickly. Can I get someone to move approval of those minutes? Somebody?

Erika: I will approve.

David: Thank you, Erika. A seconder?

Johanne: Could somebody send me the meeting package? It was sent to William but not to my email.

David: Yeah, we will do that right away Johanne. Apologies for that.

Johanne: Thank you. No worries.

David: So where were we? Approval of the minutes: Can I get somebody to move approval?

Yes, and a seconder? Marc, did you second?

Great, thank you. So we will move right into the action items. Before we do that, I guess I should remind people that we are going to be recording the discussion today, so the transcriptionist, as always, would like people to identify themselves before they speak. I'll try to do the same.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

- Natalie: Can I ask that we do introductions, so we know who is on the phone please? Thank you.
- David: We should actually do a roundtable shouldn't we? I'm just so anxious to get out of here. Alright, so I'm David Livingstone. I'm the Chair of the Giant Mine Oversight Board. Ben?
- Ben: Ben Nind, Executive Director, Giant Mine Oversight Board.
- Jessica: I'm Jessica Mace. I am the Engagement Manager with the Giant Mine Remediation Project.
- Andre: Andrei Torianski, Socio-Economic Policy Analyst with the Giant Mine Remediation Project as well.
- Natalie: Natalie Plato, Giant Mine Remediation Project.
- Candace: Candace DeCoste, Regulatory Manager with the Giant Mine Remediation Project.
- Erika: Erika Nyssonen, Senior Advisor with GNWT on the Project. Also, Diep Duong sends her regards, as she will not be able to attend. We have last minute senior management requests, but she had intended to be here like every year. It will just be me.
- Marc: Marc Lange with GMOB, Director.
- Mark: Mark Palmer, GMOB Director.
- Paul: Paul Green, GMOB Contractor.
- Ken: Ken Froese, GMOB Director.
- Jessica: Jessica Hurtubise, Environment Department Manager of North Lave Métis Alliance.
- Graham: Graham Clinton, Director with GMOB.
- David: Okay, now I will turn to the folks on Zoom. Johanne?
- Johanne: There are two of us in this meeting room. I'll introduce myself. My name is Johanne Black. I work for the Yellowknives Dene First Nation, Treaty Rights and Governance, as well as Acting Environment Director. Mahsi Cho.
- Mike: Mike Rudkin, CEO for YKDFN
- David: Ken Hall?

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

Ken: Hi, everybody. It is Ken Hall, Director with GMOB. Apologies. I would far sooner be there than here, but I am with the plague, so we will do the best we can. Thanks.

David: Thanks, Ken. Katherine?

Katherine: Hi. Good afternoon. It is Katherine Ross. I'm the Integration Manager with the Giant Mine Remediation Project for CIRNAC out of Ottawa. I would also just like to give regrets for Chris MacInnis, our Director. He would be here on the call, but I believe he is still one of the people without power after our big storm. He would send his regrets.

David: I am sure he would rather be here. Katharine Thomas?

Katharine: Hi, everyone. I am Katharine Thomas here for Alternatives North. Unfortunately, Michael and Gordon were not able to make it today. I was hoping to be there in person but also am recovering from the plague.

David: All right, Todd?

Todd: Todd Slack here. I am a part-time consultant in Yellowknife, and I'm working for the City. Thanks.

David: And last but not least by far, Kerry.

Kerry: Hi, everyone. Kerry Thistle, City of Yellowknife, and I are home due to illness as well. Thanks.

David: Thanks, everyone.

Review of Action Items:

David: Where were we? The Action Items. The first one is GNWT is to share the Remediation Economy Report, and I don't know if that's out yet. It was scheduled to be released in the spring of 2022. Erika?

Erika: It is still spring, right? It's still spring until I can get out to my camp. The Remediation Economy Discussion Paper has been completed. We have presented it to our internal committees, at which point we will be releasing an overview document of the discussion paper on ITI's GNWT website to solicit input. Also, there will be a link provided to the full report.

There will be questions that are targeted for people to answer in addition to letters going out to interested parties to make sure they are aware of this piece coming out. It is now led by ITI. It did sit with us, and with me specifically, to push that through

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

the process. Now, in terms of soliciting engagement and input, that really is an ITI lead, as it sits within their mandate.

Our hope was to have that posted before session and that session, I think, started maybe today. I can't remember, but anyway, in the next few days it will be up, and I will commit to letting this group know when it has gone live.

David: Great. Thank you. The second item is CIRNAC Contribution Agreement for Alt North to be completed. Natalie?

Natalie: That was completed.

David: Action Item 3: YKDFN sharing the release of the TK brochure...Johanne, are there any updates there?

Johanne: In terms of the update on that brochure, I know it has been distributed within the Yellowknives Dene First Nations. What we do need to get back is information from Chief and Council in regard to making it public. That is the next step. I do have an upcoming session with them, so you will hear back from us after that. Give me approximately a week to get a response back on this action item.

David: Great. Thank you. Action Item #4: Remediation Project Team to share socio-economic data with GMOB, as per the request by Graham Clinton. Are there any updates there?

Andrei: Yes. This information consists of two parts. One is the labour resource information and the other are the categories and the dollar values. The labour resource information is currently with Parsons. They are finalizing the data. We expect the draft to come in by the end of June, and the information itself to be available in the summer. For the second part, which are the dollar values and the categories, for this information we are going to have to wait until October for the Treasury Board approval before we can release any of this information.

David: Thanks, Andrei.

Jessica M: I just wanted to add something. Johanne, we actually did get approval from William to distribute the brochure. I'm not sure if you were off at the time or it was just an email, but he did get approval from somebody. He let us know we could distribute it, so we have actually passed it on to site. I was just thinking, if you would like us to get them to hold off on handing that out, we can ask them to do that, or are you okay if they continue to hand it out?

Johanne: If you got the approval from William, then William has done that work. The problem that we have internally right now is William got into an accident, so he is on medical leave. There was not any instruction to me regarding that brochure, so if you already did get that release direction from William, then it should be okay. William has done

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

his work to ensure that it was reviewed and commented on, and probably out for distribution. You can go ahead with making that public. My apologies for that.

Jessica M: That's okay. Thanks a lot because we definitely like the brochure and are happy to hand it out. Thank you.

Johanne: As far as feedback we were given on that, it was well received, that brochure. It was good work that was put into that, so thank you for that.

David: Thank you, Jessica and Johanne. Action Item #5: GMOB Team to share the Project and Implementation Plan early works with the Parties in the spring of 2022. Given that it is still spring, I suspect you are okay if you haven't yet.

Natalie: Thank you. I will just note that there is a typo. It is just Project Implementation Plan. We do have that. We received that in early April, and we are planning to present it to the June Working Group. We will also make it available at the time at our public SharePoint sites. It is coming next month.

David: Great. Thanks, Natalie. Action Item #6: GMOB to post to its website that the Project Team responds to the GMOB socio-economic reporting and analysis of the GMOB report. Where are we, Ben?

Ben: Posted.

David: Posted. Alright. Thanks, Ben. Action Item #7: Project Team to share with GMOB a draft Table of Contents for the Status of the Environment Report, and GMOB to review and respond. Where are we on that?

Natalie: We shared the draft Table of Contents a number of months ago. We circulated it to our working group as well, and we met with GMOB a couple of times. Katherine can provide more details if needed, but we are on track to meet the June 15th deadline.

David: Great. Thanks, Natalie. Marc and I were on some of those calls. That is good. That is the end of the Action Items. Where are we now? The Activities Report.

Update on Activities Report

David: So I am going to read every line in this report, because we have lots of time.... Okay, I am not going to read every line. In fact, I am not going to read any of it. It has been circulated. If people have comments, concerns, or questions, now is the time. Johanne, have you got the package yet?

David: Okay, Ben just said that he sent it.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

Johanne: Yes, I have it.

David: Okay, great, and you probably have not had a chance to review the Activities Report.

Johanne: I have not read it yet, but I will give it a quick read-through with Michael Rudkin to see if there is any response from us.

David: That can happen at any time. It does not have to be today.

Johanne: Okay, thank you.

David: Are there any comments, questions, concerns, or observations? Again, if you do not have any today, the door is open for comments later. It seems we were fairly busy.

Okay, so I do not need any approval for this one. It is an information item, so we will set that aside.

The Survey Phase I Report. Ben, do you want to walk us through quickly on the results of that?

Ben: Certainly. Everyone has received the Phase I Results Report. This was sent out with the package. Some interesting data has been coming in. What we decided to do was instead of running this as a one-month, two-month, or three-month survey, we decided to do it for the entire year. We then divided it into summarizing the survey in three phases.

This is the report for the first phase, so it is 215 responses. The review here, the summary report, covers all of the responses and gives you percentages. It also starts to identify some threads and some summary results that are coming out of those threads of information from the open-ended questions.

This is really for both the review of the Giant Mine Oversight Board in terms of communications and how that is going in terms of GMOB communications, and also those issues that will be of interest to both the parties and the Project Team itself. We are sharing this first Summary Report with you, and we are wide open to communications on that and what your ideas are with that.

To tell you right now, we are at 302 responses now. There has been a big increase. We expect that when this report gets released to the public – We are going to present the results in the Annual Public Meeting tonight, but there is also some interest from the press in the Phase I results. We expect there is going to be a lot of input by the public back into the survey again. We expect that then in the third phase as well.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

In the third phase, what we will be doing is summarizing the entire year and all of the results that come in from the input from the community. That should give us really, really good coverage, but this starts to identify the trends that we are starting to see.

Erika: Ben, is there anything that is worth highlighting now in terms of major trends or signaling of coms or pieces like that? We are working on communications, especially with work starting and our Engagement Plan and things like that.

Ben: I think it is interesting to note what the public is interested in. The other thing to note is how much confidence they have in the actual Project doing what they say they are going to do. For the most part, it is a very low confidence level. Those who are very, very, very confident, that is on page 29. Those who are very confident is 18%. 70% are somewhat confidence, 46% are neutral, 61% are not very confident, and 20% are not confident at all. It just shows that there is a lot of work still to be done in messaging and essentially with communications with the public on all levels.

Also, the breakdown of the information that they are interested in is of interest for all of the parties, and especially for the Project and for GMOB. Thank you.

Jessica M: I was just going to ask about phase two and phase three. They will be the same questions? You won't be adding any questions on or changing them?

Ben: No. They will be the same questions. The thought is for next year to also do a public survey but built upon what we have learned by this public survey, and then to be able to readjust the questions accordingly. So, it will be an ongoing survey to essentially feedback to both GMOB and all the Parties for this work where the community sits in terms of how much knowledge they have, what questions they have, and how they feel about the information that is coming back to them.

David: I guess I would point out that one of the areas that we need to work on a lot is reaching out to the smaller communities. We got very, very low response from Ndilo, Dettah, and the Tlichô communities. We need to improve that, and I think Ben has had some discussions with William. COVID permitting and all the other protocols, we will probably have to do a door-to-door approach in the smaller communities to get a sense of how folks in those communities see the Project and what their major areas of concern are. Is there anything else? Natalie?

Natalie: I just want to note that Katherine Ross has a question.

David: Sorry, Katherine. I do not see the notifications. Oh, there they are. Yes, I do see them, now that I know where to look for them. Katherine, go ahead.

Katherine: Thanks. I have done a bit of a look through the report. There was some really interesting information in there. I would like to say I do agree that those boxes where we see where the open-ended comments are, I think are hugely useful.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

There is one thing I did want to note. I did not do a completed survey, because I do not live in Yellowknife, but I did run through the survey. When it comes to the question of what people's interests or concerns are, and there was a similar thing that happened later on, I guess if you are not willing or thinking of adjusting the question, interests and concerns are two different things.

It could be more useful to understand what those differences are. Someone who is like, 'I'm really concerned about arsenic,' which we know is a concern obviously, as opposed to 'I'm interested in hearing about arsenic.' It is tough to understand where it falls, I guess, when you are showing that there are so many responses, whether it is something that we just need to engage on in general because people are interested in what we are doing versus wow, people are concerned about x, y, z and we should really address that. I do not know if there is an opportunity to adjust the survey in the future to deal with that.

The other thing that I noticed is that if you say, 'No, I don't have any general interest or concerns,' it still makes you put something in before you can continue. It does not skip the question or the big bunch of, 'What would you be interested in hearing about?' You cannot just say, 'Nothing in particular,' or 'Just general stuff,' or 'No, I wasn't interested.' It forces you to put in a response. I think that happened with one of the further questions to do with GMOB things. I just thought maybe it would be useful to point that out. I know it is a small group of people who might not have an interest in things, but it is still forcing them to put in a response. It skews it a little.

David: Those are really good points. Ben, do you have any immediate response to that?

Ben: No, thank you. We will take a look at the survey. We will bring your response and observations when we take a look at it, especially in phase two and phase three stage. If some tweaking needs to be done, we will carry that out, but thank you for those notes.

Katherine: Perfect, thanks.

David: For me, one of the puzzles, and I guess we will tease it out as we go, but there will be two types of responses or respondents: those who are already familiar with the Project and have specific concerns, and those who are not and just want to know more. I know there are questions intended to separate those two, but when you aggregate the responses, then we do have a bit of a challenge. I think it gets back to your point, Katherine, about being really clear in some of the questions. If we have to tweak them, we certainly will. Are there any other comments or questions?

(Pause)

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

Alright, I skipped one of the Agenda Items, the Annual Report. It is here. There will be plenty of copies available for folks tonight as well. Are there any knee jerk reactions to the Annual Report that we can talk about now?

Erika: I just want to thank Ben for making a few tweaks. There was the initial version that went, and then there was some changes and tweaks that needed to happen on just a few pieces. I just want to thank Ben for making those changes.

David: Thanks, Erika. Are there any other comments, concerns, or observations, or are you just going to save them for tonight?

Okay, the Survey Notification of Serious Incidents. Ben, I will turn it to you to walk through, and then to Natalie.

Ben: Actually, this had been a question to Natalie, and we said we would address this here at the meeting. It was essentially brought about because the near-miss incident at the mine site and whether GMOB should be informed. Natalie sent me back a table on a near-miss and water management reportable spill accident malfunction. I am just going to let Natalie speak to that, and then we can go from there.

Natalie: Thank you. For those of you to refresh your memory, we had a near-miss at site in the winter? Spring? Anyway, according to the Environmental Agreement, we have to notify GMOB if there is a reportable spill, accident, or malfunction. We did not believe the near-miss fit any of those categories. I just said perhaps I would like to hear what you think it is and how we rectify this. Thank you. Candace, did you have anything you wanted to add? No? Okay, thanks.

David: Alright, so what is the follow-up?

Ben: I think follow-up is discussion on what should be reported to GMOB. I think the question for the Board came because the press phoned GMOB for a reaction to the incident, and we had not heard about the incident. It was almost like we heard about it from the press before we heard about it from the Project. That really was what brought it up, where the protocols are for communication in terms of incidents like that. Should GMOB be notified? Looking at the Environmental Agreement, we said that yeah, probably we should be notified on that, but again, that is something open to discussion here.

Natalie: I guess near-misses happen on the site, and it is not our practice to report those out. We would not want to start trying to figure out what we should and should not report. I think it would not be clear for us. I'm not clear what is being asked of us here.

Candace: I will just add to that. We do report near-misses in the Annual Report to GMOB. It is not that they are not reported, but maybe it is the speed at which they are reported. In terms of this incident, it went to the media not because the Project informed the

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

media about the incident. I think normally, you would not see a near-miss coming through the media, but they would be reported in our Annual Report.

David: Thanks, Candace. From my perspective, I do not know that we need to do anything more at this point. If we get contacted by the media on something like this, we will refer them to the Project Team. We will leave it to the Project Team to notify us if they think it is something significant enough. Does that work for you, Natalie?

Natalie: I think that is a great idea. We will also take into consideration if we think there is going to be media. Then we can also notify GMOB. Thank you.

David: All right, that sounds good enough for now. Ben?

Ben: Yep.

David: All right, well now it is the highlights from each party.

Todd: Can I ask a question?

David: Yeah, go ahead, Todd.

Todd: We were just talking in terms of this particular example. This was a human health issue. I am looking at the Environmental Agreement, and I would say that something of a similar magnitude that was more environmentally based. Certainly, spills are directly referenced in the Agreement. If there was something else of a similar nature that was not a spill, some sort of upset condition that had an environmental rather than a human health issue, I would encourage the Project to consider that one in a similar way to the spill. That is something where there should be direct contact with GMOB and possibly the Parties, depending on what the event might be. I am just trying to wrap it up and draw a distinction between this incident and things in the Environmental Agreement within the purposes or objectives. Thanks.

David: Thanks, Todd. Candace?

Candace: I agree with you that we do report any environmental events through our Management and Monitoring Plans. We have our action levels, so that lays out when we would report up to the Board. That information also goes through the distribution list to the Parties that are signed up for those notifications. There is still quite a bit of information going out when we do have an environmental event on-site.

Todd: Okay. I agree and I got it. So, when the press calls, we will say, 'Look at the Annual Report that will be submitted in a few months or at the end of next year,' that sort of thing. There is a better way to do that, but that is your guys' choice.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

Candace: I think if we were also looking at something that was really significant, then we have our Emergency Communications Plan that would be rolled out, which does have more direct contact with the Parties. I guess it depends upon the severity of the incident. We would increase our communication depending on what type of incident we have. It is hard to give a scenario for every possible event, but we do have an increasing level of information going out depending on the severity.

David: Thanks, Candace. I think we will just leave it at that for now and work through any other incidents that crop out. Initially, at least, we leave it to the judgement of the Project Team to disseminate that information as they see fit. If complications arise, then we will deal with them at that point.

Okay, we are on to the roundtable for each party. I am going to the Zoom folks first. Todd and Kerry, do you want to take the floor or take the mic?

Roundtable Highlights from Each Party

Update from the City of Yellowknife

Kerry: I know that Todd has to sign off in a couple of minutes. Todd, do you want to jump in here?

Todd: No.

Kerry: Essentially, I will not go on for too long. The City is really focusing its efforts on things we think that we might be able to make or see a difference. It is really the socio-economic side of the Project. We made that position public throughout 2021 when we went to the council. That is where we feel like our efforts are most focused. We will still participate throughout the regulatory process, but we have already given a lot of input throughout and do not really see any big changes on the horizon with respect to that. It is really socio-economic.

On that, we have been working with the Project Team and other City-related interests. For example, the City is trying to compile a Capital List Project so we can try to evade a boom and bust cycle, where we have a lot of capital projects between municipal, territorial, and federal governments, and Giant Mine happening at the same time, and then nothing happening at the same time. I sent that, I think, in November to Andrei. We are still waiting to hear back with respect to that because the Project Team really hinges on the Project Implementation Plan. We are really eager to see that.

Then, there are other things with respect to whether the Project can assist the City by taking fill from the expansion of our landfill, the rock and not garbage, and things of that nature. We have ongoing discussions with the Team on a regular to semi-regular basis to see where our interests overlap. Todd? If I did not miss anything, I think that is it.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

David: Thanks, Kerry. That was very efficient. Are there any questions of Kerry?

I do not see anything popping up, so thank you, Kerry. We will go to the Yellowknives. Johanne?

Update from YKDFN

Johanne: In terms of a roundtable, right now we are going to be sitting down to go over our Communication Plan for the work that we do under Giant. That is coming up shortly. We will be back in the office on June 13th and subsequently, after that, we will be setting up a meeting internal to go through a planning session on how to communicate our initiatives on Giant. That is one of the tasks that we are going to be working on.

We do have an upcoming community engagement session with Giant Mine. Giant Mine will be in our community from June 15th to 16th, and we will be hosting them. They will be engaging the community members on their activities at Giant. That will happen here shortly.

We are also going to be planning a site visit to Giant for the Vegetation Project which will be coming on board shortly. We are involved with that as well. We are still involved in the Hoèla weteèts'eèdè Study. That study is being done out of the Wellness Department of the Yellowknives Dene.

Also too, when it comes to the Health Effects Monitoring Program, I know the next steps for that one include the younger folks in our community as the target research study. We are aware that is going to be happening shortly as well. That is the quick and short update from the Yellowknives. Mahsi Cho.

David: Thanks, Johanne. I just wonder if there would not be an opportunity associated with some of those meetings to distribute the community survey. I think probably on paper, would be best. Do you think that might be possible, or would it be simply confusing?

Johanne: No, I think it is possible. Directly after this meeting, Ben, can you send me an email just so we have a touchpoint on that?

Ben: Yes, I will.

David: Thanks, Johanne. Thanks, Ben. Natalie?

Natalie: Thanks, Johanne...

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

Johanne: Just to add on to that, Ben, if it is going to be done in our community, we should have a touchpoint too in terms of translators for those folks that do need that service.

Ben: Yes, we will talk about that as well.

Johanne: Thank you.

David: Okay, Natalie?

Natalie: Thanks, Johanne for your update. There was quite a bit of feedback on your first item. I was wondering if you could repeat it, because I did not catch it and I do not know if other people would benefit. I think so. Thank you.

Johanne: Sorry about that. I didn't get that. Can you say that again?

Natalie: I was wondering if you could repeat the very first item you talked about before talking about the planning initiatives. We did not hear that. Thank you.

David: Johanne, just for clarification, there was a lot of static on the line. It has cleared up now, but it was hard to hear the first part of your update.

Johanne: Oh, it was regarding a Communication Plan. Just FYI, William is away on medical leave. He got into an accident on the highway. He will be back in the office on June 13th. When William is back in the office, at that point in time, we are going to be setting up a session on communication initiatives and what the Yellowknives are working on when it comes to Giant Mine to create that awareness within the community. Perhaps it is a newsletter or pamphlet, but making sure that gets sent out to the members on a regular basis. That was all I mentioned.

David: Great. Thank you. Katharine Thomas, I almost skipped by you.

Alternatives North Update

Katharine: Yes, usually we go first, but this is a good mix-up. Michael sent some thoughts, so I am going to read those out first. Of course, he sends his regrets for not being able to make it. Regarding the PCP, he says we are glad about what we have accomplished to move the Perpetual Care Plan forward. We look forward to seeing the draft that is currently in development.

With the MMPs and design plans, they continue to improve with each iteration, and we are grateful to continue that work. It is nice to see some of our previous concerns reflected and to see the study progress on those documents.

I want to talk about the Hoèla weteèts'eèdè Study a little bit. In general, when reaching out to this study team with specific questions or concerns, they continue to

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

be excellent at responding to those concerns. However, we would really like them to take a more proactive approach in engaging with the Advisory Committee. I know they are very busy right now. To my knowledge, there has not been an Advisory Committee meeting since January. We have not met the new coordinator or even received official word that a new coordinator has been hired. We do not have an up-to-date schedule and do not know when data collection is set to begin. We know that keeps getting bumped. I am also keen to see better engagement and communication from the study. I looked to see if there was an up-to-date Communications Plan, and it looks like it is still in draft format and has not really be updated since we saw it in, I think, 2020.

I also wanted to touch on communications, engagement, and education more generally. I am really looking forward to having more regular meetings with the Education Committee. Communication and engagement have been really awesome in the past six months alone, from multiple different parties. The publication of the arsenic pamphlet was really great. The Arsenic 101 Workshop that was hosted in Dettah was awesome. The Engagement Evaluation engagement went really well. I have also seen the Traditional Knowledge pamphlet from YKDFN, and that looks great, and from GMOB, the community survey. It is really awesome initiative. I also think there have been updates to the online library, which is awesome. We said 'awesome' a lot. Communications has been a struggle, I think, with all of Giant Mine, so it is really excellent to see all of these initiatives. It is something that I am really interested in, and Alternatives North as a whole has a really keen interest in as well. Thanks. Mahsi.

David: Thank you, Katharine. Are there any comments or observations from folks?

(Pause)

There is a lot of stuff going on. All right, thanks. There do not seem to be any questions, so we will go to the next group. It will be...who is making eye contact? The Project Team.

Project Team Update

Natalie: I will just run down the list of items you asked to report on, and I will probably look to some team members as well to assist me.

Current site status: I am sure most of you are aware that we are entering Year Two of remediation. Year One went great, and we are slated for Year Two. I will not provide any more updates, because we update every time on everything all the time, so I will just leave it at that unless anyone has specific questions.

The GMRP Budget Update: I do not have a budget update at this time. We do have a revised budget that came with our Project Implementation Plan, but we have to go for

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

Treasury Board approvals on that, and I think we are currently on the docket for late September or early October. The only thing that can derail that is the federal election, which I do not think is going to happen. Once we have that approved, we will be able to release those numbers.

Schedule Update: The big item that came out of our Project Implementation Plan was an updated schedule, scope schedule budget where the items are looked at. At the last Working Group, it was updated that our schedule now takes us to 2038, so it does go past our funding. That is, hence, why we are going back to the Treasury Board. The 2038 was the optimal schedule to minimize critical path issues, obviously the sequencing on the scope items, which are very intricate and challenging.

When we had originally given 2035 to Parsons as our deadline, they did come back with some options for a schedule to meet that 2035 deadline, but there was a lot of risk in that schedule. A lot of items had to happen early on in the Project, and there were a lot of peaks and spikes for labour demands to meet 2035. So, they came back and said, "Can you let us look at some options that go past 2035?" We gave them that, and they did come back with 2038 that actually normalized the labour demands across all the years, not perfectly, but it was a much more consistent dollar value per year and labour capacity, which is actually what we wanted to maximize in northern local Indigenous labour.

That is why we did approve the 2038 budget. It is much more achievable. It maximizes all of the items we want it to maximize, and it did not have to push a lot of work early on in the Project. Hence, we have this new schedule. For instance, a lot of the public is interested in the townsite area and the boat launch. In the 2035 schedule, that was happening right away. Now the work can be delayed until 2038, so that gives people more time to get organized, get their boats moved, and that sort of thing. That is what we heard from those stakeholders in the area if you can delay it, that would be great.

Anyway, the new schedule does have us going to 2038. We are going to do a presentation at Working Group, and we can share that as well. The schedule is available now. We submitted one with our annual Water License Report, so there is a high-level one on the website, and we have distributed it too. If anyone would like that, we are more than happy to share that.

I'm just looking for questions or comments before I continue.

Erika: Natalie noted 2038, but it is 2028 for the Town Site Marina area. It is just a slip of the tongue, I think.

Natalie: Oh yeah, because I am so focused on the finish date of 2038. Thanks for clarifying, Erika.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

- David: I think you are optimistic when you refer to 2038 as a finish date as well, but that is just a personal comment. All right, are there any other questions on that?
- Natalie: I do have some more updates, but that was the big schedule update.
- David: Graham?
- Natalie: The next item on the list -
- David: Natalie, Graham has a question.
- Graham: Natalie, with respect to the release of the PIP in October, one of the things that I talked about previously is understanding the overall PIP and if we could see it without the values so we can understand where the activities are actually going to take place. It would allow us to do the modeling in advance and insert the numbers when they come available.
- Natalie: Absolutely. That is available today if you like. I will upload it onto our SharePoint site. It is over 800 pages, but that is the document I will be presenting to the Working Group and a high-level summary of it. I am sure most people do not want to read 800 pages, but I can certainly share that with you right away.
- Graham: Okay, thanks. Thank you.
- David: I can assure you that Graham will read every line. Marc Lange?
- Marc: Sorry, I am just trying to clarify. The Project schedule is proposed to be changed to 2038. With that change, there is a change in the budget. The budget change goes to Treasury Board. That part is private until approved. Do I understand that correctly?
- Natalie: That is correct. Any Treasury Board submissions are considered Cabinet confidential.
- Great. Thank you. The next item is our QRA update, and that was the piece specifically requested by GMOB on acute toxicity. We did have some contracting challenges to get our consultant working on them, but they are back on board. I am just reading my note from Emma. They are currently working on it, and they would like to come back and consult with the Working Group and GMOB this summer, I believe, before they finalize it. It is coming. It is not done yet, though.
- Katherine? I will just add it might not be until fall.
- Ken F: It is just good that it is ongoing, so I will look forward to the results.
- Natalie: Thank you. The delays were strictly from a contracting perspective, so we are back on track. Thank you.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

Regulatory reviews: I am not sure if Candace has anything she specifically wants to point out?

Candace: I don't have anything specific other than to thank everybody for their participation in the regulatory reviews. We do get a lot of feedback, and our documents are really improved because of that feedback. Thanks, everyone for participating.

Natalie: The next one is the socio-economic update. Andre has a few, but I guess I will just point out that in our latest newsletter, we did award three contracts. Those were the ones from last year, the early works backfill, the non-hazardous waste landfill, and the AR1 freeze pad, which all went to Northern Indigenous contractors, and all through the PIP Implement Strategy for Indigenous business. For us, that was a great success. With that, I will pass it over to Andre.

Andre: Thanks, Natalie. I just wanted to go back and let Kerry know that I have received a request for labour resource numbers from the City back in November. As I mentioned earlier in my update, as soon as we have this information from Parsons – and we are aiming to receive a draft in June – we will share that, not just with GMOB, Graham, and the City, but also with the larger Socio-Economic Working Group. As Natalie mentioned, there are more reduced peaks in the overall breakdown of labour, and we will analyze that throughout the remainder of the schedule for the Project. That is one of the things. I just wanted to note that.

One of the key things to the budget currently from the socio-economic perspective is focusing on the Socio-Economic Strategy Update. We have engaged the Socio-Economic Working Group on this, so they are aware that this work is ongoing. One of the key things that needs to be included in the Strategy update are the labour resource numbers, as well as the overall dollar value of the Project. Due to the TB submission, we are going to have to wait to finalize the Strategy and wait for TB approval before we can include that, finalize the Strategy, and release it. We are aiming for November or December of this year to make the Strategy available our stakeholders.

I also want to note that a significant amount of work went into the report, and the ITI has been working on assessing Parsons' performance since they took over in December 2017 as the Main Construction Manager. From the Project side, a lot of work went into it, but as well as ITI. I just wanted to appreciate the concern and the work that ITI has put into it. We are really looking forward to seeing this posted out for everybody, for stakeholders to look at that.

One of the other key things that the Project is working on from a socio-economic perspective in addition to the Strategy is the website update for the CIRNAC Giant Mine website for socio-economic stats. I also wanted to note one of the key commitments we put forward is to modify the procurement tools. It is very important for us to pay attention to if those tools we are using like that IOC, Indigenous

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

Opportunity Considerations, and the upcoming strategy for Indigenous businesses, serve their purposes. But, there are other tools available for Parsons to use. One of the significant things that has been modified this year early on in January was the increase to the sole source. I think that is a very significant change from the usual 25,000 threshold to 100,000. Again, considering the size of work packages that are going out, we are talking millions, so not a lot will fall under that category, even with increased threshold. It still gives opportunity for smaller contracts, for Parsons to direct them towards local businesses. Thank you.

Natalie: Great. Thank you. Continuing on, the next item requested was the Perpetual Care Plan Update. I just wanted to acknowledge Alternatives North and Katharine's comments. Thank you very much. It is lovely to hear that you like the accomplishment of the Perpetual Care Plan Advisory Team, because we echo those as well. We think we have done some great work. We do acknowledge that we did not meet the deadline in the Environmental Agreement. However, as I have said before, I think we should rather get it right than meet an artificial deadline.

That said, COVID did provide a lot of challenges for the PCP Advisory Task Force, such as challenges to meet only online, especially with the Yellowknives and some of our other rights and stakeholders. It made it more difficult.

I can report, though, the scope of work or Statement of Work is with PSPC, Public Services Procurement Canada. I do not know if we have an exact date when it is going to hit the streets, but it is soon. That is the RFP to get a contractor onboard to right version one. Erika has something to add.

Erika: Just almost right. The Statement of Work has been completed based on all the work from the Task Force, so thank you everyone for that. We have put together a Statement of Work, and that will be a component of the larger RFP and in conversations with PSPC. Because it is a project that is complicated and has so many different facets of the Project, the recommendation from PSPC is that they send out a request for information. This is...actually, Mark, you could probably tell us better. This is things like a reasonable amount of time for the contract to actually be set. Is it a period of 10 years or 1 year? Likely, 1 year is not enough. Is it 3 years? So, some sort of feedback on that before we make final decisions; things like what kind of information you might need in the RFP package that we were not thinking of including, and things like that.

The Scope of Work is done, and we are just in the conversations. Roxanne is back from her international travels. Actually, Graham, you can tell us all about that too. Our thinking is that perhaps we can send out the Statement of Work now. The other option is to wait until we have that feedback from the request of information and then come together and do a walkthrough of that Statement of Work with the whole Task Force. We are just batting around those ideas. We have lit the fire under the butts of PSPC, and we said let's aim to get that RFP out in July. That means there will be a workshop

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

prior to that at some point. I am poking those guys, but a lot of really good work has been done, and so a couple of days of meetings with the Task Force was really valuable. We have a really solid scope of work.

David: Great. Thank you. Natalie?

Natalie: The next item is the Hoèla weteèts'eèdè Study. I don't think Johanne provided an update, but obviously it is an independent study by Wilfred Laurier University in partnership with the YKDFN. The YKDFN have asked us to pause for data collection. I know Katharine, you expressed some lack of information, so we will get that information out to the Task Force or ask Ketan Shankardass, the lead, to get some of that information out. We are just waiting to hear back from the Yellowknives if we can proceed and when we can proceed. We were ready to launch the study last week. We are hoping to go. We want to get it done.

YK HEMP: Obviously, we are in a slow year. We will start data collection, as Johanne mentioned, of the children. We will start next spring, so we are just sort of getting organized. We were really hoping the Hoèla weteèts'eèdè Study would be done, and then the YK HEMP would ramp up, because we have the YKDFN Wellness Team on it. We don't want to overburden them, so we hope the timings will work out on that.

Then the last item on the list here was the Apology and Compensation. Again, I will just remind everyone it is outside the scope of the Giant Mine Remediation Project. Matt Spence was invited. He could not make it today, but he did provide me with an update. I don't know if anyone listened to the last Federal Budget when \$2.2 million dollars was announced to support the Yellowknives Dene in their involvement in the Apology and Compensation. They are preparing their legal brief and their documentation with that. It was \$2.2 million over years, so they got \$1.1 million this year, and then I believe it was \$1.1 million for the next year to support their work for that. So, that is ongoing.

I think that is all I had from this list unless anyone had anything else to add.

David: My only comment would be congratulations on the pronunciation of the Stress Study. Alright, are there any comments or questions? Is there anybody on the Zoom call? Graham?

Graham: Yes, just to sort of back up. I actually had a question for Andre. It is a request that we made. I'm all about trying to do as much work as the Strategy is developed and to do all the background work. One of the requests we had was about the data that was used to produce the last Annual Report, the economic data that was contained in it. I think in one of our calls I mentioned that the presentation of the information was in percentages, and it was hard to understand. Certainly there was a database that was used to generate those graphs and figures. One of our requests was if we could have

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

that database so we could start to put together the labour market side of what will eventually become a model.

Andre: Yes, correct. The presentation was done in percentages, but the Annual Report does also present them in person, hours, totals. Are you looking specifically for a fiscal year or the entirety since we started tracking that information?

Graham: If the entire database is available, I would take it all.

Andre: We are working on posting this information on our website. Understandably, that will take several months before it is published. Let's see if we can take this offline and try to get you some of that information beforehand.

Graham: That's good. Thank you.

David: Great. Thank you. Are there any other questions or follow-up for the Project, the federal side of the Project?

Jessica M: I just had one quick update that I thought GMOB might be interested in. We were at the trade show this past couple of weekends ago when it was Mother's Day weekend. I started as the Engagement Manager when COVID was happening, so what I am hoping, because I of course looked at the survey results and it seems that people do not know a lot about Giant. What I am hoping is that there has been a gap because we have not been able to get out into the public. Even our annual forum a couple of years ago did okay online. We had 50 people, or 50 to 60 people. Then this past year we only had 25 to 30. I think that people might be burning out online and they might hopefully come in person. That is one piece is the annual forum. The tradeshow I found really fun to be at, and a lot of people did come up and speak to us, which was encouraging. They asked us lots of questions wanting to get an update on Giant Mine. I think we talked to over 100 people, and I am hoping there is word of mouth in Yellowknife and more information will get out that way.

Then the other thing that we are doing is a media briefing, which was on hold the last two years because of COVID. That is in person, so I think Natalie, you guys are scheduling that for July. I think that will also be a great way to get information out.

David: Thanks, Jessica. I mean communication is always a challenge. It just is frustrating for me in a community of 20,000 people plus the smaller communities that we have 300 respondents. Most of those respondents would be people who are already are engaged in the discussions. Somehow we have to reach out more, use all the tools we have, and then really be able to understand what the concerns are that the community wants addressed.

Right now, personally, I don't know how valid the results are, to be frank. You get the interested people, and they have their points of view. Then you have a few people

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

who happen upon the survey and respond. Somehow or another, we really do need people to care a bit more about what is going on. I don't know how you do that, but we have got to keep trying I guess. Erika?

Erika: I was looking at Jess to see which one I was going to get. I touched on the PCP, and Katherine and I are...no, not Katherine. Sorry, to regroup...Hi, Erika Nyssonen here with you today. So, I gave an update on the PCP work. As it was mentioned about the work that is happening on the economics and the modeling, I have looped Graham in, which is great. We are happy to have you work with us on that with the NWT Bureau of Stats who Graham mentioned, "Oh yeah, that guy can do some stuff for you." The Bureau of Stats has done the work on the remediation economy, so this offline meeting that Andre mentioned would be great to have soon, because we are doing work for the City on the Capital Project.

We are trying to pull all of this information together and have a product or an end product that will actually accomplish the goals of many parties. I look forward to that coming together. I know a lot of it has been dependent on Parsons labour numbers coming out, and we are hopeful with the budget. Things need to happen in the way they are supposed to happen, so there is a bit of a delay there. However, we have the Bureau of Stats on standby to do the work that needs to get done, so we are there and ready to go.

We have been doing a lot of work on arsenic. It is related to Giant, obviously, but there has been some other work that Jeff and I have been working on like the results of the Legacy Arsenic Risk Assessment. The brochure, you gave us props for it in your Annual Report. Thank you very much. That should hit your mailboxes, I think this week or next week... You got it? Alright. That has gone out to everybody in Yellowknife. Working with the YKDFN, we had a couple of keen kids go out and deliver the pamphlet door to door in Ndilq and Dettah. Right now, if you have not seen it yet, it will be at your doorstep soon.

We have also worked with the YKDFN Wellness Department to get arsenic information up on their website. It has gone on some social media. We have been working with Renada, Johanne, if you're not familiar with that, and Jennifer Shops. We plan to continue to support any kind of coms materials they need on arsenic-specific stuff. That's great. I look forward to the Communications and Engagement Planning Sessions, Johanne. I think there is a lot of stuff that we can support with that.

As Andre mentioned, ITI did carry out this procurement report, analysis of procurement onsite. That also hopefully was supposed to go out this week, maybe next week. It will be a two-pager overview of the full analysis, sort of a snapshot telling people the major outcomes, but then there will also be a link to the full report that will be provided. This is information that we know MLAs are interested in as well, so there will be some targeted, "Hey PS, we have done this; have a look." That should

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

be very soon. The Project Team worked very closely with our colleagues at ITI, so this is great.

We did the Arsenic 101 Workshop in YKDFN, which brought together all the researchers that have been involved in arsenic plus the work that GNWT has done in addition to having Health and Social Services there. Ken was there along with Sandy, your health consultant or advisor. Then we also gave a similar presentation to the Tlîchô the following week. We are really trying to get that understanding of what all these studies are, what they are informing, and ultimately at the end how to use the land.

Land use planning: We know that is a hot topic. We hear you. Our consultants have been working on a lot of million things with all of Candace's regulatory. We have put a lot of reliance on this constraints map to continue those conversations. We have that now, and our plan is to again, like I've mentioned, go to Lands with that and start having those conversations followed with conversations with the City. That is so close.

That is enough for me. Actually, just one last thing...I'm sorry, I babble and chat a lot. We know that there has been interest in having GNWT and Waters be involved in management plan reviews. They have come onboard to review water-specific plans. I will note that they did review the latest tailings management plan as well, and those comments have been provided to the team. Again, focus is really on water plans, so the updates to the AEMP. They have provided a review on the Dam 3 Reclamation Plan, which folks will be seeing soon. That was an internal review. They are participating, but on a smaller scale than they typically do.

David: Okay. Thanks, Erika. Are there any comments or questions from anyone? Yeah, Paul.

Paul: Just with regards to your last point, Erika, I believe during the water license process, the Waters comments were integrated somehow into the document so the Parties could see that. Is that possible with this next round or are they meant to stay sort of internal to your work?

Erika: Thanks, Paul. Yeah, I should have clarified that. The process is continuing how it was when they initially did the review. What is happening is that ENR Waters will review during pre-engagement like all the other stakeholders. Those comments will be submitted into a comment response table and provided. I am not sure if it is part of the plan or a supplementary document of the pre-engagement comments from stakeholders. When it moves into the Board process, if folks want to echo similar comments that ENR Waters has already said, they are welcome to. This is our effort to show transparency. The role of ENR within the actual Board process is to step back and participate as a proponent essentially once it hits the Board, but there is that review for those specific plans prior.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

Paul: How about for things like the AEMP, which will not have a pre-engagement step? Is there some way to get that feedback communicated? Yeah, with the pre-engagement stuff, it works perfect because it is all there. It is just these things that do not have the pre-engagement stuff.

Erika: Yeah, I'll let Candace speak to it, but there is an intention to have some meetings with the GMRP team, Candace's group, and the consultants, plus ENR experts to have those discussions. How that would be captured or recorded, that probably has not been fleshed out, because we have not actually carried out an exercise like that yet. I'll hand it over to Candace to see if she has some thoughts.

Candace: I think what we were thinking on the AEMP Design Plan would be our more significant update, so when we move into YK Bay. I am not sure that one won't have some sort of earlier review. There will be more engagement on it, so I could see us submitting that review or comment table again with our submission to the Board, so you would see them then. We usually have them attached to the cover letter that goes in the plan. They are a separate document.

David: Alright, thanks Candace and Erika. Are there any other questions for Erika? It was an interesting comment about getting some kids to distribute the brochures. Maybe we could use the same approach for the communication questionnaire. Alright, Jess?

NSMA Update

Jess H: I will just track down my list, and I will try to keep an eye out if there are questions at some point in time. Please just stop me, because I tend to also blab sometimes.

Starting on the regulatory, I definitely personally have been feeling a little more challenged on regulatory reviews in the last few months, only because it has been overlapped with year-end. I feel like every time I do a GMOB semi-annual update, I have something capacity-related, so we took on two new staff this year. It was their first time living through a reporting season, and it was very epic and exciting, but a lot of work on me for training purposes. But, they were champs, and it has been going really, really well.

That being said, though, the regulatory reviews that I have done, I will echo what Katharine said that I have less and less things to say. The documents, we are seeing a clear progression through them. I will commend the GMRP for that.

For socio-economics, I think the growing ticket item topic for NSMA...I was just talking to Mark in the other room here at lunchtime before I migrated over to our GMOB meeting. Our board is struggling to find contracts at site that suit membership experience and scale of work. NSMA does not have as many either businesses within membership or subsidiaries within Metcor or Metshaw sister businesses for NSMA

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

on the same scale as say, Yellowknives Dene or Tl'ichô government. Trying to find bids that match the experience level or the scope of work is our biggest challenge.

It is my understanding that we have not had any successful bids thus far, but we do admit that there is a big responsibility on us to make sure that we are continuing to be updating ourselves on the bids that are coming out, applying for them on time, and putting our effort in. I will say that we have had quite a number of great conversations with Jess Mace, with Andrew, and Aaron to try to understand where it is NSMA comes in for that application and how to improve and get ourselves in there. If it is at all, it is just flagging the importance that that board is concerned about the fact that we have not gotten ourselves into that. It will continue to be a priority for them.

In terms of socioeconomics on a broader scale and staff at NSMA, it continues to be a really big concern for us in terms of having more than just me and sometimes the Board being on socio-ec. We are really hoping that at some point in time we will be able to have a dedicated socio-ec person within our membership, whether it is Giant Mine specific or just broadly socio-economics.

I had conversations with Jess earlier, late last year or earlier this fiscal year, about funding that could have maybe come from Giant Mine, but it did not seem to fit within the scope of our Contribution Agreement. We got suggestions for looking to Can Nor, which I will continue to look into as well, but yeah, the funding money for a salaried socio-economic staff is something that we kind of hit as a barrier for our organization right now.

There might be a possibility within our NSMA five-year training plan, which I am happy to chat with you guys about because we are developing that right now. I am hoping that by the end of the summer, or actually in the next two weeks, we will have a Draft 1 for you guys to review for a training plan. I am hoping we have a fleshed-out training plan in the next four to five months I guess. We are hoping to really get that done before Christmas time at the very least. There are some good lights at the end of the tunnel that might be able to help us with that gap for a socio-economic position.

I will pause a second there because I think that was probably the biggest information dump. Okay, there do not seem to be questions, so I will keep going.

For the PCP, I don't really have many updates. I participated in the workshops. It definitely was intense in terms of the online format, but I am happy we were able to get through it anyway. I look forward to seeing what it looks like in terms of the Hoèla weteèts'eèdè Study. I did meet with Sophie, Keaton, and Sue probably about a month ago when they were in town. I got to go see the study offices, and they seem to be really, really excited about the work starting because they had just done the training. Then I haven't heard anything since then, so I am kind of on the same wavelength as Katharine that it just went radio-silent. It was a little bit jarring

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022

because I think somebody brought it up to me last week. Yeah, has the study been happening? Is it going to start? I had no updates to say.

If it is at all possible to communicate a bit of what the anticipated next steps are then that would be great because I also did not realize that it was a request from YKDFN to pause it. We definitely want to be respectful of any Project needs if it does need to be delayed.

One thing that I have been discussing with Mark, our Vice President, is NSMA's role in promoting the study to make sure that residents, whether NSMA or otherwise, participate in the study and it is not just solely YKDFN. We do want to have that broad perspective for the study itself. The way we can do that is just by being prepared for our own communications within our own membership to say hey, the study is coming up here. Please participate in it, as you did with HEMP for example. That is my only request for that one is to keep us up to date. It does seem like it has been progressing well, and we are really looking forward to seeing how the study turns out.

For HEMP, my colleague, Noah Johnson, has taken over NSMA's seat for the working group for HEMP from Adelaide who was previously with HEMP. Noah and I met with Renata a few weeks ago when she was in town, and she dropped off the data for NSMA's participation in the HEMP study. That was really great. I think that was a perfect example of just Indigenous stewardship, ownership of data, and reconciliation on a broader scale. She showed up. She gave us the USB stick, ran through all the files, and went here you go; this is yours now, and please let us know how we can support you if you would like to do further studies, participate in conferences, do any type of reassessment, and this is ultimately yours now. That was a great feeling and a good meeting we had in the last few weeks. That was really nice.

I know Aquatic Advisory is not on this list, but I did want to bring it up because I have been seeing this budding interest from either our members on the committee or just broader members who are interested in hearing about what is happening with fish during remediation. This has definitely become of growing interest in our membership.

One concern that we continue to have is just the DFO's broader role in determining overview of remediation onsite and guidance in terms of what protocols and equipment can be used for fish protection and water protection. Who is doing what? Is it DFO? Is it contractor? Is it Project? I will say thank you to GMOB for setting up a meeting with DFO to chat about that. That will be helpful.

Then this summer we are going to be hiring one to two students that are going to be starting shortly. I am hoping to tackle some Giant Mine-related topics like updating NSMA's website to have more Giant Mine info for our members. Ben, you had suggested that would be super key for communications, so I am hoping we can have

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

a specific Giant Mine page on our website. Then you can click anything that is related to NSMA or even link it back to broader CIRNAC webpages and that kind of thing.

Then my last item is relating to Bill Slater, only because NSMA is the host for Bill Slater's contract. I have been doing the invoices for his work as our technical advisor. Understandably over the last two years, the contracting amount of work has been lower than what we expected, which makes sense because he has not been traveling to Yellowknife, or meetings, or we have not had the volume of meetings perhaps as we used to. This is just my gentle request for Parties to consider how you might want Bill Slater to be doing document reviews or just generally providing technical input to us over the next year, because I think he misses us and might be a little bit bored. That might be an assumption. I don't want to talk for Bill, but just as a reminder because I think there are some big things that we can better put specific requests to him to really get his input and advice on work.

I think that is everything from me.

David: Thanks, Jess. I think Bill has a side business called "Pine Point." He may not be missing us all that much. Are there any additional comments or questions for Jess? Erika?

Erika: I will insure that Ketan and Sue know that Parties are interested in understanding where the study sits right now. We have been respecting the internal processes happening with YKDFN in terms of reporting back on how they would like the study to proceed. We have been sort of silent in waiting for that, but we can nevertheless provide that kind of update to the Advisory Committee and the Technical Committee so people know where we are at. Thanks.

David: Thanks. I've got to correct myself. It is not Pine Point. It is Faro, and I think he is busy on that. Maybe he is busy on Pine Point too. I don't know. Are there any other comments or questions for Jess?

Alright, so we will turn it over to GMOB now. As usual, I will turn it over to the Board members in order. We will start with Marc Lange and get an update from each, including Marc, and their respective portfolios.

GMOB Update

Marc: There are probably three areas I have been working on. One is the regulatory review. I think as I updated last time, my general observation continues now of being pretty satisfied with the amount of information shared during the meetings and the response of the Project Team, the concerns that they hear and including them in the revisions of documents. There is not much more on that, but I'm attending those meeting and enjoying learning more about the Project.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

The second one is that we have had a couple of concerns come to GMOB about DFO's transparency in the regulatory process as it relates to the Project. We will be hosting a meeting shortly with a few of the affected parties and DFO. We are going to keep this meeting small at this point as opposed to broadening it to the entire Project Team, because the sense we are getting right now is the lack of information and transparency is coming from DFO as opposed to a wider Project issue.

We will try to break that logjam, but at some point, it might be helpful to increase the size of the meeting, because some of the issue we are hearing are Project related, like aquatics, fish, and what we are doing with this particular element. At this point, just a heads up, we will try to work with Fisheries on that part.

As I am hearing from folks about what their concerns are, it has brought to mind what other major projects have done once a project transitions from design to operations. There may be a gap or an opportunity to have a meeting, more regular meetings of all the regulators and have them report on what they are doing with respect to Giant Mine remediation. So example, we will have a table where inspectors can say I've gone to the site, this is what I have seen, and involve other parties who want to know who is watching the site and what is going on. For example, having Fisheries, having Environment Canada, having GNWT and saying, "This is what we are noticing. This is what we are doing as part of our mandate. Here are some updates." That is a thought that I am having. We might not be at the time yet to do that, but maybe in the coming future we might make that suggestion.

The third thing is working on the arsenic research side of things. We do not have anything to announce at this point. We would like to enhance a little bit and develop a bit of a science strategy or research strategy for what GMOB has been doing, along with TERRE-NET. That will be something I'll be working on in the next couple of months. That's it for me.

David: Thanks, Marc. Are there any questions, comments, concerns, or observations? Natalie and then Erika.

Natalie: Thanks very much, Marc. I have a question. The research strategy: I'm not sure, maybe it is not in your update, but is there an update on the Research Program? Thank you.

Marc: Yeah, what is the best way to answer that? We don't have a document to hand out publicly. I think that is part of what I would like to do is have a bit of an evergreen structure where we can update every quarter what the scientists are doing and where they are at and have that evergreen document be public-facing and plain-language as opposed to the scientific reports that we are getting now.

We did have a meeting with TERRE-NET though, GMOB and TERRE-NET. Was that in April? They gave us a bit of an update on where they are at. I do not have a ready-made update here for each of the six studies, but the general message is they are

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

returning more and more to the lab. I forget now if they will be producing something for us in written format other than the scientific publications that they are working on. Is there anything from you, Ben, you recall from our discussion?

Ben: Essentially for the Research Program for the most part, there is a return to the labs because COVID shut down all of them. There is a return to the labs now. They expect that this time next year the results for the studies are going to be available. What they have to go through is number one, compile those reports. Then they have to go through an editing phase, and then they have to get published. Once they are published, they are shared with us. Then we can share them broadly. So, we expect by this time next year there will be a raft of reports coming back to us.

That is on the four streams that we are looking at. In other words, the sulfidation study, the cementation study, the vitrification study, as well as the speciation study. That will be those four. There are three more studies have been added as a result of Alliance funding managed through the University of Waterloo. It will have a positive effect upon our Research Program, but GMOB puts no money into that. It is a net benefit as a result. That is where we are at with that.

David: I have just one comment. I believe we post the updates from the Project Team on the website. There is some information there, but from my perspective, we have never done a very good job about communicating the Research Program. We need to fix that. There has not been a lot of progress lately, but that does not mean we should not be reporting that there has not been a lot of progress lately.

Natalie: Thank you. I do notice in the back of the report that there is a summary as well, so that is great. Further to that, I guess my question is related to the samples. I know we had originally met and talked about a plan for 2022, and we are now on track for 2023. I just want to check in and make sure that is still adequate and sufficient. Thank you.

Ben: Yes, Natalie, that is the understanding from our point of view. We are planning accordingly with that. We have already checked in with Lakefield and taken a look at storage protocols with them for such a large amount. That is definitely our understanding, so we are working on that date with you. Thank you.

David: Erika? I have a question for you. I forgot to raise this earlier. The Wildlife Management Protocol for the site that ENR put together: Are there any updates on that? Is it actually being tracked? Do you have any idea?

Candace: Do you mean the Wildlife Management and Monitoring Plan, or are you talking about the feedback from ENR on our requirement to have a plan?

David: I think the latter. What I am thinking of is the requirement that ENR has of project proponents elsewhere to develop a Wildlife Management and Monitoring Program. In this case, they decided it did not apply to Giant but voluntarily put something

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

together. I am just wondering if there is any kind of reporting mechanism. Do they report the number of observations and all that stuff?

Candace: Giant Mine voluntarily put together the Wildlife Management and Monitoring Plan. We submit that to the Board, but the Board does not have it as a condition for approval. Then in terms of monitoring, we do not have a reporting aspect on that, other than in the annual report, but it is escaping me right now exactly what those requirements are. I can look them up.

David: Yeah, I would appreciate that, because there is not much point in having a monitoring program if you are not reporting on the results. I mean, maybe there aren't any bears onsite, who knows, but there has got to be something that is being seen and reported. I mean, I recall the report of a crane being down on the tailings pond years ago, but it was a different kind of crane. Whatever you can dig up for us, I would appreciate.

Candace: We definitely have wildlife encounters onsite and nesting birds sometimes. I will just double check that those are included in the annual report, but everything is documented from that point of view. We follow-up with ENR any time we have to take any action to remove a nest or even if we have encounters. We have not had any bears this season, but we did last year. I will just double check what is actually reported and get back to you.

David: If you can just point us to the site these are reported to, that would be enough I think. Erika?

Erika: Well, I have the draft State of the Environment Report, and that is where it is going to be. There is a wildlife chapter. Within that, there are the birds observed onsite, whether they are nesting, and key results of birds and mammals. That State of the Environment Report will capture aspects of the wildlife monitoring onsite.

David: That is over the period of the past five years basically. It would be interesting to see the regular reporting, those bears-on-site reports. Is there any follow-up on Marc's presentation?

Okay, thanks. Mark Palmer?

Mark P: I would like to say it is good to see people. This is double the number of people I have come in contact with in two years, so it is good. It has been pretty quiet. Again, I know I said this last time, but I am very excited to see the Project actually being implemented. It is great. I have been involved with this, I think since it started in 2004 in many different capacities, so I am glad to see that.

My main involvement is on socio-economic right now. I attend all those meetings, and I am looking forward to the Strategy and updating that to reflect lots of changes and lots of things that have happened. I think that is going to be good.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

I have also been involved with the PCP, which up until now has been mostly on trying to help or give advice on procurement and different things you might be able to do. I also think that is a really key document moving forward, because it touches on every part of the Project, obviously, including socio-economics. It is extremely important for everything. I think I will continue on with that.

I also attend the Working Group meetings, because I think that is a good way for me to just keep my pulse on the Project. Yeah, other than that, I don't have a lot to add. I am looking forward to those two documents, especially to work on those and get them going.

I am hoping that with all the work that is going on now that there is not any supply chain issues and too many things that would put a strain on the Project over the summer. I know just from my personal experience in building in Kelowna, we could not get driveways poured. We could not get things done between either lack of supplies or lack of staff. I am just hoping that does not come into play in the Project during this summer and next summer probably. Hopefully, that goes away soon after that. Anyway, that is all I have.

David: Thanks, Mark. Are there any questions or comments for Mark? Yeah, Natalie.

Natalie: Thanks, Mark. The only supply chain issue we have really encountered is the cement for the paste backfill program, but we have lots of lead time, so it is not an issue. Otherwise, most of the activities like the town site deconstruction, do not need a lot of supplies, so luckily we have been okay. Thank you.

Mark P: One more thing: I hope there are no Calgary fans in here, because there are only Edmonton fans. Big game tonight.

David: That's going to make for a short public meeting tonight. Paul?

Paul: Thanks. I don't really have much to add to what Marc Lange said with regard to the regulatory. It is progressing. I really appreciate the outreach efforts the Project does make in engagement in the Working Group meetings. I think they are very valuable in facilitating the reviews of the plans and hopefully making the documents better. I think that is what everybody wants is to have, documents that are legitimately useful and meet the requirements. I appreciate the outreach and the efforts that go into it.

David: Thanks, Paul. Are there any comments?

(Pause)

Seeing none, Ken?

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

Ken F: The mic situation here is the least comfortable for me, for I am going to sit back. Sorry, I've got middle-aged male problems.

David: We don't need any more details.

Ken F: Sorry, that also came out wrong. Sciatica. That is the issue here.

Okay, on that note, Ken Froese here with Human Health issues, of which I am experiencing some, so if I get up and walk around, it is not because I am bored. It is because I'm changing position.

The updates from the Hoèla weteèts'eèdè Study were good. I was also wondering where things were at, because I had not heard anything in the last six weeks or so, or eight weeks. I'm not sure how long, six weeks. I think all of us involved with the project are really looking forward to getting into the data collection phase. That project team, the HW Project Team, has done a whole lot of work, and I think very good work, so getting to that stage will be really good.

The Arsenic 101 Workshop that Erika mentioned was a very good time to be together in the same room. It was another one of these first in-person meetings since the pandemic began. It was apparent that we all really looked forward to that interaction. I think the interaction with the Arsenic 101 approach and the YKDFN community was well received. Some of the comments that came out on the second day were very good in that participants were receiving new information in a new context that really helped them understand the role of arsenic in health outcomes and in how we can use science to understand them, or on the other hand, not understand what we cannot do with the science. I think those are both sides of a very challenging legacy we have with arsenic around here.

The HEMP study: It is always good to catch up with Renata and Lori. They are certainly looking forward to the next phase of the study. I think what their team has done with publications and data they have received in the first round, has been good. For an academic group, for a university group to do a study like that, getting publications out is always great. It is part of their reason to exist. Also, their approach to providing authorship to those on the advisory committees who wish to have authorship is also a good approach.

There was one other thing in my head before I sat down, but it is not there right now. Are there any other questions for me?

(Pause)

David: I'm not seeing any. You know, loss of memory is one of those age-related things, eh?

Ken F: It is one of those things too.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

David: Alright, before I go to Graham, I am going to not forget Ken Hall. Ken, are you still there?

Ken H: I am still here, yes. Thank you, David, and thanks, Ken Froese for sharing your old guy stuff with another old guy. I will not reciprocate.

I noted David's comment about the wildlife, and specifically the crane. It was almost a little bit tongue-in-cheek. It reminded me about when we were meeting a couple of years ago and the fact that despite the continued activity out at the site, the Sandhill cranes that were pushed in here by the forest fires in 2014 had taken up the northern point of the Northwest Pond as a roosting site. I was half-joking that part of the mine site now has become critical crane habitat. It was just interesting to note that there is still some significant perhaps increasing wildlife activity onsite.

There are a couple of other things I just want to touch on. Erika, you were talking about the progress made with regional issues. I presume that in spite of my complaining about it in the past that Con Mine continues to not still be involved in that work. I'm just taking advantage of this opportunity to raise that again that someone is missing at the table when it comes to regional issues.

Mark and Graham are certainly the socio-ec experts on the Board, but I just wanted to talk just briefly. We seem to be pushing the Project Team and contractors, Parsons particularly, to work harder towards involving particularly small local contractors in the work out at the mine site so they can benefit in some way. I have talked to a number of contractors that are working on the site or hoping to work on the site. Just to let you know that the responses are quite varied. Some are happy with the way things are working, others less so, and some are not involved. So, there is a range of feedback from the different contractors and potential contractors for the site. I just wanted to let you know that it is not all criticism. There are some who are pleased with the way things are going. We will continue, of course, to push to have more local contractors benefit from work at the site, particularly the small contractors.

I work on the Soils File. Without getting into any technical discussion or even whether it would be applicable to Giant – and Erika, I apologize, I should have asked when you were presenting for an update on the GNWT Soils Guidelines and where they are at. My recollection was they are scheduled to be updated sometime this year.

I am glad to hear and see from talking with the people involved that the work is continuing with folks who are onsite, particularly the YK Heritage group, the Sailing Club, and of course the silent majority of boaters who are just general members of the public who use the boat launch. I am glad to hear things are progressing on that file. I'm optimistic that during the course of remediation there will be some little stumbles there and people bumping into each other, but I am confident we will be able to see our way through that.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

Lastly, I just want to say that I'm glad to see things physically progressing onsite and work starting to be done. People are noticing now. You may hear me on the radio. I just did an interview, not as a GMOB Director, but just as an individual. You might hear me expressing perhaps a little bit of sadness to see the town site come down, but I am glad to see that things are moving along and progressing on the site. I wish the Project Team another successful year of work on the site. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Ken. Erika?

Erika: Sure. Thanks, Ken. Yes, Con Mine, I know you have been trying to get them onboard and be a part of the process, but it was a hard no. However, the information has gone out, and that was done in support with CIRNAC Regional Office. In all the documents, we definitely highlight that it was not just Giant, and we make note to Con Mine that legacy issues are the result of other mining activities. That is kind of our way to shine the light that it was not just primarily a Giant Mine issue.

In terms of your Soil Guidelines, they are still in the works. In terms of arsenic, though, that work was completed last year. We do have some soil criteria numbers. However, they have not been released publicly until the Guidelines go out, and there is some other work that is required on the Guidelines. Harvey's shop is working on that still, and we should be seeing something very soon in terms of engagement. I am hoping that happens this summer.

David: Thanks, Erika. Are there any comments or responses to Ken's update?

(Pause)

Okay, Graham, it is all yours.

Graham: My past six months, and I suspect my next six months, efforts will be directed entirely towards understanding the economic performance and potential of the Project. Perhaps sometime in the distant future I will be able to turn my attention to some other aspect of the Project and charm a different working group, but that might be a while from now.

One thing I have learned in the past six months, and I would fully agree with this assessment, is that the economic performance of the Project is better than expected. Now, admittedly, our understanding of that performance is at a very high level at this stage. We certainly do not have the data to justify a statement beyond a high-level understanding. That really gets at the next steps for me, and I think for GMOB, and I appreciate also from the Project's perspective, to start to peel back some of those layers so we can understand more than, for example, the percentage of contracts going to local Indigenous companies and the total number of hours spent on the Project by the local labour supply. As that data is released, we will be able to improve

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022

our understanding and hopefully will cement our early assessment of the performance.

In terms of next steps for me, I have already made a couple of requests in this meeting, but really just to summarize that, on behalf of GMOB, I fully intend over the next three to six months to undertake an economic assessment of the Project with the information I have, understanding that we don't have the full dataset, and we won't have it for some time. My experience, I think, allows me to fill in the gaps to a level of accuracy that would be acceptable to everybody. The result of that work should provide an assessment of the potential of the Project, such that we can appropriately assess its performance.

As a part of that economic work, I was just thinking as the discussion went on that I might also do an historical study. It is not that much labour from my perspective of what the potential of the Project was based on its initial design, such that we will be able to compare the economic benefits or the potential economic performance of the Project from what we would have understood 5 or 10 years ago to what we understand now. It might answer the question that I am sure you will get when you release the new budget: Why has it changed? What is the effect of this change? How will the economic performance of that change be different than what you expected before?

I heard a discussion about extending the life of the Project as a way to mitigate the ebb and flow of the labour market. I will be interested to see the numbers, because I am not sure the labour market really acts in that way. Nevertheless, it is an interesting strategy to attempt to manipulate the labour market in that way. So, I am keen to see. Again, I will be able to see that by looking at the historical Project profile with one that is going to be released in the future.

Yeah, I am just sort of appreciating that we are still at least 8 months away from an economic strategy. I think that is a fair assessment. There are several significant roadblocks in terms of data that we have talked about, if there are any delays in the release of that information that further pushes back the release of the Strategy. The extent to which the Strategy is the be-all and end-all of allowing the Project to perform well in terms of the economics, I'm not sure. I think a lot of the critical work that goes into a strategy are the sort of things we are talking about doing in advance of the Strategy actually coming out.

Regardless of what that looks like or the contents of that Strategy, we are going to have a really good understanding of the economics of the Project. If there are any further delays, we will have that to use as a method to compare to establish an assessment of its performance. That is about it. That's what I am working on. Thank you.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

David: Thanks, Graham. Are there any comments or questions for Graham? Observations? Erika?

Erika: Graham, when you talked about doing an assessment, that is different than what we would have the Bureau of Stats do in terms of modeling the numbers. Basically, it's like once the numbers are there, again not cost because we won't have those to work with earlier, it is a matter of you looking at that and comparing it to the larger NWT economic profile? We can talk about this offline once we get more weedy into it, but I am just trying to understand what you would do, because I just don't want work to be duplicated with what we are trying to do with our stats guys.

Graham: No, it is a fair question, and I think it is appropriate to answer here. The Bureau of Stats won't be able to complete the model assessment until they have all the data, nor will they have an interest in doing the work in advance. The Bureau will say, "What kind of model do you want us to build?" and they won't know until you give them the data. I know, because you are going to share with me the previous PIP and the PIP without the numbers, so I am going to have that information.

I can give that to the Bureau, but they will just sit there until they have that data, whereas I can, just using my experience and my knowledge of modeling and statistics. I can give us an estimate of let's say plus or minus 30% in a ballpark that is very usable by this group, by all the Parties to the Agreement. We will have something to sort of grab hold of and understand so when the Strategy is being discussed, particularly at the Working Group level, it is not theoretical. It is something tangible that they can use and discuss.

I mean, I would not use it once the official modeling results come out and I've already talked to Jeff in working with him and assisting him in any way that he needs. He does not really need my assistance. I am fully confident that those numbers will be the official numbers, and I won't have anything to say about it. You know what I mean? In the meantime, I don't think we can just sort of sit here and wait. Eight months is probably optimistic in terms of when it is all going to get done. If it is a year from now or longer, that means every meeting I attend to, we talk about data eventually coming and eventually we will know. In the meanwhile, things are going on, and I think we need to know. Part of it is really about doing work that should have been done maybe about five years ago, but we can sort of fast-track as much as we can.

David: Thanks, Graham. Any questions from anyone? Alright. I don't have anything to report on, because I don't do anything. Ben, do you have any wrap-up comments? None.

Alright, it is 3:12. We are out of here. I hope to see some of you tonight. I don't know if there are any other closing comments that anybody might have. Erika?

Erika: I am just curious of what the format is going to be at the public meeting. A couple of us, a couple of us will be in attendance, but I'm just curious how you plan to run the

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**

meeting. More specifically, we are there and we are interested, but the plan is not to participate in the meeting in a sense of answering any questions and all of that. I'm just curious how you plan to manage that. Would, for example, if someone starts talking about offsite legacy arsenic, like would the spotlight shine on me? I am just curious how you see the meeting going for more Project-specific type of questions.

David: I am not really sure, to be frank. If there are questions about offsite issues, then yes, I probably would look to the audience. If somebody happens to have some expertise in that area and volunteers to say something about it, then great. At our first public meeting, we tried to separate very clearly the Project Team from the GMOB Team. That did not work as well as it might have, so we have kind of gravitated toward if the audience asks a question that is out of GMOB's mandate, I will say so. I will ask for anybody in the audience who might be able to contribute to that discussion, but we have no idea how many people are going to show up even. We will play it by ear.

I apologize, because all this time I thought there was only one page of the agenda, but there is a backside. We have gone through the updates. I'll pick up on Katharine Thomas' comment that Alternatives North was first on the list. That just goes to show that, I too, have age-related issues. We are at the Reconciliation and Issues Actions. I don't know what people have to contribute to that beyond what we have already talked to today. I mean, reconciliation is just part of life at this point, and we try to do the things we do in that context as well as others. I don't know if anybody...Erika, of course.

Reconciliation Update

Erika: I know. I'm sorry, guys. Reconciliation is something that GNWT is thinking about how we can be more proactive, how we can educate settlers, and what that means. GNWT has put together a number of modules that are teaching tools. They are available to anyone. I have passed those along to the Project Team, but I found them really great. They are really well done. I think there are 9 modules. It is a commitment of time. Each module takes about 2 hours or something like that, but I am happy to share with the other organizations here that might be interested, GMOB or the City or whoever. Anyone can access those, and you can share them with your family. I thought I would bring that up.

David: Yeah, I think we would welcome that for sure. Thank you. I mean, reconciliation is just part of the fabric of what we do these days, but the more structure we can put into it, the better I think. Jess?

Jess M: I guess I will add, too, that CIRNAC brought in a new policy that was effective as of about a year ago. It is that all CIRNAC employees have to do two days of mandatory Indigenous cultural awareness training. It is called competency training, I guess.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022

Natalie has been great to get us all to make sure that our learning plans are updated with that training. It is pretty loose, like we can do various training.

I actually was able to set up a workshop on *Paying the Land*, that book. I don't know if any of you have had a chance to read it, but I think it is an excellent book for people working in the Northwest Territories. We organized kind of a group thing for Giant so even the people in Ottawa read it as well. Then we had Paul Andrew facilitate a discussion on it, and I think people really appreciated it. It went well, so we will continue to do that sort of thing.

Johanne, it is something that I spoke to William a little bit about, but it would be great to do something with the YKDFN. I am not exactly sure what yet, but as a team. We will look to you in the future to discuss that.

I wanted to mention one more thing. Johanne, I am really glad that you are okay with it. We were handing out the brochure, because Natalie and I attended the site orientation that we put on. So, sorry, Parsons puts it on for every employee coming to work at the site. It is really the only time that we speak to every person that is coming to work at Giant, because they all work for different subcontractors. This is like the only chance for them all to be together, and we can reach out to them. Parsons has incorporated talking a little bit about the brochures, so they screenshot part of it and actually bring it up in their presentation. That was something that we had flagged. The YKDFN had actually flagged it to us that they wanted more cultural training and awareness, so that was one of the ways that we identified being able to do that. It has been done, so we are glad about that.

Next Steps:

David: Thanks, Jessica. Are there any other comments from that?

All right additional agenda items: Are there any last-minute thoughts, other than it is a really nice day out there, and we would rather be outside than inside?

Then I will facilitate that as fast as I can. Next meeting and next steps: In six months from now or ballpark, we will meet again. All the action items will be recorded, and we will follow up as need be. There is a public meeting tonight. Whoever can show up, we would certainly appreciate it. It may be just us, who knows. We have enough room, I think, to accommodate about 50 people or so. We should be okay. We have some additional chairs and things. Is there anything else? Are there any last minute remarks?

Alright, thank you very much, everyone.

Meeting Adjourned

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 26, 2022**



Ken Hall, Acting Chair
Chair, Giant Mine Oversight Board

2022 12 06

Date

MOTIONS

Motion: Moved: K. Froese moved to approve the agenda.
Seconded: N. Plato
Motion carried.

Motion: Moved: E. Nyssonen moved to approve the GMOB Minutes of November 30, 2021
Seconded: M. Lange
Motion carried.

ACTION ITEMS

Action item: GMOB to hold a discussion with YKDFN on the response to the Community Survey and how to get more community responses. (Page 8)

Action item: GMOB to review the current community survey and note comments and suggestions for improvement for the current survey and those in the future. (Page 9)

Action Item: GMRP to gather and provide GMOB with economic data for the Project. (page 21)

Action Item: NSMA requested feedback from the Parties about how Bill Slater will engage with future document reviews and provide technical input. (page 27)

Action Item: GMRP to provide GMOB with the requirements for regular reporting for the Wildlife Management and Monitoring Plan. (page 30)