

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

IN ATTENDANCE:

Present	<p><u>Giant Mine Oversight Board</u> Ken Hall – Chair Graham Clinton - Director Marc Lange - Director David Livingstone – Director Mark Palmer - Director Ben Nind – Executive Director Paul Green – GMOB Contractor</p> <p><u>North Slave Métis Alliance</u> Marc Whitford - Acting President</p> <p><u>Yellowknives Dene First Nation</u> William Lines</p> <p><u>City of Yellowknife</u> Kerry Thistle</p> <p><u>Government of Canada</u> Natalie Plato Katherine Ross Jessica Mace Andrei Torianski Candace DeCoste</p> <p><u>Government of the Northwest Territories</u> Erika Nyssonen Jeff Rosnawski</p> <p><u>Alternatives North</u> Katharine Thomas</p>
----------------	--

Regrets:	<p>Ken Froese – GMOB Director Todd Slack – City of Yellowknife Contractor Jessica Hurtubise - North Slave Metis Alliance Johanne Black – Yellowknives Dene Gord Hamre – Alternatives North Michael Nabert – Alternatives North</p>
-----------------	---

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

Welcome & Introductions

- Ken H: Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the Semi-Annual Meeting. We have a couple of new faces around the table and maybe on the phone. Before we do introductions, we are recording the session for transcription, so anything you say can be held against you, because we will have it on tape. Just to remind you that before you speak or when you speak, just tell us who you are. Give us your first name so the transcriber can know who said what, please. Let's do some introductions. Let us start this time with the folks on the phone.
- Katherine: Good afternoon. It's Katherine Ross. I'm with CIRNAC, and I am in Ottawa today.
- Kerry: Kerry Thistle with the City of Yellowknife.
- David: David Livingstone in Toronto today, with the Board.
- Paul: It's Paul Green, Contractor with GMOB. I'm in Calgary today.
- Ken H: Okay, thank you, folks. Sorry to hear about your travel arrangements, Paul. Wish you could be here.
- Paul: Well, I got halfway anyway.
- Ken H: Here in spirit, right?
- Paul: Correct.
- Ken H: Okay, let's introduce ourselves around the table, your name and who your organization is.
- William: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm William Lines. I'm here with the Yellowknives Dene First Nations.
- Mark W: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Marc Whitford, and I'm with the North Slave Metis Alliance.
- Andrei: Good afternoon. My name is Andrei Torianski, and I'm with CIRNAC.
- Natalie: Hello. Natalie Plato with CIRNAC.
- Erika: Erika Nyssonen, GNWT.
- Jessica M: Jessica Mace. I'm the Engagement Manager with CIRNAC

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

Jeff: Jeff Rosnawski, GNWT.

Candace: Candace DeCoste, Regulatory Manager with CIRNAC.

Katharine: Katharine Thomas with Alternatives North.

Mark P: Mark Palmer, GMOB.

Marc L: Marc Lange, GMOB.

Graham: Graham Clinton with GMOB.

Ben: Ben Nind, Executive Director GMOB.

Ken H: Ken Hall, Acting Chair, Director with GMOB.

Okay, welcome everyone. Does everyone have a copy of the agenda for this afternoon? Oh, housekeeping, I forgot housekeeping this morning. Washrooms are right outside the door. The emergency exit is right there. There's one. The other is out through these doors and to the left. If all else fails, grab one of these chairs and just throw it through a window and drape a tablecloth over the hole so you don't get cut from the glass. That's got your attention.

Ken H: Are there any changes to the agenda? Natalie?

Natalie: Thank you. I probably should have flagged this earlier, so my apologies, but could we also add an update on the Research Program to the agenda?

Ken H: We can do that.

Natalie: Thank you.

Approval of the Meeting Agenda and Minutes from May 26, 2022

Ken H: Noted. Is there anything else before we move to approve the agenda? Okay, can I have a motion to approve the agenda? Marc, thank you. Natalie, second. All in favor or any nays?

(Pause)

Okay, motion passed.

Next item on the agenda is approval of the minutes from the Semi-Annual Meeting, which was held on May 26, 2021. Hopefully, you've had a chance to look through the minutes.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

If there are no issues with them, then can I have a motion to approve the minutes from the Semi-Annual Meeting of May 26, 2021?

(Pause)

2021...Should that be 2022? Yeah, 2022. Sorry, there's just a typo on the agenda. The Semi-Annual Meeting was this past May, so May 2022. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes from that meeting? Erika, thank you. A seconder? Mark. Any nays?

Review of Action Items

Ken H: Okay, approved. Moving right along is the review of action items from the meeting.

First action item: GMOB to hold discussions with YKDFN on the response to the community survey and how to get more community response.

Ben: Yes, that was done a number of times in the spring and the summer and the fall, and we just had a member of YKDFN go door to door with the survey. That has just been completed as of yesterday.

Ken H: Thank you. Next action item: GMOB to review the community survey and note comments and suggestions for improvement for the current survey and those in the future.

Ben: Yes. Comments, especially in the public meeting were noted. Those will be applied for future surveys. The final report of the survey is going to be done and should be completed by March 31st. We are hoping, actually, that it will be completed in February, but it depends on the contractor to be able to do that. Thank you.

Ken H: Good. Thank you, Ben. Action item 3: Giant Mine Remediation Project to gather and provide GMOB with economic data for the Project.

Andrei: The Project responded back to GMOB with data, once in the summer and just recently last week with a follow-up request.

Ken H: Thanks, Andrei. Action item 4: North Slave Métis Alliance requested feedback from the Parties about how Bill Slater will engage with future document reviews and provide technical input.

Ben: I can respond to that. I just had an email from Jess in that regard. They received no feedback. However, I believe with CIRNAC that has been covered off as far as the contract is concerned, but in regard to any feedback from the Parties, they did not receive any. Thank you.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

Ken H: Okay, and Action Item 5: Giant Mine Remediation Project to provide GMOB with the requirements for regular reporting for the Wildlife Management and Monitoring Plan.

Candace: We have a couple of ways that we report on wildlife, and I will start with external and then tell you internal. Under our Annual Water License Report, we provide a summary of activities and monitoring that happened over the previous year. Then in the Annual Report to GMOB under the Environment Agreement, we have to include a summary of results and findings of monitoring for environmental programs and plans, which includes wildlife.

Then in the Status of Environment Report, which is also under the Environmental Agreement, we include a summary and the methodology of the results and findings of all monitoring done for all of our environmental programs. That also includes our wildlife reporting there.

Internally, we keep a log of wildlife sightings. ENR has asked us to maintain that log, but they don't require that we submit it to them unless they request it. So, it is something that is maintained onsite but is not submitted unless asked. That's how we report on wildlife. I don't know if there are any questions about that.

Ken H: I think there was some discussion or some suggestion that there may be more frequent reporting made available, even though it was not a requirement. I don't know if you have had opportunity to consider that. I think that comment was made during the last meeting.

Candace: Yeah, I think we would need to know what that request is, what you are asking for, but right now we would not have any ongoing reporting that we do provide. It's just in the annual reports.

Ken H: Okay, thank you.

Erika: Ken, before you move on, I was just curious a little bit more about the community survey piece seeing that the final report is anticipated for end of fiscal. How do you, as GMOB, plan to use that information at that time? I can't remember when the annual meeting is, the public meeting, but I am just curious if there is thought to meet with the Project Team to say hey, here is some feedback we received. You guys can action some of this already right away rather than waiting. Thanks.

Ben: Once that report is completed and goes through GMOB's hands, it will be shared with all of the Parties. We will share the report with you, but I don't think any recommendations directly will come out of that to the Parties themselves, but we take note that there may be interest to meet with the Parties, both the Project and everyone else concerned to be able to share what that is.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

That report then will be posted publicly on the website for everybody to be able to see and receive feedback, but it will also be part of the Semi-Annual Meeting as well as the Annual Public Meeting, which will take place in May. Thank you.

Erika: Okay. Thanks, Ben. On behalf of GNWT, we are happy to have some conversations to see where the synergy is, like level of effort, where we can brainstorm some actual actions coming out of that. So, I'm happy to be part of those conversations.

Ben: Thank you for that offer. The thought is to be able to have a second follow-up survey as well next year. We will develop that, I guess in partnership with all of the Parties in conjunction with the results that come out of this particular survey to see where next we need to do some focusing. Thank you.

Jessica M: Ben, I think I heard you say that the survey was updated with input from various parties. No, sorry, I guess I misunderstood that.

Ben: No, we took note of it. We did not change anything in the survey itself, because we felt coming halfway through, it might skew the results. In other words, then you have two surveys going at the same time. We decided to keep with the same format but taking notes of what was said, both at the public meeting and what we have heard from other Parties and the Project themselves to be able to say, in consideration for a survey when you do it again, think about these things as well. So, for us, it is a learning experience, and we will be able to apply that in the next survey. Thank you.

Jessica M: Okay, great. Thank you. Yeah, I just wanted to make sure you did have our comments. Okay, thanks.

Roundtable Highlights from Each Party

Ken H: Okay, the next item on the agenda is the roundtable. Here is the chance for each of the Parties to provide us with updates on the world through your glasses, in particular any progress that has been made.

There was a list of suggested topics provided in the agenda for people to speak to, to give a little bit of an idea of what people might be looking for. I am not sure what order we will go in. Maybe we will let the Project Team go first. That might stir up some thoughts by the other parties. I know typically you guys end up being at the end, but maybe we will let you lead the charge. It might trigger some questions or thoughts or comments from other Parties. I will turn it over to Natalie with the Project Team.

Summary Update from the Government of Canada

Natalie: Great. Natalie with CIRNAC, GMRP. I will just follow your items and try to keep to those for you. In terms of site status, I don't think I will give a site status. I give that all the time.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022

Everyone should be up to speed with the site status from our working group and various meetings, but we are just finishing year two of remediation, and things are pretty quiet this time of year, but remediation did go successfully this year.

In terms of the GMRP, it says budget, but we are going to call it the cost estimate is what we just recently released a few months. I'm sure everyone was aware that our new cost estimate is \$4.38 billion dollars, which is a substantial increase from the previous one of around \$1 billion. We are working on releasing some additional details.

The actual cost estimate itself is a very detailed worksheet broken down by construction costs, so we will not be releasing that publicly for the very reason that is a protected document from the Treasury Board, and it is also protected for a reason. If those numbers were to get out, it could compromise our contracting processes, because it has construction cost estimates, which contractors could use to provide bids and compromise a fair process.

So, what we are working on is producing a slightly higher-level summary document. We have had an ATIP request that we are just finishing up. The information that was prepared for that ATIP request, Access to Information request, we will be sharing with GMOB as well as all of the Parties to the Environmental Agreement. We will likely present that at our working group in January, but we will also send it to GMOB probably in the next few days.

It will outline sort of the various buckets where the money will be spent, but it won't be by construction work package. What we have committed to doing is once we have...and this is what we already do, we do post our contract construction award actual amount, so those will continue to become publicly available as they are awarded.

Sorry, my notes don't follow the exact order, so I'm just going to go through my order. Next up, there was Apology and Compensation. What I can say from Canada's side is in budget 2022, there was just over \$2 million dollars announced for the Yellowknives Dene First Nation, so they have received that funding, and they are working on preparing their case. With any updates further, I will leave to the Yellowknives.

For the QRA, we did a presentation to working group on October 13th of our latest preliminary data, but that data is currently undergoing a third party review, an independent third party review, so it is not quite final yet. It should be final by year end, our year end of March 31st.

The Aquatic Advisory Committee: We had our last Aquatic Advisory Committee on November 17th of which GMOB is a party to or attends, so we went over our Fisheries Act authorization. We are on schedule to submit that early in the New Year. With that, I am going to pass it over to Katherine Ross on the phone to hit a few items on the Stress Study and the Status of Environment Report.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

Katherine: Thank you, Natalie. I'm just getting my notes up on the screen too. Everyone can hear me, okay? Thumbs up? Yeah, good. Thanks.

I will start with the Stress Study, formerly known as the Hoèla weteèts'eèdè as well as formerly known as the Stress Study. So, we have reverted to the Stress Study. I think most people are aware that we received a letter from the YKDFN on June 6th notifying us that they were withdrawing from the study. We had already put the study on hold when we received a verbal request, but it was then placed on hold indefinitely.

Since then, we did have some meetings with both the lead investigator and with the advisory committee on whether there would be merit in proceeding with the study. Based on the feedback we received, we did make the difficult decision to discontinue with the study altogether. We recently sent a letter to the YKDFN to inform them of that fact.

Thus far, we did know that the YKDFN had made some indications that they had their own plans for the study, and currently, we are just waiting to hear from them at some point.

The Status of Environment Report: This was the first year that we were submitting one. The final draft went in on June 15th. The final designed report went in, in September. We have recently received comments from GMOB, and we did want to say thank you very much. We actually felt they were really constructive comments that we can use as we move forward in our reporting.

Just on another note, we also wanted to say that we really do appreciate that there was a bit of a collaborative effort made as we were trying to build our report. At the beginning of the process, we had sent out the table of contents, and we worked with members of GMOB on some of the indicators. I think it really helped guide us and develop a product that people were somewhat happy with, I think. So, that was great. Thank you.

Aside from that, our Annual Report, as usual, is a bit late. The final draft went on October 17th, and we submitted our final designed report on November 30th. That is it for me if there are no questions.

Natalie: Thanks, Katherine. I think that is it from GMRP unless there are questions.

Ken H: Are there any questions for the Project Team?

(Pause)

William: I was just curious about the ATIP request if you know who that was from or if it is just anonymous.

Natalie: It is anonymous.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

Marc L: Just on the Status of the Environment, I wanted to thank the Project Team on behalf of GMOB. We had quite a few comments that we submitted to the Team about making Status of the Environment more friendly for the public to see how the environment is doing quickly with you know, colour-coated red, green, and yellow bullets.

We did spend some time with the Team to come up with the project, but I just really appreciated the open approach to taking our comments and the big changes that you have made to the report. We thought at this point, a good report. I am sure it will change and evolve over the years as we hear back from the public to see how they would want to see it better, but it was a good effort and a good report at this point, so thank you.

Ken H: Okay, any other questions from the Project Team? Anybody online or on the phone?

(Pause)

Let's then call on the City next to give us an update. Kerry, can you fill us in on what you've been up to?

Summary Update from the City of Yellowknife

Kerry: One sec and I'll turn my video on.

Ken H: Maybe while you are doing that, I will give people a heads-up as to the pecking order. I've got the City next and then YKDFN followed by NSMA, Alternatives North, and then GMOB. Thanks. It's all yours, Kerry.

Kerry: Thanks. Sorry I could not come in person, but I've got back-to-back meetings today. We are in budget week this week, so it is an extra busy time. I don't have tons of things to update. Todd is attending the regular meetings that are occurring month to month, week to week.

Sheila is attending the Socio-Economic Advisory Board Meetings, and Jeanine Farmer is on the Socio-Economic Advisory Committee. However, for the working group, she moved on to the GNWT, so we have a new manager of Economic Development who will start attending those meetings, Sarah Sibley. So, that is kind of some of our staffing changes.

The City was surprised, and hopefully it will be a good thing, to see the updated cost of the Project. To see if those benefits are going to be reaped by the Northwest Territories and within the City. So, we are working as much as we can with the Team on socio-economic benefits to the area. We have our regular meetings. We have one tomorrow, I believe it is, with the Team to discuss City-specific issues. Those are really with respect to the socio-economic aspects and getting into the plan and land use questions at the site.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

Also, we will be having some discussions about the access agreement because it was flagged recently by Erika. There are going to be some gaps now that the Project timeline has increased. So, we have got to work through a few of those technical changes. I think that is it from us unless anyone has questions.

Ken H: Thanks Kerry. Does anyone have questions for the City?

(Pause)

Hearing none, we will move right along. Next on my list is YKDFN, Yellowknives. William?

Summary Update from the YKDFN

William: Good afternoon, everyone. It's William here. It is unfortunate that Johanne was supposed to be here this morning and afternoon, but she recently had somebody close to her pass away, so there is a bit of a family emergency. So, you are stuck with me for the afternoon.

I have been away for the past six or seven months, and I am still working only half time right now, so I don't have much of an update. Johanne did give me some notes to speak on.

In terms of socio-ec, we had an employee. His name was Roman, but he is no longer employed with us, so we are working on filling that position so that we can attend the Economic Development Working Group. In the meantime, the Project can engage with Kieron Testart as he is our Manager of Ec-Dev.

We are working on community-based monitoring. We are collaborating with our addition to the Dechjta Nàowo Program. Right now, we are doing GIS and mapping training, and the students are doing a practicum in the office. They are working on map digitization. Then we will be working on a Monitoring and Stewardship Framework. So, that is coming down the pipe.

AAC and DFO, we are looking forward to the Fisheries authorization. Before I was away, we were working closely on that. We are looking forward to having a community meeting in January so that we can update the community on that and talk about it in January. During COVID, we have not been able to engage as much as we would have liked to, but that's okay, because we had Angus and Ted there and they were meeting consistently.

Then for the apology and compensation. There have been community meetings, and there have been leadership updates. I can't go into detail on it, obviously. Our Chiefs and our Council have been working diligently, so there is progress there.

We just recently had a Chief and Council meeting, and the Project was there. They presented and gave an update on the Project. It was great, because it was in person. That

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

is one thing I wanted to mention too. It's so nice to be in person right now. Looking forward to more in-person meetings.

Ken H: Thank you, William. Any questions for the Yellowknives?

Ben: Just a question on the meeting regarding DFO. Who is leading that meeting? Is that GMRP meeting with the community to talk about that? How is that being done?

William: So, my understanding is that in January, we will be updating on the work that has happened depending on where the DFO process is in that place. Once it is submitted, it will go through the DFO process, which they will give us funding. Then we will engage in DFO directly. So, we will have community meetings and Chief and Council meeting, and DFO will come in and do their whole routine.

Ben: Okay, thank you.

Ken H: Anyone else with questions for Yellowknives?

(Pause)

Okay, next on the list is the North Slave Métis Alliance. Marc, take it away.

Summary Update from the North Slave Métis Alliance

Marc W: Yes, thank you, everybody. I am just here covering for Jessica Hurtibuse. I have got some notes here she has asked me to present, so we are going to read them into record. These are the speaking notes here.

On the ACC DFO update, we are glad to have had the Fisheries Act authorization engagement session a few weeks ago. It was useful to see the application broken down into topic sections. We look forward to our engagement with DFO on the application. We worked with GMRP to use some funds this year to start our community-based monitoring program for Back Bay, Yellowknife River, and Yellowknife Bay, which will help provide information on NSMA priorities for fish health, water quality, and general aquatics data from the community perspective.

On the AEMP update, there is no update at this time. So much for that. In the regulatory reviews, we have a new staff starting today. His name is Alan Alex who will be taking on the role of Environmental Officer. Jess will be training him to assist in Giant Mine regulatory reviews in place of Noah, who will be shifting to wildlife files.

We have the socio-economic update. We have successfully completed a five-year training plan agreement with Giant Mine, which Noah has been spearheading. It supports NSMA in setting up training classes and grants to members to build up the skills and experience

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

needed to work related to Giant Mine. We are looking to working with a consultant this year to shape a higher-level training plan, which will direct this work. We are looking forward to it and appreciate the collaboration with GMRP.

On the Perpetual Care Plan, we are happy to see the workshop progress. PCP continues to be a challenging topic, as it is difficult to remember which components are linked to which phase of the Project, but it seems we are making progress in developing the IRP.

On the Hoèłta weteèts'eèdè, we are saddened for YKDFN that this project did not amount to the original goals I guess everybody hoped for. NSMA's intent was always to support YKDFN in completion of the research project. We hope this study can start again one day.

On the YK HEMP, there are no updates to provide. Noah continues to attend HEMP meetings, and Jess plans to onboard new staff, Alan, into the HEMP files. So, again, if GMOB has questions, please feel free to ask and I will pass along the question. They can answer via email after the fact. That is it on my side. Sorry I can't be more useful than that, folks. I am out of here.

Ken H: Thank you, Mark.

Marc W: Thank you.

Ken H: Any questions for the North Slave Métis Alliance? Andrei?

Andrei: My question, and Marc, if you can't answer it, maybe you can take it back to Jess. You mentioned for socio-ec, that you are working with Noah, or Noah is working with Jess on the training plan. I am just wondering if Jess is going to be leading or continuing to lead socio-economic from NSMA's perspective, or is it going to be Noah?

The reason why I am asking is because we have on December 13th our next Socio-economic Working Group, and the focus is going to be on training. I am wondering if Noah should attend that meeting as well on behalf of NSMA in addition to Jess, or in her place. Thank you.

Marc W: Yes, thank you, Andrei. I am just not quite sure, as Jess is the lead and Noah is starting to pick up a lot more of the file. So, as soon as Jess gets back, I will send her a note and find out whether one, or maybe even both of them, can attend or whatever it is. That might be better. Then if it had to be passed off, at least they are both in the loop. I hope that helps, Andrei.

Ken H: Thanks, Marc. Thanks, Andrei. Any other questions for North Slave Métis Alliance?

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

Ben: Marc, I know you were thinking about getting a part-time Economic Development Officer for the NSMA. I just wondered if you had a progress update on that or if you are still planning that or thinking about it.

Marc W: What is happening here is we have a part-time person that is with us at this time. That is John Hazenberg. He was actually involved a little bit before, and he continues to work with us on an ongoing basis. He is not full-time or anything else like that. We just task him for various files and stuff like that that we are working on at this time. That is John's role, but I guess the question is do you have a dedicated person on the Giant Mine file? Is that what you are asking, or just a general question?

Ben: More just in general, but somebody that we could engage on socio-economics I guess, because Jess has expressed that it is not really her forte, and even Noah. They are more on the environmental side.

Marc W: Yes, actually what I have been doing is leading the charge on a whole bunch of areas. What has happened, just for everybody's information here, President William Enge was laid low with a pretty bad blood disease. Anyway, he is basically out of the loop, and I have been filling in as a Vice President all the way along. I have been filling in since probably, I would say July 2021. It is my first whole year, I guess.

What I have been doing is picking up any economic files that needed to be attended to. I am also cutting a lot of new economic teeth out there as well, by the way. So, I'm pretty busy. That is why, by the way, I am not attending all your meetings, just saying. In any event, yeah, I guess I am the contact person as well, but I don't know on the matter of hiring a specific person other than we have John on the plug-in, plug-out basis for us. You've got to consider costs, you know. There you go. Thank you. I hope that helps.

Ken H: Thank you. Just a reminder to give us your first name before you speak. It would be appreciated for the transcription. Next, we will pass it on to Alternatives North with Katharine.

Summary Update from the Alternatives North

Katharine: Thanks, Ken. Hi, this is Katharine Thomas with Alternative North. Unfortunately, Gordon and Michael were able to meet this morning but not in the afternoon. They send their regrets, so I will be reporting for the three of us with a jumble of notes that were sent.

For the AAC, we are still working through the Fisheries Act Authorization Application. We are thankful for the meetings that led up to this review, although it is still a pretty daunting document. We are thankful for the additional time that was granted for us to review and submit our comments on this.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

As for regulatory review, we are glad to continue to see movement forward and improvements to the design plans through the review process. It is nice to see work on the Perpetual Care Plan and see that work moving forward, if slowly. The process has really underscored for Alternatives North the need for a resolution to the outstanding issue of long-term funding.

As for socio-ec, I guess the big thing there is the updated cost estimate. We wanted to say that David Livingstone's comments to the media on the updated cost estimate were good and that Alternatives North concurs with these comments. We want to express regret at this cost and our gratitude that the federal government is prepared to pick up the cost.

We also want to observe that everything that happened on the Giant site took place under the watch of federal inspectors. In light of that, we wanted to share that Alternatives North recently expressed to the GNWT Department of Lands that the mine closure securities need to cover all aspects of closure. I thought that was worth mentioning here as well.

For the stress study, there is not much to say here that has not already been said. We are thankful for the meetings recently where we were able to discuss the potential future. We regret that it did need to be ended, but we thank the team and everyone that worked so hard to develop this study.

It is not on the list, but I also wanted to add that we are eager to meet with the Education Committee and discuss the future of this work. That is it for our update. Thanks to everyone here.

Erika: I am wondering if GNWT - I have a couple of items that are not really part of GMRP that have come up, so whenever you are ready for me, I can do that.

Ken H: We will endeavour to fit you in, Erika. Thanks, Katharine. Are there any questions for Alternatives North from anybody?

(Pause)

Thanks, Katharine. I just presumed you would have jumped in after Natalie but forgive me for that. Now is your opportunity, Erika, on behalf of GNWT.

Summary Update from the GNWT

Erika: Actually, it sprouted from what other folks were saying of a couple of points that I could touch on. As Kerry noted, we did have a conversation on post-closure land use out at site. That meeting was with GNWT Lands, MACA, City, and the GMRP, and that was in October.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

What we did there was review our constraints maps and talked about the different defined categories that the Project has defined based under our constraints and our risk assessment work. We had a great conversation. It was good. We are all familiar now with our mandates under our respective organizations and departments. Kerry, I still owe you some shape files. They are coming. That is for Charles Lee's team to start looking at that.

The plan is to touch on Giant in the upcoming community plan at a very high level, but we would see the City, and Kerry, forgive me if I am speaking out of turn or if there is anything to correct there, it would define the area as passive recreational now in the upcoming 2028 plan, and then with more work progressing. So, we are making movement, and I wanted to highlight that. Thank you to the City for their patience on that. So, now we have a bit of a team, and that is great.

The other thing I wanted to touch on is just the arsenic work that we have been doing. I can officially say that any advancement of studies or additional investigation is complete, with the last doing some additional work for the YKDFN questions around dried fish in the traditional land use areas.

We have sent a memo outlining that and providing some clarity on that. That has gone to YKDF a couple to a few months ago. Then I also believe I sent it out to the working group for GMOB folks who attend that. Ben, you would have received that. That was it. I will just maybe hand it over to Natalie.

Natalie: Are you done?

Erika: Yeah, I'm done.

Natalie: Mr. Chair, if I may, there was one thing that was not on the list that I just wanted to mention. I just wanted to honour and acknowledge the passing of Dr. Sue Moody this year. For those of you that don't know, Dr. Moody was a researcher who has been on the Project a very long time. She started off, I believe, at the request of Alternatives North on our Human Health Ecological Risk Assessment, and then most recently was advisor to the Yellowknives Dene First Nation. She did pass earlier this year, and I just wanted to honour her and for the tireless effort she had put into the Project. She will be missed. Thank you.

Ken H: Thank you, Natalie. Any questions for GNWT? William?

William: I just want to say I'm sorry to hear about Sue. I didn't hear that. It is really unfortunate.

Just going back to Erika's update about the post-closure land use, I had a discussion with Johanne about this, and we really want to be a part of those conversations. So, I am just wondering if you can include us in future meetings and future discussions.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

Erika: Sure. I acknowledge that, William. Kerry, I am not sure if there is anything that you can offer in terms of the City process as you move forward with your Community Plan that talks about engagement or how you do that with the YKDFN or other Parties at all, if there is anything?

Kerry: We actually are not doing our Community Plan. It was just done and adopted. The Community Plan is only done about every 10 years, and it is a huge undertaking. It takes a couple of years to get to the finished product, and that is legislated under the Community Planning and Development Act.

I believe what was discussed is, depending on the files we receive and the potential uses for the land in the future, there may be ability to amend the community plan to permit some activities, because as far as I am aware right now, nothing is permitted out there.

William, we definitely could include YKDFN in those discussions but to date, there have not been many discussions. That is the extent of the work. The meeting happened, like Erika said, sometime in the fall. I think she said October. I was not at that one. I was away. We don't have the files yet, so there really has not been any work since then on our part.

Once we get the files, like I said, we will take a look and see what, if anything, could possibly be done, but we are not doing our Community Plan. That was done and adopted in 2020 I believe, or 2021. That won't be redone for quite a long time, many years. I think it was more of a discussion about the possibility of amending certain sections. That is all I have today.

William: No, I recognize that there have not been very many meetings. I just wanted to highlight that if there were any future meetings, we would really appreciate being there.

Ken H: Any other questions for Erika? I have a small one, just to get it on the record again. Is there any involvement with Con Mine or Newmont on regional issues, or is that going nowhere fast?

Erika: We did try, and you know, they said they are not interested. However, the work on legacy arsenic issues is done in the sense of carrying out any sampling or investigative work. However, we still plan to reference that it is both from Giant and Con. All our messaging on our website does note historical mining, and not even just Giant and Con, but other arsenic impacts coming from other industrial activities. So, we continue to have that message.

Then just in terms of annual messaging on legacy, we would have Facebook and some radio ads to highlight to people that there is information out there, but everyone would have received an arsenic pamphlet in the mail. We did a massive mail-out to every single home in Yellowknife, and YKDFN had that delivered.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

To answer your question, no. At the time, that was when we were getting rolling. There was no interest. So, from my perspective, I feel that Con's involvement is not critical. I mean, we are still sort of pointing the finger that that legacy was there from them, but we don't really see any action required by the company.

Ben: I'm just wondering if between yourself and Natalie you can give us some sort of update on the two community organizations that are onsite, both the Yellowknife Historical Society, just your discussions with them, as well as with what is happening with the Great Slave Sailing Club.

Erika: I will touch on the Yellowknife Historical Society, because there is a lot of back-and-forth happening with GNWT right now on that. In a nutshell, the Historical Society received funding from CanNor and from GNWT to advance their museum project.

They have done a ton of work. The last stages of that is to have some exterior improvements to their building, which includes a deck and stairs and an accessible ramp. There has been some back-and-forth, and it has not been completed with GNWT. GNWT needs to give that approval for them to advance any work. Work has advanced and is almost completed.

So, there is some additional information that GNWT is looking for from Historical folks. There is desire to collaborate. We know that conversations with the City that the Historical Society has been working with the City for their support as well on this. Right now, Lands is waiting for an additional information package from the Historical folks that refers to development permit approvals, really what work they are doing, what they are doing with soils out there, and things like that.

We are eagerly anticipating that package, and then Lands can make some final decisions and have their green light to complete that work, because the anticipated opening date is spring next year. So, we are very aware of that. I will stop there and hand it over to Natalie or Jess to speak to the Great Slave.

Natalie: Great. With the Great Slave Sailing Club, we are actually meeting with them tomorrow in your office, so thank you very much. This will be an update to update them on the latest schedule, because I think that will be of most interest to them, our extension until 2038.

Otherwise, we have been keeping them up to date. We met with them about a year ago to show them our substantive, or the first draft of our design of the boat launch that will be in their area. We made sure they had reviewed and were onboard. We will show them the substantive design tomorrow as well.

We are working with them on what the parking will look like. We have had the request from them to maximize parking. We are willing to do that. We will continue doing that in our designs. I will hand it to Jess or Erika if there is anything else I missed. I would just say

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

they are up to speed. They are onboard, and after tomorrow, they will be much more up to speed. Thank you.

Ben: Thanks for that. The last question I have is for Erika. Erika, we understand that you have a merge of departments happening. We are just wondering what the impact for you and your division is going to be in terms of that happening.

Erika: Thanks, Ben. I was going to mention that. For those of you who don't know, GNWT is making changes. They like to do that, merge and then separate departments. Here we are going back into a merge with the Lands Department. On an optimistic outlook, I am hoping that things like quarry permits could be potentially streamlined for the Project. That is my one optimism there.

In terms of actual direct impact to the Contaminated Sites Unit that Jeff and I work within, that is going to be status quo. We are staying with the division that we are in under Diep's leadership. Diep sends her regrets today. She is sick. So, we don't anticipate too much change, but I mean the driver really for this merge was about efficiency and Contaminated Sites was one of them. We will see what happens. That is anticipated for April 1 that we will be a united department. The department's name is Environmental...Jeff, what is it?

Jeff: I think it is Environment Natural Resources and Climate Change, Lands. They fit in Climate Change in there somehow.

Erika: Yeah, they jammed that in there. A little bit more what I can share about that is that a high-level work chart has been shared with staff. It has gone to Cabinet. We have the mandate to merge, and so a lot of the nuances of operationalizing that merge will come through what they call an optimization period over the next few months.

So, there are a lot of unknowns. We are just kind of going with the flow, and we don't actually know if there is any actual movement of divisions with buildings and things like that. Basically, in a nutshell, it is status quo for our division. That's great. We look forward to working with our Lands colleagues.

Ken H: Thanks, Erika. Next on our list is GMOB. I know we are moving right along here, but I am going to suggest maybe a quick 10-minute break, and then we will reconvene. What time is it right now? It's 2:00 on the nose, so 10 after 2:00, we will reconvene.

Break

Ken H: Okay, we will reconvene. We are doing Party highlights. Next on the list is GMOB. What I am going to do is have the directors individually say a few words and give us an update, as well as our Executive Director, Ben. Then Paul Green is on the line. He is our contractor.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

I will get you to give an update on regulatory review on behalf of GMOB. So, let's start with the folks on the phone. David, how would you like to go first?

Summary Update from GMOB

David: If I must, Mr. Chair, I will do that and give a brief list of the things I have been involved in, in addition to the regular GMOB administration, supporting Ben in his role.

Media: People mentioned the media engagements I have had over the last little while, mostly with respect to the change in the budget estimate for the Remediation Program. I have been attending working group meetings as much as possible. I have been doing a lot of travelling lately, so it has been kind of difficult to do that. I have been attending the regular GMOB meetings and participating in the Research Program meetings.

What else? There is the Meeting of Canadian Parliamentarians a couple of months ago now with Natalie and Kevin O'Reilly talking about the Giant Mine Project. I think that is really about it. I don't know if there is anything I am missing. Ben, feel free to fill in the blanks there. Thanks.

Ken H: Thank you, David. Who would like to go next? Mark?

Mark P: I would just like to start off with saying that I think it is great that we have a second year now that went well from what I have heard with no major incidents and no injuries, and everything going off even with all the supply chain issues not totally rectified yet. I think that is a great year.

I want to echo that I thought the State of the Environment Report was well done. It is just going to get better and better, and more user-friendly. That is good. My main thing is I usually participate in the Socio-Economic Working Groups. I attend the monthly working group meetings. I find them quite useful for me to keep in touch of a whole bunch of different topics. Then I jump in on other ones like Research. I try to go to those as well.

Perpetual Care is something that I am interested in. Although slow, it is moving, and hopefully we can get, or I would like to see a product. It would be interesting to see that. I know it won't be perfect the first time, but it is going to give a straw dog to really work at and get better at. Those are my main things that I'm working on. Yeah, it has been a good year, I think. That is about it.

Ken H: Thank you, Marc, would you like to provide the next update? Marc Lange.

Marc L: I had the fun opportunity of attending a whole lot of meetings this year, AAC and others. The areas of focus that I have spent probably a little bit more time on has been the Aquatic Effects Monitoring Program. I will probably be spending a bit more time on that this year

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

and getting some help from an external consultant to unpack that document a little bit more and how the different components of the AEMP would fit into monitoring Aquatics for the whole Project.

The other temporary project that took a bit of our time is, and you probably had heard, we heard quite a few concerns about the Fisheries Act process, the engagement, and the content and stuff. We spent a bit of time with some of the Parties that were interested in trying to come up with enhanced clarity a little bit more in the air in the DFO process. Another thankyou to the Project Team for cracking the nut on that one and offering an opportunity to engage more thoroughly with the entire process of the Act, the Fisheries Act, the authorization submission. There is a process to give comments to DFO, so thank you for that.

Then the third area is research. Do you want me to spend a bit more time on that?

Ken H: Yeah, if you could just give us sort of the Reader's Digest version of an update on the Research Project, or the research work.

Marc L: That is a tough one. Let me try my best. Scientists don't talk in soundbites, but I will see if I can give everyone a bit of an update on the seven projects that we are working on. I think I am going to have to run through the seven just to give you a quick title and what is going on.

Well first, let me start with admins, so I think we are in Year 4 of the TERRE-NET-GMOB partnership. Partway through that partnership, TERRE-NET went to NSERC and got new funding and took on more projects. So, that is Year 2 of the NSERC TERRE-NET-GMOB and Year 4 of the program. We are doing research.

The first project is about the arsenic trioxide dust composition and how it dissolves in water. The reason why that is important is because a lot of the solutions for dealing with arsenic have to do with ultimately dissolving it, the arsenic trioxide, to turn it into something that can dissolve less, that is safer.

The researchers are going to be providing a little bit more of an update. We have a draft update now, but we have got to review it and make some changes. Then we are going to be submitting it to you. Some papers are coming out of this work shortly. Basically, they are finding that arsenic oxide at the site is not behaving like pure arsenic trioxide.

The fact that is attached to antimony is really changing how it can be dissolved. They expected about 20% of the arsenic trioxide to be able to be dissolved in water at room temperature, and they are getting in the neighborhood of about 12% dissolution. They are trying to find out what is it about this molecule and what other chemicals it is attached to that prevent it from getting dissolved. Once they understand that, they can work on making it more soluble. That's the first project.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

The other one is transforming, again, the arsenic molecule into an iron arsenate. There are a couple of different molecules of iron arsenate but transforming it into that state and then testing it under an environment where there are bugs and microbes that you would expect down in the ground, as well as doing tests without any bugs so you can see how stable it is once it is transformed into iron arsenate. That project is being started this year, so they are not expected to start the experiment part until early 2023.

The third project is, again taking arsenic oxide and turning it, making it react at really high temperatures, like 200 degrees Celsius and mixing it with sulfuric acid to transform it into another molecule through sulfidation, so adding sulfur. On this, they are exposing it at various temperatures for various amounts of time with various concentrations of acid, and then looking at how much of it gets transformed properly using X-rays. They've got a bunch of curves of how it is getting dissolved and transformed. I won't bore you with the results, but they are getting better at finding the right mixture to transform it.

The fourth is again, using sulfide as a molecule to transform the arsenic but using bugs to do so. This project is just getting underway. There are no results on that yet.

The fifth one is taking vitrification, so that is a product that is commercially done by another company to turn into glass. What these researchers are doing is using different concentrations of arsenic, so 5%, 10%, 15%, then crushing it, destroying it, and putting it in a ton of different environments that would mimic would below ground would look like, to see how stable it is at releasing arsenic if it was turned into glass and sent back below ground.

What are the findings so far? They are zoning in on two metals. Some arsenic is coming out at certain concentrations. The 15% glass seems to be the most stable so far, but there are some metals coming out that they are little bit surprised at. They are going to have conversations with Dundee to see if it is the making of the glass, that process that is introducing metals that they were not expecting. So, there will be more on that next year.

The sixth project is mixing arsenic with cement backfill, cement dust. Again, they are mixing arsenic with binders and cement at different concentrations. One of the more stable ones seems to be about 5% arsenic with the rest cement, sand, and binders. This is about making a recipe, the best recipe of arsenic plus other stuff to make it stick together.

They found it does not stick together very well. It does not turn hard. The stuff that is turning hard is not as hard as you would expect, so they measure it by trying to crush it with a press. Typical cement I think, in a building is like 800. I forget what the units are here...kilopascal. They are only getting about half that. 400 is the best mixture they can make so far. So, that is the toughest stuff. Then they grab the cement, and they expose it to manufactured groundwater. They have our water chemistry for what is down here. So,

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

they made that water, and they run it through the cement and stir the cement pucks just to see how it would handle basically being underground. The news is very varied, and we will need to see the results in detail. They were very surprised by some of those results, but some of these cement pucks with a certain formulation did stay intact. We will follow the results on that.

The last project is kind of interesting. They are trying to develop...As you can probably tell, the type of arsenic molecule that you actually deal with is very important to determine what the solution is. They are developing an isotope system to track antimony, not arsenic. I mentioned that at lunch that it is an arsenic isotope. It is an antimony isotope that they are actually hoping to track.

An isotope analysis allows you to know where that particular molecule came from, whether it was coming out of the roasting process, whether is naturally in rock. They are coming up with a new method to track antimony and what its source would be in the Giant tailings.

That is the seven projects. The only other addition to this is two things. One, is we are looking at this upcoming calendar year to take the plain language summary of all these seven studies and refresh them with the latest results. We are going to take on this work shortly.

The last part is we are looking to spend some time on the Research Strategic Plan for GMOB. We started this research with a bunch of assumptions. We would like this Strategic Plan to articulate our assumptions, why we decided to fund this kind of work, and then be explicit in terms of where we think we are going over the next five years. That will be another project for this year. That's it for me.

Ken H: Great. Thank you for that, Marc. Ben?

Ben: Something to add, and Marc may want to speak to this as well, is that the plan for next year is to bring all of the researchers here to have a meeting with the Project and the Parties and a public presentation as well. Marc, do you want to add to that at all? No? Okay.

The second part is that out of the recent research meetings that we just had, there are several action items. You will see, probably within a month, that the researchers are going to be asking for certain things from the Project that we will submit as formal requests in support of the Research program.

Most of those will involve water sampling. Those will be directed from the specific teams of researchers. I will give you lots of heads up to the Project Team in that regard. Thanks.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

Natalie: Sorry, can you elaborate on what you will be requesting? You want water samples? We might have to wait until spring, but anyway just a bit more information on the types of things that you might be requesting just so we can be prepared. Thank you.

Ben: There will be some water samples asked for, and some of them are related to deep water samples. Paul Green and I are putting the notes together. When they are ready to go, I will share them with you. We have time on this.

Ken H: Thank you, Marc. Thanks, Ben. Natalie?

Natalie: Thank you. There is one thing I should have updated this group, and probably now is a good time. We are preparing to do the arsenic trioxide...we are calling it sampling. We were calling it extraction. We changed the name and thought that did not sound quite right. So, for the 600 kilos that GMOB has requested, we are developing the specs right now.

We plan to post in early January, but Parsons is very reticent to post without having those letters from the carrier and the receiver, because we don't want to be liable for having to store this on surface and not be in compliance with our water license. So, when we pull it, we want it to be shipped offsite immediately. Anyway, we are working on that, and that will happen in probably May-June hopefully of next year. Thank you.

Can I add something? Sorry. On that, because we are extracting arsenic trioxide, we anticipate heightened public concern, so we would like to work with GMOB on what that messaging is and how we get that messaging out there. I don't think the Project wants to lead that. Since it was a request from GMOB, we would certainly like it if you guys took the lead, but we are certainly willing to work with you on that and work together. Thank you.

Action Item: GMRP and GMOB to work on public messaging regarding the extraction of the samples for the GMOB Research Program.

Ken H: Not to make light of any of that, it is just I find it, I guess you can say a little bit funny sometimes when I reflect on working there and working with the arsenic. I ran a couple of pilot projects on purification. Anyway, when I think back to the way we worked and handled this stuff and the way it was handled on the site in addition to other stuff, I look at the heightened awareness or concern or potential public concern, and again, I don't want to make light of it, but it is quite a contrast to the way things used to be when the mine was operational. I understand it, but it sometimes makes me step back and reflect.

It is quite a contrast in perception. It is the same as the Remediation Project itself. The amount of effort and the work that has gone into this Project compared to the mine on the south side of town, which is all but done now except for the water treatment, it is an interesting contrast in approaches to these sites. Anyway, enough said about that.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

Thank you for that, Marc and Ben. Next, from a whole different perspective, I will turn it over to Graham.

Graham: Thank you for that lead-in. It was perfect. I am not going to talk about science. Okay, so when we met in late May, there was discussion about the construction of an economic model. We had a brief discussion about the necessity to do that, or at least certainly from my perspective. At that time, I know the plan was for Andrei, Jeff from Bureau Statistics, and I to get together. We all had holidays at different times, so that just did not happen over the summer. Then I found myself with some free time at the end of August, so I just went ahead and did it.

I have built an economic model of the Project that is able to determine, amongst other things, the difference between the gross output, so the \$4.38 billion dollars, and its contribution to GDP, which is the summation of labour income, profits, depreciation, and indirect taxes.

I did that by essentially by reverse engineering the information that was provided through the PIP and through some of the estimates that Andrei provided regarding the amount of labour that is going to be required, and then a lot of assumptions because at that point I did not have the actual cost estimate, so I made that up.

From that, there are a lot of interesting results, of course. I have presented it to the Board just as a sort of preliminary first step. It is a linear model but I did not feel comfortable sort of multiplying everything by four, which is why we requested the cost estimate.

I will just put this on the record. I don't know what information that we are going to receive, and I am anxious to see it. From my perspective, economics is going to be the essential component of the Project moving forward. I think the media sort of expressed that, and being able to deliver a message other than the cost estimate has just increased by a factor of four to deliver a message saying the impact on GDP and employment, and in particular indirect effects through business activity, is the story you probably want to tell. With the type of work that I have done, that is the story you will be able to tell.

So, the more detailed information that we are able to access, the more confidence. You will produce a number either way, but there will be more confidence in the number if it is based on accurate information. I don't know how that will go. We will see what happens after next week. We will get the information, and we will take it from there. Depending on my level of comfort with it in terms of telling an accurate story, we will discuss it.

The reason: Why is this important? I often get asked that question. It seems very academic. I built a model. I talk about GDP, a term that nobody really understands, and we sort of move on. But we are in the process of developing an implementation plan, so it has to be based on something, and in my mind, and it should be based on economics.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

How is the City of Yellowknife and the territory doing from an economics perspective? And how is this project going to contribute to it? What is the marginal effect of this strategy going to be? Is it going to have any effect whatsoever, and how do we measure that?

Well, you measure as you would in science. You create a baseline. This is the baseline. So, from this point forward you can say, well how did you spend money this year in comparison to how you expected to spend money? How did the business community in particular, and the labour resources available in the territory, how did they participate with the Project? Again, how is that performance measured against the potential?

That is why it is important. I put a lot of stock in it. I think it is valuable. I think, again, from my perspective, this is where the bulk of interest from the community is going to come from. Through this work, I think it can provide answers to all those questions of interest.

It does create a bit of a measure or metric, which is always good. It can be scary, because you say oh, we are actually doing worse than we did before or whatever. People are spending money in a way we had not expected. How do you control that? It is different than in science where you can sort of add something and say we created something new. You have to create policies and action plans and convince people to do things differently, but that is probably the next step.

How does this Project actually have a real, tangible effect on the economy of Yellowknife and the NWT? It is different than it would be if you didn't do anything. In the territory, we play a lot with the market. We interfere a lot, not always necessarily to the net benefit of the territory. This will allow us to sort of start that conversation and potentially have a more positive or meaningful effect that you can measure and demonstrate.

That is what I have been working on, and that is what I will be continuing to do. I guess the next couple of weeks are going to be interesting from that perspective. That's it for me.

Andrei: Thank you, Graham, for that information. Internally, our deadline to complete the Socio-Economic Strategy, not the Implementation Plan, but the Strategy itself, would be for the beginning of the next fiscal year, so April 1st. You will be receiving data from us, well next week. You mentioned that the modelling itself is pretty much complete for the most part, other than just updating.

I wonder, do you think it is reasonable for us to get together and start working on including this modelling and the metrics in our Socio-Economic Strategy document itself and looking at it from that lens, the economic lens that was not previously a factor in the previous Strategy, in the original Strategy in 2018? And, do you think that the middle of

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

January to the beginning of February would be reasonable for us to get together and start working on that?

Graham: Yes, to all your questions. I should have mentioned that. I think it is absolutely critical that it is part of the Strategy. Also, to add, one of the things I did is present the preliminary model to the other directors. It stirred up a lot of interesting discussions, because again, it approaches the Project from a different perspective. I did not feel comfortable delivering that presentation or that information to anybody else because it was based on numbers that I really just made up. With the actual data, GMOB will make me available to the Project and to any Party who is interested to participate in that presentation, whether it is as a group or one-on-one. It does not matter to me. One-on-one actually works better, because I can address questions from a different perspective, and I am happy to do that.

So, the information that I put together, I am absolutely willing to share, to demonstrate, and to work with, and for sure to include in the Strategy.

Ken H: Go ahead, Erika.

Erika: I am just curious. First of all, thank you for doing that, and thank you for your patience. I know we just keep saying hurry up and wait, but here we are. I am just curious of GMOB's thoughts or recommendations, suggestions about how to communicate that message out.

I mean, you carried out that work on your own. Once you have the new data, you would then carry out that work. You are very generously sharing that with the Project Team to help with our messaging, but was the thinking that it would be... I guess, I am just curious on the coms part. Anything out from this room, how did you see that playing out?

I know it will get fleshed out once there are more meetings and the Project can see what we can say and all of that, but I am just curious from your perspective. Is it something like, well we did this, but messaging will come out from the Project, or is it we did this and this is what we saw? Anything?

Graham: It is a really good question and actually one that I have thought of, because typically I would do this I guess as a professional and it would be my story to tell, I suppose. In a lot of ways, for me it does not matter who delivers the message. One of my motives in doing this is to try and change the discussion.

I mean, people don't necessarily like economists, and I can understand why, but Giant Mine is a project that keeps giving to the City of Yellowknife from an economics perspective. I think it is an important message to deliver, and it changes the narrative. To be honest, the Board has not gotten together and decided this, so it is a good question. It does not matter to me personally. I would be happy to tell anybody.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

The CBC called me, but I deferred because I did not feel comfortable having not talked to the Project Team, anybody else, or even GMOB about it. They call me all the time anyway. It is something and it is good to think about how to do that, because it will create a new conversation around Giant and will then result in a lot of questions. Well, how are you going to do this? What policies are you going to change? How are you going to increase economic activity as the result of the money you are spending? Yeah.

Natalie: Thank you very much for that. I'm glad you have waited and did not just scale it up four times because I think when you see the numbers, you will realize, for instance, this cost estimate had a huge contingency in it that the other didn't, so right there that is a billion dollars, for instance.

So, yeah, we will get that to you, as I said. Once that is out and we have shared it, obviously, that is what we are prepared to share, but we are still willing to have the conversation. If there is clarification or other points you would like, we will do our best to answer those and get those to you. I just want to put that out there. Thank you.

Graham: Yes, thank you. It is really about the accuracy to which we want these estimates. There are ways in which to provide information where it would never...I mean, no one could take the results and figure out the actual numbers that went into it. It is not possible. Thanks.

Ken H: Thanks, Graham. Like I said, it's looking at things from a whole different perspective. David, if you are still on, do you have any preliminary thoughts on how this information might be shared?

David: No, I think it is premature. I think once we get the information, and once Graham works through it and we have a product, then we can talk about it. Right now, I think the work needs to be done before we start thinking about how to disseminate it.

Ken H: Thank you.

David: I guess I will just add one thing. I have said this before. Please avoid the phrase, "the project that keeps on giving." I mean, it may be true in the economic sense, but it is not something that at the taxpayer's expense we should be bragging about. That is just my personal opinion on that. Thanks.

Ken H: Okay, before I turn it over to Paul for a regulatory update and Ben for his input, I will just tell you a little bit more about what I have been up to. I don't have a lot to add to what others have said. They have covered it pretty well.

I did go on a site tour this year. I had not been on one for a year or two, and it was interesting to see how many things have changed, and how many things had not changed.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022

It certainly is a dynamic site. The people, I think probably half the tour group that I was with had not been out to the site before at all, so it was a bit of an eye-opener. Just the sheer physical size and the complexity of the site is really something that most people are not aware. It is not just a hole in the ground and a couple of buildings.

I have attended some of the working group meetings. I am always impressed with the amount of work that is going into this Project. I have said it before, but I am really amazed at the level of activity and dedication that is going into making this job a job well done, hopefully in the end.

A big part of my work, too, is bringing the historic context to not just the Board members or the Parties, but anybody and everybody I can talk to, and not just the technical perspective but also the human side of the story. So, that motivates me to remain involved. As such, I try to be the eyes and ears for the man on the street having grown up here.

I know a few people, especially the long-timers, and I am always seeking input from them on their perspective on the whole project. Probably the most common underlying comment is always, so when is this going to be finished? Why is it taking so long? Then I go on to explain, etcetera. So, that is what I have been up to and keep up to during the year. I will turn it over now to Paul to give a regulatory review and then Ben. Thanks.

Paul G: Thanks, Ken. As Ken stated, I do most of the reviews for GMOB. Ben listed them in his Activities Report. There is still a fair bit of work going on the regulatory side. On balance, the remediation seems to be progressing, and it seems to be going ahead. There are changes, little, small ones, but that is sort of expected.

One notable, I guess on the regulatory side, is the engagement the Project undertakes. That is really appreciated, and particularly the pre-engagement or the working group-type discussions. Once these reviews get into the Board process, it is very structured, and there is less room for back-and-forth and understanding, but the pre-engagement is very valuable, that is when you can speak directly to the Project Team and their consultants about the things that are being proposed and discuss potential terms or make suggestions.

I think that is a very notable component of the regulatory process that this project is going through. I don't have any sort of specific points to bring up, just sort of general thoughts on it. Any questions?

Erika: I will just say, thanks, Paul, for the positive feedback. We are glad that you are happy with those pre-engagement-type meetings. Also, thanks to you, Marc for letting us know that you appreciated that work we did on the DFO process and trying to make it more understandable. It did take us some work, so we are glad that you are happy with it.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022

Ken H: Thank you, Paul. Now I will turn it over to Ben.

Ben: My update: The office is open. It was a relief after the pandemic after working in the office for such a long time to actually open the doors. We have seen a large increase in traffic in the office, especially visitors, both from community and outside. We have been tracking them, and they are coming from all over the place.

What is very interesting is the Visitor's Center downtown actually approached us and said, by the way, how many visitors can you take at a time? And I went, oh no, here they come. Well, you've got a sign that says everybody is welcome, come on in. What we are seeing is the Visitor Center saying go down if you are interested in the remediation project and talk to GMOB. So, we have become a second information center.

Each one of those tours, to let you know, takes an hour and a half when they walk through our office. Sometimes I get one person coming at 11:00. That goes to 12:30, and then somebody comes in at 1:00 that takes two people or three people through. So, we are talking about better ways to be able to deliver that program, but we have seen an increase.

We have also seen an increase in student groups coming in, both the schools and also out of YKDFN. There have been some incredible student groups that have come in who are really interested. Particularly the monitor training program.

We are continually adding to the archives and the libraries. Be prepared for a timeline document that has been in progress for the last three years. We are looking for a tool, an online tool that will allow us to input the pieces of history with links to it that can be put online. That is all in conjunction with the Archive Strategy that was developed for us. Also, we are following the Communications Strategy. And of course, we are supporting the Board in so many ways, in other words, keeping communications flowing with Board members, sending them their meeting materials, and making sure everything is forwarded. And, if a Board member can't come, I am stepping in to be able to attend those as much as I can and then share the information.

I really want to thank especially Paul Green and his work on the regulatory. He takes a huge weight off everybody and the contractors that we are working with. I really have to say I appreciate the response from the Project to questions that are asked, and the Parties as well. The Parties are extremely responsive when GMOB asks a question.

What I am finding is it is sometimes easier to call than it is to email, but when nobody is answering the phone, I send that email. Sometimes I must call William twice before he actually answers me, but I get it.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

Natalie pointed out to put when you are in the office and sometimes when you are out. What I am finding is sometimes I get drawn to my bookkeeper's office or I am drawn to a community meeting, that sort of thing, so we are doing that as best we can.

We are operating with an increased load, and sometimes success in the office just applies a little bit more pressure and challenges, but we are meeting those as best we can. So, that is my update. Thank you.

Ken H: Yeah, that's everybody. Are there any questions of Ben or the GMOB office or operation?

Jessica: I was just going to say that William usually answers my call on the first one. I'm just kidding. I am glad to hear how many visitors you have coming in. I was just thinking, well you run the tours yourself always, right? You're kind of the only one there. I am just wondering if you talked about different ideas of setting up a certain time and then only running one a day or hiring a student. I'm just curious.

Ben: These are options we are starting to look at. I also think a digital presentation is important and probably is a good outreach tool to be able to post on the net as well to put in conjunction with the timeline.

Erika: I know a guy for video. Just kidding. Question. I am just curious, and I ask this every year. Based on the foot traffic, what are people asking about? What are they concerned about? I mean, this is really part of the community survey as well, but is there anything that kind of stands out that we as GNWT - and I will have to speak for GNWT - that we can do better with information sharing on our website or other types of brochures or information?

Again, just keep us posted. We want to keep you stocked up with the TK brochure. We are providing the funds for the printing of that. William, we can work with you if you need more and all of that, but then, the arsenic brochure as well. So, we want to just keep in touch. If there is anything else, I am open to hearing that, because we are going to do some work on our website as well.

Ben: Thanks, Erika, for that question. I really think it has to do with everything about this particular site. Most visitors who comes in from away, leaving and say, "I had no idea" number one about the site, and number two about the contamination, and number three about the remediation".

A lot of them come in with stories of contaminated sites within their own jurisdictions, and they are amazed that GMOB as an independent oversight body, actually exists with the ability to be able to make recommendations and report, but also to have a storefront that is open and share information.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

So, the model is talked about quite a bit, but for the most part, we are finding it is really giving good information about the site history, about past, present, and future of where the site is going to go. That is of great interest to everybody who comes in.

William: I just wanted to say that I do answer everybody's calls equally. I try to anyway. No, I just wanted to give thanks to Ben. I have heard from numerous community members, leadership, and even our staff that the tours of the GMOB office are very, very well done. I have recommended to a lot of people to go there, so sorry, Ben, for all the extra foot traffic. You do a really good job at that, so I just wanted to say thank you. Mahsi.

Ken H: I just had a little tiny thought. I find it interesting the tour in the office takes an hour and a half. When I was working at Giant in the summer, we would take tours. We would have visitors come to the mine one day a week, and I used to do the mill tours with them. It took an hour and a half. Just a coincidence. I'm not looking for any meaning in that.

Natalie: When Ben said that, I whispered to Andrei, that's how quick I can do a surface tour too, without the orientation. Can I also add? I did not mention anyone, but we have been developing a virtual reality tool. Yes, so we want to work with GMOB to get some headsets in your office as well. The ones we are in right now are the HoloLens, and they are around 5 or 6 grand a headset, so we are working with our developer to get them in the Oculus headsets, which are less expensive. We are hoping to have that done by the end of our fiscal year, so March 31st. I think that is a good opportunity to get that out there in the public. Thank you.

Action Item: GMRP to share with GMOB their virtual reality tool for communications about the site.

Ben: Thank you. We currently have one of the Project virtual reality tools on an iPad. It is fascinating to watch, especially with older people, the difference in their understanding of using that digital tool versus the young. There is a generation gap, but it is quite wonderful. It is a tool that I think has lots of potential for the future. Thank you for that.

Natalie: Okay, good to know. Thank you.

Ken H: Okay, I think that is all we have on that agenda item for highlights. Thank you all.

Reconciliation Issues and Actions

Ken H: Next agenda item is reconciliation issues and actions. This is an opportunity for all the Parties to update us on their reconciliation issues and actions. I think I will start with William.

William: I don't have much to add other than, like I said earlier, we are continuing to work on the apology and compensation piece. We did receive funding, and our leadership has been

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

actively involved in that, as well as our community. There is not much else to add just because I have been away for so long.

Ken H: Thank you, William. Marc?

Marc W: Yes. There is not a great deal to add other than what William is saying. I am headed down pretty much the same road as well that we are working that type of arrangement with the federal government, so thank you.

Ken H: Thank you, Marc. Maybe we will just keep going around the table. Natalie?

Natalie: Thank you. I was just trying to think of ones we have not talked about. I am really happy the apology and compensation is moving along. It was always distracting us from the actual remediation work, so it is very good to hear that there is the commitment from Canada.

Other ones that I just thought I would mention is we are working on a Procurement Framework Agreement with the Yellowknives Dene. That is very close to being signed. That, I think, is another important step in terms of outlining how the Project will do procurement and how the Yellowknives Dene will be involved.

We are also working on a similar agreement with the Tłıch'ô right now and the North Slave one as well, but it outlines how we are doing business and our commitment to continue doing that through the life of the Project for the most part. It does not change how we are doing our business, but it commits to how we are doing it. Also, I think there are some other things as well like regular meetings directly with Yellowknives to discuss any concerns and to make sure we have a forum for discussion.

The other one I thought I would mention was at the Chief and Council Meeting last week, we did hear from Chief and Council that they would like us to change the name of Baker Creek. We had heard that maybe in the past. People might also remember that we also had a request from the Yellowknives through William to change the name Akaitcho and name it something else.

So, we are always a little reluctant on where to go with this, but now that we have had that direct request from the Yellowknives, we have a community meeting with the Yellowknives in the community, and I think what we will do is ask people what their thoughts are and where we should go with this. That is something we are certainly looking to pursue.

The timing we do not know, because all our drawings and all our documents say Baker Creek. We would not want to go back and change all our, for instance, our Closure and Reclamation Plan or change all past documents. It would be a going-forward thing, but

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

that is something that we are certainly willing to explore. I will just look to Andrei, Candace, and Jess if they have anything else they would like to mention. Go ahead.

Andrei: Just to give a couple of examples, Natalie mentioned the Procurement Framework Agreement that we are working with YKDFN. Just to give a couple of examples of the commitments made, those commitments at the request of YKDFN benefit not just YKDFN but Indigenous businesses and Northern businesses in the area of the contract.

I'll mention just a couple of examples that are just around the corner. We briefly mentioned it at the Industry Day that Parsons hosted on November 1st and 2nd. In the past, Indigenous opportunity considerations was up to, I believe, 15% was the limit. It was part of the technical points, so it was not out of a value of 100 but out of a value of 70. Those have been now separated, or will be in the coming contract, separated from the technical. So, they will be valued out of 100 and increased to a threshold of 35%, so between 15% and 35%.

Also, something the Project is doing, which I believe the first time is happening within the procurement in the federal government and we are kind of piloting it, is the Regional Procurement Strategy for Indigenous Businesses. For those of you who are not familiar, PSIB is limited only to Indigenous businesses across all of Canada. What we are doing is not just limiting it to Indigenous businesses across Canada but limiting it further to the area of the contract, which is the combination of the Tl'chô Land Claim Agreement and the Akaitcho Interim Measures Agreement. Those are just some of the examples of things that are actually happening.

Well actually one other thing we are looking to implement is the Master Service Agreements, so ongoing contracts to support a variety of activities on a short-term basis. It increases efficiency so we don't have to go through contemplated change estimates. I think that is what they are called, CCEs. They are currently applied to contracts. So, those are some of the examples that are being utilized now. That is all thanks to the negotiations of the Procurement Framework Agreement.

Ken H: Thanks, Andrei. GNWT, anything you want to add to the item?

(Not identified): I was just going to add that is great to hear, William, that you have been able to get back working on the Community Based Monitoring Program. I did not get to meet with the community for such a long time because of COVID and having finally been able to meet with them, I really see how people want fish sampled. They want water sampled, and for the Yellowknives to be able to do it themselves. So, it is great to hear that is getting going, William. Thanks.

Erika: Nothing really too specific to add except that as a department, last time we met with you, I had noted that the GNWT has these education modules. There were like nine of them that everyone had to go through. Now as a follow-up, actually Jeff and I are heading into

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

a workshop tomorrow about okay, well you've learned some information on colonial history of the site and Indigenous impacts and all of that, and now what do you plan to do with that information? How do you plan to action any steps into reconciliation? That is a workshop that we are having tomorrow, and that is for all of ENR staff. We will be doing that over the next few months.

Well, welcome to Jeff, here today for his first GMOB meeting, I believe, unless you were here with Alex at all. Jeff, being a Yellowknives Dene member too, is really valuable for us to get those perspectives and things like that. We really have been spending some time thinking about how to educate site workers when they come on to site. So, Jeff, it has not progressed too far, but maybe Jeff, I will just give you some mic action time. You can talk about some of the work that we are trying to advance with YKDFN with Angela.

Jeff: Just to follow-up on what Erika said, I just recently got appointed to this position, so I will be around a lot in the indeterminate position, in this current position, as Alex has moved on. I will be around with the Project a bit longer.

I guess to follow-up on what Erika said, I am just going to try and collaborate with the Yellowknives Dene and the federal government to develop some kind of a video with the Yellowknives Dene culture. Their new department is headed by Angela. I think it is Cultural and Language Revitalization, something along those lines.

Along with that, I was also going to be reaching out to all the Parties to the Environmental Agreement for some signage off road in the pullout area in Graham Trail. We are just going to look at maybe collaborating with everyone and seeing what they envisioned would be appropriate for that area. So, look forward to advancing that. With that, maybe we could...yeah, further discussions on that, and maybe we could even have some kind of reconciliation material presented as part of that as well. I look to working alongside everyone here in the future. Mahsi.

Ken H: Thanks you guys. Yes, go ahead.

William: I just wanted to say that it is the Language, Culture, and History Department that is newly formed. It is with Angela, and we really appreciate the work that Jeff does and continues to do. The TK brochure that we worked on prior, everybody loves it. I see that as a major step for reconciliation. Fred does as well. He just loves that brochure. Mahsi.

Ken H: Thanks, William. Alternatives North?

Katharine: Nothing specific to add on this, except to say that we are really happy to hear all of the updates and that progress is being made on various agreements. There are some exciting new initiatives. Thanks, all.

Ken H: Thanks, Katharine. Who have we got? City of Yellowknife, Kerry, if you are still with us?

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

Kerry: Sorry. I had to take a second. It went on mute. Yeah, I don't really have anything to add to what has already been said. Thank you.

Ken H: Thank you. We are now on Agenda Item 7: Additional Business. Does anyone have any additional business that they would like to bring to the table or discuss?

(Pause)

Oh, I am sorry. My apologies. I missed GMOB on the reconciliation issues and actions. Ben, please could you speak to that.

Ben: Yes. I think number one: With reconciliation, the more that we work with that term in GMOB, the more we realize it is moving words to actions. I think that was reflected in some of the statements before. GMOB is open to the public, and that means to everyone and anyone that comes in, and especially to those who are in Ndilq and Dettah and within the Metis community within this area, and to all Indigenous persons who are within the community. The doors are always open.

The community survey is very reflective of it, and it is part and parcel of trying to collect the thoughts of everyone in that regard and very sensitive to those participants who are in the communities of Ndilq and Dettah, and the Metis community in this area on what their thoughts are, and how we are doing.

GMOB celebrated Orange Shirt Day with a display in their front window this year, as well as Indigenous Day. We have continued dialogue with YKDFN and North Slave Métis Alliance on all issues related and through the lens through which they are viewing both successes and challenges.

We are also helping with the distribution of that TK document, which is being distributed to the visitors. The visitors pick up lots of packages when they are walking out that door, so it is good.

The last thing I would say is the continuing gathering of documentation related to the history of the development not only of Giant Mine, but what we are finding is Giant Mine is one of the mines that was a resource development initiative within this area starting in 1936, but Giant is linked. It is very much linked to all of the other developments.

What we are finding is that there is a lot of cross reference between the mines, but there is also a lot of documentation related to how officials were handling the issues related to those who are Indigenous who are living within this area. That is definitely part and parcel of the story of how mining development happened within this area. What we have seen is that there was definitely a cause and effect, so that timeline will definitely reflect that.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
December 5, 2022**

I think that part and parcel of the reconciliation piece is to open those doors to those sources of information that we have found to allow people to be able to read, think about t, and move forward on the story of telling this story about the site. So, these are things that we continue to work with in terms of that lens of reconciliation. Thank you.

Additional Business and Next Semi-Annual Meeting

Ken H: Thank you, Ben. So, one last check-in on additional items. I think we are going to be a little bit ahead of schedule, which is always a good thing. Any additional items?

(Pause)

Next meeting of the Semi-Annual will be six months from now roughly, sometime next May. We will be in touch to arrange a suitable day and time. Last time it was, what, the 26th of May? So, it is sometime in the month, maybe a little bit later on in the month. I think that is everything.

I have to share something, a little show-and-tell, high-tech low-tech after the meeting if you want to see, after the recorder stops. So, if there is nothing else, does someone want to make a motion to adjourn the meeting?

William: I will motion it.

Ken H: William, thank you. We are done. Thank you very much. Well done.

MEETING ADJOURNED



David Livingstone
Chair, Giant Mine Oversight Board

June 01, 2023

Date

MOTIONS

Motion: Moved: M. Lange moved to approve the agenda.
Seconded: N. Plato
Motion carried.

Motion: Moved: E. Nyysönen moved to approve the GMOB Minutes of
May 26, 2022
Seconded: M. Palmer
Motion carried.

ACTION ITEMS

1. **Action Item:** GMRP and GMOB to work on public messaging regarding the extraction of the samples for the GMOB Research Program. (page 23)
2. **Action Item:** GMRP to discuss the sharing with GMOB their virtual reality tool for communications about the site. (page 31)