

Verbatim Minutes
GIANT MINE OVERSIGHT BOARD
SEMI-ANNUAL MEETING
June 1, 2023, 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. (MST)
Explorer Hotel, Kat D/E, and Zoom, Yellowknife, NT

IN ATTENDANCE:

Giant Mine Oversight Board

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

North Slave Métis Alliance

Marc Whitford
Alan Alex

Yellowknives Dene First Nation

Johanne Black - Online

City of Yellowknife

Shelagh Montgomery

Giant Mine Remediation Project

Natalie Plato
Katherine Ross
Geneva Irwin
Andreei Torianski

Government of the Northwest Territories

Erika Nyssonen
Jeff Rosnawski
Diep Duong

Alternatives North

Michael Nabert – Online

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

The first section of the meeting was not recorded but is summarized here from the notes taken by B. Nind and P. Green.

Welcome and Introductions

David Livingston welcomed everyone to the meeting.

The participants introduced themselves, as recorded in the attendance list above.

Approval of Agenda & Meeting Minutes

Motion: Moved: M. Whitford moved to approve the agenda.

Seconded: Diep Duong

Motion carried.

Motion: Moved: N. Plato moved to approve the GMOB Minutes of December 5, 2022

Seconded: K. Ross

Motion carried.

Review of Action Items

The action items from the last meeting were addressed.

The verbatim recording of the meeting begins at this point.

Roundtable Highlights from the Parties

Natalie: Thank you. I would just perhaps suggest that at the public meeting tonight, that could be a good opportunity to discuss the sample extraction. I am not sure if that was in the plan or not, but it might be a good opportunity. Then regarding the headsets, we did get more of the headsets. We have been challenged with them, and we would suggest that the app on tablets is the way to go. I'm not sure. I think you have that already, so certainly that is the most user-friendly tool that we have at the moment. Thank you.

David: Alright. Thanks, Natalie. Are there any other comments? You will appreciate that because it is just a nice day out there that I will do my best to move us through the agenda quickly, but no pressure on anybody.

So, with the Roundtable Highlights, we will move the Project Team to the end. Johanne from the Yellowknives Dene First Nation.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
June 1, 2023**

Update from the Yellowknives Dene

Johanne: Yellowknives Dene First Nation, in terms of highlights, when it comes to some of the activities that we have been working on, we are working on some capacity-driven internal programs around community-based monitoring, as well as summer student selection as part of the Giant Mine file to work with William.

When it comes to ec-dev initiatives, there are a couple of different things that are happening with that. We just finally got some staff, our ec-dev officer, on behalf of the Giant Mine file. The other initiative that is happening because of Giant is that now we do have an office on the first floor of the Det'on Cho Building. That office is staffed with an ec-dev person that is responsible for the intake of communities, resumes, and ensuring that there is conductivity between members and benefits that could be assigned to them in terms of employment, training, contracting opportunities, and those types of things. So, that is the connection between the community members and Det'on Cho as well.

When it comes to community-based monitoring, we are working on developing a framework. We are just in the inception stage. What the monitors will be applying in terms of roots on the ground, we are not exactly sure until some of the policy work is completed. Now when it comes to the technical components, we are still a part of the working group in reviewing materials and providing advice. Thank you.

David: Alright. Thanks, Johanne. Are there any questions of Johanne?

Okay, seeing none, I will turn it over to Marc Whitford for the North Slave Métis.

Update from the North Slave Métis Alliance

Marc: I am going to pass that right over to Alan Alex over here.

Alan: Thanks, Marc. I would like to begin by expressing my gratitude for the opportunity to address this meeting. My name is Alan Alex, and I am currently working as an Environment Officer for North Slave Métis Alliance. I am relatively new to the organization. I started working with Giant Mine files from April 2023, so please be aware that my knowledge regarding Giant Mine files is limited. If there are any questions, me and Marc will try our best to give our answers. If there are unanswered questions, I will get back to my team, and I will come with an answer.

Over the past few months, there have been notable changes within NSMA in relation to Giant Mine files. In April, Jessica Hurtubise, the Environment Department Manager responsible for coordinating the Giant Mine files resigned from NSMA. Consequently, I have been assigned as a staff member responsible for coordinating the working group attendance and engagement meetings for Giant Mine. No other lead regulatory

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

officer was promoted to the Environment Department Manager, so I started working with more regulatory files for NSMA starting from April.

Throughout the past year, NSMA has actively participated in various working groups involving both staff and members. However, due to recent transition capacity challenges, there have been slight adjustments to the individuals participating in working groups. Moreover, members have expressed their desire for increased involvement for Giant Mine-related aspects. Considering these factors, we have finalized the members and staff who will serve as representatives for various working groups as of May 2023.

Regarding the Aquatic Advisory Committee, Lawrence Mercredi will continue to act as the primary delegate for the working group. I will closely collaborate with Lawrence as the alternate representative for these meetings and reviews.

Apart from that, currently we are in the process of developing a community-based monitoring program for NSMA. The initiative was initiated by Jess. It is being continued under my supervision. We have a consultant and are in the final stages of developing standard operating procedures for water, sediment, and for sampling in Yellowknife Bay. This CBM program implemented will give us better aquatic data from a community perspective.

As for the socio-economic update, this year, our acting President, Marc Whitford and Noah Johnson, the Environment Department Manager, will jointly represent NSMA in the working groups. Marc will be the primary, and Noah will be the secondary delegate for the meetings. NSMA has made significant strides in capacity building for our members and staff over the years and will continue to work for the benefit of the community members and staff.

We have recently commenced collaboration with CIRNAC on the strategic partnership initiative for the Remediation Economy Program, aiming to enhance our Environmental Department's capacity in the coming years.

In terms of Education Resource Working Group, Jess Hurtibuse, previously participated in these meetings. However, moving forward, Lawrence Mercredi, our Elder with a background in the education sector, will serve as the primary delegate for this file. Lawrence's extensive experience will greatly contribute to NSMA's representation in the working group.

Regarding YK HEMP, Noah Johnson and Brian Mercredi used to attend these meetings. However, Susan Cable will now be NSMA's primary delegate moving forward. Susan is attending her first meeting in April and is enthusiastic in participating in future sessions.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

Regarding the Perpetual Care Plan, there have been no updates currently. However, I will be the primary delegate representing NSMA at any future PCP meetings.

Moving on to other updates, NSMA is planning to organize a site visit on June 13th for our members and staff. We are currently in the process of scheduling the visit. Lawrence expressed a strong desire to see the site. By doing so before the Aquatic Advisory Committee on June 20th, Lawrence hopes to familiarize himself with the site and enable NSMA to contribute more effectively to the discussion on that date.

Since assuming the responsibility from Jess, I have reached out to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada regarding the fishery (*inaudible*) aspect, and we are aiming to schedule an engagement meeting in the coming months to address this matter in greater detail.

Additionally, NSMA is in the process of hiring a wildlife officer who will potentially assist us in community-based monitoring for Giant Mine. The wildlife officer is expected to join NSMA in the coming months, enhancing our capabilities and environmental management.

NSMA has made significant progress in implementing new framing and capacity building programs related to the Giant Mine Remediation Project. Late last summer, we began receiving new funding to develop a five-year training plan with the objective of providing benefits to members and enhancing NSMA's involvement in the remediation economy, specifically environmental monitoring of contaminated sites. A new staff position was created using this funding, an officer who has been working with the Environmental Department Manager to understand members' needs and link members with opportunities.

Also related to capacity building, we are conducting major upgrades to our boat fleet that will enhance our ability to run our CBM program. We are also investigating a business wing, which would focus on contaminated site monitoring contracts and the creation of a dedicated facility to support operations.

These are the updates I have to share with you today. Thank you for your attention.

David: You guys have been busy. Thanks, Alan. Are there any questions of the North Slave Métis?

Seeing none, thank you. I'll turn it over to the City of Yellowknife.

Update from the City of Yellowknife

Shelagh: Well, I have not been that busy since coming on in mid-April. The City has had, as so many of you would know, Todd Slack. He had handed his role to me, and the City agreed to that. It has been fairly quiet since I began in April. I sat in on one of the

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

bilateral meetings with the Giant Mine Remediation Project Team at the City of Yellowknife. We have another meeting next week and a working group meeting coming up, I think, in two or three weeks as well.

Otherwise, I have mostly been familiarizing myself with some of the background and some of the subject matter that has come out of some of these meetings in the recent past.

Also, as many of you are probably aware, for the Health Effects Monitoring Program Advisory Committee, Shin Shiga sits on that for the City. Then he provides a summary report to me and to the City, so there was a meeting at the end of April on April 21st. He was there for that meeting and just working keeping up to date. I think there are a couple of sampling programs underway related to the Health Effects Monitoring.

Other than that, I think those are the main areas for the moment for the City of Yellowknife. Thanks.

David: Thanks, Shelagh. You are busy enough, I would say. Are there any comments or questions from anyone?

Alright. I appreciate how quickly people are moving through this. Alternatives North. Michael?

Update from Alternatives North

Michael: Thank you. We are proud of the work that we have collectively done here. Alternatives North is honoured to continue to be involved. My contribution will continue to be primarily review, which has been a spectacular learning opportunity, as well as a chance to move the needle on the direction the whole Project is going.

I knew four years ago when I first got involved with Giant Mine that this would be a marathon rather than a sprint. This year, as we have gotten into versions 2.0 and beyond the various design plans and monitoring maintenance plans, it has been gratifying to feel that we have established a solid foundation to start with and are still successfully improving things in an incremental way on an ongoing basis.

Personally, I am going to miss having Todd here representing the City, and Jess for the NSMA, but I want to gladly welcome their replacements who will bring valuable fresh eyes to material that the rest of us have been looking at for ages.

I am particularly glad that we have made as much progress in the last year as we have on the Perpetual Care Plan. It is a huge, complicated piece of this whole thing that is nice to have momentum on. I am looking forward to starting to explore some of the climate assumptions this month, which are likely the largest variable to Project performance.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
June 1, 2023

As always, Alternatives North is appreciative of the great work that has been brought to the table by all Parties and the valuable support we continue to receive along the way from GMOB as well. Thank you all so much.

David: Thank you, Michael. Are there any questions? Observations?

Alright, so that brings us to the end of the Parties aside from the Project Team.

Update from the Project Team

Natalie: Thank you. I see GMOB is on there, but they will go after us?

David: We can go first if you would like.

Natalie: It does not matter at this point.

David: Okay, why don't you do that, and then GMOB can follow up.

Natalie: Okay, we will do our update according to the bullets list, and we will probably pass it around, since there are several of us here to speak to. We will start with site status and schedule update. As you know, we are entering the third year of active official remediation. The town site deconstruction continues, and the water treatment plant construction has started. They have cleared the area, and construction has started. Those are great schedule site status updates.

We are also starting three bigger work packages for this year. The investigative drilling: We are calling it the sample drilling, which is the retrieval of the arsenic trioxide samples for GMOB, which will happen this summer. As well, we have a package on the legacy debris piles or the random debris around site cleanup. That will be happening this year as well.

With the water treatment plant, an update to this Team is that we have no parking lot on site anymore, because that is where the water treatment plant will be going, in that vicinity. They are using that area, so it is creating a bit of a challenge, I guess. Everyone must get to this site on their own, and there is no parking. So, contractors have to get their staff by bus or taxi and find alternate places to park.

With that, I will go on to the next item, which is the YK Heritage Museum and Great Slave Sailing Club. We have been working with them and keeping them updated. We have been invited to the lift-in, which is June 10th for the Sailing Club. We will be there to answer questions, have some handouts, and just be present in case there are any questions. They are also having their AGM on June 24th – or it's an open house, sorry. They have also invited us to that. We will be there and set up a booth or some sort of information session as well later this month. We will participate in the Mining

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

Heritage grand opening whenever we get a date on that. I don't think they have a date yet.

We are also in the last stages of moving the last item requested from the Yellowknife Historical Society, which is the diesel generator from the A-shaft area. That will happen in the coming weeks. We are ready to move it, and that is the last item they have requested. Go ahead. I will pass it over to Erika.

Erika: Just to add to the Heritage folks and the Sailing Club from a GNWT perspective, as GMOB is aware and maybe some other Parties, some of the improvements on their site needed approval from the Lands Department. That has now been merged with Environment and Natural Resources. We are now officially Environment and Climate Change, so the Lands folks are a division within our group. It is still the same people, Lands Admin.

A couple or few weeks ago, their approval was granted from Lands Admin, so all the improvements that they have done onsite or plan to, still prior to the museum opening, are okay. That is a big win for the Historical folks, because it has been a long road for them to get the museum ready. I know they are losing sleep to get it going. So, that's great. We are still looking for some information from the Project perspective on some of the work they did there to inform our detailed design work in terms of contaminated soils and where things are. I just wanted to update on that.

Also, from the GNWT side with the Sailing Club, we are looking at what that shared space period of time will look like. We know that members still want to be on that site, but they will be sharing space with all of the public. So, we are looking at considerations for parking and potentially a designated area for the membership. We are still working on sailboat storage and where that will happen over the long-term. That is a tough one. We are hoping land opens up. That is from the GNWT perspective on those two items.

Natalie: Great. Thank you, Erika. The next two items were tagged with you as well: the QRA update and the Perpetual Care Plan update.

Erika: Great. Everyone knows the QRA has wrapped up. However, there is a small component of the QRA called the Acute Risk Assessment that actually got rolling because of some recent research that Ken brought awareness to the Project on. So, we have done some work on looking at some of those scenarios.

Emma just gave me an update and was the lead on running the QRA work. She said she has the final. We did present to the working group on that. She has the final now in her inbox, and we are about to review that. Then we will be closing the loop with the working group, but also having some conversations with GNWT Health, especially to see if there are any messaging considerations that might need to change. At this

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

point, we are seeing that it is still status-quo, but we have done the work. You will see something soon on that.

In terms of the Perpetual Care Plan: Drum roll. The RFI is out, so we have something in the public world, which is great. For the RFI, what this means for people who are not familiar, it is Request for Information. Together as a taskforce, we created a scope of work. Thank you, everyone, for your input on that.

We sent that scope of work out for a Request for Information, asking some tailored questions about if this is realistic and just getting input from potential bidders. We anticipate quite a bit of feedback. As people know who were on the taskforce, it is a heavy package that kind of went out of what we are looking for. That input will be valuable. It is on Buy and Sell or Canada Buy and Sell. Anyway, Natalie sent out the link to everybody. It is out for four weeks.

At that time, we did some internal work as well, working with all our engineers, project leads, to get their input as well. So, we have some anticipated changes already that we think could make the scope a little bit more refined and more manageable and just framing it differently. That is the deal with that. We are hoping for kind of a quick turnaround on those revisions and then get the RFP out.

I will address the fact that it was in a recommendation in your recent Annual Report that you would like a draft on May 31st of next year. Right now, how we have tailored the scope is we see it as a two-year contract. It might be for some offline conversations of what might be ready in March, but we are moving ahead. If GMOB is interested in more of an update for what has been happening on the taskforce or from the Project's perspective, we would be happy to have a chat more about that.

While I have the mike, I just want to acknowledge the work that the Parties have been doing. Alan, since you have been here, it sounds like you have done a lot of work. Right on. That is great to hear about how you have progressed in the Community-Based Monitoring Program. We are feeling secure with the information we have, but we always know communities want to know from their point of view what is out there. Shout out to you, Johanne, as well, for the work that your department is doing on that. We are here for support as you guys advance. We are here for a resource if needed.

Another one, Johanne, I just wanted to say that it is great to hear about De'ton Cho and a community office there. It is bridging that gap. That is wonderful, and we just look forward to the success of that relationship and that close connection there to get members involved and everybody else. Thanks for your technical reviews on our MMPs and design plans and all of that. Welcome, Alan and Shelagh. Natalie, sorry, over to you.

Natalie: Thank you, Erika. That was a great update. Continuing down the list, the next item we were asked to update on was Apology and Compensation. I do not think Johanne

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

provided an update unless I missed it. If I did, I apologize. I think the update still stands from last that Canada provided funding to the Yellowknives for them to complete their submission.

At this point, the Yellowknives have submitted something back to CIRNAC. It is in draft form, and it is preliminary. They are still working on it. I am not sure if you had anything that you wanted to add, Johanne. I did not mean to speak for you, but it was on the list. I just wanted to make sure it did not get lost.

Johanne: No, we are good. It is accurate.

Natalie: Okay, thank you.

Johanne: Thank you.

Natalie: So, we do not have timelines on that. It is ongoing. The next item on the list is the AAC, DFO, Transport Canada update. From the Parties' perspective, I think that is probably one of our biggest...it is not a concern, but it is certainly, well it is a concern I guess, in terms of the DFO authorization.

As you know, we have been working for many years on the Aquatics Advisory Committee getting feedback and input into our Fisheries Act Authorization. We did submit that earlier this year, which from a Project perspective, is fantastic. We are very happy that we got that in, and it is now with DFO. The concern for us is now it is with DFO. It is out of our hands, and we are on timelines. We will need the authorization for next summer according to our current schedule to construct the outfall for the water treatment plant.

Just to put this to everyone in this room to please work with DFO to do what you need to do to respond to DFO. I think Alan, you mentioned you are working with DFO in terms of your engagement, and I know YKDFN has been in contact. If there is anything the Project can do to support that, we will help you through that. I just want to flag it that if it does not go timely, we are going to have to delay the water treatment plant. From a Project perspective, it is certainly a risk. I put that out there for everyone just to be aware to please respond to DFO in a timely manner, and if you have concerns, please flag them.

Action Item: GMRP encourages all Parties to respond to DFO processes to avoid delays for the approval of the new water treatment plant.

We think we have done a great engagement for 2+ years at the AAC. We don't think there are any outstanding concerns. We feel like we have addressed everything. We have taken all input, so we really would be surprised if there were concerns at this time, but if there are, please let us know. That is the biggest thing we are facing right now as a Project Team. So, I implore you to please respond.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

In terms of Transport Canada, I think we have our approvals, so this DFO Authorization is our last hurdle in terms of authorizations to proceed. I don't think anyone would want the water treatment plant delayed, because it is a key piece to get the water quality in this area improved. I will pause there. That was a big piece.

David: Are there any questions of the Project Team so far? All good? Yeah.

Johanne: Just one question. Sorry for my lack of knowledge, but I rely on William, and he is away right now on bereavement leave. If you can, give me the contact of DFO just so I can have that initial meeting with them. That will speed that process up for me in terms of if there are any submissions for the Yellowknives before the deadline.

Natalie: Thank you very much, Johanne. We can meet with you as well if you want some more information. We will be happy to provide that, but we will certainly provide the contact info. Thank you.

Johanne: Thank you.

David: Marc Lange?

Marc: There are maybe two things from me, one thing and then a question on the DFO process. Way back, we had heard grumblings from the Parties and some members of the public that they were not getting traction with the concerns they had with DFO, so they turned to us and asked how we can help. The Project Team had held a public meeting to try to address some of this. I just want to say that since that meeting, we have not heard concerns from the Parties that initially came to us, so there is nothing new on our side.

Then the question I have is I am getting a sense that entering the DFO process has left you with some uncertainty around the timeline, and the timeline might be tight. Have you got an idea of what the DFO process is at this point? What are your concerns basically in terms of the timeline? We can help.

Natalie: I will try to answer them. I don't have Candace here, my Regulatory Manager, but I feel I can speak to it. Once it goes to DFO, they don't have timelines unfortunately. It goes out to Indigenous consultation, and it is on their timelines. So, I think it is the groups getting back to express what they want to have happen in terms of any engagement or consultation. It is out of our control, right? So, that is our concern that there is no timeline, and it could drag on. That is why we are just imploring that we will do what we can to continue the conversation and hopefully have our Fisheries Authorization before next year.

David: Thanks, Natalie. I have a question of mostly the Métis and the Yellowknives. Has DFO reached out to you folks?

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
June 1, 2023**

- Alan: Yes. I had one conversation with DFO already, and we are looking forward to organizing an engagement session in the coming months, yeah.
- David: It sounds to me like a couple of months might be a little long.
- Alan: We had some capacity challenges for the past two months with our Environment Department manager resigning, so we have a lot of projects. I was handling all those things, so potentially we have a couple of site visits going on this month. July is the time I am looking into having this engagement meeting.
- David: And Johanne? How have the conversations gone with DFO?
- Johanne: We have reached out. We have heard from DFO, but we have not scheduled anything upcoming. I do have a process that they will have to go through in terms of consultation. Thank you, and I will try as best I can to speed that up, just so we are not the ones who are responsible for slowing down the Project, because we certainly do not want that. We also want to ensure that all the effects are mitigated, but I am sure that our folks sitting at the Aquatics Advisory Committee have assisted in that front as well. Thank you.
- David: Thanks, Johanne. I guess that does bring up the role of the Aquatic Advisory Committee. We have a recommendation in the Annual Report, but perhaps that group could be used as a vehicle to expedite the DFO work. That is just a suggestion. The timelines are awfully tight. That is for sure.
- Natalie: I think when we started the Aquatics Advisory Committee that was exactly our intent in the two years, we worked with them, to address all those concerns before we submitted it, so once we submitted it the process would be smooth.
- David: Shelagh?
- Shelagh: I am just wondering on the DFO process, and I know from my regulatory life that DFO was always kind of in a black box. You never quite knew what they were doing, and they did not ever share any information. At this point, there is engagement or consultation happening specifically with Indigenous agencies or governments. Then, is there another phase? Do you know? Do documents go out like our public review phase, or is it that it stops with Indigenous governments and there is some sort of authorization issued in the absence of other parties participating?
- Natalie: Sorry, Erika is just helping me out here in the absence of Candace. There was the 90-day review period. That is as far as we know. Once that is closed and the consultation with Indigenous governments closes, then Fisheries makes their authorization. That is how I understand it.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

Shelagh: Oh, okay. So, there has already been a review that all Parties around this table would have participated in?

Natalie: Yeah. Correct.

Shelagh: Okay.

David: I always get nervous about black boxes. If we can help, we will do that. Marc Lange would be our lead on provoking and prodding and encouraging DFO to get this thing done. I am sure the folks at DFO are aware of the timelines as well and will try to do it as quickly as they can, but bureaucracy being what it is. I just wonder if inviting DFO to our next semi-annual or to the working group meetings or something like that might be helpful in encouraging them to do what needs to be done.

Natalie: That is a great suggestion, and I think we will explore that. I think at this point, it is at the Parties' response. I think DFO is engaged, as Alan has said. It is just ensuring the Parties work with DFO and get back. We will certainly put that as a suggestion if we need it.

Action Item: Have DFO attend the next Semi-Annual Meeting to report on the status of progress of their process to ensure clarity for everyone.

David: Great. Thanks. More?

Natalie: Yes. I am just going to continue down the list. Oh, I think Graeme has a question.

Graeme: Thank you. From GMOB's perspective, we have discussed risks to the Project. From my perspective, what that means in terms of cost, I don't know how tight this is, but to consider what it means, for example to the Canadian taxpayer, if the delay causes you a full year, that obviously.... The site is complex, and how much that pushes everything back a year, it all comes with costs to the contractors and whatnot.

I do not know if there is a direct question here, but the extent to which these risks are being – I don't want to use the word management but understood – will help the public understand what is at stake. To the extent to which we can do that, there is a pretty simple cost benefit analysis. If we don't meet this deadline, the cost to the taxpayer is whatever, a million or ten million, or 100 million dollars. At some point in the federal government system, you get high enough up that they say well that matters, and there might be action that takes place as a result.

I don't know if that's – there is no question in there except it is something that we have been discussing because of the complexity of the Project. We anticipate delays. The extent to which they cause the Project to become a 2040, or a 2045, or a 2050 Project has implications for everyone. It is just a comment, I guess.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

Natalie: Great. Thank you, and at this point we are hoping to mitigate this risk that we could come back to help us work on those numbers potentially. The next item is the AEMP update, and with that I will hand it to you, Geneva.

Geneva: We will be discussing AEMP locations with the Aquatics Advisory Committee on June 28th, but we have also scheduled a specific meeting with GMOB directors who are interested just to have a one-on-one with the Project prior to the wider group if there are any additional questions that you would like to clarify prior to the wider meeting. That was June 13th.

David: We are good with that date.

Natalie: Great. Thank you. The next item was regulatory reviews, but I covered what I wanted to talk about on the DFO there. With that, I will pass it to Andreii for an economic update.

Andreii: Hi, everybody. I have a couple of updates regarding socioeconomics. I guess the first and probably most important for the team here within the Economic Development Unit is the Socio-economic Strategy. We provided an update to that. Thank you to GMOB and other rights and stakeholders for reviewing it for almost a year and providing your feedback. That strategy is going to take us from 2023 until 2028, so it is a five-year strategy.

Now we are going to transition into working on the Implementation Plan that follows it and complements it. That is something we are aiming to do starting from September and October, so in the fall.

Also starting off this year, from April 1st, we introduced a new key performance indicator: Indigenous Affiliation. Essentially, what it does is it asks individuals working onsite voluntarily if they would like to let us know that they belong to either North Slave Métis Alliance, Tłıchǫ, YKDFN, or other First Nations from the North or the South, or if they wish not to report. That is a new KPI that we are looking forward to, because it is not just important for the Project, but it is important for rights and stakeholders. Everybody has been asking us to do that, so we are happy to start reporting on that starting in the 2023-2024 fiscal year.

A couple of things have been signed between the Project and our rights and stakeholders. One is the Procurement Framework Agreement. I believe Natalie provided an update on that at the last semi-annual and what it entails. I added things like increasing the IFC threshold and Regional Procurement Strategy for Indigenous businesses. Those are some of the things that stem from this agreement and negotiations that went behind it.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

The Procurement Framework Agreement was signed with the Yellowknives Dene First Nations on April the 5th. There is still a formal signing ceremony to happen. We are hoping to have that around July possibly. Looking forward to that.

There is also a Community Benefits Agreement that the Project signed with the North Slave Métis Alliance on March the 6th, so we are happy to see that. That is a continuation of capacity building and training and economic development for the North Slave Métis Alliance. There are also ongoing negotiations with the Tłı̨chǫ for the Procurement Framework Agreement as well. That is ongoing.

Then, the Project was invited as a case study just last month at the Northern Development Ministers' Forum that was held in Churchill, Manitoba. The topic for discussion was remediation economy, and that was led by Rasel from CIRNAC. He provided a presentation on that, and Giant Mine was a case study. There was also a report that came out of that that goes more in depth, but the presentation and the Project itself were well received.

There were some questions about key performance indicators that we use, and some definitions, and how we manage procurement between federal and territorial governments being co-proponents. Minister Vandal was present, the Minister of Northern Affairs. He was present there in person. I believe at the end of the discussion, the decision was made that the Giant Mine Project from the perspective of that group from this forum is complete, and it will not be reviewed anymore, because I believe there have been several presentations on the Project on that. It looks like we have answered their questions, their concerns. They will just listen to us from the background now, I guess, not directly from us. Thanks.

David: Thanks, Andreii. Natalie?

Natalie: Thank you. The last item on this list was the YK HEMP update. I am so happy to report that the YK HEMP is active, and they are doing the five-year plan sampling with the children and youth. I don't know, Erika, if you had a stats update on how this is progressing? No? You can go to their website and find out: YKHEMP. It is independent, so we will just report that it is ongoing. We are funding it. It seems to be going well.

Other items that did not fall into any category is that we participated in the spring tradeshow along with YK HEMP on one side and Parsons on the other. We had three booths. We saw over 400 people, I think, or more. It was very beneficial. We had lots of good questions. We were there to get ourselves and Parsons and YK HEMP out there.

The last item just leaks back to no site parking. Site tours are going to be somewhat limited going forward. Please have patience with the Team if you do request site tours. We will do our best to accommodate, but we would have to coordinate with ongoing site work and that sort of thing. It will be a little trickier during the busier summer months. I think that is all I have, unless there are any questions. Thank you.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
June 1, 2023

David: Erika?

Erika: I found the stats. The latest update is 70% of people are eligible in terms of past participants. 89% of those...okay those numbers do not make sense. Hold on. Hold on. Nope. I'm not even going to try to explain this, because I might say it wrong. There are regular updates coming out of Katharine Thomas actually. She is working with Renata on the YK HEMP. She is also with Alternatives North. It is going to go out to the HEMP Advisory Committee. Ben, you are receiving those. Then you will have your representatives there. Those are weekly updates that Katharine is sending out, so your health reps can send that to Party reps here today. I'm not going to go through that.

In the beginning, they were having issues with sending the letters out and having people respond to just even say no, not interested, because the Team...Ken, are you going to try and explain it? The Team still needs to go back three times to say okay, that person can get off the list. So, I had said put up an ad at the movie theater to try and get that awareness out there. They said great idea, and then they said Erika, can you do it for us? So, if you have gone to the movies, that commercial is done by me and voiced. There has been success with that, and people have recognized through that that oh, I did get that letter. I need to respond.

That is great. Those houses can come off the table. Ken, actually I will hand it over to you. Then David, I have one point on the economic side of things too to relay.

David: Alright, and I think we should put up notices at Canadian Tire, Wal-Mart, and Arctic Farmer, and we will have the community totally covered. Ken Froese?

Ken F: I'm just doing some long math on my notebook here, but I also do not understand their percentages at the bottom of this. It makes no sense to me whatsoever. The important numbers are of past participants. So, just a reminder that this is resampling the children and youth from the first sampling. This is the fifth year. You want to try and resample the younger generation every five years rather than every 10 years.

The past participants have either completed or have scheduled an interview with 131. Of the new random sample count to make up the difference of those who are no longer eligible or people who have moved away or various things, right now they have 42. That total is 173. So, they are climbing up in numbers. I do not remember what the number they are looking for to achieve a certain statistical relevancy here, but they are working at it. We will have to find out what those percentages mean. I don't know if you can give a shrug in the transcript here, but anyway, it is there.

David: It is duly noted in the transcript already, so it will be good. Erika, back to you.

Erika: Just to add onto Andreii's update on the socio-economic area of things, I wanted to acknowledge, and most of you are aware that there is a Remediation Coordinating

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

Committee, which is senior management across relevant GNWT departments plus federal side, folks like Russell and crew and Altaf. There is a committee, and I think they meet on a quarterly basis. I understand that GMOB was there and gave a presentation.

I understand and you haven't had really too much time to get into some of the modelling work that you have done. Diep and I have been really pushing up to have walls broken down and make sure that people are sharing the information they are working on so that we are not seeing redundancy or overlap, things like that. So, we are happy that you were in attendance there. I look forward to a little bit of an update today on how you felt that meeting went, the reception.

We have heard the message over the last little while that GNWT plays a bigger role in the remediation opportunities on a broader scale, and Diep and I continue to raise that awareness. Now with this committee, we are hopeful that the right people are talking, and we can get momentum behind some of these actions and awareness about what can be done. That's it for me. Thanks, and Graeme if you want to, pop in there.

David: Yeah, I will step in there before Graeme does. Graeme and I went to that meeting. I will be as gentle as I can on this. It was eye-opening. It was discouraging. How shall I put it? There was considerable room for improvement. I would really strongly encourage you guys to continue working with the folks around that table, because I was more than a little taken aback by some of the comments, the general awareness of what is actually going on out there.

I will turn it over to Graeme. You can do it now or in your update about the concern we have about simply the economic understanding and the teasing out of what really needs attention and what doesn't, and launching off on initiatives without fully understanding the context. There is considerable work to be done, I would say. Graeme?

Graeme: I don't know how much we want to discuss the outcomes of that meeting, but similar to David's comments, to remain respectable, the starting point from the GNWT and the people that ran that meeting was far too high a level. It was too conceptual. It was too hypothetical. The reality is that the Project is already underway, as everybody in this room understands. I am not sure if the people in the meeting knew that.

They did not understand the economics of the Project. There were economics people in the room. They had not done the analysis to learn what the economics of the project is. Given how much this woeful term, remediation economy, is spoken, there does not seem to be a very strong knowledge of what that means, perhaps because it does not really exist. It is something actually different, so people are pouring their energies into trying to understand something that is not real.

There were simple questions about labour market and the future labour demand, future overall expenditure. Areas of focus just were not there. There is not much more to say, except I think David and I felt there were decisions being made based on very little

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

information, which is a bit disappointing given how much work the Project Team has done. I don't think you can be in Yellowknife and not know the Giant Mine Remediation Project exists. There was far too little information about the actual Project and the types of activities that are about to take place that seem relevant to the discussions. I will just leave it there.

David: Yeah, room for improvement.

Diep: Thanks for the insight there, Graeme and David. I am wondering. I guess I have a couple of questions. I guess behind the scenes, behind the GNWT perspective, we are really happy now that ITI is a lot more involved. Initially when we started work on – I am going to put quote-unquote around “remediation economy,” because I understand it is not just an economy on its own. It involves many different sectors.

It would be great to hear and perhaps to meet with GMOB and ECE or our group specifically, to know and understand what it is exactly that you would like to see, concrete activities, projects, or things that you say we are lacking in data. Tell us what it is you would like to see, and we will work with ITI and ECE to come up with those things.

We have been trying to push other departments to be more involved on the economic side of it, but we are not economists here at the table. Certainly, we are sort of the lead department for GNWT on this, so we can bring in other departments, and we really want to. So, if you guys are okay with that, let's meet and talk about what it is that you would really like to see, what data is missing. Whether it is ITI that needs to do it or ECE that needs to do it, or even ECC, we would like to not have another report that says we are not doing very good on the socio-ec side.

So, what is it that you would like for us to do, concrete tangible things, and we will push as much as we can at the GNWT level to get this work done. I recognize, too, that I think the Project Team has done quite a bit, but it is broader than Giant Mine, right? There are multiple other Parties involved, because there are numerous other projects that are happening right now and in the future.

David: Graeme, are you interested in following up? I will just say that Graeme has been doing an enormous amount of work on this and trying to lay out the context that arguably should have been done by the two governments five years ago. It is never too late, and perhaps lessons learned from the Giant Project can be applied to other initiatives elsewhere in the territory. We at least hope so, but I don't know how far GMOB should be getting into this.

We have a bit of a challenge in saying this is the context that we have set out. Graeme is working, in particular, on the model. It is over to you guys, the Project Team, and not necessarily the Project Team but the two governments behind this. The Project Team, from our perspective, is primarily engineering and is doing a very good job on that side

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

of it. The concern is enabling the territory to capture opportunities that are not being well enough characterized, well enough addressed, and launching off or laid out.

Aurora College is developing a multi-year program to train people for jobs that may not be necessary, may not be the priorities without understanding the context. For CANNOR to fund that, it was really quite breathtaking at that meeting. I will turn it over to Graeme to wrap this part of the discussion up, but I am not entirely sure what our continuing role in this is other than describing what Graeme has done and then hoping that the responsible authorities will pick up the ball and run with it. That meeting of the Coordinating Committee was not encouraging.

Graeme: I mean I think there are some things we can do. I agree with David in the sense that it is touching the limits of GMOB's role, I think. It is probably worthwhile the approach that I have taken and the idea of trying to communicate the Project as something other than just a massive engineering undertaking. I think David said this. My colleagues here seem to think that it is going extremely well to the point where they have less to do than I do.

I think the whole conversation around Giant Mine needs to change from it being so focused on engineering. Not that it is a concern, but the federal government is about to spend, well including money already spent, \$4.4 billion dollars. The example I used at this committee, I used the example and was told later that it was a bad example. If Elon Musk were to show up in town and say I'm building a \$4 billion dollar research facility on the outskirts of town, it would be a fight amongst all the people to try and get in front of that parade. The discussion in this territory would be about it and everybody would want to be a part of it. Everybody would want to be involved. How do we train? What kind of capacities do we need? Retooling and all that sort of stuff.

The same thing is happening with the federal government showing up on our doorstep, and they are going to spend \$4 billion dollars in the city limits. It is an enormous project with massive economic consequences, whether we take them or not. Our message is that the discourse around the Giant Mine needs to change such that when you hear about Giant Mine, it is not the fear of the arsenic trioxide, but rather the opportunity of taking advantage of the \$4 billion dollars that is about to be spent.

If we can change that dialogue and start communicating that way and say, oh, where is that \$4 billion dollars going to be spent, then that is where we can help because we have done that work, at least on an initial basis. We are at the point now where we can start to drill down into even more specifics.

We know all the industries that are going to be affected. We know the extent to which they are going to be affected. We know where those industries spend money, the types of contracts they sign, how much of the goods and services they purchase are purchased within Yellowknife and within the NWT economy, and we know where all of that labour spends money. We are tracking all of that sort of stuff. We can now drill down even

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

further to specify what type of labour they require, like how many HEOs are required onsite at any given time and what specific contractors are in town that actually deliver those services. We can get that specific.

You start to understand as you follow the money through the economy. You can say, oh jeez, there are a lot of opportunities here. Maybe we need certain investments, perhaps not in some of the things that Aurora College is doing, but other things. But that information must come first such that when CANNOR spends \$3 million dollars developing a program that is targeting something, it is clearly identified as something that we need.

All of that starts with changing the dialogue or the discourse around the Project to understand what it really means.

David: Alright. Thanks, Graeme. In the interest of time, we will move on a little bit. Ben?

Ben: I have a question for Andrei. Andrei, the presentation that was done at the conference, is it possible to get a copy of that presentation?

Andrei: The Northern Development Ministers' Forum? Yeah, absolutely. The presentation that was given by the Project Team, right? Yeah.

Ben: Thank you.

Action Item: GMRP (Andrei) to provide GMOB with a copy of the GMRP presentation given at the Northern Development Ministers' Forum

David: Marc Lange?

Marc L: You asked us if you could help us some more. I think I would like to take that question under advisement and for us to meet as a Board to talk about this and answer her question properly. I won't say anymore. There is a fair bit of flailing, and I don't think we should stop where we are at, the recommendation. I think we should help and drill down a little deeper, because \$4 billion dollars is important, and the City is going to have to be part of that discussion at some time. When it comes to housing and infrastructure for these workers, it gets into the City issues.

David: Shelagh?

Shelagh: I was going to ask after you asked that question if there seemed to be within the GMOB an interest in convening some sort of meeting on that topic and could the City be invited as well. The more information that is shared, the better. The more understanding, the better, so I would certainly be interested in participating in some way.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

David: Alright, and just as an editorial note, it is not surprising that people are finding it difficult to get engaged in the discussion. GMOB has been raising the issue about the economic side of the Project for years, but we were not able to articulate what it was we were looking for. We knew that there was something out there that was falling between the cracks, and more time and attention needed to be paid to the economic side of the Project. It was not until Graeme became part of the Board that we had somebody who could actually translate what we were kind of groping toward into real numbers and a real process and a real understanding.

So, I get that it is catch-up, but there is a lot of money potentially and actually slipping through the fingers of people in the Northwest Territories because that attention has not been paid, and there is money being misspent. The Aurora College Training Program, for example as described, will not actually be ready for five years. I mean, there is a problem there. Much of that training that they are proposing is already in place. It just needs to be re-jigged, and some of that training that they are proposing may not be necessary at all, but they are going to be spending \$3 million dollars to develop this program at CanNor's direction.

You know, there is a lot of communication and understanding that needs to be developed. Yeah, we will certainly talk about this as a Board and figure out an approach that we are comfortable taking, but it is not just for the Board to be doing this. It is for people to start, and all the Parties including industry and everybody else, to start paying real attention to this. We don't want to be at the end of this Project saying well, that was a missed opportunity. Right now, there is every possibility that will be the conclusion unless things change direction. We can do better than that. Andrei?

Andrei: I just wanted to add a bit of a clarification point. The program from the Aurora College should not take five years to be in place. It is most likely that five years from now, we will see recruits or trainees coming out of that program. I know when I presented this in April to our Socio-economic Working Group, I referenced that number. ITI corrected me saying that it actually might be sooner than that, probably three years from now. I just wanted to add that point. Thanks.

David: Well, that is inconsistent with what we heard at that meeting. It was five years to develop it. It would be five years before the first student entered the program. At the same time, there are other people around the table saying, "What?" We were not alone on that, but that was agenda that the spokesperson from Aurora College laid out.

Erika: I have just a slight twist on perception on the work being done. Recognizing with time there might be opportunities missed at Giant, but with the modeling work that we did look at to forecast remediation projects for the next 15-20 years out, there are still opportunities coming. So, just because Aurora College might be slow in getting those bodies out to hit Giant, there are still opportunities. That is the decision that drove that program. Thanks.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

David: Yeah, there are certainly opportunities, but they will not happen on their own. It is going to take effort. It is never too late, as we have said before. Graeme?

Graeme: I know we want to move on, but rather than bring this up again when it is my turn to talk, I may as well close this off. It is easy to kind of get carried away I think when we start to talk about the economic opportunities and what is being missed. I want to stress, and this is important to understand. The Project is doing extremely well in terms of spending money in NWT-based businesses. The employment record to date given the current labour market is excellent.

I don't want anybody leaving the room thinking that the Project today is not performing. What we are talking about going forward, as the Project Team understands, is that the Project is going to get significantly bigger quickly. So, I think there is a nuance there that I want to make sure everybody understands. Don't take it as a criticism of the current level of, in particular contracting, but we are at the point where we want to start to drill down into that contracting and understand where the money is going once it passes through Parsons and into contractors, and where it goes from there, especially when it gets bigger. That is where we are focused. Thank you.

David: Thanks. Natalie?

Natalie: Thank you. I just want to thank GMOB, and particularly Graeme, for all the work you have done on this. I know it was a bit of a challenge to work with us to get the information, so I am glad you stuck with us and we were able to get you that information. So, thank you.

David: Yeah, and I will just add our appreciation for the efforts that you have made to get the information to Graeme. There may be follow-up requests. Alright, let's leave this for the time being.

Johanne: I just have a comment to make.

David: Go ahead, Johanne.

Johanne: There definitely is a need for us to understand fully where all the leakages are in this Remediation Project because it can create an economy that we should be taking a look at and making it near and dear to our hearts to ensure that when it comes to these types of developments, it does not fly over us accessing those benefits.

So, having the ability to operationalize some of the modeling, understanding where those leakages are at, and I am not sure what this Coordinating Committee's responsibilities are, but there is a definite need for a body, recognizing that Andrei too is new in the ec-dev world, having one body on behalf of CIRNAC to try and ensure that the benefits do flow. I think it would be daunting for even just Andrei to do that. I am just wondering how we would operationalize some of these concerns, recognizing that

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

GMOB put in a lot of effort into the modeling. I am still unclear what the next steps are to ensure that these leakages that will be occurring, we put a plug in it as fast as we can.

Also too, Shelagh, I am glad to see that you are on the file. I know that you have vast experience in the North. Prior to you working with the City, we did have a quick little, well not a quick session. We did have a session with GMOB when they did their modeling presentation. Kerry Penney did attend at that time. Sorry, not Kerry Penney, but Kerry anyway. Kerry from the City did attend, and we were supposed to meet up to figure out what type of approaches or perhaps identify if there is an approach that we need to work together in terms of how to ensure that these leakages are best handled.

I guess we also would have difficulty figuring out how that would get done, recognizing that there are a lot of players on this file. You have GNWT departments. You have CanNor. You have this model. You have the Strategic Plan that is going to be implemented. So, there must be some type of entity created just to plug that leak I would think. I am not sure that is the intent of that committee. Thank you.

Update from the Giant Mine Oversight Board

David: Thanks, Johanne. I will try again to close this off, but we will meet as a Board and talk about our next steps and what kind of ongoing engagement we think we can do and should do. So, now on to the Giant Mine Oversight Board update, the directors' update. I will just quickly touch on the obvious.

The 2022 Annual Report is out. There is a meeting tonight, a public meeting at 7:00. That, I think, is about the size of it from my perspective. I am going to turn it over to the directors to update from their perspective, their respective portfolios and all. I will turn it Ken Hall because he is visible right now.

Ken H: I may be visible, but if my voice sounds a little bit off, I have been up since early morning with one of my granddaughters. I was looking after her until I came to the meeting. So, if I nod off midstride here, just understand.

I do not have a lot to report. I am glad to hear about the work going forward with the boaters and the sailors and the Heritage group. That is the genesis of one of the recommendations in our Annual Report. There is a large portion of the boating community that is not represented by any group, so I would encourage you to reach out to them in any way you can just so people know what to expect and what is coming. I think it is going to have a pretty big impact on a lot of people's lives here for a few years. Look for their input on what is going to happen there.

I must admit that I get a little nostalgic when I start reviewing technical stuff and going through reports and talking with past employees and doing my GMOB work. It is the place that I grew up. It is a place where I worked with families. I have about 75 years of work history there. When I see buildings start to come down, it is sort of like taking

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

away reminders of the past, which was a great past. It was a wonderful place to work and a tremendous place to grow up, to be a kid.

Unfortunately, people only remember Royal Oak. They do not remember Falconbridge, which was the owner of the property for most of its life. Fantastic company. Very community minded. Really good to employees. It would have been a much different world, I think, if Falconbridge had not sold the mine. I think we would be talking in very different terms today if they had continued to be the owners.

It is going to be a little bit sad to see the town site come down this summer. I know it must be down. Our houses were covered in asbestos. That was the norm of the day back when houses were built, but it is going to be a little bit sad. It is sort of the end of an era of a community that thrived for over 50 years. So, I will be watching that, either from my boat with my mother who is still with us, or on the shore as best we can with mixed emotions.

I just want to say that there is an aspect of the mine that does not receive a lot of attention, and that is the great people that worked and lived out there. They were part of the community. I like to keep telling stories to remind people that there was certainly a lot of good that came out of Giant, and I am part of that. So, enough said. Thank you, David.

David: Thank you, Ken. Ken Froese, did you have a comment or question? I have a request for a break. You were requesting a break? Alright. Okay, so we will take a 15-minute break if that is okay with everyone and folks on the phone. Michael, I have not been reaching out to you, but make sure that if you do have questions or comments that you interject when you can.

Michael: I will. I am happy listening and making notes thus far.

David: Alright, thank you. Okay, so let's take 15 minutes.

Break.

David: Can I get people to take their chairs again, please? I want to be out of here by 4:00 if we can. You have a point, Erika?

Erika: I was just going to add to Ken's point about public communications to the broader boat community. Ken let's talk about it offline as well. Some of the outside-of-the-box thinking, we were thinking the timing is not known. But we would like to get signage up out onsite at the boat launch saying here are the upcoming dates and start to give people a signal. The minute those town site buildings come down, people are going to start to panic and feel that anxiety, even though their access to the lake will not be disrupted for several years still.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

So, we are thinking about signage. We are developing FAQs that will be on the website, but we are also looking at one- or two pagers. I have a contact at the Yacht Club as well, so we know that those guys kind of get forgotten a little bit because they are not right within vicinity of our site. But loop those guys in and send the information. It is not to discuss, because I know David wants to get rolling, but just to say that we are open to other ways that we can reach out to the larger boating public.

Ben and Ken, I know you have a lot of contacts there. From a GNWT perspective too, we are happy to hear from that, and we can encourage whatever. Thanks.

David: Thanks, Erika. I would just add Cabin Radio. We had a pretty reasonable experience just recently with them, so that is another medium. Back to the director updates, next is Marc Lange and Paul Green on the research and stuff like that.

Marc L: Okay, thank you. Environment, you know, easy as she goes really. It has been a whole lot of fun interacting with all the working groups, but things are chugging along very well. There are not a whole lot of concerns from us there. We have thrown a couple of recommendations at you. We are pretty interested in tracking emissions year after year and having a method where we can track whether they are going up or down. That was one recommendation on the environmental side.

We like meeting with you guys so much that we wanted that committee to continue. No, but specifically too, as you get into operations, you get all sorts of incidents and things that happen that are not as planned, and I thought it would be wise for you guys to have the current outfit continue as you go into operations.

I think the only other one that has us scratching our head and we don't have a hard, firm opinion on one way or the other, is the AEMP. We are spending some more time on the AEMP this year. Thank you for the offer to pre-meet and have a next follow-up meeting on reference sites. On the environment, I might pause there and see if Paul has other things he wants to talk about.

Paul G: Yeah, thanks. I don't really have anything to add, but as I said before, we are just very appreciative of the pre-engagement work that happens with the working groups prior to entering a board review process. I find those very helpful. Thanks. It is great that you continue to do those.

Marc L: On the research side of things, it has been exciting for me personally. I will try not to talk too much about it because we want to get moving. I might talk a little bit more about it tonight if we get the pulse from the public that there is an interest there. But if I don't even talk about it that much tonight, we do have something really cool that Ben and I have worked on.

We worked with the research team as we produced a simple page-and-a-half summary of each of the seven research streams. It was just completed late yesterday.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

We have them now, but we are going to probably just circulate them around the Board for next week. Then we are going to start firing them off to the Project Team, GNWT, and the public at large. We may even consider a bit more coms on those project summaries. Yeah, we are excited to actually have something, a piece of paper that we can share the research projects on.

The next one that we have been plugging away at is a bit of a research strategy or where we have been in terms of the research programs and where we are going. We are hoping with that work to have a draft to start engaging the public, the Project Team, and others, probably in the next six months or less.

I am particularly excited about that part because it starts to put legs on the plan in terms of what GMOB would recommend as the next best option for a permanent solution. It aligns, whatever we recommend, with the Environmental Assessment, Measure 2 in particular that said the Project within 20 years has to take a recommendation and do a detailed assessment of whether this proposal, suggestion is viable. So, the strategic plan starts putting together not only our research but how we recommend it to you and what you do about it. We are excited about that part, or at least I am. That is the strat plan.

Then with the research, I am not entirely sure we want to get into the weeds of all the research projects. Maybe I will give you a high-level overview. The cement study, for those who are not familiar, this is the cement paste backfill. The Project does that already, make cement with tailings, but it is tailings that does not have arsenic in it. We have been working on that project to use the arsenic dust with cement.

You might have recalled from last time that the cement the scientists were making was not sticking together very well, and the reason was arsenic. So, they have done some more work on this recipe. The first part is the recipe. What proportions of arsenic plus other components like Portland cement, do we add to make it firm up? I forgot what the percentage is, but I think it is mostly figured out, the formula that works best that stays. It does not turn into hard concrete. It is mostly sort of a soft sand mixture. It does not flow so well.

I think the next stage after cementing recipes are perfected is really testing it against warm temperature, cold temperature, running water through it, and then seeing what comes out of it in terms of arsenic. So, this project is particularly complex, because as soon as we add arsenic to cement, it just does not behave like normal cement. That is the cement.

The glass study: This one is always more advanced, because there was always a commercial solution for making glass. We had glass made four to five years ago. If you remember, there are three types of glass. There is a 5% arsenic dust content, 10%, and 15%. What the researchers have been doing is not making the glass but taking the glass and then crushing it and testing it by putting acid on it, putting base on it,

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

putting Great Slave water on it, putting groundwater on it, and running it through tubes to see what comes out of it.

That work is pretty well advanced. I think we are looking at a publication very shortly. I don't even know if I can say that, because we have agreements with the scientists not to share stuff. The G10, what we call G10, so the 10% glass is showing the best results so far. I'll just give you a ballpark.

So, as you run water through this column of this crushed glass to simulate lots of years and water moving through, what they are collecting for water on the other side meets license conditions for your maximum grab discharge from your new water treatment plant. The summary for us is that glass is looking very good in a very stable way of holding the dust.

With sulfidation, there are a couple of projects on sulfidation. If you recall the ore initially when Giant was getting it out of the ground, it was like a sulfide basically, rock. It was stable there for millions of years, right? So, now they cracked the ore and took the gold out. We have a couple of projects that are looking at adding sulfide back to the dust to turn it into a stable compound. This is not new. Other mines have done this before. The problem is that the dust is deep below, and you have to process it.

We have a couple of studies on that one. You will remember the one is more of a commercial solution. You take the dust, and then you have to dissolve the dust. You can dissolve it in acid or base, but that would be very expensive to bring all this acid north. So, they are dissolving it in water, and the best way to do that is very, very hot water at 200 degrees Celsius for at least 10 minutes. That would be a commercial process to dissolve the arsenic. Then you introduce sulfides, and then the arsenic that is now dissolved in the water would bond and form a more stable product.

So, they figured out the dissolving part in the hot water, and now they are going to be starting to form these sulfide compounds that do not dissolve that are more stable. Then after that, they will test it. To compare to the glass study where we already had the glass and are starting to test it, now we are just starting to make arsenic sulfide and then test it. So, that is a while away to test that solution.

The other sulfide-type studies, there are two of them. One is the bacteria one. Those other ones are not so much to deal with the dust below ground. It would be to deal with other problems. One study is to use bacteria that are here in the North, so use some of the wastewater coming out of the mine site and selecting those bugs that produce the most amount of sulfur. Then some of that sulfur would be used to clean up, to pre-clean the water that is going through the site, and turn it also into a more stable sulfide mineral. It is not a solution, per se, for the 237 [thousand] tonnes of arsenic. It is more like cleaning up the arsenic that is already in the water. What is the other sulfide one?

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

Well of course, the first study was quantifying the arsenic in all the different chambers. The goal there was to find out what it is made out of. It changed over the years. It changed depending again over the years, but where they deposited it below the ground. So, the first basic study was what does this thing consist of, this arsenic dust? That one, I want to say is about 90% complete, and they are looking at publishing results on that shortly.

Also part of that study was just to dissolve it in water at normal temperatures, should water ever go into the chambers or that kind of dissolving. They want to see basically what the rate of dissolving is and what it looks like. It is hard to dissolve, but the bit that dissolves is really bad. That is what they tell us.

Another research area that is a little newer is the fingerprinting business. Why am I forgetting that word?

Ben: Isotopes.

Marc L: Isotopes. Thank you, Ben. The scientists are trying to develop a way to fingerprint a specific arsenic that would be coming through the site. This is really helpful on our side, because if we propose a permanent solution, you want a way to track any arsenic that comes out and say oh, that arsenic came from the stabilized arsenic, or it came from the original arsenic, or it came from a tailings, or it came from natural rock.

One way to fingerprint them...well, you can't actually with arsenic because there are not multiple forms of the word I just forgot again.

Ben: Isotope

Marc L: Thank you. I claim to have a science degree. Isotope. So, arsenic does not have more than one state. It does not have multiple isotopes with different protons on them. But antimony, which loves arsenic and tends to hang out together, does have a few different isotopes. What they are developing is an isotope analysis for antimony with the goal that it would be a marker to track arsenic of different kinds on the site. That is in development and is still pretty new with no results to report at this point. That is it.

David: And the proposed fall workshop?

Marc L: Thank you for that. Yeah, so Ben and I have been bandying around the idea of instead of us travelling to the scientists occasionally to get their quarterly update, to bring them up here and really have a more community meeting on the results. Yeah, we are still planning on doing that in the fall. We do not have a month yet picked but stay tuned for that.

David: Alright. Graeme, do you have any questions of Marc? Well, your turn is coming. Diep?

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

Diep: Do you mind if I ask you a couple of questions, Marc? So, these projects that you guys are conducting research on with researchers, they are all based on having the arsenic dust in your hand, in the lab, or whatever to do the work. Is GMOB also tasked with finding a safe way of extracting or removing it from underground, and is there any work being done on that? That is my first question.

Marc L: Yeah, that is a good question. Certainly, I think it is not necessarily self-evident how to get it out of the ground. It could be an area of research. I think we took some cues from the ARCADIS report way back that said there is probably a decent solution for extracting it. I forget, was it hydro jet mining of some kind that had been used elsewhere? So, you are basically drilling in with a jet of water that literally drills the rock, and then you suck it back up.

With that on the table, it seemed when the engineers were saying it was reasonable, we did not pursue that line of research, like the extraction part, but I am certainly curious whether that would work.

Ken F: When we were setting out the research agenda, a research plan early on, we decided to focus initially on the fundamentals of identifying or characterizing the arsenic trioxide and then looking at what might be stable forms. I think we deliberately decided not to dilute our research efforts right away to look at okay, how do we get it out of underground?

The ideal way of dealing with it would be to be able to treat it underground where it is. So, in that case, that might be an option. That was one reason why we held off on actually looking at how to get it out. So, there are a few questions that we wanted to have at least some guidance on before we started looking at those things.

David: I will just add: We did some work with somebody at the University of Bristol on different extraction techniques. We spoke to some folks in Saskatchewan as well about remote mining techniques because of the uranium mining they do there. It just seems that thinking about extraction before you find a method that could stabilize the arsenic is putting the cart before the horse. I mean, it may be that Kathy Racher's proposal of arming nanobots with little lasers might be the best thing.

I am also thinking that we need to start taking advantage, to the extent that we can, of the AI stuff that is out there and start to think about posing the questions that we have in some more innovative way. I heard the other day about a bacteria that was highly resistant to all the known antibiotics. The researchers turned AI loose on it, and in two hours, the AI software came up with a solution, which would have taken months or years according to the researchers if they had been doing it themselves.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

So, I think AI obviously is a multi-edge sword, but it might be that we start to think about that approach as well and see if there is not something more innovative out there that we had not thought about.

Ken H If I can just make a comment on the handling of this material. Not to downplay it, it is poison. It is nasty stuff, but there are a lot worse materials out there being safely handled by industry today. The stuff was put there by people to begin with. My personal concern is not whether we can safely extract the stuff. I think that is a given. It is whether we can get it all. That is the question in my mind. But as far as handling the stuff, again not to downplay it, I have been up to my elbows in the stuff doing experiments back in the day. I am confident that there is a safe way to extract this material if that is part of the permanent solution.

Erika Thanks for the answers from many people. I just wanted to commend GMOB on the work that you have done on the Research Project, because what I have heard from people is the question of what the permanent solution is. I just tell them GMOB is working on it. We are working on it. We are working on it. So, I am happy to see that.

It looks like the glass one is more advanced, and it looks like it is looking pretty good in terms of okay, maybe we are getting closer to a solution, so that is great. I am just curious about the glass project. Is the reason why you are breaking it up because you want to see the worst-case scenario? Like would we not want to have a big block of glass, which would be more stable than crushing it and all that stuff, to test leachability?

Marc L: Yeah, that is exactly the thought. First, we made marbles, or at least the company made marbles at first. Then they were crushed just to see what the worst-case scenario is. It gets into the storage side. Let's say you extract it safely, process it, and by the way, the company that makes the glass has now got a couple of years of commercial production. I think there is one in Ghana and maybe South America. Chile, I think, was the other one where they were cracking the ore, sending gold, and now this glass company came in right between the waste pile and the ore, and they are making glass on the fly.

They have discovered a bunch of things in the last couple of years. Once is big blocks. Big blocks are better than small blocks. There is less surface area. I think in a few cases they are storing it high and dry, so tailings type as opposed to putting it back below ground.

I think the original design was to put it back underwater and let's see how it reacts with water. Let's see what happens if it breaks as we deposit. Let's test the worst-case scenario, and the worst case scenario is looking pretty good right now.

There are two other things, so not to forget. We have our core Research Program that was led with TERRE-NET, but we also have this other path where other people could

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

come in with great ideas and give us some suggestions. We had a couple of folks come to us with proposals, people in the U.S. who have been dealing with these supersites, super-contaminated sites in the U.S., both nuclear and oil and gas. They are dating us right now. They are just sort of asking would you be interested in that kind of stuff. So, we don't have a proposal on the table. We don't have a program launched with them, but there are two areas that we are pretty interested in.

There are a couple of national labs in Washington State. Instead of producing glass for high-risk waste, they are producing ceramics. There is debate in the literature of which one is best, glass or ceramics. Ceramics has the advantage of being so much more stable. There are probably cost implications, though. They are also more brittle. You have to cook them at higher temperatures. So, they are different, but we have not tested the idea of ceramics yet. They may submit a proposal. We are hopeful they will this year to maybe look at this business of ceramics.

There is another outfit in Texas that is focusing on isolating bacteria and fungi that really like certain contaminants. They actually tell us they have essentially a grocery list of "What's your contaminant? We have the bug isolated, and we know how to reproduce it in the lab."

This business of finding an arsenic-specific bacteria or fungus that eats the stuff got them really interested, because there are other sites with arsenic problems. So, they may propose something to us this year. But, the business of microbes that might be interested for what is left over after you extract, like if there is a wall with a thin layer of dust or something like that, then maybe at that point the most efficient way of cleaning up is microbial action. Anyway, so those are two other areas that may come at us this year.

David: Are there any other questions of Marc and Paul? Shelagh?

Shelagh: It might not be a particularly fair question but if the glass option was something that could move forward, I am just wondering what the potential increase in volume would be if there is whatever, an X-number of Precambrian buildings of arsenic trioxide. How much glass would that potentially be?

Marc L: Yeah, a lot. Yeah, the G10 is only 10% dust. The rest of the 90% has got to come up some place, which would probably be silica, like sand and stuff. You know, if you are pushing me to how feasible and what the materials are and what the costs are, this is where I think our strategic plan will be to say hey, we've got a solution. It is technically feasible. It is being done in other countries, but now we have got to do a Phase II engineering, so this is where maybe the 20-year review comes in. So, we say, "Hey, here are the options now. You study it."

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

Doing a Phase II engineering is, I don't know, I want to say between \$1 and \$5 million dollars. We don't have the budget for that kind of stuff. This is where we will have to work together with the Project once we have some decent solution to put on the table.

The other one that sort of suggests your question of what is left over is there is also the possibility of combining approaches, like using the glass and cementing it. Then put it as backfill. Yep, so I will leave it at that.

David: I am glad you tempered your enthusiasm, Marc. Erika?

Erika: I have a quick question. When you said you have some agreements in terms of what information you can share and then you talked about a publication, I was just curious of what that looks like. Then we have a potential upcoming community meeting, which I think is great. I think there are a lot of people who are interested in how you have progressed and the weedy bits of it. But could you just briefly talk a little bit about when information would become public? Then publications, I am sure all these guys are itching to get in a journal and all of that. What does that look like in terms of the public world?

Marc L: Ben might have more information there, but I think when we signed up with these researchers, it was about meeting each other's goals. We wanted results on what is stable, and what they want is to publish things. That is how they measure their success. I think some of the agreement is that we will not spew out results for somebody else to grab. That is the nature as to sort of why we are not sharing with you the table of raw data at these meetings. We will give them the opportunity to publish. Many of those are coming out this year, even in the next month or so.

What is totally sharable are those summaries that we are about to send out to you this week. We would also like to update those. They are meant to be evergreen. Right now, there is no data on saying glass would meet your license condition. That was too deep in the weeds for results, but maybe once it is published, that is the outcome. Glass meets this standard, for example. Does that answer your question?

Ken F: All the publications will be open access. They will not be behind a pay wall for the journals. GMOB is supporting that, because for many journals that has a cost implication. So, we are supporting that.

David: If you want the details, we can share the agreements that we have with them. It is essentially don't scoop our results, and that is totally appropriate. Are there any other questions for Marc?

Ben: Quick detail, Erika, to your question: The whole idea behind the Research Program is that all results will become public. The only agreement that we have outside of the TERRE-NET research agreement with those research teams is with Dundee Sustainable Technologies, who produce the glass. They have asked that the

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

researchers share with them the information before. Then once they are comfortable with those results, it is not that they can change those results but once they are comfortable in accepting what is going to be shared, then that can go out to the public through a published result. So, it is all open access.

David: Okay, we will move on to Ken Froese.

Ken F: I might have touched the volume button on the speaker here. Okay, we have already talked about the YK HEMP study, so I will not redo my math on that. I think there was kind of a little action item there to understand what their summary results are, so I will take that on and contact the research team and figure out what that means. I will get back to you.

The QRA: Thank you for that update. I am kind of curious when we might see that report and have a chance to go through it. Erika, you need to review it internally first, I am assuming, and the Project Team.

Erika: Yes.

Ken F: Okay. I would like to briefly discuss some of the issues that come out of that. It is stuff that we have had in the Annual Report for a couple of years that even once remediation is complete, there are areas that are not going to be remediated, right? I think that is part of the impetus for this additional piece on the QRA and how we help the public understand that a remediated site still has influence from a lot of arsenic that was deposited on it, especially in the 1950s.

So, I think there remains a certain level of communication, public risk communication that is required, regardless of what this additional piece on the QRA says. I think it bears repeating, certainly after we have seen the results of our GMOB survey on people's understanding of the remediation. I do not think we can repeat this often enough. It will still be a site that has arsenic, even on the non-fenced area.

I am kind of responding to a lot of the issues that have been discussed already, and I am just wanting to put my perspective on them. Aside from the YK HEMP, there has not been too many human health files that have been opened at the moment.

On the economics and the discussion that we had earlier, that discussion was very good. I appreciate these meetings, especially in person where we can have those discussions. As you will also remember, most of you around the table here, ever since I joined the GMOB, I have been pushing for some concept that we leave this Project at the end of active remediation, now in 2038, with a sense and an understanding that the City and the region and the YKDFN and the NSMA are in many ways better off than when we began the Project in 2004, for instance. The economic discussion is a critical part of that.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

I also want to just say that the social implications – the social benefits, the social effects, the social impacts – are part of that economic discussion, which is in effect, part of the ultimate definition of socio-economics. Yet, when one talks about socio-economics, it is often economics and the contracting that is the sole focus.

I just want to remind everyone of the broader social effects and hopefully looking forward to positive impacts of improving the economic uptake within the Northwest Territories on this Project, which will also improve many different social factors. I am not a social scientist. I am a person who thinks in a systems kind of perspective and what influences what, and economics influences that.

Let's keep that in mind as well as part of the focus of why we want to take advantage of the economic opportunities that this large Project brings. I think one of Graeme's analyses of the Giant Mine as it operated was that the overall dollar figure was maybe much less than what the remediation figure is, but families lived here. The workforce was here, and the corporate headquarters was here. So, a net economic benefit of having the mine here and everyone living here was greater than if we have the remediation where so much of the workforce is not in the Northwest Territories.

I see all of these things linked together. There is a three-dimensional model or multi-dimensional model here that is part of that discussion. If anyone has any questions or thoughts or wants to continue dialogue on that, I am all for it.

David: Thanks, Ken. Erika?

Erika: I know. Don't look over here, because I always have my two cents. I did want to respond to that social piece and the world of socio-economics. Andrei and I recently did meet with GNWT Health, and they walked us through what they do for other projects that have gone through environmental assessment. They walked us through a number of indicators that they track, and they look at trends, like are people actually living in...I don't know. Andrei may have examples.

Andrei: They look at a variety of different indicators, not just related to health. There is crime. Their sources vary from RCMP to Stats Canada, and data is collected in a variety of different timeframes annually, maybe five years or so. It is a list of over 100 indicators that they provided us. They align to a greater extent with what the Project put together in a Social Impact Management document, some of the potential indicators. So, there is alignment there.

We had a gap when we developed that document in the beginning, because we did not know where to obtain information, and we were not sure if it is really the Project's responsibility to track all those things. Should we double down on something that someone else is already doing? So, this meeting that we held, Erika and I, with Health and Social Services, really helped close that gap, because we found out that they already do this kind of work. They do not do it for Giant, but they do it for other

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

projects. Yeah, so there are additional things that we need to consider and next-steps to determine, but there is definitely some progress being made there for sure. Thanks.

Erika: Yeah, thanks Andrei. Basically, what that would look like is they gave us a list saying here are some of the things we have already thought could be relevant to Giant that you would want to look at. We went through, and it was an interesting exercise, because on my initial review, I thought, "What? This doesn't make sense of Giant. How?" But their experience of saying this is an indication of a healthy community on a broader level, provided us with clarity.

What they would do then is they would do the work for us essentially, and they would develop a report. They would work with us. From their perspective, they are saying like...We are not saying if we see a trend like crime is higher than normal, that we are going to say 'Well, that's Giant.'" But they would help us do some of the assessment of things we could be doing.

In general, it is just understanding healthy, broader community. So, we must do some internal work and do our own assessment of indicators based on that. Then you would see it come to the Socio-ec Working Group and relevant folks. We are pleased that progressed. We waited a while for that, but Andrei and I after that meeting actually said that was worth the wait. They are invested, and I think there is a lot of great data there.

Ken F: That is good news, and I appreciate that update. Rather than looking at the economics and seeing if the economics are improving in the Northwest Territories, all these other things will follow. It is good to understand which ones are tied to it so that it does not all have to be a passive thing that we are just focused on the economics and accidentally these things are happening. There can be some purpose to it and some targeting.

David: Okay. Thanks, Ken. Are there any other questions? Alright, I will move now to the most exciting part of this meeting, economics. Graeme and Mark Palmer?

Graeme: Mark is too shy. He is going to have me talk. Well, I feel like I have already provided a lot of insight on the economics, certainly the outcomes of the economics. It has been a rather busy six months for us all, I think, on the economic front. Importantly, we have somewhat dropped the social economic language and just moved to economics, because it is all economics to me, even what some people refer to as the social things. Economics is a social science.

Over the last six months, the Project has provided data that has allowed us to do economic impact assessment of the Project. It came out in stages as it turned out, but that is okay. Starting this time last year, we built basically a shell of a model, which we were then able to populate once the data became available. Then we would be able

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

to drill down into increasingly more accurate estimates, I think, of the Project expenditures, which were then fed into the model producing the results that we had.

I think the highlight of the last six months is definitely the opportunity that we had to meet first with the Project Team, then with all the Parties. Then we had another one. Who else did we meet with, Ben? I did it three times. I don't know. It will come to me.

Anyway, we were able to present that work that we have done, and importantly of course, the results. As Ken was alluding to, we were able to show the economic effects of the Project, vis-à-vis the Giant Mine one is producing gold, which I think is an interesting analysis and kind of makes people sort of understand the difference, so the evolution of this particular site, the Project, and the expenditures that are taking place.

The only thing outstanding now from a reporting perspective of that information is to basically produce a bit of a summary of all of this work. I don't know if we know exactly what it is going to look like yet. We are discussing that as a Board right now in terms of the level and extent to which we produce a report that shows the work that we have done that will go outside of these walls into the public.

Action Item: GMOB to produce a summary document of the economics of the GMRP to be shared with the Parties and posted publicly.

We are looking at that carefully to convey a clear message as to what the economic opportunities are and the effects on standard economic indicators of GDP and labour income, government revenues, things that people are interested in, in particular the demand on what we call intermediary goods and services, so the contracting.

As I mentioned before, the flow of money through the economy is something that we have worked a lot on. So yeah, I think it is great for the Project. Apart from maybe being a little slower than I had hoped 18 months ago, I am happy that we are here today and talking about these things that were missing from the Project. But they are not anymore, so we do not have to worry about that.

Moving forward, I think we have enough information, and I have enough confidence in the information that we are now able to drill into more specific questions, not just the high-level industries that are going to be affected by the Project, but more micro-level types of companies that already exist within our economy. We will be able to communicate or have discussions with them about their challenges in terms of recruitment of labour, of investing in capital, contracting issues, and whatnot.

We really want to get to the point where we are not just talking really high-level, but we are able to drill down to the point where we can measure progress in terms of increasing the economic effects of the Project. We know globally what the size of the effect will be now. It is a matter of how much of that we are able to capture.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
June 1, 2023

So, yeah, I don't know. Because I have given the presentation to everybody, the groups represented in the room, I needn't do it again. I am happy to keep us all up to date on the modeling effects, and I am happy to talk about this work to anybody who is interested in listening to me. That is kind of open going forward over the summer.

We are going to start to, like I said, put out that report and move forward with probably more requests for data. I think we are keen to look at how the Project came up with its numbers such that we can reconcile the difference between the results that we produced from an economics perspective versus what the engineers associated with the Project came up with. That will be an interesting exercise, and I think it will help with the Socio-economic Strategy in terms of determining what is a reasonable expectation of local labour force participation and the capacity of our business community to participate. I think I am going to leave it there. Thanks.

David: Thanks, Graeme. Anything you would like to add, Mark?

Mark P: No, I don't think so. I was just going to say yeah, Graeme has been doing the heavy lifting on this for quite a while. I just participate on that and the working group and the PCP. One thing I want to mention about the PCP, it that is really quite closely linked to the economic stuff for sure.

Right now, all the jobs until 2038, not all of them, a lot of them are seasonal, the water treatment plant, security, things like that are year-round. After this Project is done, that is going to be around for a long time. So, don't lose focus. I know it is 15 years out and it should be covered in the PCP, but to me, that is really important. That is a lot of money for a lot of years of good year-round jobs. It is almost like a second project in my opinion.

So, focus on this one, but don't lose sight of that. We have got **to** make sure due diligence is done right in the PCP, management of the site. Who is going to run it? All that kind of stuff. That must be in there. It is something I always think about. That is maybe 100 years or who knows how long of good jobs.

David: Good point. Erika?

Erika: Mark, just to follow up on that PCP thinking, are you saying that employment vision needs to be incorporated into the PCP?

Mark P: Well, I would think so. To me, a good PCP would have in there who is managing the site and how you are going to fund it, how you are going to manage it, and what your procurement process would be. You've got to outline how you are going to run this for the next while, so you need a good strategy in place and who is accountable and all that kind of stuff. It should be in there in my mind. You would want a good management plan. I mean, right now you have the Care and Maintenance Plan. You

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

know that is all documented. We know that CIRNAC is responsible for that and all that, but we need it documented for the future, I think, and we have to start working on... I would think after 2038, most of the jobs, if not all, should be local, delivered locally, right? It is something to just keep in mind.

David: I would just add to that the linkage that we talked about earlier on the economics side and Aurora College training programs. If there is a need for additional trained water treatment plant staff, now is the time. Identify that. Get that program up and running if a new program is needed, because Mark is right. Those jobs after 2038, and as many as possible before, should be local. There is no reason that we shouldn't have the capacity to do that if we know right now that is what is coming.

Are there any other questions for Graeme or Mark? Ken?

Ken H: Just a comment: There are still a handful of employees at Con Mine. Most of that has to do with the water treatment plant, and that will be running for another 20 years.

David: Okay. In the interest of time, we are going to move on to Ben who will quickly summarize the admin stuff and the community survey. We have already talked about; well we don't need to talk about the Annual Report. People have got it in front of them and will be following up no doubt with questions and concerns people might have about that report. Reconciliation issues and actions, we will get to that. I don't think there are any other agenda items, so the last part would be scheduling the next meeting, and it is six months away. Ben?

Ben: Thank you. This is the regular report of activities for the last six months, GMOB budget. Thank you to CIRNAC for putting that together so well, as usual. You see the numbers that are there. Also, to let you know the GMOB research count, I have accounted for in here as well. Right now, we have three GICs. We cashed one out, only because of the new expenses, both for the strategy and the plain language work that was being done, and an expectation of the research conference that will be going on in the fall.

The GMOB work plan has been set out. Here the GMOB board member terms, please be advised that all three – David Livingstone, Ken Hall, and Mark Palmer – all their terms are coming up in August. Think about that. If you want to have discussions with me or with the Chair regarding that, that would be good.

Our activity summary: thanks to both the Board and to Paul Green for his very, very efficient work in doing all the document reviews and plugging into both the pre-engagement as well as the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board inputs.

For our ongoing regulatory monitoring, those are the things that we are looking at now. We are also monitoring the development of three pieces: the release of course, of the 2022 Annual Report, a summary of the Project economics, and where we sit

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

right now with the Perpetual Care Plan. That now must be updated with what you have given us today.

The Giant Education Module has kind of come to a standstill right now. There is a discussion that needs to take place amongst all the groups on how to move forward with that, so we look forward to those communications.

Engagement and communications, which is what we do, the update on the Research Program. Attached in Appendix 1 for the details, is the GMOB Work Plan, or mandated meetings as per the Agreement. Up until last week or the week before when I sent this summary, we had 77 meetings, but I think we are up over about 81-82 meetings to date right now. Any questions? That is the report.

David: Are there any questions from anyone?

Alright. Silence is eloquent. The last item on the agenda for any real discussion is reconciliation issues and actions. Ken Froese, do you want to lead off on that?

Reconciliation Issues and Actions

Ken F: We have had the reconciliation discussion at these meetings ever since, I think the first or second year that I was part of GMOB. We have had very good discussions. I think we have come a long way on understanding how we approach reconciliation through this Project. The level of increased trust that I have seen between the Project and the Parties, NSMA, and YKDFN continues to build. I think that is obviously a good thing.

I think we can continue to do more, continue to do better. The challenge that GMOB sees right now is how do we continue to do this in a good way that is valuable for both NSMA and YKDFN and helps the rest of us non-Indigenous parties and groups to understand how to do this well? The Stress Study, the fact that it is not going forward is essentially a case in point. How do we learn from that and how do we understand where the approach that was used – did we do something wrong in that?

This can be a challenging discussion, and I think at the same time it is a discussion that we need to have so that we can continue to do better and continue to build trust. I think I will leave it at that right now. I am hoping in spite of the late hour that we can have a little bit of dialogue on this. Johanne, I understand that you are not in the room. I sincerely hoped that somebody from YKDFN could be here, but I think it is still a valuable time to have a bit of a dialogue here.

David: Johanne, do you want to respond to that at all? I will turn it to the North Slave Métis as well.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

Johanne: So, in terms of reconciliation, recognizing that is a sensitive topic, how to bring it up probably tends to be uncomfortable, only because it is an outstanding matter.

I recognize and appreciate the thoughts and concerns that you do have in terms of ensuring that this Project goes in a manner where it takes that into consideration so at the end of the day, we are all happy when the Project is complete; we are all happy with the outcomes.

One of the things, and I am sure you are aware too that is a challenge, one of the things that we were contemplating when we were developing the Procurement Framework Agreement was the reconciliation that was needed for the current Project, not for the past but current. I am very thankful for the work that GMOB has done, and Graeme has done in terms of the model that he presented. I just wish that in terms of the timing, we were presented with that model before we finalized our agreement. We would have been able to, I think at least, take care of some of those existing challenges right now.

Anyway, going forward, you would think that as part of reconciliation, and not just reconciliation over the past, but hindsight being 20/20, you do not want to be there 20 years from now and a lot of the leakages having occurred, our communities look the same way. Recognizing that this is a huge project, the amount of dollars that is being spent towards our remediation far surpasses the amount that they made from the site.

So, you look at how this city was built. A lot of it was on the backs of the Yellowknives Dene in terms of them not receiving any benefits from it. The rest of the town, which eventually became a city, has prospered. So, with that in mind, I am hoping that the work that gets done to close off these leakages, gets done in a manner where you do not learn these lessons again in 20 years.

Now when it comes to the Stress Study, recognizing too as well, when the Yellowknives first initially were a part of the Stress Study and the methodology behind it, the measures and suggestions did come out. As a result of measures and suggestions, the work had to be done to complete those measures in order for a license to be had to remediate. Now, one of the things that was tough for us at that time was not knowing what the future will hold in terms of what risks the Yellowknives will have in terms of pursuing past reconciliation.

So, when we were developing the methodology, we did not have that process developed yet. The process that we developed to achieve reconciliation for past effects had the ability for us to look at some of these current processes and plans such as the Stress Effects Project and look at what risks it had for the Yellowknives to achieve reconciliation for the past. As a result of that assessment, there was a risk for us. We had to ensure that when it comes to our members and our Elders who have always advised us to reach reconciliation for the Giant Mine Project that it became a

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

priority. That meant that we were not able to participate in that Stress Study. I apologize for that, because I know a lot of effort did get put into that. Mahsi cho.

David: Thanks, Johanne. Marc?

Marc W: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This book I see before me here is not too impressive. The content overall is well created, but what I do not see in this book here today is any attempt or any reference here for reconciliation with the North Slave Métis Alliance community. It is not just the Yellowknives Dene that have been here. It is us, and I am very, very offended today when I read extracts in this report that say everything about the Yellowknives Dene and nothing about the North Slave Métis Alliance.

It is time for our members and Canada to work together here, and I mean this Natalie, in a very sincere and respectful way from here on in. When I come back to this next meeting, I want to see that happen. I am very angry right now. This is an offensive document as far as I am concerned. It has lots of facts, but there is nothing that illustrates any attempt or any reference to an Indigenous community of people that were here when this mine started and continued and left its legacy behind. That is all I have to say at this time, and I hope to see a lot better when I come back. Thank you, David.

David: Thanks, Marc. We will take that into account for sure. Are there any other comments on this theme? Reconciliation is clearly not an outcome. It is a process. There are achievements made during that process, but reconciliation is about continuing to work together to improve how we work together and making sure that the affected Indigenous individuals, organizations, and nations are comfortable in their dealings with government in particular, GMOB included.

We have a role and a responsibility to help to improve things, so we will take your comments very seriously, Marc. Is there anything from anybody else?

Additional Agenda Items and Next Steps

David: There were no additional agenda items, as I mentioned. I skipped over the community survey. Do you want to quickly summarize that? Ben, please?

Ben: Thank you. As far as the community survey is concerned, it was completed. The final report was produced and shared with all the Parties as well as the public. We have gotten some questions on it, a little bit of press on it, but we are taking back into our communications with our own Communications Strategy to be able to pull from that report those things which we can focus on for ourselves. Also, I think that a larger discussion has to take place with all of the Parties in terms of what they are seeing or what they have found coming out of that report and how to address those things.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

June 1, 2023

Some of the findings are quite revealing in terms of the responses that were given by the community and what their interests are, where they are curious and lacking information, and how they are accessing that information. So, we have a Communications Strategy, which we look at every year. This will be an influencer upon what we are going to be doing over the next year. We really would like to be able to talk to both the Project in terms of what they saw coming out of this report, as well as the other Parties. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Ben. Are there any comments? Erika?

Erika: Thanks, Ben. It is so great that you guys have the results of a survey. I know for federal government and GNWT doing surveys, it is not so easy. There is a lot of great data that this is showing, and maybe Geneva wants to pipe in here. I think a communications-focused party meeting is great. GNWT is happy to participate in that. Yeah, let's look at ways of synergizing our efforts.

David: Yeah, and just from a personal perspective, I take the survey results with a grain of salt. They were essentially volunteers who stepped forward rather than a conventional random selection. Some people were quite knowledgeable about the Project, and others were not. I think we just must recognize that the survey is not a random survey. It is a little tilted in some directions and not in others. Take it for what it is worth. There is some useful stuff that we can pursue, but it is not gospel. That is for sure.

I think we can wrap up now unless anybody has got any additional comments or conclusions.

? *(Question off the microphone; inaudible relating to the upcoming GMOB Annual Public Meeting)*

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
June 1, 2023

David: Same as last year. I hope nobody shows up so we can all get out early. No, we will go through a brief PowerPoint presentation that sets the context, touches on the recommendations, and the Annual Report. Then each of the directors will make a quick presentation about their portfolios. Questions will be ongoing, but essentially that will be it.

Well, thank you very much for the afternoon. Apologies, I guess, for the last-minute disruption.

Meeting Adjourned



Chair, Giant Mine Oversight Board

January 11, 2024
Date

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
June 1, 2023

MOTIONS

Motion: Moved: M. Whitford moved to approve the agenda.

Seconded: Diep Duong

Motion carried.

Motion: Moved: N. Plato moved to approve the GMOB Minutes of December 5, 2022

Seconded: K. Ross

Motion carried.

ACTION ITEMS

Action Item: GMRP encourages all Parties to respond to DFO processes to avoid delays for the approval of the new water treatment plant. (pg. 10)

Action Item: Have DFO attend the next Semi-Annual Meeting to report on the status of progress of their process to ensure clarity for everyone. (pg. 13)

Action Item: GMRP (Andrei) to provide GMOB with a copy of the GMRP presentation given at the Northern Development Ministers' Forum (pg. 20)

Action Item: GMOB to produce a summary document of the economics of the GMRP to be shared with the Parties and posted publicly. (pg. 36)