

**Verbatim Minutes of the Giant Mine Oversight Body Society
Semi-Annual Meeting
January 11, 2024, 1:00 pm (MT)
Explorer Hotel, Kat D/E, and Zoom, Yellowknife, NT**

Present	<p>Giant Mine Oversight Board David Livingstone – Chair Ken Hall - Director Graham Clinton - Director Mark Palmer - Director Marc Lange – Director Ken Froese - Director Ben Nind – Executive Director Paul Green – Contractor</p> <p>North Slave Métis Alliance Mark Whitford Alan Alex</p> <p>Yellowknives Dene First Nation William Lines Silal Shafqat</p> <p>City of Yellowknife Shelagh Montgomery</p> <p>Government of Canada (CIRNAC) Natalie Plato Katherine Ross Candace Ross Geneva Irwin Chris MacInnis</p> <p>Government of the Northwest Territories Erika Nyssonen Diep Duong Jeff Rosnawski</p> <p>Alternatives North Katharine Thomas Michael Nabert</p>
----------------	--

Welcome & Introductions

- David: Let's get started. Welcome to the first Semi-Annual Meeting of 2024. I am David Livingstone. I am Chair of GMOB, and I will chair this session, unless we have volunteers. Okay, let's do a quick roundtable.
- Ben: Ben Nind, Executive Director, Giant Mine Oversight Board.
- Paul: Paul Green, contractor to the Giant Mine Oversight Board.
- Katherine: Katherine Ross, Integration Manager for the Project with CIRNAC.
- Natalie: Natalie Plato, Deputy Director, Giant Mine Remediation Project, CIRNAC.
- Diep: Diep Duong with the Government of the Northwest Territories, Department of Environment and Climate Change.
- I am also going to say that Erika is here. I think she might have stepped into the washroom. Erika Nyssonen, also GNWT, Department of Environment and Climate Change. There she is. I think we missed you this morning as well, for the record.
- Erika: Erika Nyssonen for the record, with GNWT. Thanks.
- Geneva: Geneva Irwin, Acting Engagement Manager for Giant Mine Project, CIRNAC.
- Candace: Candace Ross, Regulatory Manager for the Giant Mine Project, and I have changed my last name. It was DeCoste before, and now it is Ross.
- Jeff: Jeff Rosnawski, Giant Mine Technical Specialist, GNWT, Department of Environment and Climate Change. Masi.
- Shelagh: Hello, everybody. It is Shelagh Montgomery, Consultant to the City of Yellowknife.
- Graeme: Graeme Clinton, Director for GMOB.
- William: Good afternoon, William. Good afternoon, everyone. I am William Lines, Yellowknives Dene.
- Silal: Hi, I am Silal Shafqat, Director of Economic Development at YKDFN.
- Ken: Afternoon, William. I'm Ken. Ken Hall, Director of GMOB.
- David: On the Zoom, go ahead whoever wants to go first.
- Marc W: Can you hear me? Good. Great, thanks. Yes, it is Marc Whitford, President of North Slave Métis Alliance, attending by Zoom.

Alan: Hi. This is Alan Alex from North Slave Métis Alliance.

Mark P: Mark Palmer, GMOB Director.

Michael: Michael Nabert, I am here with Alternatives North.

Katharine: Katharine Thomas, also here with Alternatives North.

David: And the last Marc?

Marc L: Marc Lange, Director with GMOB. Hi, everyone.

David: I think that is everybody, eh?

Natalie: Chris will be joining a little bit late - Chris MacInnis, Director for the Giant Mine Remediation Project. He will be showing up in Zoom in a few minutes.

David: Ken Froese? Okay, at some point, he will be coming in.

Approval of Agenda and Prior Meeting Minutes

David: I am looking for my agenda. Are there any comments on the agenda? Are there any changes, additions, deletions?

Hearing none, can I get somebody to move approval?

Marc W: Okay, I will move it.

David: I think we have a suggestion pending here.

Katherine: Sorry. We were thinking maybe we could add an item to have a short discussion on the timing of the 20-year review that has been mentioned several times in the past few months.

Ben: Sure.

David: Okay. Marc, do you want to move the amended agenda?

Marc W: Yeah, let's move the amended agenda. I still move it. Thank you.

David: A seconder? William. All in favor?

Okay, the minutes of the previous Semi-Annual Meeting, the verbatim minutes. I don't know if there are any transcription errors or changes that people would like to make.

I do not see any. Alright, can I get somebody then to approve the minutes of our previous Semi-Annual Meeting? Graeme. A seconder? Natalie. All in favour?

Review of Action Items

David: Okay, action items. Alright. Action Item G – The Remediation Project encourages all parties to respond to DFO processes to avoid delays of the approval of the new water treatment plant. What is the status on that, Natalie?

Natalie: Mostly completed, I believe. We held a meeting in Dettah with the YKDFN in December, and I think the YKDFN were going to confirm with DFO if that was sufficient. I do not know if that has happened, so I would look to YKDFN to confirm that.

David: William?

William: I was going to discuss this in my update, but I can discuss it now if you would like. It is not really a discussion. It is more just that we are working with DFO, and we want to wrap it up as well.

David: Okay. Oh, and we failed to do this, didn't we? The second action item was to have DFO here to speak for themselves.

The third action item was for Andre to provide GMOB with a copy of the Giant Mine Remediation Project presentation given at the Northern Development Ministers Forum. That has not been completed?

Ben: I did not receive it.

Natalie: Let me double check. I am pretty sure it was sent. Andre is on holiday, so my apologies. I will try to get that by the end of the meeting.

David: No worries. Thank you, Natalie. The fourth action item: GMOB to produce a summary document, the Economics of the Remediation Project, to be shared with the Parties and posted publicly.

Ben: Yes, that was done in July.

David: Thanks, Ben. So, we will have to try to remember to invite DFO to the next meeting. Shelagh?

Shelagh: I have a question about that economics document. It was circulated in the summertime. Was there going to be some follow-up for GMOB to explain it a little bit more? It kind of sets out results, but it does not say if anything is actually good or bad.

It seems to me, when I saw it first, that it indicated there is yes, a huge amount of money, but it does not indicate whether it is all going to be lost to Yellowknife or where it is going. It did not seem to have any conclusions that a member of the public could use for one reason or another.

David: Graeme?

Graeme: A couple of things: The report that we posted on our website was a summary of the work that we obviously have done the prior year, for which we gave a presentation to the Project and then to the Parties. You probably were not present for those of course. I think some of the details that you are looking for probably came out during those presentations.

We have had discussions about next steps, which is I think to your point in trying to engage the public on it to see if there is interest in learning about the economics of the Project. It is something that we have discussed, and I think are planning for. Everything feels like it is a little bit behind, as you know, in Yellowknife. We are planning follow-up work with that.

We have requested some data from the Project around expenditures so that we can start to turn what probably looks and feels like a theoretical sort-of examination of the Project and then comparing it to reality. That is all work that will happen in time, but of course, the work was done before, at the end of the first year of implementation, so there is not a lot of data. The actual data is largely theoretical, but that is work to come.

David: Thanks, Graeme. Are there any other questions or observations thus far?

Okay, moving on to the roundtable. Oh, just one point: Based on the questions that we had this morning on the financial update, I have asked Ben to put together a plain language summary that we can all understand. I find these reports difficult to walk through. As Ben suggested, the accountants tend to speak backwards and make a lot of assumptions about how much we understand economics, finances, and all that stuff. Graeme, you just reminded me of that. That will be an action item that we will take on.

Roundtable: Successes, Concerns, and Priorities.

David: So, next is the roundtable: successes, concerns, and priorities. We will start with Alternatives North if that is okay.

Update from Alternatives North

Michael: That is totally okay with me. Alternatives North, as always, is happy to be here. The last year saw much accomplished. Several improved design and monitoring plans were

improved somewhat further. Perpetual Care is finally ready to go to its first drafter. Site tours showcased a lot of good work getting done.

Once again, we are pleased to play a role in moving things forward, and it is very nice to see tangible results manifesting based on our previous collected efforts. We were also pleasantly reassured by the progress that we shared on the research side. Kudos to all concerned.

But the big story was the climate, and not just the wildfires. It was just verified that 2023 was the hottest year of at least the last 100 millennia by a surprisingly wide margin. On New Year's Eve, Yellowknife got rain for the first time since record keeping here began. It could not be more clear, that warming is taking place more rapidly and severely than anticipated.

So, in June, the Parties were finally given an opportunity to see the climate assumptions the design plans have been based upon. This has been my personal overriding concern as a reviewer for five years. It remains unclear to me why this document that was completed in 2020 was not released to us sooner in response to frequent questions about it. We observed that different sets of assumptions are in play, or different aspects of the Project, with no clear rationale for this inconsistent approach.

We are, for example, currently reviewing Version 3 of an Erosion and Sediment Management Plan that likely underestimates future extreme rainfall events and the subsequent erosion that they may cause, but we lack the necessary information to estimate by how much.

We are investing billions of dollars in a project with an immense timeframe, and we are doing it without looking at or discussing the most likely climate scenario even once. That is indefensible. It presents an existential threat to the success of the entire Project.

Alternatives North respectfully submitted several urgent questions and recommendations about the Project's climate assumptions in June. Additional submissions followed from GMOB and from the always excellent, Bill Slater, which echoed our concerns. More than six months have now passed without any official reply whatsoever. So, it is a primary concern.

I have three questions I need to bring forward once again to the Project:

- Why have these concerns remained unacknowledged and unaddressed?
- When can we expect to review and discuss among the working group what assumptions based on the most likely climate scenario would mean to the various design plans as they current exist?
- How much work, based on current, and Alternatives North believes, inadequate assumptions will be completed and impossible to revisit in light of any new information before that long overdue discussion finally takes place?

We have some very important work cut out for us in 2024. We bear the moral responsibility to ask and answer these kinds of tough questions to get it right. Alternatives North will be proud to continue to contribute as best we are able. We remain grateful to the Project Team, to the other Parties, to GMOB, and to all of the other agencies and entities that have brought their expertise to our shared table or will be doing so in the months to come. Thank you to all.

David: Thanks, Michael. Natalie, do you want to respond now or just take it on notice? It is up to you.

Natalie: Sure, thank you. I guess first and foremost, Michael, we would like to thank you for your comments. We always appreciate them, and they are very well thought out and very well presented.

While we have not provided an official written reply to both your and the GMOB comments on our climate change assumptions, I did provide an update at our last working group that we do take this very seriously. The reason why we have not provided a written comment is we have gone back to our design team right now to ask them what level of effort, how much time, how much cost, what type of delays, or other implications would result from updating or going to the next model - sorry, the name has escaped me - to incorporate the latest into our design. I think they had said they would come back by the end of February with an update on that.

We are trying to find out what level of effort is going to be required to do that, Michael, and we definitely will report back if not by February, by the end of March of this year. Thank you.

David: Michael, anything further on that particular item?

Michael: If I may, I appreciate that the question is being answered internally of what is involved and coming up with a new assessment and so on, but time is of the essence. One of our primary concerns is that work getting done now is based on previous assumptions, and once it is done, if we change our assumptions based on updated information, it is too late.

So, the concern is if we are taking nine months from the point that we ask the question about the assumptions before we even have a prospective date to start looking at answers to those questions, what amount of work is getting done that will be based on assumptions we consider inadequate?

Time is of the essence. We have had the first bits of information that came out of AR6, the most recent IPCC assessment that has been available for about a year. It is not the same scale of a challenge to plug in new numbers than it is to do some of the other enormously complex things that we are doing with the design plans and so on.

I appreciate that you are telling us that you hear us, and I appreciate that there is some internal discussion, but I am very concerned by the timeframe, because it is absolutely a time-of-the-essence thing. I will not beat this drum anymore today. Thank you so much. Hopefully, we will have some useful information back sooner rather than later.

David: Thanks, Michael. Is there any other follow-up on that? Natalie? Okay, good. Do you need the questions that Michael posed in writing? Okay. Is there anything else for Alternatives North?

Okay, we will move on then to Yellowknives. William?

YKDFN Update

William: Good afternoon, everyone. What a year it has been. Wow. Where to begin? Where to begin? So, I was away for most of the summer, as some of you probably know. Then we had the evacuation. Then our Chief of sixteen years passed away. Prior to him being Chief, he was also a Councilor of sixteen years, so that is thirty two years with the band. We have a new Chief and Council elected, so there have been a lot of transitions for the band. Yeah, so here we are.

In December, we had our DFO engagement on the FAA. That went pretty well. We are confident with that process. We still need to do some work with DFO to finalize that and wrap it up, but we are looking forward to continuing and finalizing that so that the Project can move on and finalize that process.

We also had an onsite tour of Giant. We toured a certain location that the Project is intending to blast, and we have concerns with that. The Yellowknives have concerns with that. We are working with the Project on mitigating those concerns and finding solutions.

Just so everyone is aware, the location that we are concerned with is just when you get up the hill just past the Vee Lake turnoff. There is that big rock outcrop on the left side. The Elders and community have brought that up as a point of contention. So, we have got to work with the Project on finding a solution to that, and we look forward to continuing those discussions.

Priorities until the next meeting is we want to get back to having regular GMAC meetings. As you know, we have our GMAC Committee, and we have not been able to participate in those as much as I would have liked. We want to start hosting regular meetings and getting back on track, because we found a lot of success in that committee. That was where we could really hash out these issues and come to common ground. So, we want to get back to that.

I am going to be working with Geneva. It is always a pleasure working with Geneva and Nicole. They are always great to work with. I have got to say kudos to them. I know I

have worked with other government officials, and sometimes it is not so great. With Geneva and Nicole, it is always excellent.

Aside from that, we are looking forward to our usual events, the site tour in the summer, and future committee meetings. We are also looking forward to working on the Education Module. Kind of like what Ben and Natalie were alluding to, I think we need to decide whether we are going to pick it up and give it the push to get it to where it needs to be, or let it go and look at it at a future date, or just let it sit for now. I feel that pain, as well, of it kind of stagnating and not seeing any progress. Like Natalie, I have the same thoughts. If we are not giving it the justice that it needs, then why spend the time on it. That is my update. I am not sure if Silal has anything to add to that.

Silal: I am just going to add the same thing that William said. It has been quite a year. Things slowed down a little bit, from the social economic perspective, I think it was a good end-of-year, because we picked up a few meetings. We are going to go ahead with doing them regularly. They kind of dropped off because of evac and all the other stuff happening at YKDFN.

We are trying to work with Parsons on the procurement stuff and trying to get that sorted out. We are working on the Procurement Framework Agreement as well – sorry, the Socio-Economic Framework that comes out of the PFA. We are working on that as well. Hopefully in the next few months, there should be significant progress on the socio-economic perspective. Thank you.

David: Thank you. Are there any questions or comments? Natalie?

Natalie: Thank you for the update, William and Silal. I did have a couple of questions on that. The first one is not a question but a comment. We are eager to get GMAC up and running as well. It is a very useful committee, and we look forward to that.

The first question circles back to the DFO process. You did say you had a few more things to wrap up. Do you have timelines? Before you answer, I will just say that we will be putting our outfall in the spring, so we are on a very tight timeline. Just to remind everyone that it is a tight timeline, so I am wondering do you have a timeline on that? Thank you.

William: I do not have a timeline right now. I cannot commit to anything, but I do recognize that the Project is on very tight timelines. So, I just want to say we will be expediting that process because we recognize. We have heard it from our Elders and community members. We want to see the site remediated, so we don't want to be blocking the road for the Project.

Natalie: Great. Thank you. I have one last question, if I may? You mentioned the borrow site across the road from the Vee Lake turn off. I just want to confirm that is not the site we visited in the fall, or is that the same site we visited with Chief Fred Sangris and yourself and Johanne? It is the same site?

William: Yes

Natalie: Okay, good. I thought it was a different one. So, that is the one. Thank you.

David: I don't know if you are at liberty to explain more what the concerns are regarding that site.

William: There are several concerns. Number one is that with that rock gone, there will be clear access to the tailings pond. People will have to see that and drive by it. There are concerns with the dust, and there are concerns with the visual. The concerns are spread out. It is not just one exact concern. It is just that people are not comfortable with more damage along the road as they drive by.

The other thing too, I think a big point of contention or a big point that members had, is the access to the tailings. You know, if it is just a simple chain link fence, then that might not be adequate.

I do not want to step ahead of myself of finding solutions, because I think that would be best with the community and with the Project, but the concern is that it is right along the road. People have to drive by it every day, and it is going to change the view that people have been used to for quite a while.

David: Thank you. That is very helpful. Shelagh, do you still have a question?

Shelagh: Yes, thanks. It is not specifically a question for William, but he mentioned that Education Module. We have touched on it a little bit this morning, and I may have totally gapped on things that I was reading or supposed to have read. It was not something that I was specifically aware of, and I was just wondering if somebody could give a nutshell summary of what it is. It was not clear to me even this morning if it was a GMOB initiative or if it is a Project Team initiative. I did look at some of the past Annual Reports of GMOB and could not find anything about it there. I just want to know what I should be doing. If I should be doing anything? Thanks.

David: You should be doing everything. That is why it is not moving anymore. Before I get somebody to answer that, I just want to note for the record that Ken Froese and Chris MacInnis are on the call now. Ben, Natalie?

Natalie: Sure. Thank you. This stems from one of the suggestions. I do not have the number off the top of my head, to develop an Education Module. A few years back, we did take it on, and we worked with I think the Toxic Legacies Group and came up with a module. However, we heard from many people that they wanted to work on it again.

So, I believe Ben and GMOB expressed interest in pushing it, so that is why it is sort of this joint-led one, because we had already done and sort of put it aside. Then I think Ben with GMOB expressed an interest in taking the lead on getting it going again. Then

I believe a taskforce was struck with Ben and Nicole being the primary people to lead, taking the charge again to getting something more substantive than just a standalone module to try to get something incorporated into the curriculum. With that, I will hand it back to Ben, because I have not been involved since that.

Ben: Thank you. An examination took place with the Department of Education on where this would sit. There were a number of options. Wendy Stevenson was brought on board, and she worked with us for a while. It was thought that it should fit in with the Northern Studies Program as a separate module. Then there were discussions about how to put that together and what information would be used.

I think it started to slow down when the Parties started to discuss what the point of views would be, because it is essentially a very, very short module. So, what is the viewpoint? How is that going to be put together? How is that going to be presented? How then, going back to each one of those separate communities, will it be ratified so that the information is good going forward? That is where it is right now.

Shelagh: Okay, thanks for that. Just a quick follow-up, so whatever exists currently, is it available somewhere for people to see, or for my eyes?

Ben: Yes, so the preliminary documentation that we have from Wendy and where it sits, yes. Definitely we will share it with you.

David: Thank you. Ben?

Ben: I have two questions, William. One of the questions is the participation of YKDFN in the YKHEMP program. We have heard that YKDFN is not participating in that anymore, so I just want to confirm that.

Number two is the status of the Apology and Compensation discussions right now, if you could give that to us. Thank you.

William: Sorry, just to be clear, you said that YKDFN is no longer participating in the YKHEMP?

Ben: That is what we have heard. I do not have the details on that right now, so I am just wondering if you have anything.

William: No. That's news to me. No, because the YKHEMP moved from our department to the Health and Wellness Department, we don't have any staff in our department working on that. I have not gotten an update since the last time Lori was here. I think that was last year. So, no, I can look into that and see, but that is news to me.

In terms of the Apology and Compensation, unfortunately, I have nothing to update on that, nor can I speak on it. I was hoping that Johanne Black would be here today, but unfortunately, she is sick. I do not have any speaking notes that I can speak on the Apology and Compensation front.

Ben: Okay, great. Thank you, Will. If you could get those notes, that would be great. Thanks.

David: Shelagh?

Shelagh: I can, if I may, give a little blurb about the HEMP study and YKDFN, only because I have a report from Shin Shiga who sits on that committee for the City of Yellowknife. He sent me his bi-monthly or semi-monthly, every two months or every three months report about it, and it mentions it.

I was not going to mention it during the City update because I did not want to speak for YKDFN, but he did mention there have been some meetings in September, November, and December. YKDFN just responded to the HEMP research team to inform them maybe they are still interested in the program. Then he had a specific note about YKDFN participation just saying that the new YKDFN Chief and council will meet with the research team in the new year to finalize a data ownership agreement.

I guess there had been at some point some concerns about the consent form and questionnaire, but those have been addressed already. He indicates there may be data collection for YKDFN in the spring of 2024. So, it sounds like YKDFN is still involved.

David: Thank you, Shelagh. Are there any other comments or questions for the Yellowknives? Nope, failing that, we will segue right back into the City of Yellowknife.

Update from the City of Yellowknife

Shelagh: Alright. Those items that are listed in your agenda and the items to focus on in terms of regulatory reviews, yes, we have looked at the documents that become available that are out for public review through the water licensing process for the water license. Then that about the YKHEMP.

In addition to what I just said, there were meetings in mid-September, early November, and early December. There has been sampling progress. He indicated as of mid-December, they have been doing the repeat sampling of people that had participated in the earlier survey, so that is the longitudinal samples with 162 people who have been through that sampling so far, or as of December 19th. I think they are expecting some more, and the numbers will be finalized later in November. That 162, he indicates is out of 419 who were interviewed in 2017 or 2018.

Then there is a new cohort, so there are random cross-sectional samples from new participants. There were 215 of those as of mid-December. Then a small number of additional interviews were conducted after December 19th. He indicates the final number will become available in mid-January. Preliminary results of that ongoing work are expected by this coming summer.

There was some mention of the research agreements or the partnership agreements. It seems like they had not ever really been formalized. I guess when this project got underway, those agreements were drafted in 2018 but had not been formalized. I think the research team has been going through that process now. It seemed to me maybe YKDFN was working on a separate agreement, and it was indicated that the City of Yellowknife or NSMA, if they wanted, could have a separate agreement. For the purposes of the City of Yellowknife, it did not seem to be necessary. I believe the City now has signed off on that partnership agreement. That is for the HEMP.

Then there were a couple of other points in your agenda related to land use planning and the economic monitoring and reporting that you identified for the City. I did speak to Kerry Thistle last week about that, and there are not really any updates from the City on either of those topics. Primarily the strike and evacuation had hampered the City's work in those areas.

Those, I think, are probably the extent of the updates from the City. Thanks.

David: Thanks, Shelagh. Are there any questions for Shelagh? I do not see any. Oh, William?

William: This will probably be a quick question. I am just curious if there has been any progress or updates on land use planning? I see that the City is listed there with GNWT.

Shelagh: Yes, I spoke to Kerry Thistle last week, and the City does not have any updates related to that. I think it has been a topic that has been discussed at the meetings that the City has directly with the Project Team. Obviously, we have not had one. We have not had many topics to discuss in the last several months, so I imagine it will come back to the surface fairly soon.

David: Thanks, Shelagh. Anything else?

Alright, in my eagerness to get this meeting over with quickly, I skipped over North Slave Métis Alliance. Apologies, Marc.

Mark C: No problem, Dave. We are good.

David: The floor is yours

Updated from the North Slave Métis Alliance

Marc W: Alan Alex, here we go.

Alan: Thanks, Mark. Good afternoon, all. I am really glad to be here to talk about the updates that have happened on behalf of NSMA. Since the last GMOB Semi-Annual Meeting in June 2023, NSMA has gone through several updates regarding the Giant Mine file. I will try not to take too long.

On June 13th, we had our site staff visit. Ten people attended, including our staff and NSMA members with a special thanks to Geneva and Natalie for coordinating it.

One of the key action items for NSMA from the previous Semi-Annual Meeting was related to the Fisheries Authorization engagement. NSMA successfully conducted this engagement with DFO and CIRNAC on July 18, 2023 with feedback from our members and staff. It was a really productive conversation. Our appreciation goes to representatives from DFO, Geneva, and the whole CIRNAC team for their coordination of efforts.

NSMA, with guidance from our Elders, has been actively involved in all working groups and regulatory meetings in the past year. Lawrence Mercredi from NSMA represented us in the monthly working group and AEMP meetings, reviewing all the pertinent documents. Susan Enge represented NSMA in all the YKHEMP meetings.

Beyond these general meetings, NSMA engaged with the YKHEMP team a couple of times, collaborating on sampling for the Child & Youth Program. Five NSMA members participated in the recent Child Youth Sampling Program in 2023.

NSMA also reviewed the GMOB research program documents and attended the GMOB research project meeting on November 14, 2023. Our Environmental Department Manager, Mr. Noah Johnson and President Mr. Marc Whitford participated in a Socio-Economic Working Group Meeting on Giant Mine Industry Day in the month of December. We met with several prospective business partners who are interested in working with us at the Giant Mine in the future in those engagement sessions.

Regarding the Giant Mine Community-Based Monitoring program, NSMA has finalized our Standard Operating Procedures for field sampling. We are working with a consultant to acquire the necessary equipment and permits, aiming for a test field program and training in the summer of 2024. We have got a chance to engage with University of Saskatchewan researchers who are interested in a different monitoring program in Yellowknife, potentially funded by CIMP under GNWT. If approved, this collaboration will align well with our Giant Mine CBM initiatives.

In terms of the remediation economy, we've been collaborating with Catalyst consultants through CIRNAC since June 2023 to develop an environmental business wing for NSMA and other capacity improvement programs. Discussions are ongoing, with expected tangible progress this year. We have also engaged with CIRNAC to set a tentative date for the next Giant Mine community forum on March 6, 2024.

Regarding the capacity building for participation in the remediation economy, there are some updates from our Environment Department Manager, Mr. Noah Johnson. I am going to read his notes here. He said 2023 was a very challenging year with the departure of the former Environment Department Manager, Jessica Hurtubise, who served on the Giant Mine file with NSMA for many years. We also dealt with the summer

wildfire crisis and subsequent evacuation of Yellowknife. Despite these challenges, NSMA made significant progress on capacity building in 2023. We are currently furthering several major projects with support from the funding that includes:

- Building a business wing of the Environment Department. We are currently working on establishing a new company, which will be called Metcor Environmental. The company will undertake private-sector environmental monitoring work at contaminated sites such as GMRP. We aim to have a new entity up and running by the end of Q1, 2024 and we are actively in talks with several technical partners who want to work with us.
- Multi-purpose environmental facilities and other projects that we are working on. We are currently applying to CanNor for additional funds to be used towards the construction of a new facility that would house environmental business operations for Metcor Environmental. If the required funds are successfully raised, we could begin construction in fiscal 2024.
- Regarding the major capital assets and procurement, we have been acquiring strategic assets, which will build our capacity for undertaking environmental monitoring projects. In 2023, we used funding from the Giant Mine Community Benefits Agreement towards purchasing a new truck, which will be used to support environmental fieldwork, including our Giant Mine CBM. We also used funds from GMRP to conduct several boat fleet upgrades, which will also be used for our community-based monitoring programs and other monitoring programs.
- Training and education: Funds are actively being used to support a variety of training activities for staff and community members. This includes educational events and presentations, attending strategic conferences or workshops, and traditional educational support like scholarships.
- Hiring and staffing: Funds from Giant Mine are used to support staffing roles in various areas of the department, including the Lead Regulatory Officer, Manager, training support staff, and seasonal hires. Within the last fiscal, funds from Giant helped us hire two summer Environmental Technicians, including one Indigenous NSMA community member. We also created a new position within the Department, a wildlife biologist position, which may be supported in part by funds from Giant. We plan on hiring another core environmental staff and two more summer students this coming summer.

These are the updates from NSMA.

David: Are there any questions or observations? Seeing none...Oh, Geneva?

Geneva: This actually is not related to NSMA, but we did find the Socio-Economic Report that was talked about during the action items. It was sent July 12th, and Nicole has re-sent it to Ben, so it is at the top of your email now.

David: For the record, Ben says 'thumbs-up.' Marc Whitford, are there any comments from you on your activities?

Marc W: No. Actually, thank you, Alan, for doing all that for us. We are just going forward. This has been a really, really busy year where we are working on 53 different fronts with small resources, but we are moving ahead anyway. We are kind of taking advantage of all the opportunities that the particular Project here, the Giant Mine Remediation Project, will offer. So, you will see us knocking at the door here and there, Natalie, in hopes of getting a bit more work that we can bid on and go forth from there.

Anyway, thank you. I also had good meetings with Ben and company as well. They are very, very good people to work with, and I am very, very happy, Mr. Chair, to work closely with you guys, or closer anyway, as we move forward altogether. Thank you, everybody. Happy New Year, and I will just stay here shivering in my office.

David: Thanks very much, Marc. Are there any last-minute comments? For the record, Natalie went thumbs-up as well. Alright, GNWT. Erika?

GNWT Update

Erika: We were going to actually do a tag team. I do not know guys, Natalie, if I should cover my topics now, or should we interweave?

Okay, I will go for it. Okay, nothing has changed in terms of Human Resources at GNWT for us. It is Diep, me, and Jeff for the Giant Mine crew, and we are happy to be here again.

My topics for the team are going to include the land use planning, which I am not sure entirely what the thinking was from GMOB with the agenda item, but what I will do is just recap the last time we did have conversations on land use issues and post-closure state of the site.

We had meetings with the City in October, and when I say we, that is GNWT, the ECC Department, which is the department that represents Giant for GNWT, but we also had Lands and MACA in attendance. They all had a role. Since that time, Lands has merged with ENR, and now we are ECC, as everyone would be aware.

At that time, we as the Project, ECC presented a constraints map that has been shared with everyone. Really this constraints map identifies areas, what we are remediating it to and the constraints around that. In that map, it does not say 'this could be used for this type of activity.' It is really focused on 'these are the constraints.' We walked the group through that. It was also based on access and development. It did lean into a little

bit of development, like development could happen here, but it did not say exactly well, you could build a high-rise or specifics.

We also clarified the mandates amongst the government, who is responsible for what. In general, we all felt like we were all on the same page. The one point from the City that was made was our terminology for residential use and to really focus on that. Residential standards is the perspective that the City wanted. All in all, ultimately that information will be used by the Planning Division to include in their 2028 Community Plan. Those areas would be deemed as passive recreational. I am not entirely sure what that means, but that was the language used by the Planning Director. The intent ultimately is to incorporate that information and include it in the 2028 Community Plan from the City.

There were no further actions for the group. We felt like we were clear on that. As the City prepares for that Community Plan, perhaps there is more follow-up that they might have on specifics unknown at this time. I will just pause there and see if there was more from GMOB in terms of the expectation of that update.

Ben: Erika, is that an internal document right now, or is that something that can be shared with GMOB at this time?

Erika: I am not sure what you mean by that document, but all the constraints map information and then also a bit of a recap of that meeting has been sent to the working group. It would have been in October 2022 or November 2022.

Ben: Okay, I will take a look. I do not recall seeing it, but if I have it in our files, I will share it with the Board. Thank you.

Erika: Okay. If not, let me know. I will flip it back. Alright, the other topic... Shelagh?

Shelagh: I was just looking through emails. I was thinking you meant the meeting as last October, but it was a year and a half ago almost now. Would it be possible for you to forward that email to me that had gone to the working group, only because I was not who I am back then. Thanks.

Erika: Of course. Shelagh, you will get everything on that.

David: Careful what you ask for.

Erika: Are there any other questions on the land piece?

Ben: Erika, so is the anticipation that it is in the hands of the City now moving forward? So, GNWT takes a backseat to this and just watches this as it progresses through the City processes? I'm just asking.

Erika: Yes, that is correct. However, at the meeting, GNWT said if there is support as you go through your land use planning exercises or whatever the City does in that regard, we can support, but the ball is in the City's court. There was a full understanding of our mandates.

Ben: Okay, I have a question then. In the interim, because I know that land use inspection is happening on the leased areas, my assumption is that will continue from the GNWT side. Is that going to have an influence, or is GNWT still retaining that authority for land use inspections, etcetera, up to a certain date? How does that work?

Erika: Thanks, Ben. I will just jump to that item, because it leans into the Historical Society and the Great Slave Sailing Club. Just for clarity for everyone in the room, Canada has a reserve with GNWT that is for the majority of the main site. However, the town site area, which includes the public use areas, is held by GNWT proper, and then now directly leased to the Yellowknife Historical Society and the Great Slave Sailing Club.

Because of that, I don't know what the right word is – setup – our land use inspectors do inspect those leases where the museum is and the Sailing Club. We do have a presence onsite in that way. GNWT works very closely with the Giant Mine Project in terms of any kind of decisions on what those leaseholders are doing now and the interactions with the Project Plan. I will just head there right now.

The latest is that we did conduct an inspection on the Historical Society lease site. They had done some work over the summer, which everyone is aware of. They have removed areas where there was overlying soil above the bedrock in order for them to install additional decks, stairways, accessible ramps, and things like that. It is unclear how contaminated or whether those soils are contaminated, so the inspector requested the Historical Society to provide us with a report with confirmatory sampling of those soils. Also, the Giant Project has agreed to accept that pile of soil that has been removed. It has not been disposed of yet. We are still waiting for that conversation from the Historical Society to say, hey we have this pile and thanks for taking it.

Really what this does...That confirmatory soil report is really in the best interest of the Historical Society because without that, the Project does not know how clean the areas are underneath their improvements that they have done. If we do not have confirmatory results, the Project would have to assume that we would need to go back in there and remove that soil. So, that is where that has been left. With that, I will just pause there. I am sure there are some questions.

Ben: No. Thanks, that information is good to date. Obviously, that process is going forward. I imagine that these kinds of inspections, though, are also going to be very much a part of the new public dock development on the Great Slave site. However, that will fall under the auspices of the Project, will it not, and not be a part of the actual lease, because the lease is being cancelled. Am I correct in that assumption?

Erika: Great question. We actually have not thought that far in terms of jurisdiction. The lease will be cancelled at that point. It will remain GNWT, so it will not fall under Giant. I am looking at you, Candace. I would see it still remaining as it would remain as GNWT inspector responsibility, all within that public use area. Candace?

Candace: The Project would only have control over that area when we are constructing or doing work, the remediation work in that area. Once that is complete, we turn it back to the GNWT for any operation or public access.

Ben: Okay, so a further question - then anything in terms of monitoring or testing and/or removal and disposal will then become part of GNWT's responsibility, or will that be worked with the Project? Probably with the Project, right, because they are going to be doing the actual work on that piece of land?

Erika: Ben, can you elaborate? What do you mean removal and disposal? Of what, exactly?

Ben: Well, because you will be moving materials, I assume there will be materials moved to build the boat launch wider, bigger and deeper.

Erika: Maybe I can just clarify. In the periods in which the Project Team is not doing active remediation in those areas, the area is managed by the GNWT until such time that work is being done. So, we would get notice a certain amount of time prior to the Project Team meeting with that area, then it would be the Project Team doing the remediation work. Once that is done, that would turn over back to the GNWT, and we would deal with our lessees and the public boat launch area. Does that make sense?

Ben: Yes. Thank you.

David: Thanks. Natalie?

Natalie: No, I think it got answered. Thank you.

David: Oh, okay.

Erika: Okay, great. Thanks. There are some other updates on the Historical Society and Great Slave Sailing Club that Geneva will touch on. Moving along onto the QRA. I see that here, and I will take that one as well.

I am assuming that is the Acute QRA. Ken is not on the line...oh, he is if there are other questions. We did receive a final Acute QRA. GNWT was working with our risk consultant. That is Claire McCulley. She works very closely on the HEMP project. She is a consultant of ours. We had her take a look, and we noticed some tweaks that would make the report a little stronger and clearer.

Currently, GNWT is supporting the consultant that did carry out the Acute QRA work to make those changes. At that time, we would then again share that with the working

group. Also, I would be bringing that forward to our Health Department to talk about any kind of messaging changes. At this point, their conclusions do not change. There are just some input numbers in the calculations that just need to be tweaked, but the conclusions remain the same. Are there any questions on that one?

David: Are there any questions from anyone? Ken Froese?

Ken F: I have a couple of questions or comments, and I will turn my video on so that you can actually see me. I have a couple of concerns about this. One is that the date on the report is March of 2023, and it was not sent to GMOB at least, until the end of September.

My understanding is from the response to one of Ben's emails on that from Natalie is that report is final. That kind of contradicts what was posted or what was written in the Project Team Annual Report where you said that the draft report was presented to working group, and there would be a draft written report that we could review and provide comments on before the final would be produced. That draft report was, as far as I know, never delivered. Then we got a final report that is marked as final.

So, I have not provided comments yet. I will, whether that report is final or not. Those are my concerns on that front.

David: Thanks, Ken. Erika?

Erika: Natalie, do you have anything?

Natalie: Sorry, I was trying to look up the dates, because I believe we presented the draft to Working Group in late spring and then took comments and finalized it. But just let me just check some notes, Ken, and get back to you.

Ken F: Yeah, I was not aware of it being presented to the working group in late spring. I only remember the Power Point presentation that happened in late October of 2022. At that point, there was not an actual report to review. There was just the Power Point presentation.

Erika: Okay, I will move on, and Natalie will respond further to that. I did want to touch on the economic monitoring and reporting. I was the only member at the Socio-Ec Working Group out of the folks here, so I will just recap the latest meeting, the face-to-face that we had in December.

That group met, and it was our first face-to-face. Graeme, jump in here at any point if I get anything wrong. It had been a while since we had been there together face-to-face. The goal of that was to just provide an overall update of all things socio-economic.

We had a contracting update, a contract that had been awarded and contracts that were coming down the pipe. We had conversations about the labour estimates, and a difference in numbers based on who ran those. There were conversations on that. We

had some breakout groups to look at what new additions might be included into the Implementation Plan and worked through that. We also had conversations about the KPIs and thinking about moving forward with potential changes to our targets. Graeme, is there anything more on that?

Graeme: Erika, maybe you can speak a little bit about our challenges about measuring social effects. I think that would be relevant to the group.

Erika: Thank you. Yep, I had that on the brain. At the meeting, I presented the conversations we had with the Department of Health and some of the work that they already do for big projects in the North, like mines, and the indicators that they use to just give a sense of general community health. They collect these stats from NWT Bureau of Stats or Stats Canada. We talked about that and how it would be worth having another working group meeting to dive into that deeper. So, that is more on the health side.

Then in the conversation, it was like well how do we measure some of the social impacts? Graeme brought up a really great suggestion of understanding the impacts of the Project on public users within that marina area. It might be an example of starting to think about how we measure social impacts there. That was a really great tangible example. Thank you, Graeme. Our hope is to have some future meetings to brainstorm and lean into that a little bit more, how we capture that data, what that would tell us, and how we can potentially mitigate that. Graeme, is there anything more to add from your brainwave there?

Graeme: I think the important point that was made at that meeting is that the data collection process that the GNWT does as part of their Community and Diamonds Report is really just a collection of data with no analysis. For the most part, having read almost all of those reports, the conclusion is that there are so many externalities involved in all of these different variables that we cannot place the effects or we cannot determine a cause and effect anywhere. It is just there.

Adding the GMRP to the list of projects that report sort of speaks to is perhaps not very productive, because it does not really speak to the effects of the diamond mines. So, it is unlikely to do anything more for Giant Mine. Then the idea was well then, as Erika has said, how do we actually measure the social effects? At the end of the day, it just takes work to do the analysis. The data collection is the easy part. Then you have to determine the cause-effect relationships and if they are relevant.

That was when we came up with some examples, one of which was at the boat launch. There has been a lot of discussion around the effect of work camps or what is the other term – work accommodations. The difference is subtle. A lot of the concerns around work camps is the social effect or the effect on the community. There again, they are people's perceptions of what the effect might be, but not well studied or understood as to whether or not they actually occur. That is another example where at the end of the day, if you want to understand these social effects, you have to research them. You have

to actually analyze the data that you are collecting. That is sort of where we left off. Thanks.

Erika: Thanks, Graeme. That was it for my update. The only other thing that I would want to update the group on from GNWT perspective is that as everyone is aware, we have a new government. We also have a new Minister, and ECC's Minister is Mr. Jay Macdonald. He has had a number of briefings already. I have not had the pleasure to meet him yet. What is neat is that he actually is a former ECC employee prior to receiving the ECC portfolio. I think that is a wonderful asset to understand how our department already works and functions, familiar faces and all of that. Yeah, we look forward to seeing what the next four years will bring with our new Minister. I will just pause unless there is anything else from you or Jeff.

Natalie: Thanks. I just wanted to circle back to the QRA. I just looked up some things. Ken, I just want to clarify. I think I have identified your concern as the time it took for us to send the report out, not the actual report itself. We came to Working Group in January 2022 to present our plan. Then we reported back in October 2022 with the draft results. Then the report was finalized over the winter of 2022-2023.

I think your concern, Ken, and please confirm or rephrase your question, is that you did not receive it until September 2023, so it was just the delay.

Ken F: Yeah, it is the delay, but it is also in the Project Team Annual Report. There is a comment that the results were communicated and that a draft report would be made available to review. That draft report was never made available. So, the only thing we had to review was the Power Point presentation.

Natalie: Yes, and that is correct. That is how it happened. We presented the results at the October 2022 meeting. So yes, you are correct. That was our process. Then the delay following the March to the September, obviously we had evacuation in there. We also had some contracting challenges from our end to get that sent out and finalized.

Ken F: Great.

David: Ken, anything else?

Ken F: From me?

David: Yeah.

Ken F: No. In terms of the content of the report, I do have concerns that need to be fleshed out. I will leave that until I have done my review.

David: Okay, thanks. Are there any other questions or comments for the GNWT? William?

William: I have a quick one. Just going back to the land use planning, the Yellowknives Dene take great interest in that process. So, we would be happy to be invited to any of the meetings that take place regarding land use planning. Masi.

Erika: Thanks, William. I believe at that time we did discuss that with the room. The City, Shelagh, I am not sure if you know, but I think there actually is a designated process of when and how YKDFN is brought into those kinds of conversations?

Shelagh: I am not aware of that, but I have made a note. I will check with Kerry and get back to you.

William: Can I just say really quickly that if there is a process of when and how we are included, if you could share that process with us, that would be appreciated. Masi.

Ben: Erika, just a question: Have you got any sense of where Aurora College is going with this new initiative, the education initiative? GMOB has been invited to a table to talk about this education initiative dealing with looking at new jobs as a part of the remediation project, or remediation economy as they state it. Do you have any update on that?

Erika: I meant to say, Alan, it is great to hear how much Catalyst and the SPI funding is supporting your organization. That is awesome. Then Ben, to that point and folks who may not know, again, the gurus do not like the term "remediation economy," and I am trying to stay away from that. Economy...or whatever, remediation providing opportunities to benefit other sectors of the economy. Graeme, is that good?

Through that work, the federal government received funding through the SPI Program. People might have heard this. It is an acronym. SPI: Strategic Partnership Initiative, so there are dollars there. The proposal to get those dollars was based on a whole bunch of interviews, a whole bunch of meetings, folks working together including Canada, GNWT, and a number of consultants, to generate some ideas of how this funding could build capacity.

There were a number of areas identified. One was what Ben was referring to, which is Aurora College introducing new programming, a new Northern Technician Program, and a Remediation or Environmental Monitoring Program. Is that what you are getting at, Ben?

Okay, great. So, that is great. Those dollars are helping Aurora to start to develop those programs. Initially, I think everyone was really keen and optimistic about the timing of that program development. Diep, if you know more jump in here, but unfortunately, as the days go by the deadline gets longer, which is unfortunate. The last I heard was within the next five years, there would be this program that would be ready to launch. It is not ideal, because we are already full-on into the Project, but there is always more work.

David: Alright, are there any final comments or questions?

Seeing none, Natalie?

Government of Canada Update

Natalie: Thank you. With that, I will pass it off to Candace to lead us off.

Candace: Thanks. I am going to start off with the regulatory reviews update. Right now, we have two reviews that were just recently completed: the Borrow Design Plan and then the Water Management Plan with the surface runoff criteria. Thanks to everybody who participated in that process. The comments have been responded to, and it is back with the Land and Water Board for a decision.

We currently have one review that is open, and that is our Erosion and Sediment Management Plan. That also includes our Revegetation Guidance Document, and that review closes on January 19th. Following that in 2024, we expect to submit four more design plans. Those are the four remaining ones in our open pits, contaminated soils, Baker Creek, and site infrastructure. So, that is what you have to look forward to.

Plus, we are likely going to have another version of our Water Management Plan, and this would include our Chloride and Sulfate Management Plan and then possibly one more version of the Water Management Plan after that, which would include the transition from our current effluent treatment plant to the new water treatment plant. It is a lot of repetition, but there are a lot of changes to water management coming up in the next few years. It just seems easier to do them one at a time. So, that is all I have for regulatory reviews, if there are any questions.

David: Ben?

Ben: I am just wondering, and I know of course, this is going through the regulatory process, but the feedback you are getting from the Parties and those who are commenting, number one: are you getting enough feedback? Number two: Are you finding the feedback helpful? Number three: Are there any improvements that can be made on the part of those participating?

Candace: Yeah, I think we are still getting a fair number of comments. I do see when Bill Slater's come in that are generally supported by the working group. That makes up usually about half of the comments I would say on any particular review.

We are always happy to talk about it. Reviewers can reach out to the Project during the review process and ask questions or clarification. If people are struggling with the timelines, the Board is always pretty flexible to accommodate reviewers, but letting us know early is helpful. We are less constrained with our timing right now with our Land and Water Board reviews, so we do have the extra time to get the approvals. Otherwise, I think things are going pretty well. The questions are good. It always helps to improve

our documents, and it is usually challenging to respond to, but we welcome the challenge.

Ben: Okay, thank you.

David: Is there anything else on the regulatory side?

Candace: You have on here the AAC, DFO, and Transport Canada. I saw in the last meeting minutes that we had quite a few questions about the process. I do have some slides that I could pull up or send to you, Ben, if you wanted me to give more detail on those processes.

Ben: If you just share them with me...

Candace: I just sent you the email. Are you connected to email?

Ben: Yeah, I think so. Do you want to talk to them now? They can be included as an appendix to the minutes.

Candace: Yeah, you can include them as an appendix, and I will just give an overview of what is in it, or you can share it on the screen. Sorry, I don't know who is sharing the screen.

David: Before you go, Shelagh?

Shelagh: Thanks. I was just wondering if it would be possible to walk through them now. It just seems like it would be...rather than seeing it after the meeting. Looking at them but not knowing what Candace was saying about it would be...

Candace: If you send me the Teams link to the meeting, I can this afternoon.

David: Yes, you can. During the break, we can set this up. That would be easier. Okay, Natalie, back to you.

Natalie: Thanks. The first item going down that I was going to speak to is the YKHEMP process, but I think Shelagh and William provided a fairly good succinct update. The only thing I could add is just to confirm that Year 5 in the Child Resampling Program is wrapping up. It was successful, but the Yellowknives Dene did not participate. I know that the HEMP are trying to resolve the issues and hopefully pick up the children and youth in the spring. It is unknown if that will happen as well, just due to the timing and budget and participation. But, they did confirm that even if they do not get the Yellowknives youth and children, their data is still robust and complete. It will not hinder the results.

The next item I will speak to is...I might just go right into the site status and schedule update, because that covers a number of the other topics, and then I will circle back. As we all know, the wildlife evacuation affected the site. During that time, the site did shut

down. We deemed we did not need to apply for any emergency status and were fine to abandon the site.

We did a risk assessment to make sure that we deemed the site safe. The biggest issue of leaving the site unattended is obviously the water level in the underground, but the timing was such that it was in August. We had completed all of our yearly water treatment as well, and it being a drought, we do not have a lot of water as well. That was a key factor in determining that risk. That would not always be the case necessarily, but during that time it was.

As well, we wanted to release all our contractors, so we did a temporary suspension of our contractors' obligations so they could leave the site to assist the City of Yellowknife and the Government of the Northwest Territories in their firefighting efforts. So, we did release all our contractors. They left the site. Everyone left the site.

What we did do before we abandoned the site is we turned the pumps on and let them run as long as we could just to draw the water down even more than we normally would, because we did not know how long it would be until we got back. We did leave the pumps on, but they do switch off automatically.

During the evacuation, the site was mostly unattended. Some of the contractors that were still in town doing the firefighting efforts did check on the site. As well, we heard Ben checked on the site. So, it was not like it was totally abandoned, but for all intents and purposes, it was.

When we got the go-ahead to come back, we did put a number of people on the early return list, just so they could get in as early as possible just to check. When they came in, actually the water levels were good. Everything was pretty much as it was left. Yeah, the first priority, as I said, check the water levels. It had been about less than a 2-metre rise, so we had tons of room. Then they turned back on, and no other concerns were noted.

The overall impacts to our schedule, we are still trying to work on them. The strategy when everyone came back in September was to extend the season. People who were planning to shut down in November worked into December to try to catch up. So, we will not know the exact magnitude of any schedule delays and claims until probably a number of months from now, so possibly at the next meeting we will be able to report if there were any costs or schedule impacts. Right now, it is looking pretty good. The water treatment plant I will get to in a minute. I will just pause on that.

We did lend out quite a bit of equipment from the Giant Mine site to the City for firefighting efforts, including a number of our water cannons, pumps, and hoses. A number of the old dozers and D8s that have been sitting around the site got put into action, I was happy to hear. There were a number of things that were lent out. Everything has made it back, except for some outstanding piping that the City is still

using, and that will be discussed with the City at our next meeting. That was it for evacuation updates.

With that, I will just move on to the general site updates. As you know, we broke ground on the water treatment plant. Construction began this summer. Most of this year was clearing the site and prepping the site. They have now started pouring concrete for the foundation, not right now in -40, but recently, as well as drilling for the deep wells for the water intake. The water treatment plant is one of the biggest pieces this year, and they worked well into December and only shut down briefly for Christmas, which I do not think was the original plan. That was how they made up some of the schedule delays.

Another piece of work at site this year was we started the demolition and debris. All of you who have been onsite know all the debris lying around the site. That contract is in order, and significant progress was made on the debris piles. I believe it is over 50% complete approximately.

The town site deconstruction was completed this year as well. All the buildings from the town site are down. All the materials have been placed, either hazardous shipped offsite or in the onsite landfill.

The other big piece was the Arsenic Sampling Program from this year, which was the request from GMOB to obtain 600 kg of the arsenic trioxide dust. That was completed. We have delivered the arsenic dust to GMOB. I know GMOB will probably update, but it is now at the research facility in Ontario. I did just get the updated budget. I will report that project cost us \$4.1 million dollars approximately.

David: So, apparently arsenic is worth something.

Natalie: Only if somebody wants it. Apparently GMOB wanted it. In terms of some other minor site updates, our effluent treatment plant, which is our old water treatment plant ceased operation on October 8th this year, so we did a later treatment, obviously due to evacuation.

We also did a tracer dye study completed this year. That was to determine where the water from Baker Creek was seeping into the C1 pit. That work was done just post-evacuation, so we do not have the final report. I did hear it was successful, and they did find out where the seepage was. We will be reporting on that at working group at some point, or at least sharing the report.

We did some additional test pitting around the site to further delineate areas, specifically in the Great Slave Sailing Club area. That was completed this fall as well.

Then just in terms of socio-ec highlights, I have a note here that in terms of our 2023 capacity building highlights, between the Giant Mine Remediation Project and its subcontractors, we issued a total of six scholarship and supported one apprentice in

2023. The scholarship was issued by AECOM, which is our design engineer for \$5000.00 to Dech̓ta Nàowo. Three scholarships were issued by Parsons, our main construction manager, each for \$5000.00.

Then, of course, we continued with our Annual Contribution Agreements, funding to the Yellowknives Dene First Nation and North Slave Métis Alliance. Each year, that includes scholarship funding for \$5000.00 each as well. So, all in all for scholarships, that was \$30,000.00 this year from all sources of the Giant Mine Remediation Project. That is it for my site updates if anyone has any questions.

David: Are there any questions?

Seeing none, is there anything from the Government of Canada?

Natalie: I will just go down the list and see if there is anything I missed. Apology and Compensation update: As all of you know, that is not the Giant Mine Remediation Project. It is led by our Regional Director General, who is Ron Pankratz right now, but I did check in with him. It is with the Yellowknives Dene. As previously, we provided the funding for them to do the research. I believe they are conducting the research. Then I will pass it over to Geneva for the Yellowknife Heritage Museum and Sailing Club update. Thank you.

Geneva: We did attend the Great Slave Sailing Club's open house this summer, which was very successful. We shared our preliminary designs with them at that time, and we did commit to go back once we have our detailed designs complete. We also met with the Yacht Club at our Transport Canada meeting, and they are interested in being engaged once we get our detailed designs. We will be doing that as well. We will also be talking about our preliminary designs at our upcoming forum in March. Are there any questions about the Sailing Club?

Ben: Thanks, Geneva and thanks, Natalie. I have a couple of questions. First of all, it looks like some progress is being made meeting with the Sailing Club and the Historic Society, and now the Yacht Club. When you say you have an upcoming session in March to receive input, who is that going to be with?

Geneva: These are our annual public forums, so we do them every March. We offer a specific session for the YKDFN and North Slave Métis Alliance. We will go to City Council, and we have a public session that is advertised widely to the City of Yellowknife.

Ken H: That is good. I guess you probably know where I am going with this. The Sailing Club is pretty well represented. There has been really good interaction. I know there are a lot of outstanding issues and concerns, etcetera. That aside, the fact is you guys are engaged with them, and that is very positive. The same with the Historical Society. The Yacht Club further represents more members of the voting public, but I still have a real concern with encouraging you folks to really target some input from the greater boating community in the City, because the vast majority of boaters in Yellowknife are not with

the Yacht Club and are not with the Sailing Club. They are just members of the public who use the boat launch and the parking lot.

I would really encourage, if you can, maybe with the March session to specifically seek input from boaters. I mean, you can only ask. If nobody shows up, well, you have tried your best. I really feel that you need to put extra effort into that. I had a look at the preliminary drawings, and I know there are going to be some concerns with the amount of land that is going to be available at any one time once the remediation of that area begins.

I am not speaking for the boaters of Yellowknife, even though I am one. I am just giving you my observations. The amount of land that is involved at the current site is already overwhelmed in the summer because the level of boating activity in the City has grown exponentially in the last few years. I had a look at a satellite image taken last June on a weekday, and there were fifty boats and trailers at the public boat launch. They were all over the place, on the side of the roads and parked here and there.

My concern is that one of the things that is going to have the greatest direct impact in the next decade on the residents of Yellowknife is the boat issue. I know it is a seasonal thing, but still, the level of activity is unprecedented. I really encourage you to try to get some input from people who use those facilities to give their input, specifically on the amount of land that is going to be needed.

I know you are trying to do your best to use one site for both and then use the other site for both. As far as your work goes that is ideal, but I really can see problems coming down the pike when it comes to the amount of land that is available. The fistfights that are going to break out at the public boat launch is already happening just because of the space that is needed for that level of activity in the City.

So, I encourage you to specifically target, and maybe you are advertising for the session. I know there is no one organization that speaks for the boaters generally, and that makes it difficult. However, I would encourage you to really try and seek that input and give it serious consideration in your designs, because it is already turning into a bit of a nightmare with both sites currently available.

Thank you for the report on the midnight dumping sites. The information was brought forward from mostly former employers about what is called midnight dumping or illegal burial of waste onsite, right directly in one case, from the guy that actually buried it. He was doing what he was told to do. I had a quick look at the report. I want to look at it again. It looks like some good effort was put into that.

There are a couple of places I would still like to just get a backhoe, dig a hole, and see if there is anything there. I know even this fellow that I talked to directly said yeah, he buried it right there. It may have been moved by someone else subsequently, and perhaps that is why stuff did not show up on the geophysical or the geomagnetic survey,

but there are a couple of spots I would still like to get a backhoe into just for an afternoon and dig a couple of holes to see.

This one particular individual is a pretty straight shooter, so he would not be trying to pull the wool over anyone's eyes, and he was very specific about what he actually did. Maybe we will put that in some response to the report that you gave us, and thank you again for that report.

Other than that, I will leave the rest until I have a few minutes, other than to say I was really sad to see the town site come down this summer. It tore at my heartstrings. It is where I grew up. That is where I lived a good part of my life. I have, over beers and coffee with former employees and former residents of the property, talked about what happened there and looked at a few photos. It was sad to see. I understand why it is gone, but it was sad to see it go. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Ken. Natalie?

Natalie: Great, thanks. Thank you, Ken, for that information and suggestion to hold a session with the boating community and not just the Sailing Club and Yacht Club. I think it is an excellent idea to get information out, as well as maybe any suggestions as to how we can improve it.

I know when we go in there, it is not going to be as accessible as it is now. I did not want to say pretty, but yes. We knew when we first started this project, we were originally just going to shut the whole area down. We worked with the boating community. It was all of the boating community to come with this solution on the staged approach and keeping one open and then the other. The City was very vocal in that, as well as the boating community.

We have had input so far, and I guess it probably was not until we started doing the designs. There will still be restrictions, because we are going from two boat launches to one and getting input on how we can best alleviate those concerns to our abilities. It is not going to be a perfect solution, right? I think we all know it is not going to be perfect, but to try to get input I think, is a great idea. We have until 2028 to do that, but I think getting input sooner, or even just getting the information out so people know what is coming, for sure. I agree. Thank you for that suggestion.

As for digging with a backhoe, sure. You want to come work for us? No, I jest. I'm sorry. If we want to go over the areas you still think might have concerns... We did find that one area. I think it was on the calcine pond. I am not sure. It was where the road comes down. We had not identified that one, so that was great information.

We found a whole area of buried debris obviously. I think the other ones we did not find anything. Some of them are slated in the soils, excavations as well, so I think we have them flagged as cautionary, like there still could be stuff. We will be digging a

couple of them up as part of our remediation, but maybe not the others. We can certainly work on that, yeah. Thank you. Nothing else?

Graeme: My hand does not work on my screen here, so I am just going to talk. Ken and Natalie, when you were talking about the boat launch thing, I am thinking about my own skills at launching and un-launching a boat. Perhaps one solution would be to hire professional boat launchers and boat retrievers to do this for the public when it is very, very busy there so that the fights do not happen at the dock or at the boat launch. They may happen further up the road instead, but I can see that as providing a lot more efficiency in the use of the limited space.

Ken H: In the City of Kelowna, a huge boating community, you are not allowed to launch your own boat. The City of Kelowna hires two guys every summer. You pull up and give them your keys. They launch your boat, tie it up to the dock, park your vehicle, and they give you the keys back when you come off the lake. You tie up your boat, you give them the keys, and they go get your vehicle. They put your boat on it, and they pull it away from the ramp. That is what we need here. That would certainly alleviate a lot of the concerns.

Graeme: It would alleviate a number of marital discussions as well.

David: I think this conversation could go on forever, but Erika, do you have the last word?

Erika: I teach trailer-backing-up courses, P.S., just for ladies though. From the GNWT perspective, again our job is to manage that area. It is GNWT's responsibility to manage that. Jeff already this summer took a look at the parking lot that exists there now. Are there ways that we can provide some better organization to that, mark off sites? Could we push back some of the Historical Society equipment, or things like that? So, we are already starting to think about that. Maybe it is a little bit late in the game since we did start management of it a couple of years ago.

The other thing is there will be signs going up this summer. Once the season hits, those signs will be up. If people have concerns, they can reach us at whatever such-and-such number. We will have postings on our website. We will be echoing the Giant Mine Project's website. Also, at our Transport Canada meeting, all the groups there said let's work together on getting information out to folks, to the larger boating communities.

So, 100% we are with you, Ken. It is a select group of people that currently understand what is going on, but we know that we need to get out broader. GNWT is definitely on board to support with coms on that broader info-piece out there. I think that was it. Happy to receive any input that you have moving forward. Again, GNWT is a responsible party there. It is going to be hectic and chaotic, but we are looking at ways to make it more efficient.

Sorry, Geneva, I know you want to stop this conversation, but just one final word that we will be really pushing this at the Spring Trade Show as well. We will be attending,

and we find that is a really good avenue to speak to a lot of community members. We will have a lot of information there about the boat launch, and we will be advertising it at our booth.

David: Great, thank you. Now I am going to call a break.

Natalie: Sorry, I have one more update on the file, and it is really quick. It is the last one I had to speak to for Canada, and it is the Perpetual Care Plan. I am happy to report that the request for proposal was posted yesterday, so a big shout-out to the PCP Task Force for all the hard work. It was a long time coming. We started working on it in 2019, so that is four years, but COVID was in there. Anyway, thank you all for your hard work. At least the consultant gets to do some of the work now. Thank you. That is all I had.

David: Shelagh, last word. It is time for a break.

Shelagh: Sorry, I have one very quick question, and it relates to that Perpetual Care Plan. I had looked at that link when Geneva sent that email, I think yesterday. I am just curious on the website. Right at that top in the description, the last sentence of that upper description says the period of the contract is for three years plus two one-year options security requirement. Below that is a heading that says contract duration. It says the estimated contract period will be nine months. I am just wondering.

Natalie: That sounds like a typo. We will check on it. Thank you very much.

David: Okay, we will take a break. If there are any lingering questions for the GNWT or Canada, you can ask them after the break. We will do Candace's presentation, and then we will move into the GMOB stuff with Ben first and then each director. Just a heads-up to the directors, we will start with Mark Palmer, Ken Froese, Ken Hall, and Graeme. We will ask Paul Green to comment on the regulatory stuff, and then we will save Marc Lange for the last, because he is going to do the research program update as well.

Ben: Marc must leave at half past, so he would like to go first, please.

David: Okay, we will do that. Marc is always so demanding. Let's take a 15-minute break, and we will get the Power Point up and running.

Break

Update from GMOB Director, Marc Lange

David: Okay folks, if you could grab your coffee and then your seats, we will get started again. Marc Lange, we are going to put you on first as a heads-up as soon as people take their seats.

Marc L: Okay.

David: Okay, let's start again. We are going to put Marc Lange on first. Just so you know, Marc, we have rearranged the entire afternoon for your convenience. Then William has a question of Natalie. Then we will go to the slide show. Then we will go back to the GMOB update. Okay, Marc Lange.

Marc L: You are looking for my personal director's update?

David: Yes and the research program update at the same time.

Marc L: Okay, sounds good. I think that can be quick. I am looking on-camera and folks around the room. I think everyone was at the big last public research session where we gave lots of updates, so I do not think I will go in depth there. Let me know if I am missing somebody, somebody who is new who is not aware of that work.

That went well. I think looking forward into 2024, the communications documents, the pamphlets that summarize all the research but also the specific ones for each research project, I think our goal is to update those once a year regardless of whether there are big changes or not. We would like to update those annually, so you can expect an update later on in 2024 on those communications documents.

The workshop, from our perspective, went well, but we have not thought of a frequency associated with that workshop. I doubt we would have the bandwidth or budgets to pull it off every year, but we will think about that this year and see where that goes.

The second part on research is where we are going with the research. That is meant to be articulated in a strategic plan we are working on. There are delays on that plan. We have all of the components that would go in the plan. Most of the write up is done, but it is not ready for public consumption yet. The wording, the language, and the writing is just not up to snuff yet, so we are going to need some more time to clean that up. We expect to be able to release that in 2024.

The last thing that I will be focusing on in 2024 is the Aquatics Effects Monitoring Program. Some of you, and certainly the Project Team has seen some of my comments and suggestions over the last couple of months, mostly around the design of the program as it expands into the bay. We have had quite a few very productive discussions on that, but I still have some concerns, so I think the next step will probably be moving my concerns from personal ones to maybe recommendations that might come out on behalf of GMOB. That will be what I am focusing on in 2024. That is it for my update.

David: Thanks very much, Marc. Are there any question? Graeme, do you have a question for Marc? I don't know if there were people who were not at the research update, but Marc said we have got the notes from that. We have the presentations. They are available on the website, I think. There is some significant progress being made, I think it is fair to say.

Marc, just for your information and Ken Froese as well, there are transportation problems out of Yellowknife. Airlines are cancelling flights because of the weather, so the workshop that we have got planned for Sunday-Monday-Tuesday is subject to change. We will let you know as soon as we know about flights out, but it is not looking positive right now.

Discussion Regarding the 20-Year Review:

Marc: Okay, well thanks for that update. Can I ask, Mr. Chair, if there was an item on the agenda about discussing a 20-year review, and will I be missing that if I leave in thirty minutes?

David: No, you will miss it if you resign from the committee. William is going to ask that question of Natalie right now. Go ahead, William.

William: I just quickly talked with Ben over the break. I unfortunately have to leave at 4:00, so I was hoping to see if we could bump the 20-year review discussion ahead and talk about it now. Same with Marc, I would like to be there. I feel I may miss the discussion, so that was question directed to Natalie and the Project.

David: Go ahead, Natalie.

Natalie: We wanted to put it on the agenda because it is time sensitive. The Environmental Agreement says the co-proponents, me and the GNWT, shall commit to a 20-year review. I believe it says 20 years post-implementation as well as Measure 2. It is modeled on Measure 2. So, we just wanted to get agreement on when that is, because it could be sooner, or it could be quite a bit later. We just wanted to have a discussion to make sure we are not missing anything.

From the co-proponent's perspective and the Project's perspective, implementation began in 2021, but that was once we had our funding and officially Year 1. However, a lot of work started previously. The Environmental Agreement was signed in 2015. We applied for a water license in 2007. So, the discussion was more just to get consensus on when the date is so we know and can plan. It could be quite a while in the distant future, or it could be sooner. That was it, and I look to Katherine and the rest of my team if I missed anything.

Katherine: No.

Natalie: No, that was it. Thank you.

David: Okay, why don't I just go around the table? GNWT, any suggestions as to a target date?

Erika: Yes, we echo Natalie's comments that implementation would be 2021. However, just further thinking on that, maybe not today and maybe for another discussion soon is

that in my mind, I see two different streams. There is the 20-year review, and we have always thought about the research project being sort of integrated within that 20-year review. However, if there is a research solution that comes out earlier prior to the 20-year review, how do we integrate that into the Project and discussion?

I don't think we can resolve that today, but I wanted to plant that seed. The conversations that we need to have go beyond just when the timing of the 20 year review would begin. In our mind, just to answer your question, 2021 is when we would start, so the 20-year review would be 2041.

David: Okay. North Slave Métis?

Marc W: No comment at this point. I'm good.

David: Okay. William?

William: No, I have no comment other than that I think we should discuss this further maybe at a working group or some future meeting. If the Project could provide Measure 2 and any other wording on this, it would be appreciated.

David: Okay. Alternatives North?

Michael: I think I am with William on this one. It might be a discussion to table for a future working group meeting or something. Alternatives North does not have an official position on this at this time, but we might after some internal discussion.

David: Shelagh, City of Yellowknife?

Shelagh: I appreciate William's suggestion as well. I think that would be helpful. I do not know if the Project Team has ever asked the Review Board what they meant by that, what their thoughts were at the time, and what Project implementation means to them. That might help if there was maybe a one-pager that said the Project Team's views on what implementation is and what implementation could mean, if it was issuance of the water license or start of the Project getting underway post-EA. So, that would be helpful.

David: Okay, so we will defer it to a later date, but people can think about it. Yes, given that there is nothing hard and fast about it, it really comes down to what the most logical 20 year point is and measure it from the Environmental Agreement, 2035. Do you measure it from 2021? 2021 means 2041, which is a long way off. There is consideration while things are fresh, you might want to start it earlier rather than later.

Ben: Let's split it down the middle.

David: Marc Lange, do you have a view? Ben would like to know.

Marc L: I will say that I am already quite impressed with the level of discussion and what I have heard from folks. You know, I think what I am hearing is that there is some homework that needs to be done. It may be more of a focused meeting where everybody can come in with Measure 2 in front of them and sort of digest all the dates and the meanings. I do like that idea very much of going back to the Impact Board and asking what do you mean by implementation. We do not have to necessarily abide by their thoughts. It is just additional information that could feed this discussion.

From my perspective, both as someone who has been dabbling with the research and just a regular Joe Citizen, I am really keen on getting into a detailed discussion on how to integrate the research with the Project as it operates now. I guess I am seeing the frozen core deployment as very helpful, obviously for what is below ground, but it is also becoming useful to the Project for other arsenic storage and maybe stability of other things.

Some of the research is coming up with a possible solution where we do not need freezing. So, the interface of research option, the freezing and what we do with it – I am very keen on getting to that sooner than 2040. So, I am particularly interested in GNWT's comment of if there is a solution emerging prior to 20 years, then maybe look at integration sooner. I guess that would bring a whole lot more comfort to me if we could look at integration sooner than the 20-year review whenever that is.

David: Thanks. We do have a Manager of Integration here with us, do we not? There you go. We will park that for whatever the timing of that will be, but probably sooner rather than later I guess. Ben?

Ben: I am just thinking about the next Semi-Annual Meeting. Do we want to have that discussion before the next Semi-Annual Meeting just as a focused discussion just on this one topic? We could possibly do that in the spring? I know the Project is starting to get busy at that time. Maybe what I will do is canvas everybody and just have a discussion on when we could actually hold that meeting and then what resources will be needed for that meeting to review. Does that sound good?

David: Go ahead, Shelagh.

Shelagh: I am just wondering, does it need to be a discussion at a GMOB organized meeting? Could it not be a discussion at a kind of monthly or whatever working group meeting with the Project Team? Could it not be an agenda item then? It does not need to be in the next meeting, but it would be sooner than 6 months from now, I imagine.

David: I guess I don't see it as that difficult a decision to make. It's just aligning the stars. Try to do it at a time that makes most sense. There is not a hard and fast definition of what 20 years is, although there is a definition of what 20 years is.

Ken: It would be most logical to get feedback from the Board on their thinking. They might say whatever you guys think, or they might have some very specific thoughts on that. I would think that would be something to do.

David: It would be easy enough to just talk to Alan Ehrlich and get his recollection, so you can do that. So, GMOB will take that on and see what Alan has to say about it. William do you have anything? No, okay. Marc Lange, you are good?

Marc L: I am good. Thank you for organizing this.

David: Are there any final questions for Marc before we cut him loose?

Ben: It is just a comment, Marc, in case you did not hear from us anecdotally about some of the feedback from the research meeting. I talked to a couple of people, and they were very excited about the meeting. They were very thankful for it. Some were even breathing a sigh of relief that the whole concept of a permanent solution is being sought and that research is being undertaken. There was some very positive feedback from the public on that meeting.

Marc L: Fantastic. It was a huge group effort, from Ben, to Fuse, to our facilitator, and obviously the researchers. If anybody has feedback from that initiative, we are looking to improve, so provide it us. Thanks.

David: Thanks, Marc.

Candace?

Update from the Government of Canada, Part 2

Candace: Thanks. Ben, can you move back one slide? I will just start with DFO. I will start off with the DFO Fisheries Act Authorization process. We did talk about it a bit today. We have done a lot of pre-engagement before submitting our application. That was the Aquatic Advisory Committee, and that started in September 2020. We did a pre-engagement on our draft application, so that is where we sent it out to all of the working group and the AAC members to receive written comments. We responded to those comments and included that with our final application to DFO.

As part of the procedure, we have to submit a request for review to DFO. That is the first step in their process, and that sort of opens up the application with them. You need to do that before you actually submit an application, because they confirm at that point that yes, you are going to need your Fisheries Act Authorization to do your work.

We submitted our application in March 2023. About a month later, DFO confirmed that our application was complete. With that completeness check, they started their consultation process. Normally, they would have 90-day review process after you submit your application, but because they have started consultation, they actually paused their review process. That is actually the step we are in right now. Everything has been paused since April 2023 while DFO carries out their consultation.

Like we heard today, meetings have happened with YKDFN and the North Slave Métis Alliance. They have also had correspondence with the Tl'chô government who did not request any further meetings. Once that confirmation, that consultation is complete and is done, they will resume the review process.

In the meantime, they have given us a working draft of the FAA, which we have looked at. To give you some context, it looks a little bit like our water license or land use permit in that it is a framework for how we will carry out our project. It really focuses on us implementing the project the way we laid it out in our application. So, most of the details are on how we will do the work, and what mitigation and monitoring will do is all in the application.

The FAA supports that, and then they will issue the Fisheries Act Authorization soon hopefully. Once we have it in hand, we will have submittals, and there will be more work. Those are the steps, and I did run this by DFO before bringing it just so it is accurate. If there are any questions on that one, you can jump in. Otherwise, I will move on to Transport Canada.

For Transport Canada, we require Navigable Waters Protection Permits. This is for doing any work in the water that interferes with navigation. We actually got some changes in our interpretation from Transport Canada in 2023. Originally, they told us the water treatment plant outfall did not trigger an application with them, but then changed their mind because the gabion mats are considered erosion protection, and that does trigger.

So, we have been working on our application and getting all the details they need to carry out that work. That is happening this summer. That application is going in right away. It will go into a 30-day public review process, and it will be posted. Transport Canada has their own public registry, and the last time we submitted an application, we just shared that link with our working group, and that is how we let people know that review was happening, and we will do the same thing.

We have submitted other applications for the near shore and fore shore covers, as well as Baker Creek Reach 0. That was back in 2023. We did receive comments from the Great Slave Sailing Club. This winter, Transport Canada actually came up to site to do a site tour, and we managed to bring them into a meeting with the Sailing Club, the Yacht Club, and even the Coast Guard Auxiliary joined to talk about what their permitting process does.

They gave us a lot of information on what we are allowed to suggest in our application. We are taking that feedback, and the applications are on pause right now while we talk about our strategy about how to resubmit. So, we may resubmit them in a different format, or we may have to do additional applications about our construction methodology, because most of the concerns we heard were not necessarily with the planned outcome of our work but how we would do the work.

Exclusion areas were actually the most contentious part of that, but we all learned quite a bit from Transport about what we can and cannot request in terms of space in the water. Knowing now that everyone has the right to use the water, we are looking at how to restrict our footprint in the water while we do work as much as possible. That is Transport Canada. We will likely have multiple applications to them as we progress through the work.

Then Marc, you touched on the AEMP or the Aquatic Environment Monitoring Program. We have our current AEMP design plan approved, and that is for our effluent treatment plant discharge into Baker Creek. We know as we transition into the new water treatment plant that we have quite a bit of work to do with engagement and submissions to be allowed to move that discharge. So, we will be bringing back the Aquatics Advisory Committee, likely in June, to talk about the reference areas, our AEMP baseline report for Yellowknife Bay, and the reevaluation. Then hopefully in the fall, we will be ready to share and submit our AEMP design plan for Yellowknife Bay, or for the new water treatment plant.

Those are the more detailed processes I wanted to share with you. There are a lot of dates, and that is all in the slides if you want to look at them. If there are questions later, then that is okay too.

David: Great. Are there any questions now from anyone? Go ahead.

Marc L: I have a just a quick one. On the DFO timeline there, you are showing a very linear path where DFO is still at engagement. From experience, the drafting of the FAA and then the issuance and signing by the Minister or some executive also takes a fair bit of time. So, I would suggest you ask DFO to start drafting now and make some estimates and clarifications on signoff, just so you know how long that next step is going to take. I think I heard Natalie say earlier, spring is when you want to do some work, in the water I assume. That is getting pretty darn close.

Candace: I agree that we do not have a lot of time. Like I said, we have seen the working draft from DFO of the Fisheries Act Authorization. The next step would be for them to do their internal approval process.

David: Ben?

Ben: I have just a general question. It sounds like this has been a little bit of a learning experience, so I am just wondering if any of this comes as a surprise to you, these

processes that have been placed upon the Project. That is number one. Number two, is there a backup plan in case these approvals do not come through in time? Is there a Scenario B?

Candace: I would say one of the biggest surprises was Transport Canada overturning their decisions that we had earlier, and that came with the change of person we were working with. I don't know if it was lack of experience from the previous person, or I don't know why we had that change. That was a bit tougher to navigate.

With the DFO process, I think we had always anticipated it would be quite a long process, so we worked pretty hard to facilitate meetings. For example, the YKDFN meeting was led by the Project, and we brought DFO in. It was led in terms of we had already planned to have an Aquatics meeting with YKDFN, and we brought DFO to that meeting so that they could carry out their engagement. Obviously, YKDFN did all the work to host that meeting.

I think those were probably our Plan B. I mean I have always got something else on the go, but I think this is our best path forward today. The way that you can navigate the DFO permit, I guess, would be to pull smaller pieces out that are more time sensitive and apply for those separately. But, if we pull anything out of the application at this point, it creates probably extra work to get the actual FAA approved. So, we have made the decision to try and get this approved now and not try to carve off pieces.

Update from the Other GMOB Directors

David: Thanks, Candace. In the interest of time, I am going to move on, because it is already 3:30, and we have not had presentations except for Marc Lange from the Board yet. Ben. Administration.

Ben: Yes, so the Semi-Annual Report of Activities is wrapped up in the Annual Report of Activities that you saw this morning. What I would have to say is that a lot of effort has been put into the research program since the spring, especially with the movement of the samples to SGS Laboratories in Ontario. So, thanks to the Project for being extremely communicative and doing the enormous amount of work that they did.

The comment from SGS when they received the shipment is it was the cleanest shipment in sixteen years that they had ever seen shipped from a contaminated site. They literally said this is a textbook way it should be done. They took lots of photographs of it, because they could not believe how clean it arrived.

They will be managing that sample as long as the research program continues. We have a five-year contract with them and potentially a 20-year contract to be extended in five-year segments. Just to let you know, all of those samples will be catalogued, and they will be managing the shipment of all those samples to the research teams all across the

board. Kudos for the Project Team for doing that, and it was a great lesson for GMOB in how to get that done. Just to let you know.

The other thing about the research program that I have to tell you is two unsolicited proposals came before the Board. One of them is what is called the Yakum Proposal. The Yakum proposal is associated with Queen's University. The Board submitted that application twice to the expert panel. The expert panel came back, and adjustments were made. The Board approved going forward with that. So, there is the potential for a new program to be added to the seven that we have already, but that has to be negotiated with Queen's University, and we will see where that goes.

The second one is a new program out of the University of British Columbia that is asking for a sample set, taking arsenic trioxide and seeing whether or not arsenic can actually be pulled from it, purified, and turned into an arsenic metal. The UBC team is just looking for a sample. They are going to cover all the costs of the research in that regard. I am going to be meeting with them not next week but the week after that just to be able to go over that proposal with them.

Just to let you know that the research program is taking over now a lot of time, administrative time, and it is increasing. We have seen a lot of people coming in. Paul has been a godsend, continues to be a godsend in terms of his reviews and also his assistance. The contractors we are working with are first rate, and so it goes.

We had a lot of meetings this year. Almost a 150 meetings. That, in a given year for a part-time Board with only one and a quarter staff, is an enormous amount of work on top of all the reviews that have been done. So, thank you very much for everybody else's cooperation as far as the Parties are concerned. It's good to drop in to people and have conversations and also take calls, etcetera, etcetera.

For the public, especially in terms of the research program, we have seen the numbers increase of people dropping in and feeling comfortable to come in and ask questions. How is the Project going? How is the research project going, etcetera. That is my report.

David: Thanks, Ben. Are there any questions for Ben? Natalie?

Natalie: Thank you. We did have a couple of requests regarding the samples, Ben. I will follow-up with an email, but I just wanted to see if there was a possibility here. The first request was to see any of the raw data coming from the arsenic trioxide research. We don't know exactly what will be analyzed, but we do have a number of people that are looking for like moisture contents. Any results at all could be useful. People are looking and hoping we can get that data as it comes on some set timeframe.

The other thing is the contractor had a lot of challenges during the extraction in terms of differentiating the trioxide dust from the paste backfill. They would love to know as it goes along if the assumptions were correct when they logged the data. Was their quality control good, bad? They would like some feedback on lessons learned for that,

because they had never done this before. Then any other aspects of data or results would be helpful as well, and I will follow up with an email on that. Thank you.

Ben: Thank you, Natalie. For sure, we will follow-up on those requests, and any sort of feedback loop we have would benefit us both. Thank you.

David: Are there any other questions, comments? Good. Thanks, Ben. Thanks for being brief as well. Mark Palmer?

Mark P: Alright. I will be brief too. It was great to see this year that the meeting started in person again. For me, it was great to get up there for the site tour in July. I had not been onsite for many years, so that was really, really good and was well done. The tour was very well done.

For me, this year and next year, my key focus is on socio-economics, supporting Graeme, and mostly on the procurement side of things: attending the working group meetings and general reviews like we all do. I will just keep it to that. It is going to be the same next year. Hopefully, we will have some more in-person meetings. Oh yeah, I think I am 60 degrees warmer than you guys.

William: I don't want to hear it.

David: Yeah, thanks very much for that.

Male? Is that Fahrenheit or Celsius?

David: Yeah, not happy about that one, Mark.

Mark P: I thought I had to mention it.

David: Yeah, I am sure you did. Are there any questions other than weather-related questions of Mark?

Okay, thank you. Ken Froese?

Ken F: I was busy on a chat on the line here asking where paste backfill actually exists around the arsenic chambers.

Okay, for my update, a number of people have talked about YKHEMP already. That has been the primary focus of human health-related activities this year. One thing I will fill in the group about came up in September during one of the YKHEMP meetings. It was a question of whether the fires in the area and intensive smoke may have caused an increase in the arsenic concentration in the air particulates and stuff like that, and how to analyze for that. Whether to try and capture that in the YKHEMP samples or whether to develop a different study in conjunction with NWT Health to look at that kind of thing. That was discussed briefly.

The subsequent air samples from the perimeter of the site and Niven Lake and stuff like that, over the next couple of months indicated arsenic was not elevated in the particulates. That was a good thing, so arsenic was not being liberated or emitted from arsenic in the soil, in the surrounding area, or something that might have been in the trees that would then be associated with smoke particulates that come out. That was a good news story in terms of arsenic.

We all know that there are many other contaminants including PAHs and things like that that arise from major smoke like that. That is another issue altogether, and I think NWT Health was certainly interested in setting up a different type of study if there is another serious fire in the coming seasons. I think the U of Ottawa group or HEMP was interested in further discussion with GNWT on that and taking that and looking at some pre-discussions of how maybe to set up so that they would be ready for something should another fire occur.

We have already talked about a couple of the issues with YKHEMP with the Acute Arsenic Assessment. There are two things I would like to bring up with those once again. With the Acute Arsenic Assessment, Natalie, one of my main concerns that I was trying to get at before was how it is referred to in the 2022 Annual Report. I had that pulled up here. Just as the Project Team will complete the second draft version of the Acute Health Risk Assessment in '23-'24, which will address review comments.

I think because that report, your 2022 report, came out very close to the end of 2023, we already know what you did in 2023 when you wrote the 2022 report. So, that statement seems to me, it is backtracking too far in saying what you were hoping to achieve, but you know that you did not achieve that. I am a bit discouraged by that kind of reporting. I think that was, in part, what I was trying to get at. There was not a second draft report that we could respond to.

The first draft report was simply a Power Point presentation, and I don't know how many groups or people actually provided commentary on that, because it is not something that one can actually review. I will give you a chance to respond to that if you would like to.

Natalie:

Yes, sure. Our apologies if our report was misleading. That certainly was not our intention. When we presented the draft reports in the October working group, that was our intention. We obviously misrepresented that. Just checking back on my notes, we would never send a report, a draft report from our consultants directly out, because we cannot ask them to change it. They are consultants. They are the expert opinion. We would not take feedback on that, so that is why we presented the results of that at the working group for incorporation into the final that came the following March. So, my apologies if we were misleading in that.

But yes, we did incorporate the comments we received in the October working group into the final version where appropriate and where we could. Like we cannot ask our

consultant to change their opinions or actual data, but if there were mistakes or things that were misleading, absolutely. I hope that helps.

Ken F: I think because the report comes out, the Project Team report, the GMRP report comes out as a public document, when others who have not been part of the dialogue or discussion read that then they say oh well, people had a chance to review or respond to this, when in actual fact we did not. So, that is, in part, where my frustration lies.

Natalie: Thank you. We will be very clear to be careful on that wording going forward and not make that mistake again.

Ken F: Thank you. In terms of the YKHEMP and the concern about YKDFN, it is always a challenge to discuss some of these things. When I was made aware in, I believe it was the September YKHEMP meeting, that YKDFN had not been participating in the sample collection for this round of the samples, it was disconcerting for me. It brought up the issues of YKDFN pulling out of the Stress Study as well.

It leads back to some of the comments that I drafted for our last Annual Report on addressing these things through both reconciliation and through designing the studies and working with YKDFN or any Indigenous group on how we work on these studies. The study teams, U of Ottawa for YKHEMP and Wilfrid Laurier for the Stress Study, were extremely deliberate in using OCAP principles and community-based research guidelines and worked in very close partnership with YKDFN on designing these things and building in data sharing agreements and data ownership. When those are cited as the reasons for YKDFN not taking part further on in the study, it is frustrating. We need to learn how to approach that, both from a researcher perspective as well as from a community engagement perspective. How do we continue to do these projects and ensure that we are continually meeting the needs of YKDFN or NSMA?

William, I am not pointing this at you personally. I pointed this at YKDFN. I understand you said you were not up to date on the YKHEMP process, because that is a different department. Perhaps that is one of the challenges that I simply do not understand. If you would like to respond, please feel free. If not, that is fine as well.

William: Yeah, when it comes to the YKHEMP study, like I said, I was not aware that we were not participating in it, just because that is a different department. I will look into that and see what is going on there.

When it comes to the Stress Study, it was my understanding, and again this is a different department so take this as you will, but it is my understanding that study would have put a risk on YKDFN. We were not willing to accept that risk, and so I am not sure what exactly you are getting at when you mention that we were citing the OCAP policy, but nonetheless, it is my understanding that there was risk involved with participating in that study, and we did not want to go ahead with that risk.

Again, I will look into the YKHEMP study, because I was a major part of that back in 2017. I am a little bit disappointed to hear that we are not participating in that, so I will check in with Jennifer and get back to the group.

Ken F: I think in terms of the Stress Study, the risk that I understand were identified were things that the study team had worked very, very much so with the Yellowknives Dene on in terms of data ownership, study ownership. Those are some of the things that were identified in the letter that was sent to the Project Team that need to be pulled out of the study.

I will not rehash the things. There was a fairly broad discussion through the Stress Study Advisory Committee, the Technical Advisory Committee on that. If you would like to, I know you were not in some of those discussions. There are issues here that are challenging to discuss from Red Deer to Yellowknife. I think my big concern is how we continue to move forward in projects and make sure that we are addressing the concerns before they come up, before they result in the study either not proceeding or in needing changes to the study so it can continue.

David: Ken, with all due respect, we are running out of time. William has to leave in 10 minutes.

Ken F: Yep, that is all for my update.

David: Okay, great. Thank you very much. Are there any questions for Ken?

(Pause)

Okay, Ken Hall?

Ken H: I have already taken up a lot of your time. I just have a couple of things to mention, updates on meetings that were held this past year since we met last June. One was Ben and I went to the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board and essentially gave them a primer on who we were and what we have been doing. In particular, we highlighted Measures 6 and 10 and our thoughts on that. I don't think we have heard anything back from them. That is what we are doing and where we are at.

The other one was a meeting with some local contractors, some smaller contractors. We met with them and had some discussions about some of the issues they were concerned about regarding procuring work out at the site. That report is posted on our website, the results of that survey.

The last thing is if you are digging around in the lake around the old pump house corner putting in the outfall, be careful. There is anecdotal information that there is a cylinder of chlorine gas that was lost off the pump house dock years ago and never recovered. So, keep your metal detector on.

David: Alright. Thanks, Ken. Candace?

Candace: Yes, that is identified on our plans.

David: Erika?

Erika: Hey Ken, thanks. Ken, is that the procurement report? The title of that report is Procurement Reporting or something like that. Anyway, it does not matter. I guess my question is, are you able to elaborate how many contractors you interviewed and who they might be? Are they currently working onsite? Thanks.

Ken H: How do I answer this without breaking confidence? No names are included in the report. That was anonymity that was given to them so that they would have free and open discussion. There were five contractors, and four conducted follow-up interviews with our consultant who did the report for us. It is a small number of contractors. It does not speak on behalf of all small contractors, but sort of a section of some of the people that are working out there. Some of them had work out there, others not.

Erika: Thank you.

David: Okay. Graeme?

Graeme: People need to be woken up, so I get to go last. This is why. Oh, Paul gets to go last. Sorry, Paul. I will wake them up for you.

So, the first six months of 2023 were all guns were blazing. We did lots of work in pleading and publishing our work under the economic effects. We have completed the model, the economic impact model with new data. We presented it to the Project and then to the Parties. We met with the Standing Committee with the politicians. As a result of that, there was a lot of interest on the Project economics, on the business, on the flow of money.

Then it was July. Everybody went on holiday. The town burned, and we have not really gotten back to it. There is a bit of an opportunity lost there unfortunately that we are hoping to re-invigorate in the coming months. We have been discussing ways to do that. I think that our experience with the science discussions suggested that maybe the community is more interested in some of the things going on at Giant Mine than we had anticipated. We are looking at maybe giving the public an opportunity to hear about the economics of Giant Mine.

Otherwise, if I have a particular focus for 2024 in addition to updating and trying to bring some life back into that discussion that was there previously, we are trying to understand or really give second thought to the way economic results from this Project are being discussed and presented, such that people can understand them better. It is a \$4 billion dollar project, and it was shocking to me with the recent election how little attention the Project got from any of the wannabe politicians, to the point where I

thought hmmm, it is really quite odd that no one is interested in the economy anymore apparently.

I think a part of that work falls on us to do a better job, maybe just in the way we communicate and maybe just being a bit more open with the information that we are collecting. So anyway, in the coming months, we are going to give that a lot of thought and hopefully advance just the communication of the economic effects better. Thank you.

David: Thank you, Graeme. Comments or questions? Shelagh?

Shelagh: Just a very quick one that you may wish to follow-up now with the new government and make that presentation again to set the stage, whether it could be a caucus or one of the committees.

David: Okay. No more questions for Graeme?

Paul, you have a summary on the regulatory stuff.

Paul: There is not a whole lot I guess to add or to say. There have been a number of reviews out over the course of the year. GMOB has participated in all of them with comments from myself as well as other directors, and those with expertise, we have also retained additional outside help as required. I expect us to continue doing that through 2024.

David: Thanks, Paul. Just in the Annual Report of Activities, there is a list on the first page of all the reports, document reviews that have been done. Most have been led by Paul and supported by some of the others on the team. If there are any questions about those, Paul is the best guy to ask. Are there any questions or comments for Paul?

Reconciliation Issues & Actions

David: Okay, so the last point on the agenda is reconciliation issues and actions. It has always been a bit of a challenge for GMOB to figure out what its role is with respect to reconciliation. We are certainly strong proponents of the two governments and the Indigenous governments getting together and resolving their issues and working out compensation questions and so on, but I would like to get some feedback, now or later, particularly from the Yellowknives and the North Slave Métis about whether there are things GMOB could be doing that would be more helpful in that broad, sometimes nebulous area of reconciliation, and for many of the other Parties to the Agreement as well.

We will continue to support where we can the activities that help to heal some of the wounds and help to enable folks to move forward in better partnership to overcome the mistakes of the past and try not to repeat them in the future. At least we can make new mistakes, if not no mistakes. It is unlikely that we will make no mistakes.

I will just throw it out there, thoughts or comments now or later, just to help us do our job better where we can. I know it is a broad request of folks. Put some thought in it from time to time, and maybe at our next meeting for sure, we can follow-up in a little bit more detail of how we can be more helpful in trying to promote better relations. Ben, I don't know if you have anything to add to that. Erika?

Erika: Yeah, I have been thinking about this too. In these meetings, what we have done is always report on what we have been doing, but I wonder if there is opportunity to have a meeting in the future where us as settlers, even having folks who are Indigenous and be part of this, I even struggle knowing how to have that discussion.

I just wonder if it is worth, as a group, to have some focused meetings or someone guiding us through some educational information. Even this week, I have been educated about some of the terminology that I have used with Indigenous colleagues that could be triggering that I had no idea about. So, I am grateful for that teaching. I am just wondering if we could just push ourselves to work together a little bit more to just think about what reconciliation is or could we learn more. Could we have someone walk us through some sort of, I don't know, something. Anyway, thank you.

David: Thank you. I think that is a really good idea to have a focused session, a facilitated session perhaps. I don't know. I kind of defer to William and Marc on that topic. Think about it. Think about maybe a meeting that would help us do our job better in that particular area. I mean, I think we are all good pretty much on all the technical stuff. Engagement is a challenge. Communication is a challenge, but reconciliation is a big one. It is part of the fabric, but I am not quite sure what the quilt looks like. Maybe we can get some help there. Natalie, any thoughts?

Natalie: No, just that I am in agreement that we could do that. When we had talked about this beforehand, I did just want to report on a couple of things from the Project's perspective. I think I have reported on this in the past, but all federal employees are required to do 15 hours every year of Indigenous cultural competency training. That still goes on. Of course, they are encouraged to do more, but that is a minimum mandatory for all Giant Mine Remediation Project workers, all federal employees.

One item that we have done this year...We keep trying to think what more can we do, right? What more can we do? This year, I wanted to report that the Northwest headframe, formally called the Akaitcho headframe – we obviously changed the name based on the request from the Yellowknives. A number of years ago, quite a while ago, a lot of you might not remember, but the Yellowknives hired a landscape architect, and one of the requests from the Yellowknives was to save the Northwest headframe for future use in some sort of monument or to-be-decided. That was the vision at the time. It had not been decided.

So, I am happy to report, and Candace was happy to remind me that we are planning to take that headframe down. It is in the specs. We have included in it a very detailed

dismantling and labeling so it can be saved for future use. So, we do listen. Sometimes it takes a long time to get to it, but we have that in our plans now, and we have not forgotten that request.

That was something that we think we have taken a step. I do not know how big a step, but at least it is a step to save the headframe so it can be used based on whatever is determined. There is no rush obviously. It is not even down yet, but it will be available for future use through consultation with the Yellowknives and others as well. It was the Yellowknives who specifically requested that. Thank you.

Ken H: I am glad to hear that, because it also has a great deal of meaning for me personally. It is a very positive perspective, and I would welcome working with the Yellowknives on how we can maybe collaborate on that. There is the other side of the story. When I heard it was coming down, it troubled me. Anyway, I won't get into it. It has a lot of personal meaning and a lot of positive meaning, and for me as well as family members and friends. So, I am pleased to hear that is a possibility. Maybe we can collaborate on that. Anyway, good news.

David: Okay, unless there is anything else from anybody?

Additional Items & Next Meeting

Geneva: I just have one comment. Shelagh mentioned earlier that the PCP Canada's submission was incorrectly marked. I did confirm with my PCP colleague who posted it. It was a system glitch and will be updated next week.

David: Some things can be done really quickly. Look out, Geneva is coming. Are there any concluding remarks from anyone?

I think we have reached the end of this meeting. At the next meeting, I assume we will canvas people and try to figure out what the best timing would be for it. It has been a long day. Thank you, all. I hope your homes are still warm when you get there. We will see you next time. Thanks again. Thanks to the folks on the Zoom call as well. Thanks for your patience.

Meeting Adjourned



Chair
Giant Mine Oversight Board

2024 05 31
Date

Motions

1. Approval of the Agenda

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

Seconded: W. Lines

Motion carried.

2. Approval of the GMOB Semi-Annual Verbatim Minutes of June 6, 2023

Motion: Moved: K. Hall moved approval of the GMOB Minutes, February 27, 2024, as amended.

Seconded: M. Palmer

Motion carried.

Action Items

1. **Action Item** GMRP to report back on the Climate Change comments submitted to the Project by the end of March 2024. (page 7)
2. **Action Item** GMOB to share the Giant Mine education material to date with Shelagh Montgomery. (page 11)
3. **Action Item** GMOB will be submit comments regarding the acute QRA. (page 23)
4. **Action Item** GMOB to ask MVEIRB about the 20-year review start date. This is to be shared with the Parties. (page 37)
5. **Action Item** GMOB to share future data on with the GMRP for the newly extracted samples re moisture content and integrity of the cement paste logging. (page 42)
6. **Action Item** YKDFN to report back to the Parties to the Environmental Agreement on the status of YKDFN with the YkHEMP program (page 45)
7. **Action Item** YKDFN and NSMA to recommend a possible facilitated reconciliation session for all members of the Parties to the Environmental Agreement. (page 48)