



Giant Mine Remediation Project

Giant Mine Working Group

MV2007L8-0031

14 August 2014 Meeting Summary

8 October 2014



Aboriginal Affairs and
Northern Development Canada

Affaires autochtones et
Développement du Nord Canada



Giant Mine Remediation Project

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 3

2. PRESENTATION 1: WETLAND PLANT COMMUNITY STRUCTURE IN BAKER CREEK (KEVIN STEVENS, WLU)..... 4

3. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS 5

 DISCUSSION OF MINUTES OF JULY 10 MEETING 5

 ACTION ITEMS FROM JULY 10 MEETING 6

4. PRESENTATION 2: UNDERSTANDING THE NATURE, EXTENT AND FATE OF LEGACY CONTAMINATION NEAR YELLOWKNIFE (MIKE PALMER, NWT CIMP)..... 7

5. PRESENTATION 3: URINE ANALYSIS (BRIAN MCGEE, SENES)..... 9

6. OTHER ISSUES.....12

5. NEXT MEETING13

APPENDIX A – WETLAND PLANT COMMUNITY STRUCTURE IN BAKER CREEK (PRESENTATION DECK).....14

APPENDIX B – UNDERSTANDING THE NATURE, EXTENT AND FATE OF LEGACY CONTAMINATION NEAR YELLOWKNIFE (PRESENTATION DECK)15

APPENDIX C – URINARY ARSENIC (PRESENTATION DECK).....16



Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada

Affaires autochtones et Développement du Nord Canada



Giant Mine Remediation Project

1. INTRODUCTION

The Giant Mine Remediation Project (GMRP) Team organized a meeting of the Giant Mine Working Group (GMWG, or simply WG). The meeting was held in the 6th floor Boardroom of Scotia Centre in Yellowknife, NT, and was scheduled from 9:00 am to 12:00 pm MT on August 14, 2014. The actual meeting time was from 9:00 am to 12:40 pm MT.

Meeting participants included members of the GMRP team, as well as representatives from the Interested Parties.

| Giant Mine Remediation Project Team | Team Member |
|--|---|
| Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC) | Jane Amphlett Craig Wells (Senior Project Director; on telephone) Katherine Ross (on telephone) |
| Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) | Linda Pickett (on telephone) Henry Westermann (on telephone) |
| Government of the Northwest Territories – Environment and Natural Resources (GNWT-ENR) | Erika Nyssonen |
| GMRP Interested Party | Representative |
| Environment Canada (EC) | Amy Sparks |
| City of Yellowknife (City) | Karin Kronstal |
| Alternatives North (AN) | Kevin O’Reilly |
| North Slave Metis Alliance (NSMA) | Matt Hoover |
| Yellowknives Dene First Nation (YKDFN) | Johanne Black Todd Slack (on telephone) |
| Other | Representative |
| Health Canada (HC) | Asish Mohapatra (on telephone) |
| Bill Slater Environmental Consulting | Bill Slater (on telephone for first half) Kim Winnicky (on telephone for second half) |
| NWT Cumulative Impact Monitoring Program | Mike Palmer (for presentation) |
| Wilfrid Laurier University | Dr. Kevin Stevens (for presentation) Kevin Maccoll (for presentation) Rebekah Hamp (for presentation) |
| SENES Consultants | Brian McGee (on telephone) |

*Notes were taken by David Finch, DPRA.



Giant Mine Remediation Project

OBJECTIVES

The intent of this meeting:

- To provide information on research on and off the lease
 - WLU – vegetation survey of Baker Creek
 - CIMP – legacy contamination near Yellowknife
 - Arcadis / SENES – Medical monitoring (urine analysis program)
- To provide an update on site activities.

MEETING MATERIALS (PROVIDED IN APPENDICES)

- Presentation 1: *Wetland Plant Community Structure in Baker Creek* (Kevin Stevens)
- Presentation 2: *Understanding the Nature, Extent and Fate of Legacy Contamination near Yellowknife* (Mike Palmer)
- Presentation 3: *Urinary Arsenic* (Brian McGee)

2. PRESENTATION 1: WETLAND PLANT COMMUNITY STRUCTURE IN BAKER CREEK (KEVIN STEVENS, WLU)

Erika introduced Dr. Kevin Stevens of Wilfrid Laurier University (WLU) and two of his graduate students, Kevin Maccoll and Rebeka Hamp. In 2010, GNWT entered into a 10-year partnership with WLU to identify and address research needs in GNWT departments. GNWT – Environment and Natural Resources (ENR) is funding part of Dr. Stevens' project to survey vegetation on and off the Giant Mine site.

Dr. Stevens defined wetlands as being any water-saturated vegetation area, rather than simply being marshes and swamps. Wetlands often mediate human development, and offer a window on environmental processes ranging from carbon storage, water purification, biodiversity, and cultural and economic activity. His research is on the relationship between wetland plant communities and anthropogenic factors, including water quality, water quantity and species composition. The WLU team is characterizing wetland plant populations along Baker Creek using field deployable assays, and specifically on the diversity and activity of soil microbes. They are sampling nine locations including some that coincide with extant SNP sites, with fieldwork expected to conclude during the week of August 18. The bioassay work will continue in the laboratory with data expected by the end of 2014, and written results by April 2015. The research will document the species currently present in the study area, not simply grasses and shrubs (which are frequently a limited focus of plant community research). Variation in distribution and responses to anthropogenic factors (i.e., contamination, remediation) will be analyzed, with an eye towards identifying species suitable for re-vegetation efforts. Data will be examined in conjunction with historical water and soil data.

Discussion





Giant Mine Remediation Project

- Dr. Stevens explained that southern wetlands are not suitable comparisons for the conditions in the study area.
- Kevin O'Reilly and Amy Sparks cautioned that the reference sites selected (i.e., Trappers Lake, Yellowknife River) may not be representative of conditions along Baker Creek.
- Dr. Stevens welcomed suggestions for future research locations, noting that the selection of reference sites was determined in part by previous research and the current EEM program.

See Appendix A for slides from the presentation.

3. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

DISCUSSION OF MINUTES OF JULY 10 MEETING

- Erika thought that the WG would just finalize the previous minutes at the meeting. Kevin shared this understanding.
- Erika suggested that perhaps a deadline be set for comments. A final version would be sent out just prior to the meeting for a final approval to occur in person.
- Kevin indicated satisfaction with the turnaround time on the meeting notes and that it would be great to receive a draft of the notes 1 - 2 weeks after the meeting.
- Bill had sent some emails on the work plan but there were no responses/comments received; perhaps the group is not clear on direction. Karin and Kevin both indicated that they did not realize that they were to comment. Bill noted he would call each individual party directly to discuss their input.

Asish noted that the teleconference line was very bad on July 10 and that he was not able to hear some discussions. He shared some additional information on the meeting summary and provided clarification on “application of bioavailability and bioaccessibility tools.” Likewise, the utility of arsenic speciation information in contaminated sites risk assessment depends upon it’s context. The speciation, types of soil, bioavailability can provide additional value to exposure estimates and further refine human health risk assessment.

Asish will continue to share update and information resources on arsenic and arsenic bioavailability. Several agencies in the USA are working on arsenic toxicology and arsenic bioavailability. (This is already highlighted to some extent in the footnote below).

- Amy and Jane also indicated that the notes did not give justice to a complex issue. Appropriate clarifications would be made to the July 10 summary notes after this meeting following direction from the working group.
- There was general assent from the working group that the summary notes can continue in their current format. Asish suggested that use of personal names might be bolstered by including the person’s affiliation. Kevin stated that it was probably fine as is, where affiliations may be



Giant Mine Remediation Project

indicated on the first mention of their name, though inclusion of affiliation may be inserted to emphasize the role or source of a statement.

ACTION ITEMS FROM JULY 10 MEETING

Jane ran through the status of action items declared at the previous meeting.

1. Jane will revisit with MVLWB the matter of incorporating high-level summaries of the worker human health monitoring program into LWB reports.

STATUS: Complete. Jane confirmed that the worker medical monitoring results will not be incorporated into LWB reports as Board staff indicated this is not within their mandate. Jane stated that the high level summary is currently being reviewed by the WSCC. The project is working with WSCC on producing monthly one-page summaries.

2. Jane will provide organizational chart reflecting new personnel

STATUS: In progress. Jane reported that staffing is constantly changing, but the best time to issue a new organizational chart will be in fall or winter.

3. Jane will send to the WG the three options for air quality reports.

STATUS: Complete. Jane sent out the options by email. She obtained some feedback from WG members. As roaster and site stabilization work is going into October, the air quality monitoring program will continue. The question is whether to change the reporting options now or delay the change. The Working Group members confirmed they supported changing the format immediately to a weekly summary and monthly detailed report. It was also confirmed that fewer tables and more graphs in the air quality reports would be best.

4. Erika will provide an update on highway schedule.

STATUS: Erika reported that chip sealing is complete on the section of Highway 4 adjacent to the mine.

5. Jane will share WG meeting summary notes with WG for review and the minutes will be approved at the next meeting.

STATUS: In progress. The minutes of the July 10 meeting were shared by email. Written feedback was received from some members, with others providing comments at this meeting. The July and August minutes will be finalized and approved at during the September meeting.

6. Katherine will confirm whether stabilization criteria were met at end of last drilling contract.

STATUS: Complete. Chris MacInnis responded to Todd via email. Email was distributed to the WG.

7. Karin will investigate permit variances for Erika in regards to the Niven Lake monitoring station.

STATUS: Complete. Information forwarded to Erika.

8. Erika will confirm sampling locations of Wilfrid Laurier researchers and share with WG.

STATUS: Complete. Information shared at this meeting during presentation #1. Further information may be obtained directly from Dr. Kevin Stevens.



Giant Mine Remediation Project

- 9. Jane committed to developing a collaborative risk assessment process in regards to soil sampling analysis in undisturbed areas of the lease.**

STATUS: In progress. Jane reported that more work is to follow.

- 10. Erika will send out revised closure objectives with WG for potential discussion at next meeting.**

STATUS: In progress. Erika reported that Tony Brown (SENES) has looked at the work but next steps are unclear. She offered to relay Tony's comments to the WG and possibly arrange a call.

- 11. Jane will communicate to WG the results of the investigation into the June 20, 2014 spill at the MSA.**

STATUS: In progress. Jane reported that results of the investigation into the spill would be available on August 29. Information will be available for the WG at the next meeting. Erika noted that the spill was listed on the spills list as being closed out. On a related note, Jen Potten (MVLWB) requested that spill reports go through MVLWB.

- 12. Jane and Erika will look into developing high-level summary work plans and/or contract schedules to inform Bill's work plan and identifying priorities for WG members.**

STATUS: In progress. Jane reported that the project is waiting for a decision on the EA to narrow down the scope. It may be possible to share a work plan with the WG within the next two months. Craig Wells (AANDC) explained that they were waiting on work plans from PWGSC, but the EA would help confirm some details. The major phases and activities are known, so that information can be shared for purposes of obtaining input. A summary table of some sort was suggested to provide.

- 13. Jane will obtain a report on the June 16 emergency drill held on site when it becomes available and share it with the WG.**

STATUS: In progress. If there is any documentation from the drill it will be distributed to the WG.

Kevin raised the issue of the commitment to develop a Standard Operating Procedure for dust suppression. Jane indicated that work on the document was continuing.

4. PRESENTATION 2: UNDERSTANDING THE NATURE, EXTENT AND FATE OF LEGACY CONTAMINATION NEAR YELLOWKNIFE (MIKE PALMER, NWT CIMP)

Mike Palmer (NWT CIMP) presented on historic contamination on and off the Giant Mine lease. Jane indicated that this research was outside the scope of the Giant Mine project, but the information was useful to have. Mike explained that comparatively few resources are available on contamination in areas around Giant Mine. A multidisciplinary research program is underway on the topic, involving CIMP as a coordinating body and with partners from NWT Geoscience, Queen's University, Carleton University, the University of Ottawa, the Geological Survey of Canada, and local communities. CIMP identifies pertinent northern research questions and approaches its partners to pursue and coordinate funded research opportunities. He discussed two major project streams, one funded directly through CIMP and the other





Giant Mine Remediation Project

recently funded through NSERC. He stated that the research group would be meeting at the end of August as preparation for a session at the Geoscience Forum in Yellowknife in November 2014.

Mike outlined the history of Giant Mine and noted that much of its associated contamination is quite old. He noted that arsenic occurs naturally in the environment, its toxicity and bioavailability depending on its form, its concentration, and the duration of exposure. The bulk of arsenic trioxide emissions occurred within the first 12 years of its operation (86% over the years 1949-1963). The Yellowknife Arsenic Soil Remediation Committee (YSARC) was established to address natural levels of arsenic in soil and to recommend guidelines for soil remediation. The listed remediation objectives for Yellowknife area soils ranged from 160 mg/kg in residential areas to 340 mg/kg in industrial areas.¹ GNWT has these guidelines scheduled for review in the next couple years.

The influence of Giant Mine extended beyond the lease boundary. In September 2012, CIMP projects sampled more than 60 lakes within 40 km of the roaster site. The resulting map of dissolved arsenic concentrations was similar to extant soil maps. However, for reasons unknown not all lakes near the roaster had high concentrations. 50% of sites within 10 km of the roaster exceed 25 µg/L, Health Canada recommended level for arsenic in drinking water. The question remains as to why they vary at all. This pattern is possibly geogenic (i.e., influenced by natural arsenic sources in the host bedrock), but work is ongoing to determine the nature of the variation. A number of variables exist. One possibility is differential concentration of arsenic due to run off in areas with high organic matter. Heather Jamieson's research is exploring lake sediment to determine its role as source or a receptacle of contamination and to characterize arsenic mobility in the water column.

CIMP hopes to define the spatial extent of influence of the Giant and Con properties, as well as the environmental factors that enter into this relationship. CIMP research on the topic falls into three broad themes: 1) the spatial extent of contamination; 2) the nature of the contamination (e.g., arsenic, antimony, mercury, PAHs); and 3) the behaviour of contaminants over time. Research projects have focused on contamination in lakes as well as soils, sediments and minerals. CIMP is exploring the areas off the Giant Mine lease where extensive peatlands and some permafrost zones are present. Students from University of Ottawa were present in the winter of 2013-14 to collect sediment cores from lakes in the Yellowknife area and examine mercury and PAH levels. Surface water and sediment sampling is occurring along the Yellowknife Greenstone Belt and close to Giant and Con mines. A map of sampling locations can be made available upon request.

Discussion

¹ Risklogic Scientific Services Ltd. (2002) *Determining Natural (Background) Arsenic Soil Concentrations in Yellowknife NWT, and Deriving Site-specific Human Health-based Remediation Objectives for Arsenic in the Yellowknife Area*. Final Report. Report submitted to Yellowknife Arsenic Soils Remediation Committee, April 2002.



Giant Mine Remediation Project

- Matt Hoover (NSMC) asked how lakes were selected for study. Mike explained that it varied, including proximity to Yellowknife (Frame Lake), commercial significance (Lower Martin Lake), and seasonal variability in conditions (Niven Lake). Others, like Batwing and Alexie Lakes, have been studied by DFO and have associated data.
- Asish Mohapatra (HC) asked about the relationship between baseline studies and human health risk assessments, for example in the timing and duration of exposure to contaminated water and sediments. Mike responded that remediation values may not necessarily represent regional baselines nor typical human activity in Yellowknife, such as duration of exposure to water. In both cases, an accurate understanding of local environmental variables would improve assessments in the region.
- Mike indicated that CIMP is also working with the Yellowknives Dene First Nation on sampling of birch sap, berries and medicinal plants for arsenic.
- Mike noted he is interested in meeting folks outside of the WG discussions on further aspects of the research studies. This presentation was intended as a meet and greet, and for information purposes. Not as a Project driven program.

See Appendix B for slides from the presentation.

5. PRESENTATION 3: URINE ANALYSIS (BRIAN MCGEE, ARCADIS / SENES)

Brian McGee (Arcadis / SENES Consultants) is a PhD toxicologist who explained the urinary arsenic testing done for the Giant Mine project. He explained the indices used to track arsenic exposure among workers. Workers at the roaster site have to undergo regular urine samples as part of the medical monitoring program. Results greater than 35 µg/L are reported to the Workers Safety Compensation Commission (WSCC). Workers who show elevated levels of arsenic cease working in high-risk areas of the roaster complex but may continue to work on site in low-risk areas.

The principal index is the biological exposure index (BEI). The BEI was established by the American Conference of Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH), a Non Governmental Organization (NGO) concerned with worker safety. He pointed out that ACGIH was not a regulator, nor was it associated with government or consensus groups. The BEI is based on a nd correlates to the threshold limit value (TLV) of 10 micrograms of arsenic per cubic metre (10 µg As/m³) in air. This TLV reflects an acceptable level of occupational arsenic exposure, shown to cause no adverse health effects to workers if they were to have breathed in this amount for an eight-hour period, everyday, over their entire career. This value is conservatively based on exposures of 200 µg As/m³ in air, which is the lowest level at which adverse effects were seen in smelter workers. Based on the TLV 10 ug As/m³, the BEI at the end of the workweek is calculated to be 35 micrograms of arsenic per litre of urine (35 µg As/L).

Brian cautioned that BEI should not be used in isolation, noting ACGIH's recommendation that determinations of worker safety should not be made on the basis of single specimens. He quoted the Canadian Health Measures Survey (CHMS) as observing only a small number of individuals (<5%) whose



Giant Mine Remediation Project

urinary arsenic values exceeded 35 µg As/L. Individual arsenic values differed significantly on the basis of diet and lifestyle. Factors that influence arsenic concentrations include consumption of seafood (fish, shellfish, mollusks), rice and seaweed, as well as smoking tobacco.

In the past, laboratory analysis of arsenic in urine was measured as total concentration. However, some forms of arsenic are of low to no toxicity, so looking at total concentrations is misleading. The BEI is based upon the total of inorganic arsenic species (iAs) like arsenate and arsenite, plus organic arsenic species monomethylarsonic acid (MMA) and dimethylarsinic acid (DMA). Brian noted that samples analyzed by different laboratories yielded different results depending on the methods used. Methods used by three laboratories to measure urinary arsenic in 2013 were reviewed and it was confirmed that Pac-Tox used appropriate and consistent methods to measure iAs, MMA and DMA concentrations.

In terms of potential worker exposures, incidental inhalation of arsenic-laden dust from the roaster complex was unlikely to result in urinary values in excess of 35 µg As/L. Atmospheric exposure would need to be for periods greater than an hour without a respirator. Physical contact with dust could lead to elevated urinary arsenic levels through ingestion or dermal absorption. However, such contacts were limited in frequency and duration, so unlikely to result in elevated arsenic levels.

Exceeding the BEI one or more times does not indicate that adverse effects will occur. Short-term spikes in arsenic concentration say little about long-term health. The 35 µg/L threshold appears reasonable in light of an overview of available research, and actually appears to be fairly conservative. In conclusion, Brian stated that best practices included following the SOP, maintaining appropriate hygiene practices to minimize dust exposure, and providing workers with counselling on dietary and lifestyle factors.

Discussion

- Asish Mohapatra (HC) asked how threshold limit values (TLV) were derived in 2001. Brian responded that it appeared speculative. The principal study referred to was Apostoli et al. (1999).² This study assessed biological indicators for monitoring the occupational exposure to inorganic arsenic (iAs) using a study of glass makers.
- Kevin O'Reilly (AN) asked about the range of cancers and the exposure sources investigated in the arsenic exposure literature. To this point, most discussions of arsenic-related risk seemed to focus on lung cancer rather than exposure through the nose, throat, digestive tract or skin as would be expected for residents of Yellowknife or workers at the site. Kevin indicated that research and studies from Bangladesh and Taiwan where arsenic is high in water should have been reviewed. Brian stated that these studies had not been reviewed for this task, although the drinking water studies formed the basis for risk assessment calculations for oral exposures

² Apostoli P., D. Bartoli, L. Alessio, and J.P. Buchet. (1999) Biological monitoring of occupational exposure to inorganic arsenic. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 56(12):825-32.



Giant Mine Remediation Project

throughout the project. Upon reflection, Brian states that the BEI is the level of arsenic in the urine associated with workplace air levels of 10 ug/m³ in a number of worker studies. The urinary levels of the workers in those studies were affected by all relevant exposure routes for those workers, including air, dust, or soil exposure to the nose and throat, dermal exposure, and incidental ingestion exposure from hand-to-mouth behavior. Hence, the exposure pathways identified by Kevin are not ignored in the derivation of the BEI. In addition, review of studies from areas like Bangladesh and Taiwan where drinking water levels of arsenic are high was not necessary to review the basis of the BEI and evaluate if fish ingestion affects urinary arsenic levels, and, if so, by how much.

- Asish said that he thought that the CHMS data was provincial and not territorial, and lacked samples from north of 60. Brian said that it should not affect the basic data, but the gap was interesting. Kevin O'Reilly suggested that Aboriginal health surveys might address the gap, but Brian noted that those studies recorded total arsenic concentrations with no speciation.
- Kristin Kronstal (CoY) asked if arsenic derived from food sources passed through without accumulating in the body. Brian explained that some does not totally pass through the body, but it is a far lesser risk than exposure to inorganic As. The principal issue with food-derived arsenic is that it confounds total arsenic concentration results.
- Amy Sparks (EC) noted that much of the data presented by Brian was for males. He replied that the differences between the sexes in the CHMS data were low. He also made the assumption that most workers at the roaster would fall into an adult male cohort. He could look into data on other cohorts, including women of reproductive age.
- Kevin asked who paid for the urine sampling and analysis. Jane indicated that this was the responsibility of the contractor, per the SOP. Brian's analysis was paid for by PWGSC. Kevin asked about the role of WSCC, to which Jane replied that as the regulator all test results from the site that exceeded the BEI were submitted to them. Kevin remained unclear over details of WSCC's role (e.g., laboratory standards, what happens to the data once collected, frequency of inspection, etc.).
- Kevin asked about the assumptions made regarding contact exposures, such as dermal absorption and transfer to the oral cavity and mucus membranes. Brian explained some of the basic assumptions, such as estimated frequency and duration of contact with potentially contaminated surfaces. Kevin indicated that he would like to see these broken down in detail. He asked if Parsons addresses these confounding factors with workers. Jane responded that they went through risk factors with workers whenever there was a recorded exceedance. Brian noted that the situation in 2013-14 was better than previously, with increased schedules of cleaning and more clean rooms between areas. Jane also noted that the lab reporting process had improved with improved turnaround times.
- Amy asked about the baseline sampling for workers. Jane indicated that workers had baseline samples taken at time of hire.



Giant Mine Remediation Project

- Kevin requested more information from WSCC on arsenic testing and site safety issues, possibly a presentation to the WG on what they have learned to date and what exactly their role is and will continue to be.
- Henry Westermann (PWGSC) explained the GMRP's interaction with WSCC. The project has facilitated discussion between WSCC and contractor. WSCC drove the process to use BEI instead of total arsenic concentration, with GMRP/PWGSC helping to define it in the absence of major precedent. WSCC does conduct inspections, and in his estimation have taken a conservative, low-risk approach to worker safety. The contractors move workers to areas of lower risk when their test results are greater than 35 µg As/L.
- Brian commented that the policy of removal is probably unnecessary but it is prudent.
- Kevin asked if a written report would come from Brian's work. Jane responded that some summaries were being prepared on the testing assumptions, cancer risk, etc. These memos were still in draft form. Kevin requested copies of the final product, which Jane said she would look into.

See Appendix C for slides from the presentation.

6. OTHER ISSUES

EA DECISION

Kevin voiced his frustration with the Minister's visit to Yellowknife the previous week and that he said nothing about the EA. The delay was holding up things and the amount of time being wasted was ridiculous. Craig and Jane indicated that they were unaware that the Minister was coming to town until he was here. The Minister said nothing about the EA during his visit that included a tour of the Giant Mine. The Project Team commiserated with the Parties in that they, too, are frustrated with the inability to move the Project forward.³

SITE UPDATE

Jane reported that during the week of the meeting, an interim underground stabilization contract was awarded to De'ton Cho Nahanni Construction which includes preparing tailings for backfilling underground areas. Its approximate value was \$11 million. The schedule has not been finalized but it is anticipated that work will begin mid-September. In the meantime, drilling continues on the site, with non-arsenic holes completed outside the 10 metre radius or an arsenic stope.

Kevin stated that he went on Buy and Sell and saw taxpayers paying \$2.4 million for shipping containers (242 containers). The water tight test was used, looking for pinholes inside the container – he expressed

³ Please note that the Minister's decision on the EA was released the day following this WG meeting, 15 August 2014. See <http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?nid=876209>; <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/feds-approve-giant-mine-cleanup-plan-1.2737861>.





Giant Mine Remediation Project

concern as the containers do not seem to be very water tight. Jane said that the shipping containers are in Yellowknife and are due to arrive on site this week (24 containers per week are scheduled). Kevin questioned the cost of each container, approximately \$100,000. Craig indicated that containers that meet specifications are difficult to get and that it took two rounds to ensure the specs were going to be met. Kevin stated that at least these containers are better than tarps and pallets.

Kevin then asked where the containers were going to go (presumably not underground) and for how long they were going to be used for storage. Jane said that the material will be placed within the freeze zone however the final method will be finalized during detailed design. He raised concerns about whether additional handling of the contaminated materials may be required and the length of time that the containers will be used, potentially 5-8 years given the need for further design work and water licencing, and whether the containers themselves will now need to be treated as contaminated waste.

AIR MONITORING STATION AT NIVEN

Regarding the air monitoring station at Niven Lake, process is underway regarding access and approval but no decisions have been made yet on how to dress it up (improve aesthetics), such as a mural. Meeting adjourned at 12:40 pm.

7. NEXT MEETING

The next WG meeting was proposed for September 18, 2014. However, the timing was not good for some members. Jane would canvas the WG members for an acceptable date.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Linda provide Site dust suppression SOPs.
2. Erika will look into next steps to address Tony Brown's comments on the revised closure objectives with WG.
3. Jane will communicate to WG the results of the investigation into the June 20, 2014 spill at the MSA.
4. Jane and Erika will continue to look into developing high-level summary work plans and/or contract schedules to inform Bill's work plan and identifying priorities for WG members.
5. Jane will obtain a report on the June 16 emergency drill held on site when it becomes available and share it with the WG.
6. Erika will ensure the running list of action items are included in the minutes.
7. Jane will look into sharing Brian McGee's memos with the WG once they are complete.
8. Bill Slater will make follow-up calls to WG members to discuss work plan for Technical Advisor during weeks of August 18 and 25.
9. Jane will pass on message to WSCC that WG would like to receive more information from them on health monitoring and their activities.



Giant Mine Remediation Project

APPENDIX A – WETLAND PLANT COMMUNITY STRUCTURE IN BAKER CREEK (PRESENTATION DECK)





Giant Mine Remediation Project

APPENDIX B – UNDERSTANDING THE NATURE, EXTENT AND FATE OF LEGACY CONTAMINATION NEAR YELLOWKNIFE (PRESENTATION DECK)





Giant Mine Remediation Project

APPENDIX C – URINARY ARSENIC (PRESENTATION DECK)

