MACKENZIE VALLEY LAND AND WATER BOARD

TECHNICAL SESSION

RE:

INAC - CARD TUNDRA TYPE A RENEWAL

Facilitator:

Rebecca Chouinard

HELD AT:

Yellowknife, NT

June 23, 2016

APPEARANCES

Rebecca Chouinard	)MVLWB Staff
Jen Potten	)
Shannon Allerston	)
Heather Scott	)
Tyree Mullaney	)
Rick Walbourne	)GNWT-ENR
Astrid Salomoh	) INAC - CARD
Joel Gowman	)
Murray Somers	)
Georgina Williston	) DFO
Morag MacPherson (by phone)	)
Shin Shiga	) NSMA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF INFORMATION REQUESTS

LIST OF INFORMATION REQUESTS (cont'd)

--- Upon commencing 9:00 a.m.

THE FACILITATOR: All right, everybody I think we are ready to get started. Good morning and thank you for coming. This is the INAC - CARD Tundra Type A Renewal technical session. So if you're in the wrong meeting now's your chance to escape.

My name is Rebecca Chouinard. I am the regulatory and technical director of the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board and I will be facilitating the session today.

I just want to remind everybody that this session is being recorded and, for that reason, if you could please state your name before you talk, the organization that you work with and please talk slowly. And I have this sign to wave around to remind you if you should forget.

Once the -- once the transcripts are recorded and reviewed we will be posting them on our public registry for future reference.

I'll quickly go over the emergency exits. They're located right outside of the door, follow the lighted signs if need be and you'll go down into the back alley and there's a designated muster point there.

Washrooms, keys are located, they're hanging on the wall as you go out the door. There are three (3) washrooms out the door and the keys open any of the washrooms.

We'll take breaks for refreshments. We have snacks and coffee coming. The first break at 10:30 roughly and they'll be one in the afternoon if we need that as well but note that lunch will not be provided.

There are copies of the agenda and the comments summary table located at the front of the -- at the side of the room and there are agendas also around the room if you don't have one of those.

There's also a sign-up sheet that's going around the room so if you could please make sure you sign the sign-up sheet before you leave today.

And with that we'll get right into the session here. The purpose of the session is just to try and resolve any issues that exist with the project prior to going into the public hearing. We hope to be as informal as possible and hope to resolve as many issues as we can. But just a reminder that there will be opportunities further down in the process to put additional questions forward or ask questions through the public hearing process.

So some quick background on the file. The application was deemed complete and sent for a review on May 18th, 2016. On June 6th comments were due on the application from reviewers. On June 10th proponent's responses were received and that brings us to today June 23rd, this technical session.

Some important dates that are coming up. We hope to have any Information Requests recorded and communicated today and the responses to these Information Requests will be due on June 28th.

The pre-hearing conference is scheduled for June 30th. We hope to have that agenda sent around later today or tomorrow at the latest.

Written interventions are due July 5th. The proponent's responses to interventions are due July 8th. The Intervenor public hearing presentations are due July 11th. The Proponent's presentations for the public hearing are due July 14th. And the public hearing is currently scheduled for July 28th.

So the agenda for today is broken into the main topics from reviewers' comments from the -- the first review. We've attempted to capture the number -- the associated number with a review comment for each topic, and we will be cross-referencing with the actual review table from the online review system.

There's also -- there will be an opportunity to talk about any of the -- any additional questions, concerns, issues under each section. And again, at the end, we have a catch-all 'Other' category for anything else that people want to bring up.

The Proponent, INAC-CARD, will begin first with an overview presentation of their application, and have topical presentations to lead us into each section of the agenda. And we will get to that in just one (1) moment.

Before we turn the floor over to the INAC-CARD folks, I would like to do a quick roundtable of introductions, starting perhaps on this side of the room.

MS. GEORGINA WILLISTON: Hi. Good morning. It's Georgina Williston, with Fisheries and Oceans Canada. My understanding is there's conference call capabilities also, so Morag McPherson should be on the phone. Thank you.

MS. ASTRID SALOMOH: Hi, I'm Astrid Salomoh. I'm assistant -- admin assistant on -- with INAC.

MS. JEN POTTEN: Hi. Jen Potten, with the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board, Board

staff.

MS. SHANNON ALLERSTON: And I'm also Board staff with the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board, Shannon Allerston.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: I'm Heather Scott, Board staff, with the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board.

THE FACILITATOR: Rebecca Chouinard, with the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board.

MS. TYREE MULLANEY: Tyree Mullaney, Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board staff.

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Rick Walbourne, ENR, Water Resources Division.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, with INAC-CARD, sitting in the Proponent's seat today.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman. I'm the project manager for the Tundra Mine Project with INAC-CARD.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. And we'll turn it over to the phone.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

THE FACILITATOR: It's Rebecca here. Okay. Thank you, everybody. That captures -- sorry,

about that. There were -- there was a technical delay. Morag, do you mind introducing yourself once again?

MS. MORAG MCPHERSON (by phone): (SOUND TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES).

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Perfect. It's Rebecca here again. That's everybody in the room and everybody online. So with that, I will turn the floor over to Murray and Joel for their presentation.

PRESENTATION BY INAC-CARD:

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. I just wanted to thank the Board for the opportunity to provide a bit of a summary of -- of what we've done to date and what we're planning on -- on accomplishing under this renewed authorization, and look forward to any of your questions as we go.

So Murray's put together a fairly comprehensive presentation, and we look forward to your thoughts. So thanks for the opportunity.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, with INAC. Yeah, I'll walk everybody through the presentation here, and -- and you're going to see probably some content within the initial kind of overview that will be addressed later on in the

individual topics that we've set out in the agenda already.

But -- but just know that even though I'm -- I'm speaking to them a little bit, or some of them anyway, in the -- in the general overview, that there will be a dedicated section to them later on, okay?

Great. And do I have to stay here for the microphone?

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: You can have this one if you want.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Okay. All right. Thank you. All right. So this -- a lot of this is not going to be new information for a lot of you. We've already had the application in, and this is a continuation of a project that's been going on since 2010. And it's been permitted under a water licence and land use permit through the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board already.

So, essentially, what has happened is our operations require a couple more years to finish remediation of the Tundra Mine site, but our current land use permit and water licence are expiring in December of this year. So -- so this application is to continue our work and finalize the program and

enter into an adaptive management and monitoring phase.

So continuation of the Tundra Mine Remediation Project. This quick outline is going to go over first, just an introduction for anybody who might not be terrifically familiar with the Tundra Mine Project.

I know quite a few of you have dealt with either the original application or -- or the amendment application back in 2013, but I'll go through it pretty -- pretty briefly, just so everybody is on the same page. Overview of what the Remediation Project is, particularly Phase II.

We'll go over our time line schedule for events. I won't deal with what's already happened. I'm just going to talk about what's happening now and into the future. And -- yeah. So overview of what's remaining and the adaptive management overview -- overview as well.

So here's where we're located. We're 240 kilometres northeast of Yellowknife. It's about an hour flight to get there, so not terribly far out from -- from us.

A little bit of history. So it was an underground gold mine, first staked in '45, had two

(2) stints of operation in '64 to '68, and then again in 1983 to 1987.

And in that second period there, the -- the workings weren't actually underground at Tundra. They were an adjacent mine called Salmita Mine, and the ore was brought over to the -- the processing plant here. And so all the tailings from the adjacent mine were actually deposited in those lakes that you see there in the background, Upper Pond and Lower Pond.

So in that photograph there, that is pretty much at the very infancy of Tundra Mine because at the end, those ponds here were totally filled with tailings, and the bulk of that pond in the background, the Lower Pond, were also filled with tailings.

It was purchased in 1992 by Royal Oaks, and they went into receivership in 1999. At that time, the site became the responsibility of the federal government or the Crown.

Here's what the site layout looks like from the air. At the north end there's the air strip, and about a 5-kilometre road down to the mill area which is where the camp is now. That is the Upper Pond I just showed you that was filled with tailings, and Lower Pond as well. So combined, those made

essentially the -- the historic tailings containment area, and -- and it was formerly Russell Lake.

Any questions on that? Okay.

So Phase II, over to you. Contaminants of concern when the assessment was done showed up to be arsenic-rich tailings, about 290,000 cubic metres. It was originally thought it was less, but once remediation started, we found a bit more, and that's the more accurate number there.

We had a pretty vast amount of arsenic-impacted tailings -- or tailings water, sorry, about 1.2 million cubic metres. And just to give you a sense of -- of how much that was, there'll be a photograph coming up showing you what that was -- looked like at its peak.

And I think, at its very maximum, they were about 7 centimetres -- 7 to 10 centimetres or so from breaching the -- the containment dams at that point in time when we took over.

We have potentially acid generating (PAG) rock on site, about 135,000 cub -- cubic metres. Again, potentially. There was none confirmed, but -- but there was some oxidation and what-not signs visible. So it was all -- all essentially considered potentially acid generating.

And we also have PHC, hydrocarbon-contaminated soil and waste rock on the site. Some situations, they're mixed together, and some situations, they're -- they're separate. But -- but, yeah, we have both.

And the technical objectives that came out of this -- of this assessment was to treat the PHC soils, consolidate the tailings and waste rock into the tailings containment area, construction of an engineered cap over the Tailings Containment Area, and treatment of the impacted water.

So here we are with a photograph of the site. This is pre-remediation, even pre-Phase I remediation, because in Phase I, the mine infrastructure that you see right there, all the buildings and what-not, that was dealt with. So all the physical kind of hazards on site were dealt with during Phase I; that was back in 2009.

And then -- and then after which we started Phase II, which was to deal with the technical components I just mentioned. But you can see in this photograph the state of the water back in the day.

So this is Upper Pond, pretty much full to capacity, and this is considered Lower Pond. This is the former -- former Russell Lake.

And you can kind of see in the photograph these lighter areas right there down this way. So that's actually the plume that came from the pipe that discharged the tailings slurry out into the ponds, right? So obviously the entire area that's submerged in water is impacted, the bulk of the tailings here at the south end.

And we're going to be talking about it later, so I'll just -- I'll just mention it. That's Mill Pond right here, okay? It's just right there adjacent, and -- and that's the East Upper Dam.

All right. So what have we done so far in Phase II? So under the current land use permit and water licence, we've actually treated and discharged a little bit over than 1.5 million cubic metres of the tailings-impacted water. That was successfully treated and discharged into Hambone Lake.

That's greater, you'll notice, than the one point two (1.2). We had said it impacted water that was originally on site, and that's because every year when you treat water, you've also got your freshet inputs that come in, right, so you have to add -- add those amounts on as well.

We have consolidated approximately 112,000 cubic metres of waste rock into the tailings

containment area, so that's about 80 percent complete. I think it's actually about -- a little bit more than that complete, but -- but that was the last number that I had.

And we've consolidated a vast majority of the tailings as well into the -- into the tailings containment area.

We've constructed a fair portion of the cap overtop of both consolidated tailings and waste rock. We've got 60 percent of the tailings containment area lined, so with a bituminous liner. It's an impervious liner. And a portion of that has the earth cover complete. So about 25 percent of that has -- has it complete. So roughly, we're about a third complete, the -- the cap.

West Lower Pond Borrow Area, that's the primary borrow area, or has been anyway so far in the operations. So it is hopefully at its pretty much max extent there right now.

And we have stockpiled material on site, all graded to -- to what we need. So we've got our Type A materials, Type E/F materials, and that's our rip-rap and everything. They're all -- most of it's sitting there in stockpiles ready to go.

So, yeah, as we say, mini -- minimal

future expansion is anticipated. It's possible we might need some, but numbers right now as they work out show that probably unlikely we'll need to expand that quarry any further.

And site stabilization. So we have several berms that were constructed throughout the site to assist with the water management. Essentially, it's to minimize contact with the residual tailings that are still on site.

So when our contractor left in 2014, there were partially constructed things. Like the cap was partially constructed, some areas were cleared of tailings but weren't separated from -- weren't -- didn't have a distinct separation from the exposed tailings that were still on site, and what-not.

So that's what these -- what I'm speaking about with these -- these berms that were constructed. They're -- they're there, and -- and I'll show you a -- some photographs of them and what-not of what they look like. And -- and they're working quite well to keep the, essentially, clean side clean and the dirty side dirty.

And -- yeah. And we've successfully treated 16,000 cubic metres of PHC contaminated soil and waste rock. Any of that material that contained

waste rock was treated and disposed underneath the liner, or within the TCA.

And the -- and we went through a process there with the Board last year or the year before where, if it was just soil, as long as it met the far shore criteria, then we can use it around site. But we haven't done that yet.

Oh, and one (1) last thing about PHCs is we've actually treated all PHC, historic PHC contaminated material on the site. And anything else that's being done is just little bits that have been spilled from equipment and that sort of thing during the remediation process. Okay.

So here is present state. This was taken in August 2014. It's changed a tiny bit from this. They -- they continued working past August obviously in 2014. They worked right into October, maybe even November -- no, October.

And -- and so this here is the capped portion of the TCA, of the tailings containment area. It's actually extended a bit further than what's shown in the photograph here, but -- but other than that, this is pretty much the -- the site.

So we had seen a photograph earlier that showed the tailings containment area. The two

(2) ponds were completely submerged in water. You can see here, this is the Lower Pond, this is Upper Pond, right? And this is obviously after successful water treatment.

So the 1.2 million cubes of original tailings-impacted water has been dealt with. And -- and afterwards, now we just deal with annual freshet inputs, right? So this would have been freshet water in here, and there would have been a bit probably gathered up in this end. But the water treatment plant had already been -- been done for this year, so that's why you're seeing very minimal amounts of water. So for most of the year now, it's pretty dry in there. Yeah. So that's that.

And this is going to be the tailings containment area, the footprint of it when we're all done. And we just need to line this part and cap, finish capping the whole thing with the earth cover.

Up here is the camp area, so that's where most of the original mine infrastructure was, was up in this area. But it's all gone now, Phase I, put into this landfill right there which is lined and capped. So that material was -- was dealt with a long time ago.

Most of the waste rock and PHC

contaminated material was here. That's where the tank farms were and what-not, the historic tank farms, and where a lot of the mining infrastructure was.

So all the pads from the mining infrastructure were built essentially on waste-rock pads, so that's where that was. But all that area's cleared now. This area out here is all cleared of tailings, and we're -- all tailings there, a portion up here.

This is the East Lower Dam. There's that portion of it remaining that still has a bit of tailings left in it. And all of Upper Dam -- or Upper Pond, sorry, has been cleared of tailings as well. And there's just a bit remaining as well in the East Upper Dam.

So East Upper Dam, East Lower Dam are pretty much the only two (2) areas left that still have tailings that haven't been consolidated already into the TCA.

Yeah, this is a bit of a conceptual drawing before we did the work, but currently on site, to keep water off of the exposed tailings which are here -- these are not exposed because they're lined and covered right now, but there still is exposed tailings here -- we actually constructed a berm that

goes from this point, which is a low point, all the way around here -- that's what this north berm is -- and then there's a channel running down this side.

So any water that flows in this way before it reaches the tailings will get diverted and into this cleared area. So there's no tailings up in this area, so it goes into the clean side, as we call it, or North Pond, okay?

Time line. So this is looking ahead pretty far, but pretty much to the end of the licence, or the renewed water -- water licence and land use permit. But currently, 2016, we're going through this process right now getting our -- our new land use permit and our renewed water licence.

And we're also going through the process with Public Works to contract -- to hire a new contractor to come in and finalize the work.

For those of you who don't know, since 2014 -- well, so, yeah, 2015 and 2016, currently -- we have been in care and maintenance mode at the site. So there's been no Phase II remediation work being done just while we set up the new contract. And we made a few design tweaks which I'll -- I'll touch on later. But, yeah, that's taking a bit of time. And so this winter road will have a new contractor going

back in to finalize Phase II.

2017, again, yeah, so contractor mobilization, so probably in February. Phase II remediation will require two (2) summers and will demob winter 2019. Might not be a complete demobilization for the adaptive management requirements afterwards, but -- but, yeah, there'll be a pretty substantial demob in 2019, which will pretty much mark the end of Phase II.

And then we're going to -- and then in 2019, we enter into the adaptive management phase, which is essentially short-term monitoring, five (5) year period, where we can kind of watch the site, continue to do the water quality monitoring, and make sure that our -- our remedial objectives are -- are being maintained by the structures and things that we've implemented on site. So we can, essentially, monitor geotechnically how stable the site is.

And these boxes are -- are hollow simply because in 2023 we'll have to start getting regulatory approvals again, which will be probably a Type B water licence and land use permit, so we can conduct the long-term monitoring program which is slated to start in 2024.

So this land use permit and water

licence that we're here to discuss today should expire in theory in seven (7) years, which will take us to 2023, which is that red line. So long-term monitoring will actually fall under probably a Type B water licence and land use permit.

All right. So what's remaining? Yeah, like I said, we're going to have to mobilize a new contractor next year in -- in February. We need to finish the water treatment which is just again treating the annual inputs from freshet every year.

So last year was 56,000 cubic metres. This year I think we're running around a hundred thousand (100,000), just, you know, difference in precipitation between years.

And quarry development reclamation. So I'd said that West Lower Pond had most of the material already excavated sitting in stockpiles. But we're going to be changing our focus a little bit because we need more granular fill, more like gravelly type fill from the esker near the airstrip.

And that's to build that erosion-resistant cap on top of the TCA. So -- so luckily that doesn't need to be screened or it doesn't need to be -- or unlikely will be anyway. It doesn't need to be crushed or anything like that, so it's a lot faster

process.

Dam removal. So we'll be removing what's remaining of East Lower Dam and removing the East Upper Dam. So that is where the Mill Pond drawdown comes in. It's for the removal of the East Upper Dam, so we'll talk about that a little bit later.

Consolidation of the final 5 percent of tailings and waste rock. I think that number's a lot more correct. There's about 5 percent remaining because it's just that one (1) dam, East Upper Dam, and a little bit left of East Lower Dam. So -- in the other slide, I think it had said that we had about 20 percent left, but it's probably closer to five (5) actually.

We need to finish the cap on top of the TCA. We need to finalize the channels. So some of the channels on site that are going to convey water through the site at the end of the project, some of them are partially constructed, majority constructed, and -- and others are not. So we'll get into that a little bit later as well, so we need to finalize these.

And then obviously site stabilization. We need to make sure we're going to leave the place in

a nice stable state.

Install our long-term monitoring equipment. That's primarily related to the cap so we can monitor how the cap is functioning. And -- and it might require some others, but that's primarily what I'm talking about there.

And -- and then finally, demobilization of some equipment, supplies, waste in 2019.

So moving from remediation phase to adaptive management phase, this was something that was brought up in the review comments originally from the application.

I've spoken to the Board a little bit about it already but, essentially, making that transition from the remediation phase into the adaptive management phase, we sort of have to go back and look at the remedial objectives. And once we've met those objectives then, essentially, we're -- we've -- we've ended Phase II remediation.

So we need to construct the TCA to contain the waste rock and tailings, treat all the water which is a Type A trigger, and we need to treat the PHC contaminated soil and waste rock on the site, triggers for all that activity being direct water use over 300 cubes a day for our operations and water

treatment.

Now, operations under our current water licence is one fifty (150) -- 150 cubes a day, which is below a Type A trigger. We've actually applied for a bit more than that to continue the work because it's been difficult with a few other activities requiring water other than just camp use. They need it for dust suppression and they need it to compact sometimes the tailings in order to get the proper compaction when they're building the structure.

So there's a few different uses, so we've actually applied to temporarily have that number increased, the one fifty (150) number, I mean.

And water treatment is obviously where -- where the majority of that volume comes from considering we're -- we're doing 50- to 100,000 cubic metres of treatment every year now, right? But there's only anticipated one (1) year left of that.

And the dams are retaining more than 60,000 cubes, which is another Type A trigger. So we need to consider those things when we're looking at how we're going to switch from remediation to adaptive management.

So meeting the -- meeting those remedial objectives removes the Type A triggers. So

completion of the -- of the TCA no longer will require water treatment because all of the tailings-impacted material and the tailings themselves, waste rock is all going to be contained under an impervious cover.

So any water that -- that lands in the site through precipitation at that point in time is going to flow off and remain clean, so -- so we don't need to treat water. So our direct water use would fall below that 300 cubes a day, right? So our Type A trigger, essentially, would be gone for water treatment.

And then the dam removal and channel construction. So we'd no longer retain any substantial amounts of water on site so, again, trigger gone.

So remedial objectives will be achieved once free flow is restored between Mill Pond and Hambone Lake, which we'll get into a little bit more, but that's the ultimate goal is this drainage pathway, this -- the historic drainage pathway through the site is from Mill Pond to Hambone Lake, which, since the mine opened, that has not been the case, right? It's been a modified flow path. Mill Pond drains in the opposite direction that it normally would want to, right? So when we restore that natural drainage, then

that's, essentially, when the remedial objectives will be achieved.

That milestone will mark the completion of the remediation phase and the commencement of adaptive management.

So once we enter into adaptive management, what's it going to look like? Essentially, it's a monitoring kind of inspection phase where we get to -- to inspect the remediation features: the tailings containment area, the channels we've built, stabilization structure -- structures, quarries, what-not, to make sure that they're performing as -- as intended and -- and are stable, right, geotechnically essentially.

So site presence. For the first bit anyway -- I put a question mark on this -- freshet will likely be there full time, right, just until all -- like the first few years it's expected that it's not going to be as -- as sound or stable or unlikely to be just because vegetation hasn't quite taken off and what-not yet.

So -- so just to make sure we don't get any surprises, we'll probably have a full-time presence during freshet for the first bit anyway until things get confirmed that we are nice and stable. So

that's potential to last for all of adaptive management, but -- but likely only just at the beginning, maybe the first year or two (2).

We'll also have monthly monitoring and -- and as required. As required would be, essentially, like if there was a major rain event or anything like that that -- that we might want to pay attention to, it might require a flight out or something to -- make sure.

During adaptive management, we will continue on with the SNP program obviously. Highly likely to be moved to, again, monthly basis at that point.

And response to identified concerns. Oh, yeah. So identified concerns being that during these monitoring inspection periods, if there's anything noted, then -- then we'll likely be maintaining a small camp with limited equipment to respond to any of these identified concerns where we can perform repairs, maintenance, earthworks, manage the water, and that type of thing, okay?

So -- so it's not like we'll be gone. There'll still be means there and equipment to -- to respond to any concerns.

Time line. Adaptive management. It's

expected to -- it's tough to -- to tag an exact number onto these things. We expect it to be about five (5) years but, ultimately, it's until we see that the site has reached a steady state where there's no -- no annual works required anymore to -- to maintain those remedial objectives that we set out and -- and completed during Phase II, right?

So we might have to go back and tweak some things. Like if the cap starts to slump somewhere, we might need some maintenance or something like that that -- that needs to be addressed.

But once we have to -- once we've come to the point where we don't have to do that any more, the inspections essentially recommend that, no, you're good, we don't need to do this every year any more, then -- then we can pretty much call out at that point and say adaptive's management's over. We can enter into our long-term management phase, right?

So it's anticipated five (5) years, 2019 to 2023, which, like I mentioned before, will go to the end of the renewed water licence and land use permit there. And, yeah, I just said, so long-term manage -- long-term monitoring, sorry, will commence once adaptive management phase has reached that steady state.

We'll delve into monitoring here a little bit anyway. So during Phase II, we'll obviously continue on with the SNP program, monitoring for baseline condition and -- and construction monitoring, right?

So right now, the SNP program was -- was -- well, it was built during, what, 2009, I guess, when this was all being reviewed, 2008/2009. And we didn't know much about the water quality on site or what was going to happen during remediation to the water quality.

But we've been monitoring that for five (5) or six (6) years now. We've got a great understanding of what's going on, or a pretty great understanding. And -- and we are highly likely going to want to pare that down for the remainder of Phase II.

So -- so in August, when we get a chance to review the water licence, the draft water licence, I think you'll be able to -- or you can expect to see from CARD some proposed modifications to the current plan, right?

There's a lot of sites that we don't even get detection limit hits any more, right? So -- so there's not much point continuing on with them

considering that 1.2 million cubic metres of -- of tailings-impacted water has been treated, and now we're down to substantially less annual volumes.

And we only have one (1) more year planned for water treatment. It's unlikely we need to have this full-scale SNP program that we started with. So -- yeah. And -- and we'll be continuing on with our annual geotechnical inspections.

During adaptive management, it's expected to switch to a monthly SNP program for baseline monitoring. It'll probably look a lot like this SNP program for Phase II for maybe the first year, but, like it says here, we're likely to revise that, or apply to revise that SNP program based on the outcome of the Status of Environment Report, okay, which is -- will come out during the first year of adaptive management.

So the first -- the first year of adaptive management, and then subsequent years we'll likely have a slightly different anyway SNP program. Status of Environment Report will help us refine that an awful lot.

And then also during adaptive management, we'll have to do our follow-up aquatics monitoring in year 1 as per the current water licence.

So as per the current water licence, I forget what's -- - what condition it is, but -- but it requires an aquatics monitoring program which we've done. So it's essentially fish, invertebrates, and shore birds, I believe, and -- and waterfowl.

And -- and so part of that required -- it was basically you do it at the beginning and you do it at the end. And so it's a post-remediation, pre- and post-remediation monitoring program. So that would be done year 1 of adaptive management, first year following remediation, right?

So we'll keep that commitment if -- to button up the aquatics monitoring, and -- and then the annual geotechnical inspection will -- will continue.

Long-term monitoring, again covered under a separate land use permit and water licence. It will be reduced down highly likely to an annual monitoring program. And the long-term monitoring baseline condition will be based on a few different things.

We have a Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment being done this year, right? So it's all contracted and -- and any additional sampling work and what-not at site is being done this summer. That report will be out I believe by December this year.

Yeah.

And so -- so that will help shape the -- or give us a sense of what the -- the long-term manage -- long-term monitoring baseline condition will be.

The Status of Environment Report will be out in 2020, anticipated. And -- and again, that's going to show any risks on site that maybe need to be monitored and adaptive management monitoring results.

So from 2019 to 2023, again, anticipated time line. We're going to learn an awful lot more about how the site's responding post-remediation, right, so that we can -- we can tweak the long-term monitoring program.

So post-remediation, what's the site condition? Well, we had an HHERA, a Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment, conducted back in 2008 -- 2007 and 2008. And it was predicted -- so the HHERA will make predictions about post-remediation condition.

It's predicted that, for metals, that it's -- that -- that it's going to be a low risk to human health and ecological organisms. They're expecting short-term impacts in the majority of downstream, but -- but in the long term, everything to

recover, right?

Now, they compared all of their predictions against CCME Canada-wise standards for protection of aquatic life, right? And -- and it's deter -- determined in the 2008 HHERA that Hambone Lake sediments are too impacted from the historic mining to be in compliance with CCME in any case.

You know, you could shut water off, all inputs into Hambone Lake, and it's -- it's not going to recover within the time frame we're dealing with here, right? It's -- the sediment's already too impacted with arsenic from the pre-mining condition, so as we got it.

Powder Mag Lake, which is the next lake down, may have periodic exceedances of CCME for the -- for the short term anyway. And Sandy Lake's likely to remain compliant.

So I -- I threw this map of the site up again just so you'd have a sense of what I'm talking about. Again, here is the TCA, where it's going to be. Water treatment has discharged water into Hambone Lake right here for -- since the beginning of the program.

It's always been into Hambone Lake. Hambone Lake flows into Powder Mag Lake which flows to

these little lakes into Sandy, which comes out just right here. No, sorry, right here. There's the bridge. And then Sandy's a pretty large lake, you see.

So, like I said, Hambone already has impacted sediments from the -- from the mining operations, unlikely to recover to CCME levels anytime in the near future. Powder Mag Lake might see some exceedances in the future potentially, and Sandy Lake is more unlikely.

2000 -- right. So we're going to repeat the HHERA this year to determine if the assumptions and predictions from the original HHERA have maintained, see if they were correct.

And -- and if they're not, hopefully we'll be able to develop more accurate predictions of the post-remediation water quality and any risk to the downstream environment and human health as well. And this will all be used to establish downstream water quality compliance point and criteria, post-remediation, remember.

And, yeah, so that's pretty much it for now. There's -- there was -- there's a lot of things going on that we could have got into the real details, nitty-gritty of. Most of it was already in -- in the

application, and, you know, I -- I thought we'd just kind of cut it off at there, and -- and we'll deal with more of the specifics of these tasks in the subsequent sections that you guys already have.

So with that, I'll leave it, and we'll move on to questions, I suppose.

QUESTION PERIOD:

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Murray. It's Rebecca here. I'm just wondering, Murray, do you have the presentation available right now for us to post online so that Morag or others on the phone could follow along?

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Yeah. It's Murray here. Yeah, we -- we've got the presentation. Do you guys have the capability to -- to upload it? Yeah. Okay. You know how to find it? Okay.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Rebecca here. Thanks for that. We should have asked ahead of time. Sorry, Morag on the phone. We'll get this posted as soon as possible. And for others in the room, it will then be on our online review system, and also posted on the registry so folks can reference it again in the future.

So we do have the opportunity -- I know

some of these topics will be discussed in more detail later today. But let's take the opportunity now just to go around the room to see if there are any questions, points of clarification on the general overview that Murray just gave. So we'll start with folks in the room.

MS. GEORGINA WILLISTON: Thank you. Georgina Williston, with Fisheries and Oceans Canada. I'll defer this to Morag on the phone because she's familiar with the file.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

MS. MORAG MCPHERSON (by phone): Morag McPherson here, Fisheries and Oceans. I don't have any questions at this point. Thank you.

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Rick Walbourne, ENR. I've just got a couple of quick questions here. I've got some more when you get into the details.

Regarding the scope of remediation, I'm sure this was probably covered in '08 or '09, but just for my information, you did mention that the sediments in Hambone Lake were -- seem to be pretty contaminated, and that's affecting the water quality.

Is there any reason those sediment were never included in the initial remedial action plan or within the scope of Tundra, or -- or what's the

background of why the sediments in Hambone Lake aren't being considered within the scope of the remediation project?

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers here, with INAC.

Rick, as far -- the original remediation plan that was developed for Tundra Mine was developed in consultation with a lot of professionals and -- and with the concerned Aboriginal groups.

And -- and it was decided that -- that where they landed was -- was where it needed to be. And I'm -- I'm quite certain, but I'd have to verify for you, to be honest, why the sediments weren't addressed was probably highly likely that addressing those sediments would probably cause more risk to the downstream environment, right?

Because once you start disturbing sediments underneath, there's -- it's guaranteed that you're going to get a lot of that sediment which is hosting the metals moved downstream. So I think it was -- it was probably left so that we wouldn't impact downstream lakes even more.

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Rick Walbourne, ENR. Yeah, thanks for that, Murray.

Yeah, I -- I don't recall all the background, but that was probably something that might have been covered in that initial risk assessment. So the sediment might have been looked at and it might have been determined that leaving -- leaving them as-is might have been the best course of action.

Another quick question. You said that risk assessment was going to be redone I guess in 2016. Is that something that's going to be made available like through the water licence for review, or is that just something that CARD is dealing with, like the federal department's expert support on, or will that be -- will that be available at all through the water -- through the water licensing process -- not during this renewal process, I mean, but subsequently, just as a part of the water licence. Thanks.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Yeah. Murray Somers, with INAC. Right now, we -- we've contracted it for our own understanding of the site, right? It -- it wasn't a regulatory requirement to do that again.

I can't recall if the original HHERA was provided to the Board or not, but it's not a requirement of the licence anyway. But it might have been provided kind of more as -- as information or

appendix or something like that to -- to some initial conversations.

But -- but, yeah, at this time, it's just a CARD document. But, you know, we'll have to -- to talk to the Board and figure out whether or not we want to make that -- or whether it becomes a public document.

Anything to add, Joel?

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: I just wanted to add the original HHERA was one (1) of the appendixes within the Remedial Action Plan that was provided within the application for the original water licence. So that would be part of the public registry.

If the Board has questions after we've finalized our -- our updated risk assessment, we can follow up with the Board at that time and answer questions further.

THE FACILITATOR: Rebecca Chouinard. I -- I just -- Rick, if you check condition D-34 of the existing licence, it does speak a little bit to information that is required based on the findings of -- of the Health -- the acronym, HHERA.

But I'd -- I'd suggest taking a look at that and providing any recommendations as part of your intervention or review, if that's sufficient, or if

there's something different or more that -- that you would like to see with the supporting rationale, of course.

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Yeah. Rick Walbourne, ENR. Thanks. I'll take a look at that. I have no further questions at this moment.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Anybody from Board staff?

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: It's Heather Scott, with the Board. While we're on the topic of the HHERA, I was just wondering -- this may be a question for consultants.

When they evaluated your remediation treatment against CCME and the impacts downstream, what criteria were you looking at? What -- what is -- what was your treatment criteria, and how does that compare to what's in the licence now? Because that was done pre establishing the criteria in the licence.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: I think we can probably follow-up with our -- with our consultants on that, as you mentioned. But -- sorry, it's Joel Gowman, with INAC.

Again, we can -- we can follow-up with our team to provide more details on the sequencing on how the criteria were developed. But it was developed

with consideration for CCME, and also with the risk assessment values that were incorporated from that 2008 Risk Assessment.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: It's Heather Scott, with the Board. I think what we'll do is turn that into an Information Request following the tech session. And we'll -- we'll figure out the wording for that during a break and then bring that up later so we agree on that.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Yeah. It's Murray Somers here, from INAC. And I'll be speaking to how the -- how that -- the water treatment effluent criteria was developed, right? And part of that's through the HHERA. And I -- I've got a slide coming up later on on how that was done, so it might answer your question.

THE FACILITATOR: Rebecca here. I think as a moving-forward action item, we can work on crafting what that Information Request would look like. And then perhaps as we go throughout the day, if that information -- if we're -- if we're satisfied, then we can strike it from the list. And otherwise, we'll keep it on for -- or tweak it as the day goes on. And at the end, we'll finalize the wording of that.

--- INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 1:
INAC-CARD, based on all of the current and historical water quality data downstream of the water treatment facility, including but not limited to information collected for the human health and ecological risk assessment baseline data and annual reports to provide evidence and rationale that supports INAC-CARD's recommendation to maintain the discharge criteria identified in part B, item 6, of the existing water licence, MV2009L80008.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: It's Heather Scott, with the Board again. We can maybe defer this to a later time if you address it.

But just looking at the state -- Status of the Environment Report -- because I know under the

current water licence, that was to be submitted I think -- I forget the date, but it's already passed.

And now you're proposing 2020, so that's quite a long time since it was originally proposed. And I'm just wondering your rationale on that. Thanks.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Sure. The -- under the current water licence, it was due in -- I think it was February of this year, and -- and which was anticipated to be one (1) year following remediation, right? So the Status of Environment Report was, essentially, a post-remediation report.

And then with -- with the Phase II now anticipated to be completed in 2018, I proposed that it be likely 2020, about eighteen (18) months following remediation, to get that completed so that we had -- I thought that was a pretty reasonable time line just because it'll allow us to incorporate that final year's data into it, and maybe even some, if not all, of the first year of adaptive management's monitoring data into that report as well so we can get a sense of not only what -- what was the site like and what is it like during remediation, but even in a slightly post-remediation environment.

I will be talking more about the Status

of Environment Report later on as well.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: It's Heather Scott, with the Board. Thanks, Murray.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Rebecca here. I just had a quick question. And we might touch on this stuff later in the day as well, but I just wanted maybe a little bit more information just on the thinking or discussions that have happened in your group around the long -- or the -- the short-term monitoring, the five (5) years.

And -- and you mentioned, you know, that's to ensure that the site has reached its steady state, and you spoke to a lot of the geotechnical concerns. I'm just wondering what conversations or discussions you've had about the geochemical concerns and the water quality concerns, and particularly that short window of five (5) years.

If you're still quarrying materials for the cap and there's PAG rock on site, you know, sometimes it takes a long time before you see the effects of any acid generation or metal leaching.

So, I'm just wondering what conversations you've had about that.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: So -- Joel Gowman, with INAC. You mentioned quarrying of rock on site.

Actually, our -- our quarry operations are more of a stripping of granular material. So we've -- we'd earlier on looked at doing a drill and boss program, but with the potential acid-generating characteristics.

We moved away from that approach and have been going after -- after more loose, granular material for our requirements. So we're not anticipating to have any further contributions from ARD rock that way.

And our waste rock that is present on site from the -- from the historical activities has been consolidated and placed within the tailings containment area. So any of the water that would be released through that would be actually captured within the TCA and monitored within that.

Once we've -- once the connection between the Mill Pond and Hambone has been re-established, we'll have SNP stations within that -- that overall system to monitor how the chemistry's changing, or perhaps just monitoring its -- its hopefully steady state at that point.

With regards to the geochemistry of the overall system, we're currently contracting AECOM to complete a geochemical analysis of our exposed cleared

areas within the tailings containment area.

So that -- that additional studies on the geochemistry and the water balance within the overall system will help guide us towards any minor design tweaks that we need to ensure that our overall objectives are met, and also to feed into our -- our team's consideration of -- of compliance points and parameters that we feel would be prudent for us to include within our monitoring program.

Hopefully that adds some clarity to that point.

THE FACILITATOR: Rebecca here. Thanks. That's helpful, and I must admit I haven't gone through every page of the information you've submitted, so I apologize if that information's there.

I'm just wondering if you have planned kinetic testing ongoing, and any field cells to verify the -- any metal loading predictions.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: At this time, we don't have kinetic testing ongoing on any of the -- any of the rock. The -- the waste rock would be -- like I mentioned, would all be enclosed within the lined area, within the TCA.

And with that being a low-permeable cover on top of that material, we're expecting that

the -- the water infiltration -- surface water infiltration through that material should be quite minimal. And we should be fairly protective of the environment with that -- that system in place.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: It's Heather Scott, with the Board. So I just wanted to verify that your work with AECOM will also consider when the East Upper dam is dismantled and natural flow is re-established.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: That's correct. The overall water balance within the -- the catchment that will be -- when that historical catchment is re-established, when we remove the existing dams, should allow that -- the full scope of that will be included within the work that AECOM is currently doing for us this summer.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: It's Heather Scott, with the Board. And when do you anticipate that study by AECOM will com -- be complete?

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. The -- the work with AECOM will be completed -- there's a number of tasks actually within the overall scope that they're working on. I believe the water balance and the geochemistry will be completed by September, possibly October.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Rebecca here. Just -- I'll scan the room one (1) more time. Anybody else with any questions from a general sense on the overall presentation? Oh, Heather. Sorry, Heather.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: It's Heather Scott, with the Board. I was curious about your timing with your next HHERA. You said that was happening currently.

Wondering why you're doing that during the Phase II process and not waiting until it's completed, and if you anticipate the results of that HHERA will inform any changes to Phase II?

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: The HHERA is largely focussed on looking at what are -- what we expect to be end-of-project site conditions to make sure that our assumptions that were made in the 2008 Risk Assessment are -- are valid, and to make sure that we've got some opportunities, if there are minor changes that are -- are suggested through the results of the HHERA, that we have a contractor in place in order to actually complete that work.

If we were to hold off on completing that risk assessment until after all of the remedial

activities are in place, we wouldn't have a contracting tool or any of the physical equipment or infrastructure to allow us to make adjustments in the future so.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: It's Murray Somers here, with INAC. And Joel just gave a great synopsis there of -- of why we -- why we are doing HHERA right now. And -- and he's absolutely right that we want to know if there's any remaining risks that could addressed while there's still a major contractor on site with a full -- full amount of equipment.

As well, we want to understand what our -- our water quality should be looking like post-remediation, right? And -- and that will -- will again identify any -- any room for -- for tweaks that need to happen and that can get done. Yeah, so if we waited too long, then we might miss that opportunity, so it's being done right now.

But also, right now our water quality compliance is for the effluent at the end of the pipe, right? So once water treatment is finished and -- and we have free water flowing from Mill Pond to Hambone Lake, then -- then we want to know what that water quality's going to look like and -- and where we can establish a future compliance point, right? So the

HHERA is going to help identify that.

THE FACILITATOR: Rebecca Chouinard, from the Board. I -- I know Board staff have been talking about, you know, the water quality and compliance points looking into the future.

So I think we'll hold off on -- we do have a few questions about that, but we'll wait until later in the day when we're actually talking about that in a little more detail.

So with that, any other questions or points of clarification from folks in the room? And how about anyone on the phone?

MS. MORAG MCPHERSON (BY PHONE): No, nothing at this point, thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you. Then with that, we will move on to the next topic, which is the Mill Pond drawdown on the agenda. And I believe Murray's going to give another quick presentation about that.

Tyree, just before we go -- move to the presentations, have -- has the presentation been loaded to the ORS at this point? Okay. We are working on getting it on there.

Morag, we apologize for the inconvenience, and it should hopefully be up on our

site really soon. We're working on it here.

MS. MORAG MCPHERSON (BY PHONE):

Great. Thanks very much.

PRESENTATION BY INAC-CARD:

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, with INAC. Yeah, so now we'll move on to the Mill Pond drawdown portion. My apologies, some of these slides are a bit wordy. Just want to make sure that -- that I get it right, you know.

So the Mill Pond drawdown's associated with the removal of East Upper Dam which is a tailings core dam, right? So there -- it's the last remaining tailings core dam on site, some still remaining of the East Upper dam, but not very much.

And -- and so as -- to meet our remedial objectives, it has to go. And in the process of removing it, the -- it'll -- it'll actually restore the pre-mining water level on Mill Pond.

And it'll also restore the pre-mining drainage pathway from Mill Pond to Hambone Lake because, as I said before, since East Upper dam went in, which was at the beginning of -- of the -- the early stages of Tundra Mine's mining history, the water has not flown the way it naturally would want to

go.

It naturally wants to fall north to Courageous Lake, but right now it actually flows south originally into a Matthew -- Matthews Lake system and ultimately to Courageous Lake, but in a very different pathway. We call it Pathway 2.

So general process. Well, the East Upper dam removal will require that the Mill Pond water level be temporarily lowered approximately a metre and a half down to about 442.5 metres above sea level. So, yeah, that's a 1.5-metre drop. So right now it sits about four forty (440).

It may not have to go down that much, but that's kind of the precautionary level. Most people -- it's -- it's obviously why it would have to go down because the contractors will have to work in dry conditions, right, to -- to excavate that dam and to build the new drainage channel from Mill Pond, right? So that's why it needs to go down.

So the dam would be excavated, followed by construction of the -- the new drainage channel from Mill Pond. And that will flow into Upper Pond which will eventually connect down to Hambone Lake and which will restore that historic drainage.

So just to give people a sense of what

that looks like, I threw up a few photographs here. It seems like every photograph I put up here is taken from a different vantage point, but -- so my apologies for that. But -- but I guess as we're flying to and from site, I'm not always thinking of consistency in presentations.

But what you're looking at here is we're actually looking kind of southeast. So there's the camp right there, so that's where the former mine infrastructure was.

This is Mill Pond, this is where the Upper Pond tailings containment area was, this is the Lower Pond tailings containment area, and that -- what you see, that nice flat spot there, is -- is the cap that's -- that's been installed already, okay, for the TCA. Again, you see it's typically very dry up there now where it used to be a gigantic tailings pond.

This here is East Upper dam. There's a little wetland adjacent to it that has some -- some tailings material in there. It looks like it was basically spilled during the construction of the dam, just not being very careful.

We can't figure out any other reason why it would be there, but -- yeah, and there's some sediments and what-not that are -- are impacted

obviously from -- from having the -- being in such proximity to that dam.

Going in a little bit closer, so it's the same thing again: camp, Mill Pond up here, Upper Pond. But that's the dam. You can actually see it there, so that's what's going to be removed -- not an enormous dam, right? Not -- not huge. Probably be removed in about a week. Yeah, and there's this wetland.

So looking at it from above, again different vantage point, Upper Pond on this side, Mill Pond over here. This is the dam, this shaded area. This dotted line shows you where the actual tailings core and impacted material is sitting right now through -- when -- that was figured out through assessments, and that's what's going to be removed.

So in order to do that, they're obviously going to have to draw this down to produce dry conditions because this is a wetland right here. And then once the excavation's done, slopes are stabilized, then they're going to build the discharge channel which will be lined and -- and engineered properly.

You see some of the profile drawing of it here all lined and -- and with rip-rap. And

that'll be constructed to restore that drainage pathway.

Now, we have a couple of options which some of you might recall from the amendment request back in 2013 for the current water licence when we addressed this work. The primary option is actually to pump water direct from Mill Pond into Hambone Lake.

There's a few reasons for that which I'll get into in a minute. The -- and then there's the secondary option using an aquadam which I'll get into in the next slide. But it'll require approximately 132,000 cubic metres.

Again, that's to bring the water level down a metre and a half, which is conservative, right? So -- or it's -- it's a maximum essentially like that we'd have to draw down, or highly likely. And it's assumed we don't have to bring it down that much, but just in case, that's the -- that's the target we're trying to hit right now which equals approximately 132,000 cubes.

Additional pumping might be required to maintain this four forty-two point five (442.5) elevation on the water level. And that's just simply because of natural recharge into the pond. So if we draw it down, they can start working.

And as they're working, if there's a lot of recharge, which isn't anticipated -- it's a small pond and a small catchment -- just to maintain that dry four forty-two point five (442.5), then they might have to do a little bit more pumping into Hambone Lake just to keep it where they need it during the construction phase and excavation phase.

And then, once it's all done and the -- and the channel's constructed, then Mill Pond will just be allowed to recharge up to the pre-mining water level, which will be the invert, the base of that drainage channel.

Second option is to temporarily install an aquadam between Mill Pond and the East Upper dam, so essentially in that wetland area between the -- the dam and the pond, okay? I'll -- I'll show a slide showing that location in a minute.

But how that will work, so an aquadam is -- is basically a gigantic tube with sections inside of it which get filled and -- and act as a dam. So -- so I'll -- I don't know if I have a picture of it, but -- of what one looks like, but I'm sure you can get the idea.

It's a big tube of water, a gigantic tube of water, that will be heavy enough to -- to

actually prevent flow from Mill Pond that will allow the -- the contractor to excavate and build the drainage channel at that point.

And then following the construction of that channel, then the aquadam would actually have a controlled dewatering. So the volume of water from the -- that's in the actual aquadam would be allowed to drain out through that drainage channel.

And then as it's -- as the -- the aquadam is being lowered, then you're actually going to get Mill Pond water level spill over the top of it and -- and go down the drainage channel as well, right? So that's -- that's the process, again equalling roughly the exact same amount of water withdrawal from Mill Pond to get it down to its pre-mining water level.

Again, a different vantage point, sorry. Upper Pond up here, Mill Pond down here. That's East Upper dam. So the aquadam would essentially go on the fringe or likely to go on that fringe if it was to be used, the -- the wetland and Mill Pond.

And again, that same image shown before. Aquadam would likely go in a location such as that.

So discharge to Hambone. I just wanted to mention this because I know it got brought up in the review comments. It's something we've been discussing over the years is to remain protective of the downstream channel stability from the Tundra Mine site.

It'll be a maximum discharge rate of 300 cubic metres per hour to Hambone Lake from all sources, right? That includes water treatment, right? So if water treatment's pumping at 300 cubic metres per hour, that means Mill Pond can't pump anything, right? We can't discharge anything from -- from Mill Pond.

And if -- if water treatment's pumping at one fifty (150), then we could in theory pump one fifty (150) into -- from Mill Pond. And -- and so you get the picture, right? All sources to Mill -- or to Hambone Lake will not exceed 300 cubic metres per hour in order to stay protective.

I know Golder did the -- I think it was Golder did the modelling of that, and it showed that four fifty (450) should probably be safe. But we knocked it down during the original review to three hundred (300) just to be precautious.

So -- so -- and with that -- that

number, we've never had any issues at all downstream from monitoring. There's never shown any -- any bits of state -- site -- or slope impacts at all.

What's this next section? Oh, yeah. And -- and there was a few comments within the application as well that came up from reviewers that the Mill Pond drawdown was lacking in information in the water licence component because we had a land use permit and water licence application come in at the same time.

That was my fault. I put the information in the land use permit, didn't mirror it into the water licence part. So I just wanted to let people know, if they haven't seen that Sections 4, 7, and 10 of the application were updated, and -- and they are available. You can see them on -- on the ORS.

So they're not posted in the registry. It's posted in the Online Review System, and you can see it there. If you just click on INAC's comments, there'll be a little paperclip there. A click -- if you click on that, it will show the updated application as requested. And all the updated sections are highlighted in yellow so you can see them.

And that's all I will say about Mill Pond for now.

QUESTION PERIOD:

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you, Murray. It's Rebecca here. According to the reviewer comment table, there were some questions on the Mill Pond from folks from Fisheries and Oceans and ENR.

So I'm wondering if we could turn the floor over to Fisheries and Oceans to see if there are any follow-up questions, particularly in regards to the updated sections that Murray submitted.

MS. MORAG MCPHERSON (BY PHONE): Hi.

MS. GEORGINA WILLISTON: Hi. Georgina --

MS. MORAG MCPHERSON (BY PHONE): Oh, sorry, Georgina. Go ahead.

MS. GEORGINA WILLISTON: Sorry. It's Georgina, with DFO. I was just going to defer it to Morag.

MS. MORAG MCPHERSON (BY PHONE): Morag McPherson, with Fisheries and Oceans. I was anticipating that.

Luckily, I've been out to the site quite a number of times since 2008 with the Phase II

work happening, so I have a pretty good mental mind map of the site as Murray was going through this. So using my visualization, I was able to follow along pretty easily.

Yeah, in our initial review of the renewal, the water licence renewal, there was -- just seemed to be some gaps in some of the information. So a lot of our recommendations in our review were just to make sure that the evaluations that have been done and the comments that have been provided on the renewal -- or, sorry, on the amendment with the Mill Pond drawdown, that that was -- that that information was still the same.

Aspects hadn't changed, so we just recommended that that be more clearly put into the water licence application itself so that there weren't these two (2) pieces and so that, if there were areas that had changed or -- I think there were a couple of areas where it wasn't quite clear in how the amendment had gone, that we asked that that be incorporated in.

And INAC has done that in updating those sections, addressed a lot of the key points around the actual activity that'll be happening for the Mill Pond drawdown, the predicted impacts, and some of the mitigations that have been discussed

previously in the 2013 renewal, that those be brought right in so it was clear that that was still commitments to -- to address those, and as well as the water volumes and the discharge rates.

I think there was a little bit of confusion on some of the wording between the applications and the licence in terms of averaged -- daily averages versus just a discharge rate. So in the responses to our comments and within the updated application, they have addressed those.

And as far as we know, as far as what's been provided, the activity that was proposed for 2013 is still required, as Murray had presented. And none of that has changed, so our previous sort of advice and comments in -- are still valid, and -- and nothing there has changed for us.

So it was just ensuring there was these clarifications, and that's all been put in there. So we don't have any -- I don't have any additional questions at this point as everything's been addressed with the update there. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Wonderful. Morag, I just want -- wanted to confirm, is there any suggestion or recommendation on ways to better clarify the wording in the water licence, or was -- was that

not the issue at all?

MS. MORAG MCPHERSON (BY PHONE): No, it was just that, in the water licence itself, in the original one, it didn't really even talk -- it didn't mention some of the Mill Pond drawdown and some of the key activities and in the mitigation matrix, an impact matrix.

So I just wanted to make sure, even though it was attached as an appendix, the -- the amendment, that that activity was still the same activity, it was clear and reflected in the new -- what was being proposed for the next couple of years of work at the site.

So it was just making sure that -- that that was clarified. And in speaking with INAC, as well as with the information that they've pulled in to the update, it's clear that that's the same activity still required and -- and is what they're proposing.

THE FACILITATOR: Great. Thank you. It's Rebecca here.

ENR, any follow-up on the comments that you made?

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Rick Walbourne, ENR. The only comment we had regarding Mill Pond I think was the 300 cubic metres an hour, to make sure

that was a cumulative total and not -- because it was saying three hundred (300) from Mill Pond and three hundred (300) from the water treatment plant.

We're comfortable that that's been addressed. I -- I spoke to CARD a couple of times about that. But I did have a couple of questions on the presentation actually, if I could.

Murray, could you bring up -- I think it was slide 24, which was a -- a photo.

THE FACILITATOR: I just -- sorry, it's Rebecca here. I just want to interject for one (1) second and just let Morag know that the presentation has been emailed to you, and it is posted on the registry and on the ORS. So you should have it now in three (3) different ways.

MS. MORAG MCPHERSON (BY PHONE): Thank you.

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Hi, Murray. Can you -- do you know offhand when this photo was taken, or how -- how recently, I guess, roughly? Is it like from '08, is it the last couple of years? I have a question in that regard, and I'm just trying to figure out what the situation is right there in terms of water level.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: It's Murray

Somers, from INAC. I believe I took that from my 2015 --

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Okay.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: -- folder, so I believe that was last year, you know. Yeah, because the -- the water treatment plant previous to that sat here, right? It was sitting in this spot. Yeah, the -- and the end of 2014, we -- we put all this material here, so this is a 2015 photograph --

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Okay.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: -- last year.

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Yeah, thanks for that. Yeah, Rick Walbourne, ENR.

The reason I'm asking is obviously we've seen around -- you know, the majority, I guess, of the Northwest Territories, really noticeable around Yellowknife, we've seen drought conditions. A lot of lakes around Yellowknife, for instance, the water levels are very low. I've noticed 3 and 4 feet, for instance, in places.

So I guess my question is: Since this application was originally -- well, I guess the Mill Pond in 2013 -- has CARD noticed any difference in -- in water, like stage elevations or anything around Mill Pond that the same amount of water may not be --

may not require dewatering as originally based on what you've seen? Or is it -- or have you even been really monitoring the elevations closely?

I know you've mentioned a couple of times that the one thirty-five (135) or the metre and a half, sort of 135,000 cubes or the metre and a half elevation may be conservative, so it may be less.

But I'm just curious if you've noticed anything lately with the dry conditions we've had over the last few years, if -- if that's been something you've noticed. Thanks.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Thanks, Rick, for your question. It's Joel, with INAC. I'm getting better at that part.

So despite the drier conditions across the Territories, we have noticed that, while we do have -- some lakes are a bit lower, Mill Pond, especially after freshet, has fairly consistently been up to the toe of the Upper East dam -- or East Upper dam.

So we're anticipating at this stage that the volume is still consistent with our original application.

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Rick Walbourne, ENR. Thanks for that. Just one (1) more question.

Murray mentioned in his presentation that Mill Pond was to be temporarily lowered to -- to excavate the -- the dam there. It was my initial understanding I think of reviewing this in 2013 or whenever it was that that was to be a permanent situation because Mill Pond is actually higher now than it should be because of the dam. So when you lower it to remove the dam, I didn't think there was going to -- and you've already mentioned there's not a lot of recharge.

So my understanding I think when I reviewed this with actually DFO at the time, that the assessment was that that water was going to be down 1.5 metres, and that was going to be pre-mining conditions.

So you just mentioned temporarily lowered. Can you clarify if that is temporary or if that's permanent? Thank you.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Thanks, Rick. It's Joel Gowman here again. So basically, we need to reduce the water level within Mill Pond down below the bedrock saddle that currently separates Mill Pond and Upper Pond.

We're anticipating that, once we've done that drawdown and put in place our discharge

channel, that there will be some rebound up to that -- the base of the bedrock saddle that separates the two (2) -- two (2) drainage basins.

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Rick Walbourne, ENR. Thanks for that clarification. I have nothing more at this point.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Rebecca here. Just looking at Board staff. Are there any questions from Board staff on Mill Pond?

MS. TYREE MULLANEY: Hi. It's Tyree, Board staff. I have a question about the amount of flow that the channel can handle between Mill Pond and Hambone Lake.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: So Joel Gowman, with INAC. Our -- our drainage pathways and overall TCA design itself were modelled by AECOM with support from another consulting company called O'Kane Consulting (phonetic). So they look at the erosion potential of all aspects within the tailings containment area, including the discharge channel.

So initially I believe the models were run with a twenty (20) or fifty (50) year storm, maximum storm prediction. Some of the more sensitive areas -- the discharge channel from -- or the spillway from the diversion channel to Hambone and the -- the

channel between Mill Pond and Upper Pond -- were -- the storm freque -- or the -- the storm intensity was increased from a twenty (20) to fifty (50) year maximum storm intensity to I believe a hundred (100) year storm intensity.

So we anticipate that we're being quite conservative at the robustness of the overall design to be able to handle fairly significant peak -- peak flow intensities.

Does that answer your questions?

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Yeah, Murray Somers here, from INAC. And just -- just to add one (1) little bit more -- a bit more detail is the -- yeah, like he -- or like Joel said, they're being designed to handle the volume, right? But in addition to volume, there's erosion risk and what-not, right?

And just so it's -- it's not clear in everybody's mind till you actually go out to the site and see how little relief there is. The -- the distance -- the drainage distance between Mill Pond and Hambone Lake is approximately 2 kilometres.

And along that 2 kilometres, the -- the slope is about .2 percent of a grade. So it's -- it's almost flat. So just to -- to give you a sense of the amount of flow or the rate of flow that you'd see

would be pretty minimal going through there in the long term.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: And just one (1) further clarification. In those sensitive locations, in the spillways and within the focussed flow within the -- the diversion channel itself, those -- those particular areas are lined with geotextile and then capped with Type E/F erosion-resistant material so.

MS. TYREE MULLANEY: Okay. Tyree, with -- with the Board.

Are there any contingencies in place if, say, you get a hundred (100) year storm, that -- that discharge channel can't handle that flow?

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: I guess in the event that there was a major storm event in the area, we do have some contingencies as far as timely repair of the overall structure.

Part of our Phase II-B specifications is for strategic placement of -- of the various construction materials that we used to construct the TCA cover. So in the event that there needed to be additional -- or needed to be some repairs to the -- to the constructed design, we would be able to repair it in a timely fashion.

And as Murray mentioned, the overall

design grade is extremely flat. It's actually been one (1) of our challenges is just to maintain -- maintain flow across the site to avoid ponding with such a shallow grade over a fairly large distance. That's been more of the challenge than high-flow velocities.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Yeah, it's Murray Somers here, with INAC. And Joel just brought up a good point there that, yeah, the challenge has been to prevent ponding, you know. So -- so -- because it was such a shallow grade. And -- and it's going to be pretty unlikely that we're not going to have water sitting in these channels, right? There's such -- such a low grade.

So I just want that to be the -- to make sure everybody is aware of that. You know, there's not much you can do about it. These were former ponds. You know, one (1) was a former lake or a former pond that the water's going to be draining through. So they naturally want to hold some water.

We'll be doing some backfilling and what-not to -- to make sure there's not an excessive amount of ponding or what-not, but -- but there -- there could be some ponding. You know, it's -- it's expected.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: And Joel, with INAC. One (1) other consideration is -- is there are areas within the overall drainage catchment that, if we were to experience some high-flow volumes, there would be areas such as the existing catchment within Upper Pond that, as that water level came up, there'd been some -- some retention within Upper Pond during high-flow periods.

MS. TYREE MULLANEY: Okay. Tyree, with the Board.

Keeping with the discharge channel, and I'm thinking SNPs, would you see a benefit to having SNP at the outlet of Mill Pond and somewhere along the discharge channel prior to going into Hambone Lake, just to monitor the water quality coming out of Hambone through the site and then eventually out?

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: I think it'd be something that would be worth considering. Part of our water balance and the geochemistry studies that are being completed this summer should feed into some suggestions that CARD as the proponent might -- might have to provide back to the Board on that topic for specific locations as we move forward to a more longer-term monitoring plan.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Rebecca Chouinard, with the Board. We are right on schedule. It's now 10:30, and we are scheduled to break, drink coffee, and eat snacks. So we should do that, and we will meet back at 10:45.

--- Upon recessing at 10:30 a.m.
--- Upon resuming

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. I think we're all here. I just want to do a quick check in with -- on the phone line. Morag, are you there?

MS. MORAG MCPHERSON (BY PHONE): Yeah. It's Morag, here with DFO. I'm on.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Perfect. Then we'll get started on our next topic, which is water quality. And again, I will turn the floor over to Murray for this presentation.

PRESENTATION ON WATER QUALITY BY INAC/CARD

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, here with INAC. Page number? So we are on page number 32 for anybody who's on the phone. Yeah, so

effluent quality, because that's what I focus on in this section. I believe that's really ultimately what we were -- what we were talking about, right, and -- and how we come up with these numbers.

So a lot of this, I'll be honest, was basically just copied over from -- from how they were originally derived, because we're not proposing to change anything, right. So -- so the format of the slides might look a little different. It might -- because I borrowed them, but -- but that's quite all right.

So remedial approach to deal with the water yet treat and discharge the arsenic-impacted tailings water and discharge them into Hambone Lake, which is the only sour -- or the only place we're allowed to discharge.

The water treatment method, this is what we followed, was iron co-precipitation. This is what we still use onsite right now. Widely employed at mine sites for arsenic removal, and has worked very successfully for us since we started it in 2010, I think was the first year we -- we treated.

And like I said, it'll be discharged to Hambone Lake. We'll continue to do so. And the compliance point is and will continue to be the end of

pipe for effluent discharge.

So the selection of the criteria for the discharge, how -- how it came to be, there was three (3) main things that we looked at. The 2008 HHERA, it assessed the effects of various effluent discharge scenarios. So I'll be showing a slide here shortly that will break those scenarios down a little bit.

It's kind of a cliff note version of the scenarios. They model a lot, but essentially, I believe there was a one (1), a two (2), a three (3), a four (4) year discharge scenario to do that initial 1.2 million cubic metres of impacted water.

And then also at various arsenic concentrations as well. So discharging at -- at .02 micrograms per litre, or -- or -- no, 2 micrograms per litre, or 5 micrograms per litre, or fifty (50), or five hundred (500), or one point six (1.6), you know, like -- so there's a lot of various scenarios that they ran.

So it also incorporated input, the HHERA did, of seepage inputs from the TCA. So at the time when that was done the tailings containment area was full of water, 1.2 million cubes, and so there were some weaker spots in the dam that was there, and

there was a lot of seepage at that point.

Right now as you saw from the previous slides, it's mostly dry so we're not dealing with seepage very much anymore, but at the time that was definitely an input. So the HHERA modelled the discharge from the treatment plant, also incorporated any other inputs into Hambone Lake from seepage, and assessed the effects of long-term arsenic loadings post-remediation.

Second, we analysed performance of data for plants using the Best Available Technology. So the co-per -- the iron co-precipitation technique, based on the expected performance what can we expect. And we also looked -- or spoke to some experts on the -- the subject.

The HHERA for Hambone Lake found that several species are potentially at risk in Hambone due to pre-existing baseline conditions, which we talked about earlier this morning. None of the treated effluent discharge alternatives, so none of the scenarios that were modelled would have a substantive negative effect on the current conditions in Hambone Lake, all right. So because of pre-mining impacts we're not going to be adding much of an impact -- a noticeable impact to Hambone Lake through water

treatment.

Powder Mag and Sandy are a little different though, because they were less impacted by -- - by mining activities. So none of the treated effluent discharge scenarios with arsenic levels at .2 milligrams per litre or less under a two (2) year -- two (2) year discharge were predicted to pose risks to aquatic species. That's essentially -- the two (2) year was what was proposed by the previous contractor. It didn't pan out.

And while phytoplankton might be affected temporarily in Powder Mag, the overall risk is judged to be low as the arsenic levels recover quickly. And really, only sensitive species of phytoplankton would be possibly affected. And our monitoring indicates that that's exactly what happened, right.

So here's this cliff's note that I was mentioning before. So we've got the -- the lakes going downstream. Hambone Lake was the -- the discharge point, Powder Mag Lake the following, Sandy Lake, then Whale Tail Lake, and then you're pretty much off site at that point in time. Oh, Whale Tail Lake is off site actually.

And then obviously the various

concentrations of arsenic, this is specific to arsenic, that effluent could be, so they ran all these various scenarios and -- and they landed in -- in this area. So they mostly modelled for point two (.2).

That -- that's where we -- we -- that's where the HHERA did most of the modelling and -- and recommendations and we settle on point five (.5) simply due to the -- the fact that we weren't -- we didn't know quite what to expect with -- with the technology available. We didn't know if there would be any northern, or -- or this -- because it was such a condensed season we didn't know if we were going to be able to achieve this point two (.2).

And to be honest, I just recall, actually I should have put into the sli -- or put a slide in here was we did treat some water in 2009 and there was quite a few exceedences then of that point two (.2), right. So I believe it even when up to point four (.4) or point four (.4) plus. And -- and that was another reason why we were nervous to settle on -- on a point two (.2) level.

So best available technology, so we analyzed data from full scale plants. These co-precipitation plants located at other operating mines, the results had indicated that these plants could meet

point two (.2) on an annual average basis, but not on a monthly basis. I don't know the details of what we looked at, but that's -- but what came out of it.

The plant at Tundra, it does use the same technology or similar technology. We -- however, we were worried that we would encounter some -- like I just mentioned, some -- some other conditions, or impairments that could prevent us from meeting that point two (.2), shorter operational season, remote location.

In all honesty, we've done really quite a good job at maintaining it below that point two (.2) level even though we're authorized for point five (.5), but some additional challenges that we see potentially coming up is as we get to the tail end, the final year of water treatment you -- you run into an issue where in previous years you don't have to treat until you've got no water left.

You can -- when the dams are still in place you can treat down to a level that's, essentially, safe enough so that the next year's freshet won't exceed the volume, the containment volume and spill over, right. So you just have to treat as much as you can, but once you get low and -- and once you've got like another 10 or 20,000 cubes

left you can stop, because you still -- the dams are still there and -- and you don't need the entire area to be -- to be dry.

But in the final year you need it all to be dry, so you're going to suck right to the bottom, right. So that's going to be your heaviest sediment load. So the muddiest water is going to be coming in at that point in time. So that's going to be the -- actually the most difficult water, probably, to treat.

Another challenge that we could be facing is thus far the Water Treatment Program has been completed by -- we've had two (2) different contractors do it, but prim -- primarily by one (1). And with the new tender going out we can't guarantee it's going to be the same contractor doing the water treatment work. So -- so that could be another potential consideration to make and -- and why we're -- we don't think we need to flex much on that point five (.5) that we're permitted at right now.

So -- and here is the arsenic concentration that we're currently permitted to discharge. We've got a monthly average of .5 milligrams per litre and a maximum grab of one (1). Like I said, we have never had any exceedences of the

point five (.5) throughout the time that we've been operating. I don't anticipate that we'll have any in the future, but -- but yeah, so we're -- we're happy with this.

Short-term risks are present at a discharge of point five (.5), but anticipated that downstream lakes will recover over the long term and that water treatment con -- yeah, that's one (1) nice thing to -- to point out is that the contract itself actually motivates the contractor to reach point two (.2) even though regulatory wise we're permitted to -- or licensed to have a .5 milligram per litre concentration on an average month.

We actually write into the contracts that -- that they need to meet point two (.2), all right. So -- so we've got a .3 essentially milligram per litre kind of buffer zone there, all right. So -- so we should never come close to that, but it's there just in case for the reasons that I just mentioned, that we're going to be treating the dirtiest water at the end and -- and the -- the new -- if there's a new contractor they might not be as experienced.

So that's how we came up with those values. Yeah, they -- we -- we'd like to keep them there, but I guess we'll open it up for -- for

questions.

QUESTION PERIOD

THE FACILITATOR: It's Rebecca Chouinard, with the Board. Thank you, Murray, for that. From our online review system -- review comment table we had some comments or questions on water quality from ENR and MVLWB staff. So perhaps I'll turn the floor over to ENR first.

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Rick Walbourne, ENR. Murray, thanks for that presentation.

Yeah, we did have one (1) comment on the ORS conversation that was happening in '09 actually as well regarding the -- the point two (.2) from the HHERA and the point five (.5), I think, which is similar to what we see in -- in the MMER (phonetic).

I spoke to Murray a -- a couple times, I think, about this during the review period. And -- and we do understand that they have conditions with the contractor to -- to attempt to meet zero point two (.2). And as -- as Murray pointed out here again in the presentation, they're going to be dealing with some -- some, I guess, dirtier sediment-laden water as -- as they near the end of the discharge period.

And we also took into account the -- the quantities we're dealing with her now as opposed to -- to 2009 are significantly lower. As such, we're satisfied with the response that's been provided by CARD today and through the ORS. So, ENR has no further -- no further comment regarding EQCs. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Great. Rebecca, here with the Board. I'll turn the floor over to Board staff just to go over the questions and comments that they had during the review.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: Hi. It's Heather Scott, from the Board. So following up on our questions and recommendations on the ORS, and also in reviewing the transcripts from the 2009 licence issuance, CARD did make some commitments to -- towards monitoring downstream of the water treatment facility effluent.

And I'm wondering if you could comment on how the water quality downstream of the discharge has -- has looked, or what does water quality look like? Is it as you predicted based on the HHERA and other -- other models that CARD has completed?

(BRIEF PAUSE)

THE FACILITATOR: Just as our INAC-CARD folks are discussing, I'm just doing a quick phone check. Morag, are you still on the line, or did we lose you?

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, with INAC. Thanks for the question.

Yeah, I feel like that's something I should know off the top of my head, but -- but to be honest, every year we produce a -- an annual Water Quality Monitoring Report, right, which -- which compares one (1) year to the next. And actually, not one (1) year to the next, but all years to the current year is what it is, and -- all years of water treatment anyway.

And -- and so all those trends are identified in all the downstream lakes in that document. I know we haven't had any -- any hits or any -- any like reasons to believe there's any -- any concerns downstream. Everything has been kind of steady and -- and as predicted, as far as I recall.

But -- but I have to review that report again to -- like the -- the most recent one, the 2015

report to -- to give you specifics on that.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: It's Heather Scott, with the Board. Maybe we'll make that another Information Request. And to be honest yet, we're working on a short timeline, so we haven't gone through the annual reports either with a fine-tooth comb.

But I think what's typical in a Type A water licensing process is providing that background water quality data if you have it to -- to justify whatever effluent quality criteria you propose, and -- because in this scenario we do have that data where if you didn't in the 2009 process it would be prudent to do so. Thanks.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: So Murray and I did discuss the historical data and our performance in meeting those -- sorry, It's Joel Gowman, with INAC. We did discuss our performance meeting those objectives and as Murray has mentioned, we've been able to quite consistently achieve the point two (.2).

But given the -- the variable nature of our feed stock and the fact that our overall catchment has experienced some changes in its chemical makeup, that we'll be trying to get a better understanding on -- through the geochemistry studies that we're

completing this summer.

That's the primary reason that we're requesting that the criteria remain at the same -- same levels and gives our plant the -- the best option -- or the best stability to meet -- meet that -- that criteria consistently throughout the remaining treatment periods.

But we can take and review the trends and provide that information to the Board.

THE FACILITATOR: Rebecca Chouinard, with the Board. I -- I think it would be helpful in addition to just providing that report just perhaps a -- a little bit of background on the rationale on why that data supports your proposed EQC to remain the same.

So if you could just, you know, evaluate that data a little bit and just say that it supports what you're suggesting if it does.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with CARD. Yeah, we'll provide a bit of a discussion on that.

--- INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 2:

SNP for decommissioning.

Provide surveillance

network program stations with associated effluent quality criteria, if applicable, with supporting evidence and rationale to ensure ongoing protection of the environment following decommissioning, including testing requirements, sampling frequencies and parameters and activation triggers.

MS. TYREE MULLANEY: Okay. This is Tyree, with the Board. Just a quick followup question. I know it's going to be a far-reaching question.

Once the water treatment facility is turned off, where would INAC-CARD like the compliance point to be knowing the status of Hambone Lake?

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Yeah, Murray Somers, here with INAC. In the -- the first presentation I put up there I had given you the -- the big overview of -- of the rest of the project there.

I -- I had brought -- or I had mentioned that -- that the original HHERA, the 2008 version had indicated, yeah, that Hambone post-remediation at any point really is unlikely to be able to -- to meet any CCME guidelines.

And then the next -- next lake down would be Powder Mag Lake has indicated potentials for occasional exceedences, likely freshet exceedences or something like that, more high -- highly erosional kind of prone seasons would -- would likely have some potentials anyway for -- for exceedences on a CCME guideline.

But unlikely that downstream of that we would see much of anything for hits. So -- so based on that, if the new HHERA confirms that, that's -- that's actually what's happening. That's still an accurate prediction. Then -- at this point in time I think we would like to see Sandy Lake as a compliance point if it's determined through a consultation with HHJs anyway that -- that CCME is an appropriate application.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: It's Heather Scott, with the Board. Can you confirm inlet/outlet Sandy Lake as the proposed point?

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: I think -- sorry,

it's Murray Somers, with CARD. I think that might depend on the outcome of the new 2016 HHERA.

THE FACILITATOR: It's Rebecca Chouinard, here with the Board.

Just to followup, just a point of clarification on -- on why we're asking these questions is in drafting this water licence, you know, our thinking up until 2016, '17, '18 status quo, that's one (1) thing, but looking into the -- the sort of five (5) year monitoring, you know, post-closure scenario, where -- what should be -- we be actually writing into the licence at this point with -- avoiding ame -- another amendment down the line when we get the results from --

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: M-hm.

THE FACILITATOR: -- from those studies. So I guess that's -- that's where we're coming from is from drafting the licence at this point in time, any recommendations on -- on how to do that, or -- or your rationale for what and where.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. I appreciate the Board's interest in including post-remediation compliance points in this discussion. It -- resolution or greater clarity on this particular aspect gives our project a better opportunity to set -

- make any -- any design tweaks that we need to to ensure that we maintain compliance with that longer term and that we're setting achievable objectives for the -- for this Crown project.

So as Murray said, our current information indicates that compliance should be achievable at the inlet of Sandy Lake, but it would depend, I guess, on -- we'd -- we'd like the opportunity to use the data that we're gathering from the 2016 risk assessment to determine whether or not we would suggest going with inlet versus outlet of Sandy and exactly which criteria would be relevant for that compliance point.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, with CARD. If the Board needs a station right now, or location to -- to draft the water licence, I would -- I would think like to be a little bit protective of -- of CARD, conservative from our point, the further the outflow would be the -- the more conservative right now, which is Station 14-6H in the current SNP.

But both those stations just happen to be walking distance from the airstrip, which would be very convenient for a long-term monitoring perspective.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: It's Heather

Scott, with the Board. So just to be clear, once we issue the licence, generally, the Board is able to make changes to the SNP, but the Board is not able to make changes to the conditions or the EQC post-issuance without an amendment.

So, I think we're in a bit of a conundrum where it seems as though you would like to be informed by a -- a study that won't be completed for another year or so in terms of recommending effluent criteria, but we need to set that criteria now to avoid the amendment.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: And given the -- the fact -- sorry, Joel Gowman, with INAC.

Given the fact that the Board has interest in -- in setting that compliance point within this existing water lic -- or within the new authorizations that are being discussed here today, we can talk with our consultants and see if we can work up specific aspects of that report in advance.

And then perhaps we can work with our -- with our regulatory officer with the Board to feed some of that information into the process. If there's a -- if there's some target dates that we can work with the Board to provide updated information, we'd -- we'd like the opportunity to make sure that we're

providing the most current data possible in order to meet -- or work within your timelines that you're accommodating us on here.

So, we appreciate that opportunity for some further discussion.

THE FACILITATOR: Rebecca Chouinard, with the Board. I think that would be a really helpful conversation to have and to dig a little bit deeper into those issues. I think it will provide a lot more clarity going through the following stages of -- of this renewal.

And I'm just looking at the upcoming dates here. July 5th we've got written interventions due, so we definitely would like to have some information on the table prior to that. Our Information Requests are due from this session on June 28th.

I'm wondering if we might take advantage of the next break and sit down and -- and maybe talk about a -- a timeline for getting that additional information in so we could probably better clarify what it is that we -- would be helpful for us moving forward and discuss how long that would take from your end.

And before the end of the day,

formalize that as an Information Request. That might have a slightly delayed timeline or a deadline if -- if possible. We are quite tight on time between now and July 5th and we definitely want that information to give other reviewers the opportunity to comment on it as part of their interventions.

But perhaps we can take this conversation, just to hammer out some of the logistics and the wording of that Information Request, and formalize it at the next break.

--- INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3:

Sewage discharge. INAC-CARD to recommend surveillance network program station locations, testing requirements, sampling frequencies and parameters, activation triggers and discharge criteria for sewage discharge from the sewage treatment facility, if needed, as a contingency measure.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. That -- that approach sounds good.

And once we've clarified the -- the question and some of the -- the dates within the Board review system, we can direct our consultants to prepare a bit more of a targeted new deliverable for that specific question. Thank you.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: It's Heather Scott, with the Board.

So along those same lines in terms of, I guess, baseline data for Sandy Lake, I -- I assume there's lots of it out there, you've been collecting it for years, and -- and be comfortable using that data towards your recommended effluent criteria?

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. Yes, we've got a fairly extensive data set from, I think, over the last eight (8), ten (10) years on a lot of the lakes within our drainage system. We can make some -- have our consultant make some recommendations based on the historical data set and get back to the Board on that.

We will continue on with the more formal HHERA process just for our own internal governance and to provide information once that's

formalized as well. But we appreciate the opportunity to provide some further input into the Board's decisions on this topic.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: It's Heather Scott, with the Board. And one (1) more, so you have a hydrology station on Sandy Lake and what kind of data is that station collecting?

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, with the Board (sic). Yeah, the hydrology station there, it -- it measures lake elevation, right, so water level elevation and it gets monitored -- monitored annually.

THE FACILITATOR: Sorry, Rebecca here. We just had chuckled. You said, "Murray Somers, with the Board," I think. We're rubbing off on you.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, my apologies.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Rebecca here. If there's -- is there any other questions, comments from Fisheries and Oceans?

MS. MORAG MCPHERSON (BY PHONE): It's Morag McPherson, here with Fisheries and Oceans.

No, we don't have any questions in regards to the -- the water quality at this point. Thanks.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Great. Anything else in the room? Okay.

Then we can move on to the next topic, which is the re-submission of management plans and reports. So I'll turn the floor over to Murray for a short presentation on this.

PRESENTATION ON RE-SUBMISSION OF MANAGEMENT PLANS AND REPORTS INAC-CARD

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Thanks. Murray Somers, with INAC, and this one (1) will be short, absolutely so. That's a busy slide. For Morag on the phone, we are on slide 39.

These are the list of management plans or reports required currently under our current water licence and land use permit. I believe there's nineteen (19) there in total, seventeen (17) of which have been submitted and approved already.

The first two (2) at the top, the Reclamation Plan and the Status of Environment Plan have not been approved, according to that, which is true, because they've never been submitted. We have

int -- interim Status Environment Reports submitted, but when that condition was written in it was required to be submitted in February 2016, expecting remediation to be complete at that point in time, which it's not.

So -- so I provided in February a -- an interim Status of Environment Report with commitment to do an actual post-remediation Status of Environment Report following remediation under the new water licence. So that's why that one (1) has a not applicable yet.

And Reclamation Plan, that was specific -- or is specific to roads and drainages onsite, so essentially how we're going to reclaim the roads and -- and deal with the -- the bridges, there's two (2) bridges. So that's -- that's what that applies to, but it's required ninety (90) days before we do any of that reclamation work, which we haven't gotten to yet, so the plan hasn't been finalized. Okay.

So that's -- that's why these two (2) were never submitted and won't be submitted under the -- the current water licence. They'll be deferred. Everything else has been submitted there and approved. Is there any questions -- oh, we'll get to questions, I guess, on this.

I won't read them all unless you want -- does anybody want me to read -- no, I didn't think so. So, yeah, seventeen (17) management plans and reports were approved. We have had a design change to the land form on the TCA earth cover.

So the tailings containment area has a liner, a bituminous liner. On top of that to protect the liner we have an earth cover, all right. It's gone through a couple of iterations and design. Originally it was intended to be flat and then in 2012 had the great idea to actually create some land forms to -- to manage the flow off of the cap, which makes sense.

But it was revised again last year, or semi-recently anyway, to distribute the flow, because the 2012 design actually focussed the flow into one (1) drainage point off of the cap, which required a lot more rip-rap material, more armoury, and the new one is more distributive, all right.

So -- so I think there's five (5) channels now flowing off -- off the cap, so -- so your rows of flows will be a lot less, or highly reduced. So that prompted that.

So, I think I just explained all what's on the slide there. Oh, yeah, and the bonus for doing

that, so it reduce -- reduces the flows and required volumes. So we don't need as much rip-rap. And the bonus to that was the riprap material, we call it Type EF, just a size range, it all came from the west lower pond borrow area.

And with the reduction in need for that amount of material on the cap, the bonus is that the footprint for the west lower pond borrow area will be approximately half, and -- which is great, really great, actually.

So that was a nice bonus when -- when we re-looked at those designs and -- and came out with a new one. That's what we've been doing with ourselves during this care and maintenance period.

Now, there is, as I mentioned the two (2) outstanding reports. I won't go into those again. Oh, maybe I'll talk about the Status of Environment Report. We are proposing an eighteen (18) month period following Phase II Remediation, so likely around 2020.

Again, reasons whys -- why, eighteen (18) months will provide sufficient time to incorporate the final remediation year's water quality monitoring results, as well as the post-remediation aquatic monitoring findings. Okay. So if it was done

any earlier than that you might not get a true status of environment post-remediation,

All right. So -- so we figure eighteen (18) months will -- will give us the appropriate timeline to get a true status of environment post-remediation. And that report once complete and submitted, it'll be used to refine the SNP Program during the adaptive management phase and the long-term management phase.

But yeah, ultimately our scope has not changed. There's nothing new in -- in the new applications that -- that really differs from the previous application and the amendment application. The -- the scope's all the same. There's no new work activities, all within the same area, all triggers are equal.

Yeah, so -- so ultimately we don't really see much of a need to revise any plans. I did mention, however, that the -- the construction -- or the TCA Construction Design Report was -- we changed the design. When -- when I submitted -- when we submitted our application, we did provide a revised TCA Construction Design Report to -- to echo those changes that we've made.

The only thing that wasn't included in

that at the time were the engineer drawings, the issue for construction engineer drawings. Reason being is that until we actually tender, put our -- put our -- our new contract -- new remediation contract out for tender we can't divulge those drawings, okay, just as part of a fair and equitable process for Government of Canada contracting, all right.

So we can't. If we put them out there and one (1) group saw them and another group didn't, they would have an advantage, all right. So we had to hold -- hold on to those for the time being. But if the Board requires those drawings then we'll provide them once they're posted for the tender. And that's it.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Rebecca, here with the Board. Thank you for that, Murray.

So the -- the comments and questions on this section of the application were all from the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board Staff. But before I turn it over to staff, I just wanted to canvass the room to see if there's anybody else who has any questions on this topic before staff asks questions?

QUESTION PERIOD

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Rick Walbourne, ENR. We have no questions on this topic. Thank you.

MS. MORAG MCPHERSON (BY PHONE): And Morag McPherson, with Fisheries and Oceans. We don't have any questions on the report section. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Then I will turn it over to Board staff.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: Hi, it's Heather Scott, with the Board. So I'll just start with the sewage disposal facility operation and maintenance plan, and this is just a very minor update that I think the Board would need to see.

I realize this has been approved under your current licence, but we are dealing with a new licence. And just the section, your contingency for fecal coliform removal as is brought up on the ORS, I just don't think Board staff can recommend to the Board to approve that.

Environment Canada brought up some valid points about adding -- the concentrations of chlorine that you would require to significantly reduce fecal coliform is -- is toxic and usually those practices are used with -- with a subsequent de-chlorination step when you're using wastewater treatment and that can't be performed onsite.

So I think my recommendation would be and, as you say, this would ultimately be discharged to, I think, the TCA, if -- if discharge was ever required, so just simply your contingency could be to release that level of fecal coliform. Just a very small change.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. Just to clarify, Heather, are -- what is the Board's position then on what we should be proposing for a limit on fecal coliform?

My -- my reason for inquiring a bit further is we've had challenges on other projects where we have limited options for treatment for effective treatment as the Board's alluding to here. And that we've developed our management plans based on a -- a discharge from the treatment facility where we have overland flow removed from potable water sources.

So in addition to chlorination, a lot of the -- a lot of the data that's out there indicates that, like UV light exposure and whatnot is fairly effective at -- at addressing fecal coliform and other bacterial concentrations. So given that -- that our discharge locations from that facility are at quite a distance from any potable water sources in the area and that we're proposing discharge, like an overland

discharge, we're wondering if we could move away from setting a limit for fecal coliforms?

THE FACILITATOR: Rebecca Chouinard, with the Board. I just want to make a small point of clarification just in terminology. It's -- it's minor, but important. Just when we're responding, we're -- we're advised they're to the Board.

So when you ask, What will the Board do, it remains to be seen. We won't talk on behalf of the Board, but -- as advisors, what would Board staff -- what are our opinions.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: It's Heather Scott, with the Board. Just to clarify, from your response, you don't anticipate having to discharge from the sewage disposal facility? I can't remember exactly what you call it. The sewage disposal facility within the lifetime of the project.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. Yes, that's correct. We're not anticipating to have to discharge. So far during the last six (6) and a half years of operation we haven't had to discharge from that facility given the fact that it's a three

(3) cell system that doesn't -- the cells don't have a liner within them.

So we have, I guess, filtration out through the -- the walls of the -- of the facility itself and we've never actually had a -- a need to discharge any residual from within the system itself.

It -- the only potential concern we would have is at the end of a season if we've had a high camp occupancy as the L -- as the material within the facility berms start to freeze up, it could start to retain fluid later in the season.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, with the Board (sic). Yeah, exactly what -- with the Board, why do I keep saying that, it's INAC. Murray Somers, with INAC. For the record, if I say 'the Board' I mean INAC.

Yeah, exactly what Joel said. It's not anticipated, but -- but is possible, right. It hasn't in the past six (6) and a half years of -- of operation, unl -- unlikely over the next two (2), all right, but -- but it is possible.

But even -- even if it did occur it's unlikely that it would be a -- a large discharge. We would just be bringing it back down to -- to necessary levels, but, yeah.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: All right. It's Heather Scott, with the Board. Like -- like Rebecca said, I can't predict what the Board would and would not approve, but I can tell you for other sewage treatment in the territory the general Board recommendation, or Board decision is to set effluent quality criteria for any potential sewage discharge.

And I can say there have been occurrences where discharge criteria cannot be met and often it just requires working with the inspector for the best, I guess, alternative method for disposing of sewage. And I think my recommendation would be to -- to have that as a contingency plan instead of dumping a whole load of chlorine.

And as you said, wetland -- or on land treatment is a really great way of reducing fecal coliform, and reducing BOD, and nutrients, and all that good stuff that's in sewage. So I -- I believe that's probably a better contingency plan. And -- and, yeah, I -- I'm respectful of the fact that this is a very small discharge and a, you know, a small plan within your grand scheme of the remedial work going onsite.

But yeah, I just think in terms of what we can recommend to the Board, what I've just stated

would be a better plan of action and what I would recommend to INAC to propose.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Thank you, Heather. It's Joel, with INAC. I appreciate that clarification.

MS. TYREE MULLANEY: Okay. Tyree, with the Board. I have a quick question. Do you see the benefit of have ...

(BRIEF PAUSE)

THE FACILITATOR: Sorry, it's Rebecca, here. I just wanted to finish off this topic before we move on to any new ones and it sounds like Rick has a follow-up question just to that.

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Rick Walbourne, ENR. I was just wondering if you could give us any indication of -- and this might have to be a -- an IR or an undertaking, regarding -- I understand it's filtration, but there could be -- at the end of the year, like you said, the berms or the -- the area could be frozen.

Do you have any -- an estimate of what kind of quantities and quality that -- of that water and what we might be looking at for a discharge?

And further to that, I'd like to get a general understanding of where that loc -- how far would that location be from the nearest water body, for instance? So quality, quantity of that discharge potentially and location from the nearest water body I guess are the three (3) questions I have on that.

And I understand if you might not have all that here in front of you.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. Thanks, Rick, for that followup question.

So quantity, I guess, we do have some -- we have been provided with some of the -- the volumes within the -- each of the sewage cells within that three (3) cell system.

I believe that cell number 3 is around 50 cubic metres. I -- we can definitely follow-up with -- with more information after this meeting. We've -- we've never had the requirement to discharge from that system, so we've never actually undertaken any testing to be able to have kind of historical data on what the water quality was in that area.

And I think the nearest down gradient water body would be Hambone Lake, which is roughly about a kilometre from -- from the sewage lagoons there.

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Rick Walbourne, ENR. Thanks for that.

I was just trying to get a perspective on -- it seems like some small quantities and a -- and a fair distance from the nearest water body, but, yeah, like, I think Heather, Rebecca had mentioned that, you know, maybe some allowance for an ins -- I -- I think an EQC of some sort would still be required, but there definitely seems like some room for an inspector or the Board to make some approvals or -- or take a look at something if you guys got into a situation.

So, yeah, I -- I think there still needs to be some -- something in there regarding EQC, but, yeah, regarding testing, I think if you do need to discharge, obviously there should be some testing requirements. So, I think the Board should probably consider just making some condition that if it needs to be discharged, monitoring would be required. And then -- or testing, I guess, as opposed to monitoring, and then Board and/or inspector approval, whichever the Board seems more comfortable with.

But it's just my thoughts on that. Thank you.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Thanks, Rick. Joel,

with INAC. One (1) other point of clarification, Hambone Lake, as we discussed earlier on with Murray's previous slides, is indicated to be fairly impacted from historical operations.

So even though that's our nearest receiving water body it would be unlikely that that should be considered a potential potable water source as well, so.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: It's Heather Scott, with the Board. And just following up with another comment I had on the ORS.

So right now the licence is written such that there's effluent quality criteria for any potential sewage that's discharged. However, there isn't an SNP associated with it.

And I think what we might do just to make sure all our bases is -- are covered is recommend an SNP if -- like if -- if there is discharge, just so we can have that validation of the sewage meeting a certain -- certain criteria and then some sort of condition. I believe we would recommend to the Board if the criteria isn't met to, you know, have some inspector discrepancy, or Board discrepancy on that matter.

Again, I can only make these

recommendations and it ultimately will be the Board who decides.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. Thanks for that, Heather.

And one (1) other thing that INAC might request is we might evaluate potential discharge locations for kind of a stable discharge point, perhaps one (1) of the small wetlands that drain in through to the TCA, but outside of our current TCA structure, just to add some additional polishing through one (1) of the small wetlands neighbouring the TCA as a consideration.

But we'll maybe review that internally and provide some feedback to the Board advisors based on our team discussions on that if that's permitable?

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: It's Heather Scott, with the Board. That sounds good and I -- my recommendation would be that that seems in line with best available technology for sewage treatment in the north.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Rebecca Chouinard, with the Board. Any more on sewage? It

looks like we're good. Okay.

Sorry about cutting you off there, Tyree. I'll turn the floor back over to you for additional questions on this topic.

MS. TYREE MULLANEY: Tyree, with the Board. I'm going to shift gears. I'm -- I don't want to talk about sewage.

I want to talk about potential conditions for drafting a licence. Since we're in the Management Plan and Report section here, would you see the benefit of having a condition relating to the completion of each objective when it comes to the three (3) remedial objectives just to assist with gauging the proximity that your team is towards entering the adaptive management phase?

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. I would suggest that as part of our established annual reporting under the current water licence that -- that INAC-CARD could provide a -- a short section within our upcoming annual reports as to the current status of each of the objectives as we've set out under the remaining remedial work and the adaptive management phase of the project rather than having a specific deliverable associated with each of those phases.

Recognizing, the fact that certain components of the remedial objectives will be accomplished at different stages of the overall schedule.

MS. TYREE MULLANEY: Tyree, with the Board. Yeah, that -- I think I could work with drafting something along those lines. I just wanted to see where -- where you guys sat on that.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. I appreciate that, Tyree.

We're at -- our current schedule for remediation sees us completing most of the remedial objectives within 2017. However, our work is really dependent on a -- a very close sequencing of a number of tasks.

So there's a potential for certain aspects of the work to be pushed to the following field season. So we'd appreciate that flexibility for providing that more meaningful update to the Board on our transition between the overall objectives for the project.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: Hi, it's Heather Scott, with the Board. Just a question with respect to the TCA cap.

I'm wondering if you could tell us your

timing and scheduling for, I guess there would be some sort of tendering process for that, when you think you'll get your design drawings and when the actual work will be done?

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. Thanks for that, Heather.

So essentially, at this point our internal project team is working on finalizing our tender package, which includes the design specifications for the remain -- remaining work.

We're expecting those specifications to be finalized within the next month and tendering shortly after that. We're hoping to have -- have the project awarded before -- before the upcoming winter road season to allow our contractor to mobilize in over the 2017 winter road.

And -- sorry, I lost my train of thought as to -- could -- could you repeat the -- the last bit of your question there again, Heather?

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: When you'll receive design drawings from the con -- contractor, and I guess as well as -- as builds and then when the actual work will be completed?

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Thank you there. As design drawings will be released with the tender

package, so that should be released later on this summer, so probably by July those design drawings should be released.

The work will be happening over the 2017 winter -- or 2017 summer construction season. We expect that it should be completed by the end of that construction season. But, as I mentioned on the previous question, a lot of the work is dependent on some very tight sequencing between tasks. We obviously need to finish -- finish the water treatment to be able to -- to complete the final grading on the remaining exposed tailings and then removing up -- the East Upper dam to put those tailings material underneath the cap as well.

And -- and then we have to be able to then cap it within thawed ground conditions so we can get the appropriate compaction on the material. And -- and the implementation of the -- the liner construction as well has some -- some temperature dependencies as well.

So there's some -- a lot of sequencing that needs to be there. We should have design draw -- or as-built drawings by the end of 2018.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, here from INAC. And I just wanted to make one (1)

point of clarity there.

Heather, you'd ask that when do we expect the des -- the designs from the contractor. And I just want to clarify there that -- that it's the opposite relationship there where we've got AECOM building the design and -- and we give that design to the contractor, all right, yeah.

THE FACILITATOR: Rebecca Chouinard, with the Board. I just wanted to follow-up on this just so that we're crystal clear on what it is that has been submitted and what we are expected to do with that. And so please correct me if my assumptions are wrong.

But at this point you've given us what I'd call a straw dog. We know that there will be changes requested on the tailings cover design, but at this point we are not considering that as part of this review, as part of the renewal process. And instead, you would submit all of this information and request approval to change that design further down the road.

And if those assumptions are correct, I guess the only point to be aware of, that we've talked about internally as staff, is just ensuring that that design criteria isn't so different from what is currently on the table such that it would impact or

influence anything else in the renewal process, such as EQCs, their locations, and -- and, you know, water flow, and quality, and all that stuff.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Thanks, Rebecca. Joel Gowman, with INAC.

Again, I'd just like to echo what Murray had said earlier on during his presentations, the overall objectives of the cap have remained the same. We've just made some changes to the -- the land form structures within it to reduce the risk to the environment by disbursing the overland flow off that cap to increase its stability in the event of storm events and to make it more durable.

And by implementing those changes it also allows us to mitigate the risk to the environment from our implementation of the project by taking out -- or by revising the type of quarry material and activities that we're using throughout that construction so that we minimize impact to the surrounding environment.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, from INAC. Yeah, just a little bit more follow-up on that, is we -- we have provided with this application an updated TCA Cover Design Report, right, and it does reflect that -- that there's no change to the

footprint of the TCA and there's no change to how those materials -- the waste rock and the tailings contained within there, the volumes don't change.

You know, like they're all -- everything is still the same on the base of the actual tailings consolidation within the TCA. It's just the structure on top, how the water is shed off the top. And so we've just tweaked it to -- to be more distributive, right, instead of have -- having a concentrated flow it'll distribute the flow off -- off the surface and -- the surface of the TCA.

So that -- that's the design change. And -- and that is shown and described in the updated plan. The only thing that's not in there is engineered drawings.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: It's Heather Scott, with the Board.

So just to be clear again, so it's your intent to submit that formally as a modification with the renewed water licence at this time?

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, with INAC. Yeah, if the Board requires engineer drawings then they can be provided, because the -- the current one (1) does have them. The current approved plan, I should say, 2012 design.

THE FACILITATOR: Rebecca Chouinard, here. Yeah, just -- I'm just looking at the existing condition and all of the information that's required for approval of the TCA cover. And one (1) of those things is the drawings stamped by an engineer, all -- you know, that -- that wish list of all the things that we would need.

So I guess, yeah, just what -- how we're -- our assumptions are that this is the beginning, just showing -- showing the conceptual or, you know, the -- the hoped-for plan, but that you would submit that updated plan with all of that information for approval down the line?

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, with INAC. That's right. You're -- you're reminding me that that is a condition -- or a -- a component of the condition to provide those, so yeah, we -- we can absolutely provide them, there's no problem.

We have them, I think, about 80 percent complete right now. And the ones specific to the cap might be completed, I'm not sure. But -- but anyway, the only reason that we haven't submitted them yet is simply because of the fair and equitable process for -- - for Government of Canada contracting process, right.

So -- so we -- we need to wait until

the tender goes out before we can release those and have them be public documents and that's anticipated to be this summer, so.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. Yes, it's -- we should have finalized design drawings within the next -- within the next month to two (2) months at the latest.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, with INAC. Yeah, so those drawings, the -- the issue for construction drawings can be submitted to the Board before any issuance of any licence or probably before it -- the water licence is drafted.

THE FACILITATOR: Rebecca Chouinard, with the Board. Okay. That's helpful information.

I'm just thinking about timelines and such. If -- if this was a -- a plan that you would want the Board to decide on upon issuance or with issuance of the renewal, you know, we would have to get all of that evidence in time, prior to interventions and all of that stuff.

The way the -- the condition currently reads is you'd need Board approval ninety (90) days prior to construction. So I'm just thinking about the timelines for that, how that all fits in terms of getting all the information from you folks that the

reviewers would need to review as part of this process, or submitting post-issuance of the renewed licence knowing that there's that ninety (90) days if that same condition applied in the renewed licence.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: So -- Joel Gowman, with INAC. We've provided a -- the conceptual plan with the application, that the overall plan within that is -- is what the -- what INAC-CARD is proposing to move ahead with. The main thing that does -- isn't included in that conceptual plan is more of the design specifics, and elevations, and whatnot.

Our actual onsite work for that component of the remaining project work won't be started until probably May 2017. We would be able to provide those drawings to the Board, as Murray says, as soon as we've released the documents for tendering, which I'm not sure if that -- how that would work on the timelines.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, here with INAC. Yeah, if it -- if essentially completing the plan by providing those -- those issue for construction drawings during mid-process for the water licence renewal, if that creates a problem for the -- for the Board processes, then like -- like Joel said, we wouldn't have a chance to act on -- on that

plan and do any additional work to the TCA cover until, yeah, probably May 2017.

So if the water licence is issued kind of on schedule as per what was provided there, it would be December 2016, which would give us ninety (90) days. At that point we could submit the -- the drawings to finalize that plan upon issuance of the water licence, right.

So that should give us time, but -- but if it's -- it would be easier for INAC or -- to give us more time and more -- a less thing to worry about if we could just update the -- the plan with the drawings now, but I don't know if that jives with the -- the process.

THE FACILITATOR: Rebecca Chouinard, with the Board. My thinking off the cuff is that it would be easier to wrap it into the renewed licence just because of the tight timelines now in this process. As soon as you have that information I think you can submit it and we'd be ready to go straight out of the gate.

My other concern is that just to assist reviewers to focus their review, so they know exactly what it is that they're reviewing and commenting on for the renewal. And I think our assumption, at least

thus far has been that that plan would be reviewed as -- as part of the renewed licence. And it seems as though we've got enough time to do that.

So I think my preference would be to do it as part of the renewed licence to give the reviewers the full opportunity to review all of the components, all of the design criteria, in addition to checking off all of things that would be on that list.

But if that information is all available upfront we could get that process going really quickly, and I -- I don't think that May target date would be a problem at all.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Just to clarify though, our -- our plans to resume construction on the cap wouldn't recommence until May. But given the fact that the remote location of the site and the fact that if there's any changes, or suggestions, or concerns brought forward by the Board or Intervenors for the approval of that component to the site, I think CARD would like to try to provide the information to the Board as soon as possible so that we get the approvals well in advance of May.

Because if we do need to make any modifications, we would need some more extensive time in order to do that. So like I say, we should be able

to have the documentation ready to release by July. And I think, if possible, we'd like the opportunity to -- to submit that.

THE FACILITATOR: Rebecca Chouinard, with the Board. Yes, I -- I would then just encourage you to submit it when you get it. We can evaluate where we're at in the process at that point.

What we have done with other files in the past where we've received updated plans where they're eager to get going, we have had those plans and we've posted them so reviewers can see them, but not to, you know, fetter the Minister's decision or the Board's decision have not officially begun that review until the day of. And the day of we could get started on those reviews and -- and make them happen pretty quickly.

But that said, I think as soon as you get that information just submit it and we'll see where we're at at that point.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Thanks for that clarification, Rebecca.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Rebecca

Chouinard, with the Board. Just wondering is there any other questions from anybody on -- on this topic, Management Plans and Reports?

I'm not seeing any nods, so I think at this point we're almost at noon, right on schedule, so I think we will break for lunch.

I know there are a couple Information Requests that were put on the table and required a little bit of discussion before finalizing. And if the folks are involved in those Information Requests are available to stick around for another five (5)-ten (10) minutes that would be great.

Otherwise, let's meet back here at 1:15. Oh, it sounds like INAC has something.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. Just one (1) question for the Board advisors with regards to the reclamation plan.

A couple of our components of the site have shared interests between INAC and third-party land users, specifically Seabridge Minerals or -- Seabridge Gold with their -- their Courageous Lake project.

In particular the -- the road between the airstrip, and our site, and the -- the bridge over the Sandy -- Sandy Creek. Essentially, there -- there

may be some interest from Seabridge to include some of that infrastructure within their -- their -- within their project. So we might be adjusting some of our commitments under our proj -- overall project description as far as whether -- how the -- how we complete our project with regards to removal of the bridges and scarifying the roads.

So we were looking for some input from the Board advisors as to the best way to ensure that our operations don't -- don't unfairly impact other permitted users of the site.

THE FACILITATOR: Rebecca Chouinard, with the Board. Yeah, it's a -- definitely a complicated situation and not the first time INAC-CARD has faced these types of challenges. So I think, you know, we have some precedence out there. I'm thinking of Tye He (phonetic) and Discovery (phonetic).

In particular, I think at this point I'm strongly encouraging you folks to engage with Seabridge and -- and any recommendations you put forward to the Board just really clarify what conversations you've had and the rationale for what you want to do and any discrepancies. And I think if there's a need we could bring both parties to the table or, you know, hold a workshop or whatever to

iron out some of the details.

If there -- if you have any proposed wording for, you know, what would be required as part of the licence, I -- I encourage to put that forward. Otherwise, beyond just keeping communications tight with Seabridge and the Board, I think we would try to work that in through the process moving forward post-issuance.

But if you have a different suggestion I'm definitely interested in what that would be.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. And I appreciate your feedback there, Rebecca.

We will be continuing to have ongoing discussions with Seabridge just to advise them of our progress and various operations throughout the rest of the site, because we've got shared use of the airstrip and other components of our operation.

And I would probably suggest that it be handled outside of the renewal that we document our communication and the overall plan and the -- the reclamation plan that's associated with the -- the roads and a submittal to the Board under its -- the kind of the standard conditions and timelines. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Great. Okay.

Rebecca, with the Board. With that let's break for lunch and meet back at 1:15. Thank you, everybody.

MS. MORAG MCPHERSON (BY PHONE): Rebecca...?

THE FACILITATOR: Oh, yes?

MS. MORAG MCPHERSON (BY PHONE): This is Morag, with Fisheries and Oceans. Before we break, I have another meeting at one o'clock today so I'm not going to be available to sit in this afternoon and I don't think Georgina is able to either.

So I just wanted to -- to say a couple things if that's all right before I go. And then if -- if some topics come up on the long-term monitoring for DFO or questions, I guess those could be forwarded to myself and to Georgina.

THE FACILITATOR: Sure, yes. Go ahead, Morag, if you want to -- if folks don't mind staying another five (5) minutes or so?

MS. MORAG MCPHERSON (BY PHONE): Sorry about that.

THE FACILITATOR: No problem.

MS. MORAG MCPHERSON (BY PHONE): Morag, again, with Fisheries and Oceans. Yeah, I just wanted to say, because I won't be able to be there, if there's sort of closing remarks on this, but we've

been involved in this project and the previous water licence and a lot of the plan development and monitoring reporting that's happened over the past eight (8) years, I guess.

So a lot of the information that's here, we've -- we've provided input into that and feel pretty comfortable with what is still being proposed and any small changes that have happened, so in terms of the -- the millpond drawn-down was sort of a bigger one, which we've worked with them on that and feel that the mitigation measures are in place that we've asked for in terms of our evaluation of impacts there.

So we feel comfortable with what's been put forward and don't really have any outstanding information items at this point, or issues, and just wanted to communicate that to the Board and to the proponent at this point in time. And we'll continue to provide input on the draft licenses, and through the process, and -- and reports and plans that come forward.

It's mainly been the -- the monitoring plans and the erosion and sediment control plan that we've provided input on, so we'll continue to do that through the process. But otherwise, yeah, no outstanding issues at this point.

THE FACILITATOR: Rebecca, with the Board. Okay. That's good to hear, Morag. Thank you for that. And if anything does come up that relates to Fisheries and Oceans this afternoon, we will try to capture it in the form of an Information Request and -- and get it sent to you by the end of the day or by tomorrow.

MS. MORAG MCPHERSON (BY PHONE): Great. Thank you very much.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you. And with that, we will break for lunch.

MS. MORAG MCPHERSON (BY PHONE): Goodbye.

THE FACILITATOR: Bye-bye, Morag.

--- Upon Recessing

--- Upon Resuming

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Okay, I think we'll get started. It sounds like we've got the phone up and running. And I think we've got everyone in the room that we're expecting.

So this is Rebecca Chouinard, for the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board. And just for anybody who's joined us, the technical session today

will -- is being recorded. And so prior to speaking, if you could please state your name, your organization and speak slowly. And I've got signs to help remind everybody.

I think we'll start off by just reviewing the Information Requests that we captured during the morning. But before we do that, I just want to go around the room one (1) more time. We've got a new person in the room, so if we could just do a roundtable of introductions before starting off, for the record. And we'll start over on this side of the room.

MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North Slave Metis Alliance.

MS. JEN POTTEN: Jen Potten, Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board staff.

MS. SHANNON ALLERSTON: Shannon Allerston, Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board staff.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: Heather Scott, Board staff.

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Rebecca Chouinard, Board staff.

MS. TYREE MULLANEY: Tyree Mullaney, Board staff.

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Rick Walbourne, ENR Water Resources Division.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, INAC.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, INAC CARD.

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: And I don't think there's anybody on the phone. If there is, speak now. No, okay. Perfect.

With that, I'm going to turn the floor over to Jen to read out the Information Requests from this morning.

MS. JEN POTTEN: This is Jen, Board staff. So the following -- there's -- we've got three (3) Information Requests that we've combined, and so I'm going to go through them one-by-one. All of them currently, according to the work plan, are due June 23rd, 2016, which is tomorrow -- or today, the 28th. There we go. I'm glad that I said that so we can be correct.

So I know that we were talking a little bit about time this morning. So if that date doesn't work based on what we've -- we've proposed for wording here, then let us -- now's the time to sort of talk -- talk about that.

So the first Information Request is about the water treatment facility. Based on all of the current and historical water quality data downstream of the water treatment facility, including but not limited to information collected for the human health and ecological risk assessment baseline data and annual reports, please provide evidence and rationale that supports INAC CARD's recommendation to maintain the discharge criteria identified in part B, item 6, of the existing water licence, MV2009L80008.

And I can repeat that if you guys would like.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. I'm assuming this will be forwarded to us in an email so we'll have the exact wording?

MS. JEN POTTEN: Yeah, definitely. We're going to send out these hopefully by the end of the day and, if not, by tomorrow. Okay.

The second Information Request is about the SNP for decommissioning. Please provide surveillance network program stations with associated effluent quality criteria, if applicable, with supporting evidence and rationale to ensure ongoing protection of the environment following decommissioning, including testing requirements,

sampling frequencies and parameters and activation triggers.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. Is that effluent criteria with regards to our discussion on the sewage discharge or the overall water treatment discharge?

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Rebecca Chouinard. That's the one -- the overall, so. And we're thinking about once any dams are breached or water treatment has stopped, just sort of looking past the -- the next one (1) to two (2) years, that five (5) year monitoring, adaptive monitoring phase.

So without defining what all of those areas or activity triggers might be, we just thought if we open it up and -- and put it in your court to try to define certain activities that might trigger the need for additional sampling stations and propose EQC and SNP locations, if applicable, knowing that some stations might be just for monitoring and others might be appropriate EQC stations or compliance points, yeah.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Okay, thank you for the clarification. That -- that sounds good.

I know some of our existing stations are seepage stations and whatnot that aren't actually

relevant for current operations now, so, it's a good opportunity to make everything more meaningful. Thank you.

MS. JEN POTTEN: This is Jen, Board staff. So IR Number 3 is about sewage discharge. Please recommend surveillance network program station locations, testing requirements, sampling frequencies and parameters, activation triggers and discharge criteria for sewage discharge from the sewage treatment facility, if needed, as a contingency measure.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Okay, it's Rebecca, with the Board. So as Jen mentioned, we'll ensure that those Information Requests are sent out. If you have any questions about those or want to look the wording over during a break prior to closing the session, then you'll have the opportunity to do that, as well.

So okay, with that, let's move into our next topic, long-term monitoring and triggers. So I'll turn the floor over to Murray for a presentation on this topic.

PRESENTATION BY INAC-CARD re LONG TERM MONITORING AND TRIGGERS

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, INAC, here. I'll flip ahead. This part is going to be pretty brief considering we -- we mentioned before right at the top here that long-term monitoring is going to actually fall under a new type B -- land use permit and type B water licence, so I haven't put a lot of information up here today, but we'll -- we'll get into it here and then we'll have a good discussion.

So our adaptive management phase is intended to run until 2023 and a five (5) year ideal and after which we'll kick into long-term monitoring. Trigger for the -- a better trigger than just saying 2024 anyway is to -- to say that, once adaptive management phase indicates that the site is geotechnically stable and water quality is stabilized as per the 2016 AGGRA (phonetic) that's coming up, then -- then that will indicate, okay, it's time to go into an annual monitoring kind of scenario, long-term monitoring plan.

Yeah, which I said, yeah, will reduce down to one (1) year. Now, in order to determine what

you're monitoring you have to establish a baseline condition for long-term monitoring, and it's going to be based on a few things that are -- are up and coming, right?

So we don't have, you know, say what SNP stations need to be out there right now, what parameters exactly we need to be monitoring because, well, you can't know -- it's a little too early to know that right now.

But the 2016 AGGRA is going to predict long-term impacts and rate of recovery, so it's going to have some identified risks or potential risks out there that are predicted, which are things that will feed the long-term monitoring program.

As we said earlier, as well, status of environment report will likely be around 2020. That's also going to identify and describe any environmental risks remaining at the site which will help refine appropriate stations and -- and parameters.

And last are -- yeah, the -- during the adaptive management phase we'll be monitoring the whole time and the results of that. We'll -- we'll also show any post-remediation environmental trends that -- that we might want to continue to -- to watch and monitor.

But at that poi -- at this point, that's about as -- as far as we can look in the long-term monitoring of the site, so not much else to say at this point, so I'll hand it back over.

QUESTION PERIOD

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Okay, it's Rebecca, with the Board. Thank you for that, Murray.

I'm just looking at the -- the agenda, and it identifies a few comments that came out during the online review system review. And they're all from Mackenzie Valley Land and Wat -- Water Board staff.

Before I turn the floor over to staff, I just wanted to canvass the room to see if there are any questions or suggestions, comments, points of clarification on long-term monitoring for others in the room.

It does not appear so, so I will turn the floor over to Board staff.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. TYREE MULLANEY: Okay, this is Tyree, with the Board. Just a question that I have are -- is: What are the triggers that would move the

project from remediation to adaptive management? When would that transition happen?

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: It's Murray here, with INAC. I -- I guess it was touched on as probably definitively as -- as I can understand it right now -- right now, is once the objective of the adaptive management phase has been reached, which is ensuring that the site is, essentially, geotechnically stable and there's no erosion control issues or -- or the site features that have been engineered onsite, as long as they're performing as expected, don't need any more annual maintenance onsite, then we can consider it geotechnically stable.

And -- and once water quality has -- is likely stabilized as far predicted from the AGGRA, then -- then we can move into the long-term monitoring phase. Is that clear?

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. TYREE MULLANEY: This is Tyree, with the Board. I'm just going to go back. What I meant was, from phase 2 remediation into the adaptive management phase, what would be that transition there, not more so the adaptive to long-term?

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Right, got -- sorry. Murray, with INAC.

Yeah, I touched on that a little bit in one (1) of the previous presentations, as well. And through discussions that we've had previously, it -- it looks like once natural free flow is established -- re-established between Mill Pond and Hambone Lake, the -- the sequencing of events in the remediation program, that can't happen until basically all the other remedial objectives for phase 2 has been reached.

So that's, essentially, the last thing that can happen. And so that's probably the most logical point to say that phase 2 remediation is complete and we're entering into adaptive management phase.

There's always the possibility that during adaptive management, that monitoring could -- could show that a water quality's not behaving as expected and maybe we need to treat water for a bit longer or something while we fix something, but -- but that can still be kind of done under the umbrella of -- - of adaptive management.

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Rebecca Chouinard, with the Board.

I just want to follow-up on this line of questioning just to give you a sense of why we care, and it's just for the purposes of drafting the licence for consideration to the Board.

And I think it's linked to some of the IRs that are already drafted in terms of the SNP stations, when -- when should new SNP stations come online, when should existing ones go offline, will there be new EQCs, will there be new compliance points, will there be a requirement for additional plans or modifications to plans, that sort of thing.

So I think we're trying to think of this in -- in a drafting frame of mind. So I -- I think just in terms of your comments on the -- your responses to the IRs, if -- if any of that -- those triggers come to mind, particularly activity -- defined activity triggers for changes as it relates to a water licence, that would be helpful.

And I guess you'll have the opportunity also when you review the draft licence that -- that we'll do our best to prepare.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. Thanks for that clarification, Rebecca.

We'll -- when we're preparing our responses to the IRs, we'll keep that in mind for the

-- making sure that we try to outline our -- our trigger points for that transition between phases. And ...

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: It's Heather Scott, with the Board.

So having all that said, I'm trying to think about what information you guys will have in the next couple of years to inform some of those decisions. And I'm wondering if you'll have any reports generated on your end which will help inform your plans for two (2) years down the line when some of those triggers will occur and how that could inform our process as well and if we could write conditions.

You know, say if you have an adaptive management plan being generated by one (1) of your consultants, then that could be a requirement under our licence to -- to get that report at a certain time.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Yes, so, Joel Gowman, with INAC. We can definitely provide a bit more information on what sort of deliverable we would have for setting out adaptive management scope.

We have discussed it within the -- within the context of our upcoming tendered documents for what would be included within year 1 of adaptive management. And we can definitely provide a bit more clarity with our -- the response to the IRs that are in place.

I'm just trying to think. Is there anything you'd like to add, Murray, on that?

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Yeah, Murray Somers, INAC. Yeah, we'll -- we'll work hard on that to -- to make sure that things are more -- like an SNP program mo -- long-term monitoring -- or during the adaptive management phase, whatever it is, is set up to be more trigger based, like you said; that's essentially how it's set up now.

So during particular activities there's differing monitoring requirements, right? And -- and so we can definitely look at that as well and come up with what's most logical for -- for our operations, yeah.

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Rebecca Chouinard, with the Board. I just wanted to clarify that.

So you -- Joel, you said that you would be able to provide a list of dever -- deliverables

that are being developed by the INAC CARD team's consultants that could help inform possible water licence conditions or could help identify potential triggers, activity triggers?

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. We will have some of the -- the scope activities within our -- kind of our internal discussions we've already had with our team.

We haven't -- haven't necessarily developed other plans that we can pull off the shelf currently to feed into that. But we can -- with the context of the discussion as far as setting new SNP points and -- and compliance points, we can definitely provide more information with the Information Requests with those responses.

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Rebecca Chouinard, with the Board.

Just to clarify, you could provide that as a Information Request by June 28th?

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Rebecca Chouinard. To -- not to force your hand or anything, but perhaps an attempt to do so.

And if during your review of the water licence, the draft water licence that will be circulated, if additional things come to mind or -- I -- I mean, you might not have a comprehensive list right now, but is it fair to maybe ask for what you -- what you definitely have online right now?

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel, with INAC. Yes, we should be able to put together a conceptual approach anyhow. And we can modify further with discussions with your team once the draft licence is ready for review.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Yeah. Sorry, Murray Somers here, with INAC.

I think what we can do is take a look at what the monitoring SNP program looks like right now and -- because it's all activity-based monitoring, essentially baseline and activity-based monitoring.

And -- and the activities onsite for remediation aren't going to change, so -- so, like, the dam removals and whatnot, they're still all covered under during excavation of tailings and whatnot that -- which are already triggers within the -- the SNP program.

So I don't know if -- I think we're -- we're looking at a once triggers are removed sort of

thing, so once we move into the next phase what's it going to look like. And then -- so once we move into adaptive management, so certain triggers are going to be lost, and -- and so what's it going to look like at that point in time, and -- and the same for long-term.

So, yeah, we can definitely come up with something conceptual for that, obviously, requiring refinement as -- as reports and thing -- whatnot come in.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Sorry, one (1) other thing. Joel Gowman, with INAC.

With regards to reports, we'll still have, obviously, our construction completion reports that our consultants will be preparing and the risk assessment. And any of our annual water licence monitoring reports will all feed into how we -- what suggestions we make as we go forward here, so.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: Hi. It's Heather Scott, with the Board. Thanks for that.

I guess I was asking that original question to help alleviate the work a little bit. So if you're already producing a report that would help inform our decisions, then we could align our process with what are deliverables on your end, as well. That's what I was getting at, I guess. Thanks.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. I think, in that context, probably the construction completion report after the 2017 work season should give us a better understanding of what we're proposing for some monitoring stations, both for our due diligence and for environmental compliance.

So that report probably -- I'm just trying to think of a -- it'd be early 2018 before that report would be out. That would be a good -- a good set of data to feed into some of that.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. JEN POTTEN: This is Jen, with Board staff.

So another suggestion, instead of providing a hard and fast date, is to provide a time frame post an event, so, following the completion of that activity, then, you know, ninety (90) days, four (4) months, kind of thing like that, is -- is less accurate than a date, but that -- we can still use that to set a time frame.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. I think, from an operational perspective, if we said four (4) months from the completion of site activities we should be able to have a construction completion report from the 2017 field season.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Okay, Rebecca Chouinard here. I got a little confused, but I -- it turns out I wasn't confused, so that's good. But just to make sure nobody else is confused, I'll attempt to clarify.

I think what we are asking for is, yeah, the -- it sounds as though your team is developing a number of various documents, like the status of environment report and the HHERA and all -- you know, all of these things that aren't necessarily required under the water licence but you're doing them anyway.

And some of those reports or plans or studies have helpful information in them. And if we can align our processes and align some of the conditions with some of the findings that some of your ongoing, you know, studies will provide, then I think

it could be a win/win.

So I think the -- the request was simply, if you have a sense, even a conceptual general idea of what that list of different report studies, plans are that you've got in the pipes right now or that you see coming down the pipes that we might be able to align some of our licence conditions or, you know, annual report requirements or whatever.

If you're -- if you're getting this information anyway, maybe we can use it. So I think the way the question -- I think the Information Request is just a simple list of what reports and plans and studies and stuff you have planned for that upcoming years.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Thanks for that clarification. Joel speaking again.

I think we can definitely provide some more information on reports that would provide relevant information feeding into that. In particular, I think some of the study results that we're doing over the course of the summer, our water balance and geochemistry reports, will be really useful for -- for feeding those decisions.

And it'll also be timely information to be able to provide that information in advance of

finishing up remediation and -- and finalizing our compliance points and monitoring stations for that next phase of adaptive management.

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Rebecca Chouinard. Thank you. I think that will be really helpful.

Since, you know, the licence was drafted a number of years ago, some of that information that me -- we might want to have, that would be great to know that you already are collecting that information and to, you know, align our -- our requests with what you're actually doing if it's, you know, gives us the information we need.

So to avoid duplication or anything like that down the line, I think that would be very helpful, so, great.

--- INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 4: INAC CARD to list what reports and plans and studies and stuff you have planned for upcoming years.

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Moving on. Is

there -- are there any other questions from Board staff on -- okay.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: Hi. It's Heather Scott, from the Board. So looking at the monitoring -- what is this plan that you've submitted to the Board, Development of Tundra Mine Construction monitoring, long-term monitoring and environment programs.

So that document says that, following the submission of the status of the environment report, that you'll make decisions about long-term monitoring. So we're presuming that the status environment report will -- the submission will be a condition of the new water licence.

Do you anticipate that you'll change -- you'll make updates to this plan within the life of the next water licence or would that be something that you would do for the submission of the type B water licence application?

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. I think that the -- the preparations for our next type B water licence is going to be kind of a progressive task that we carry out as a team over the next seven (7) years, essentially, looking at what challenges we encounter, especially earlier on in the

adaptive management, to make sure that we're -- we're incorporating the right sampling -- sample frequency and sample locations into that longer term monitoring plan.

So I guess we would be -- we would be preparing a revised or updated plan for submission to the Board. We'd probably be looking to the Board staff for some advice as to whether or not it's best to formally present and review that with the Board staff during this water licence or if it -- or if it's a document that feeds directly into the application for the -- for the type B.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Rebecca Chouinard, with the Board.

I think it's a point we'll have to think about a little bit, but it's -- I think it's related to the -- the previous Information Request and part of the benefit of knowing what plans you've got and what studies and programs are in place. We could link, you know, the adaptive management framework to certain, you know, reporting requirements to -- to specific points where you get additional information,

so the findings of the SOE or, you know, other things down the line.

So I think we'll probably want to take -- have a little think about how that would be worded in the draft licence and what -- I envision probably a schedule that would say all the things that should be in there and what should be reported on and at what stage, at what time, and the linkages between, you know, the var -- various phases and the differences between those phases.

So I think we will try our best, based on the information you get -- give us through the additional IRs, to craft something along those lines. And please do comment on that element of the draft licence when it comes out.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Thanks, Rebecca. Murray and I were -- this is Joel Gowman speaking.

Murray and I were just discussing during that little intermission as well that the long-term monitoring plan, similar to what you were saying, would likely be best informed by the results of the statement of environment report.

And then any of the trends and results that were -- were identified in the -- what I'm assuming is going to be an annual reporting

requirement under the adaptive management phase. So any -- any results that we see there of elevated criteria in certain areas or if we -- if we're observing stability in certain areas and that, we'd take that into consideration when we're developing the long-term monitoring plan.

For the adaptive monitor -- or adaptive management phase of the project, similar to what we said before, we'd be looking at our water balance report, the geochemistry report, and the risk assessment to kind of develop a firmer -- kind of basically an update to the -- the 2000 -- the SENES report that you have in front of you there, Heather, 2011, sorry, basically to provide an updated sampling plan or monitoring plan for that adaptive management phase of the project.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, INAC. Just to follow-up on Joel's -- his comment there.

Yeah, once -- once remediation's done, all of our activity-based triggers are pretty much over as per SENES 2011, right. And so I envision that the -- the first year of adaptive management is going to pretty much follow the monthly SNP program as it is right.

Like I said, in August we'll suggest some revisions to that simply based on -- on results we're seeing, right, the -- the lack of -- of hits essentially for a lot of the far-out stations and whatnot. We might want to -- to reduce those numbers a little bit. But -- but, otherwise, I imagine for the first year we'll basically follow the SNP as per -- - the baseline SNP as per the current licence. And then -- and then based on that status of environment report, we can refine.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: Heather Scott, with the Board. So in terms of timing, if the Board were to require some sort of adaptive management plan or framework, what would be the right timing for INAC to submit such a thing?

It's Heather Scott, from the Board. And that timing could be, you know, by a date or by a trigger, work onsite or a trigger of a report that INAC has had contracted.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. Just to tie it back in with some of -- one (1) of our previous responses, we're just wondering if

it'd be acceptable to the Board if we said four (4) months following the completion of the 2017 field season.

Is that a time line that would be -- meet your requirements?

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: It's Heather Scott, with the Board. Can you clarify when your field season ends?

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. So, essentially, at the Tundra Mine we've -- our -- the end of our field season is usually between the end of September and early to mid-November is, essentially, the latest we've operated onsite. Just with the shortness of days and the temperature and other weather constraints, it quite severely limits what we can do any later than that.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Okay Rebecca Chouinard, from the Board.

Just in an attempt to keep things

moving here, that's -- I think this was a helpful conversation for our purposes for drafting the licence. And again, knowing your time lines for the other reports and -- and things that are coming in will be helpful.

And I think we'll take a stab at, you know, using all this information to propose something in the draft and again make recommendations, suggestions on whatever we draft and provide your rationale. And I think that will probably be the best way forward on that topic.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Okay, Rebecca Chouinard, with the Board. Just wondering, is there -- are there any more questions from folks around the room on long-term monitoring and triggers?

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: No. Okay, we're a bit ahead of schedule. And I suggest we just keep plowing through. Our snacks and coffee have not yet arrived, so why don't we just move on to

miscellaneous items. And the first topic there is hydrocarbon contamination. And there were a couple comments from ENR.

So if we pass the floor over to ENR.

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Rick Walbourne, ENR. Yeah, we did have a couple of questions on the -- on the hydrocarbons. One (1) was just related to some contamination, I guess, that happened during remedia -- the remediation phase.

I spoke to Murray on the phone about that. And they -- and CARD did provide a response in their -- in the ORS table, so we're -- we're satisfied with that -- with that response. Some -- some actions were taken moving forward to hopefully prevent that from happening in the future, so that was fine.

The other comment we had there were regarding some questions we had about the remediation criteria that was being used for soils. Again, we're -- I spoke to Murray offline there, and -- and they provided a com -- a response in the summary table. So, again, ENR is satisfied with the response that was provided by CARD.

So we have no further comments or concerns in that regard at this point. Thank you.

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Rebecca

Chouinard, with the Board. Thank you for that, Rick.

Any other questions or comments on hydrocarbon contamination? Nothing around the room. Okay, the next topic is general. And there were a few questions from Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board staff.

Before we move on to that, just wondering, are there any other questions, comments, recommendations under the general category for anyone else in the room? No. Okay. Then I'll turn the floor over to staff.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Okay, it's Rebecca, with the Board. I did have one (1) question, and it's rather just a point of clarification, and it was comment number 10 in the ORS table. And just a little bit of background on this. It's about the fact that your site is located on both federal and non-federal areas.

And I recently was at a meeting with GNWT officials and federal officials and -- and was relieved to learn that there have been a lot of conversations and collaborations behind the scenes on

this project. And it sounded as though everybody is satisfied and in support of drafting one (1) licence to the federal minister with federal inspectors.

And just wanted to get this clarification of support in the form of -- in writing from both folks at GNWT and INAC so that we don't go too far down the road without having it officially on the record from both parties that -- that this is the best way to manage and regulate this site.

So feel free to provide any background on this. But I am requesting that both GNWT and INAC respond in -- in writing just officially stating that there is some discussions going on behind the scenes and collaboration behind the scenes and the -- the federal licence, federal minister, federal inspectors is supported by both parties.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel Gowman, with INAC. So I guess, from a proponent perspective, I'd just like to say that we within INAC CARD support that approach going forward. It's worked well over the last couple of years. Since devolution we've had a really good working relationship both with our GNWT inspectors and the INAC inspectors.

And, obviously, our GNWT counterparts can follow up with -- with the Board directly. I

would suggest that perhaps through the regulatory process, that that request for INAC's support for that approach from an INAC regulatory mandate come directly from the Board to our INAC lands office rather than directly to CARD as we try to maintain a bit of a firewall between ourselves and our lands office for kind of, yeah, obvious reasons.

Just with INAC having that dual mandate, it's important for us to maintain that separation of roles. But we can -- we can definitely give our lands office a heads-up. But for -- for the record, if that could come from the Board to the INAC lands office, that would be appreciated.

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Rick Walbourne, GNWT. Yes, I'm a little aware -- I am aware that some conversations have been taking place between AANDC and GNWT. I'm also aware that it was discussed at a meeting. I think Nathen might have been at that meeting with the Land and Water Boards.

So I'm -- I'm glad it's a written undertaking so I can send that request to the proper people. I'm not re -- totally plugged in on that side of things. But it is my understanding that that's the preferred approach moving forward. And, yeah, we'll take that as an undertaking. And we'll get something

back to you in writing. Thanks.

--- INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 5: Requesting that both GNWT and INAC respond in writing officially stating that there is some discussions going on behind the scenes and collaboration behind the scenes and the federal licence, federal minister, federal inspectors is supported by both parties.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, INAC. Rebecca, I was just wondering if I could ask you to clarify something.

You said you had recently had -- sat down and had a meeting. And it sounded like the approach is going to be one (1) water licence signed by the federal minister with, I thought you said,

federal inspectors.

And so I just was wondering would -- what would GNWT's inspector's role be if we have the one (1) federal water licence?

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Rebecca Chouinard, with the Board. I think that is, in essence, what we're also trying to get at through the Information Request.

And my understanding, based on the meetings that we had, was that there was a collaborative agreement just through delegated authorities. And -- and there was something discussed and worked out that it would still fall under the -- the INAC inspectors and that that was okay with everybody. And there was some sort of collaboration happening behind the scenes on that.

So I think that is -- is one (1) of the points. So which minister and which inspectors and is there one (1) instrument or two (2)? And I think -- so that's sort of a three (3) point question, just to get further clarity that everybody is on the same page with how the licence should be drafted and approved.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Joel, with INAC. I think, from an INAC CARD perspective, we've -- like I said before, we've got a good rela -- relationship

with both -- both land offices, federal and territorial. So we would support having it either federal only inspectors with -- with some sort of agreement between the two (2) parties or -- or maintaining the separate inspector roles.

As CARD is a proponent again, we appreciate being part of the discussion but would defer that recommendation to the Board from our INAC lands office instead of directly from us.

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Rick Walbourne, ENR. All I'd ask is that in your Information Request, because that -- that'll be passed on to the appropriate people, so be very clear on what you want, if it's one (1) or two (2) licences or -- or how GNWT inspectors may or may not play a role under a federal licence.

So just outline exactly what information you want, and -- and I'll make sure it gets to the appropriate people, but just be clear on -- - on those different components of that IR that you're looking for. Thanks.

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Rebecca Chouinard, with the Board. Point well taken. Yeah, so we'll make sure that we are very clear about -- about that request, number of instruments, who's going

to inspect, and which minister is going to sign. So I'll make sure that those three (3) points are -- are clarified in the request. And we will send them to the lands office as per your request, Joel.

Okay, any other questions, suggestions, comments, point of clarification under general for the group?

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. SHANNON ALLERSTON: It's Shannon Allerston, with the Board.

I have a couple just sort of administrative and, like, wording questions as -- as I was going through the SNP and annual water licence reports. And there just seems to be some little discrepancies, so there might be a few changes in the draft water licence, and I want to kind of go through some of them and see what you think about maybe some of the changes and if they're correct or not.

So I noticed there is an SNP station, 14-1, at Matthews lake. And its purpose right now is described as monitoring potable water and dust suppression. But since the first licence was written there's also been water taken for those purposes from

Sandy Lake and Bulldog Lake (phonetic).

And I can tell from the water licence annual reports that those are still being monitored somewhere, but it no longer seems to be just SNP 14-1 doing that job. Is that correct?

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, with INAC. Yeah, that -- that is correct. Yeah, Matthews Lake, and water is withdrawn for -- for camp use. I won't say potable, but, yeah, for camp use and dust suppression for sure. Dust suppression though primarily now comes from Bulldog.

And I've never known it to happen, but I believe it has -- there has been water taken from Sandy, as well. But I think our control plan dust suppression section indicates that that is a potential source, as well yeah.

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Yeah, I believe the -- the use out of Sandy Lake was -- sorry, it's Joel speaking again. And Sandy Lake water withdrawals were primarily associated with dust control on the more northeasternly section of the roadway out in that area.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. SHANNON ALLERSTON: I guess just for drafting the new SNP for the water licence we may look at including whatever monitoring stations are currently at Bulldog and/or Sandy if there's plans to continue using those into that SNP 14-1 and be 14-1A and 'B'. I don't know which monitoring program they belong to right now because I do see that there -- the quantities in the volumes of water being taken from there have been reported.

Would that be okay?

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Yeah. Murray Somers, INAC. Yeah, I -- I don't see any problem with that, yeah.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. SHANNON ALLERSTON: This is sort of a follow-up to that question. And, like, as I mentioned, I'm not a hundred percent sure where those monitoring programs are coming from already. And this is Shannon Allerston, with the Board, sorry.

So there's also all these ground monitoring -- groundwater monitoring wells and other monitoring programs that are probably from your statement of environment or construction monitoring

outside the SNP. And I don't know if there's any benefit or disadvantage to just including them all in an SNP to have them all in one (1) in place.

And I just want to hear your thoughts on those.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers here, INAC. Yeah, no, that's something to consider for sure because, yeah, all the groundwater monitoring, you're right, it comes from that SENES 2011 construction monitoring, so. And it's -- and it's only strictly for -- for when there's construction activities happening, so, like, PHC excavation and -- and tailings and waste rock excavations and water treatment, I think. Anyway per -- maybe not. But, anyway, I'd have to double-check that. But, yeah, that's where it comes from.

And we will have one (1) to two (2) more years of those activities happening, right. So, yeah, moving them into one (1) SNP program, I don't see the problem with that as long as it's, you know, kept as a construction activity type of scenario, right, where -- yeah, when -- when those specific activities that are listed in SENES 2011 are happening, then -- then, yeah, you'd monitor as per the frequency sort of thing, right?

And just to -- to let you know, too, if you're not aware already, a lot of the groundwater monitoring stations that are listed, some of them have been destroyed intentionally, right. They were placed in the middle of the tailings and -- and we knew that they were going to be destroyed during the excavation.

So -- so some of them have -- literally, they're gone. And a lot of them were monitoring seeps and that sort of thing, as well, which have dried up. So -- so we have a lot -- a lot of trouble, even though the station's still there, actually getting enough water to sample, and so an awful lot of times, we -- we can't. There's not enough water in -- in the wells. So -- so that'll be one (1) thing that's going to come from us in August when we review the water licence as -- a suggestion we remove some of those groundwater wells.

But from an administrative perspective, yeah, that would be simple to look at one (1) document, yeah.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. SHANNON ALLERSTON: This is Shannon Allerston, with the Board again.

So I guess this could probably be added to something that you're already completing for us with the current SNPs. If maybe we had a list of sort of all the monitoring stations you have, what their purpose I, and, I guess, triggers for getting rid of them as we move forward so we can built it into the water licence, as well.

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Yeah, Murray Somers, INAC. Yeah, that -- that sounds reasonable. It sounds like something we could easily do.

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Wonderful. Rebecca Chouinard. I've added that as another Information Request. I believe it's the sixth.

I've been paying attention. Great. Okay, thank you.

--- INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 6: Provide a list of all the monitoring stations, what their purpose is, and triggers for getting rid of them

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: I think we just have one (1) more question from the Board. Okay. We just have one (1) last question, I think, if --

yeah, you guys. Okay.

MS. HEATHER SCOTT: I'm just wondering. In the groundwater monitoring you have onsite, is any of that built around your sewage treatment system? Because I believe you said it's not lined in a lot of -- there's probably some infiltration or sometimes they're called exfiltration lagoons, for some reason. I've never figured that out.

Yeah, is there any -- is there any monitoring of that system by groundwater at this time?

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, INAC. The answer is no. No, there's no groundwater monitoring wells around the sewage treatment area.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Okay, Rebecca Chouinard, Board staff. Last chance for anyone in the room on anything. Just double-checking. Is there anybody on the phone? Any last thoughts or comments from INAC staff?

MR. JOEL GOWMAN: Yeah, Joel Gowman, with INAC. I just wanted to again thank the Boar -- the Board staff for giving us this opportunity to

review our project with you guys. And I know that you're -- you're also working quite -- quite diligently at shortening up some -- working on some fairly tight time lines and that.

Murray and I were just discussing some of our current field travel, and also getting the appropriate input from our consultants if the IR response date could be revised from the 28th to the 29th, if that would -- if we can still make that work within your schedule?

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Rebecca Chouinard, from the Board. Just wondering if there are any folks around the room that have any objections to this being as interventions are due on July 5th?

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Rick Walbourne, ENR. No, no problem.

MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North Slave Metis Alliance. No issues.

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Rebecca Chouinard here. I think that we can make that work, so that's fine. We'll clarify that when we send all of the Information Requests out to the distribution

list.

Anything else from INAC?

MR. MURRAY SOMERS: Murray Somers, INAC. Yeah. I'd like to echo what Joel said. Thanks for allowing us to come and explain everything for you guys. Yeah, this was my first technical session, so I'm very pleased.

And the message is -- is loud and clear to -- to CARD here that with these Information Requests we're to respond with the appropriate information. And -- and we'll do our best to make it as useful for drafting condition licences, as well, right, yeah. So that message has been received. Thanks.

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Perfect. Rebecca Chouinard here, with the Board. I just want to quickly go over the -- the final three (3) IRs of the day.

Number 4 was that list of div -- deliverables that are to be -- being developed by consultants or the INAC team that could help inform the water licence conditions. And that was to be a conceptual list of information that you have as it would help, yeah, define some -- some trigger dates or activities in terms of other plans required by the

licence.

The fifth one was an Information Request to INAC lands office and GNWT. And that was for a clarification on the federal and non-federal components of this project, specifically whether there should be one (1) or two (2) regulatory instruments, which inspectors, and which minister for sign-off.

And the final Information Request of the day, the sixth one, was a list from INAC of all monitoring stations and the purpose that those stations serve that are not currently part of the SNP.

I believe in an earlier Information Request about SNP stations you were also going to clarify which SNP stations you think no longer apply, and the re -- reasons for that, as well.

Oh, and the same for -- sorry, just to clarify this last Information Request. So the list of monitoring stations and the purpose they serve right now, the ones that are not part of the SNP, and whether you want to get rid of any of those non-SNP monitoring stations and -- and the rationale.

(BRIEF PAUSE)

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Okay. So, as

promised, we'll get those Information Requests out to all parties ideally by the end of today, tomorrow at the latest. We'll clarify the new due date of the Information Request as the 29th of June.

Once again, written interventions are due July 5th, proponent's responses July 8th, Intervenor public hearing presentations due July 14th, INAC's due the 14th. And the public hearing is scheduled for July 28th.

We will attempt to get the pre-hearing conference agenda out today or tomorrow, as well. And that is scheduled for June 30th.

So with that, I'd like to thank everybody for taking the time, INAC CARD team for all your hard work putting together these presentations and answering questions and the reviewers for the time that you put in with your recommendations and points of clarification much appreciated. It really helps our process along. And I look forward to the -- the rest of the process.

Rick, you wanted to say something?

MR. RICK WALBOURNE: Rick Walbourne, ENR. Sorry, I just want to do just a little bit of a closing comment here regarding interventions and -- and next phases of the process.

I think, from ENR's perspective, we raised a few points there during the initial review. And we're very comfortable with the information and the responses that were -- that were provided by CARD. As such, I don't anticipate that a formal intervention is going to be provided by ENR. And I think from some comments from DFO, and from speaking to them as well, it seemed that they're leaning in the same direction.

So in place of an intervention we can make a formal submission to that effect to say that we're -- that we have no further concerns with the process. As such, we'll be make -- making no recommendations in terms of if a hearing proceeds, if -- the Land and Water Board is still welcome to request GNWT's presence if you have questions say specifically on -- on the IR and some of that -- that aspect of GNWT.

But I guess depending on the IR response and what happens after that, you can make -- you can make a decision on that end. But just regarding technical recommendations and that -- on that side of it, I don't anticipate much more from -- from ENR in that regard.

So I just wanted to -- to let you guys know that at this point so you can -- as you were

planning a further line of process. Thanks.

MS. REBECCA CHOUINARD: Thanks, Rick. Rebecca Chouinard, with the Board. That's certainly helpful information. Of course, as per the legislation, we are not able to cancel a public hearing until ten (10) days prior to its scheduled date. So we do have that marked down as July 18th.

So we'll -- we will be very interested in -- in the various reviewers' takes on whether or not they would like to participate in a public hearing or participate in some other sort of written proceeding.

So we will be canvassing folks for their thoughts on that at the pre-hearing con -- conference on the 30th, but that's really helpful information to know. And I think we'll have to just stand by and wait for that magical date to -- to finalize any plans on having or -- or not having the public hearing.

Did anybody else want to make any final remarks or statements before we close out for the day? It doesn't look that way. So again, thank you to everybody. And I look forward to the next stage of the process. Have a good afternoon.

--- Upon adjourning

Certified Correct,

_____

Wendy Woodworth, Ms.

G

Q