November 23, 2018

Mr. Sean Sinclair
P.O. Box 2498, 300-5201, 50th Avenue
Yellowknife, NT X1A 2P8

Dear Mr. Sinclair,

**Re: Information Request for DDMI (W2015L2-0001) 2014 to 2016 Re-evaluation Report and Design Plan Version 5.0**

Diavik Diamond Mines (2012) Inc.’s (DDMI) submitted the 2014 to 2016 Aquatic Effects Re-evaluation Report and Design Plan Version 5.0 for Water Licence W2015L2-0001 to the Wek’èezhìi Land and Water Board (WLWB or the Board) on March 14, 2018. The request was distributed for public review through the Board’s Online Review System (ORS) and reviewers provided comments, which DDMI responded to on August 14, 2018. Board staff have follow-up questions regarding DDMI’s responses to ORS comments that are outlined below.

1. **ECCC comment 5**

ECCC comment 5 indicates concern with the removal of plankton richness from the weight of evidence (WOE) approach. In its response, DDMI states that plankton richness “will be analyzed as part of the routine AEMP data analysis and weight-of-evidence assessments…”

Plankton richness does not appear to have been explicitly part of the WOE approach in the previous version of the AEMP Design, so it is not clear that it has been ‘removed’. That being said, there is a change in the WOE assessment whereby the Biological Response Endpoint related to phytoplankton and zooplankton has changed from "community structure" to "relative biomass of the major taxa groups". It is unclear what this means and whether it will influence the use of plankton richness in the assessment. In the 2016 AEMP, a high effect level rating for the biological endpoint was based on comparisons of taxonomic richness, but it is unclear if this would be used now that the Biological Response Endpoint is proposed to change.

Please explain how plankton richness will continue to be used as part of the WOE assessment?

---
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2. **EMAB comment 9**
EMAB comment 9 was seeking clarification on which below detection limit (DL) data was removed from the snow chemistry analysis because it was unclear if this was for all statistically analyzed variables or only those with variable DLs. The response provided by DDMI is unclear. The first part of the response suggests that the removal of below DL data was only for total phosphorus (TP) and orthophosphate (OP), but the last part of the response suggests that it applied to all nutrient and metal data. Please clarify the response.

If all data below DL was removed, please explain which data the following sentence from Page 27 of the Main Report applies to: “These data were included in the analysis by substituting values of half of the detection limit (DL) during the re-evaluation.”

3. **EMAB comment 13**
EMAB comment 13 asked DDMI to provide a discussion of whether more short-term effects have been observed for dust deposition. DDMI’s response provides a discussion of why it believes pooling is appropriate but does not answer EMAB’s question. Please provide a response that addresses EMAB’s question.

4. **EMAB comment 16**
EMAB comment 16 was requesting clarification of a potential discrepancy in dust deposition data for station SS5-4 and suggested the inclusion of error bars to Figure 3-4. In its response, DDMI committed to adding error bars to the figure and reviewing the potential discrepancy related to SS5-4.

It appears that the discrepancy was not reviewed and addressed in response to this comment. Please provide a response to this comment.

With respect to the error bars on Figure 3-4, since it is not known at this time whether a revised version of the report will be required and whether reviewers will have a chance to view and comment on an updated figure, please provide a discussion as to whether the inclusion of error bars influences DDMI’s interpretation of which sites should be considered background.

5. **EMAB comment 17**
Similar to EMAB comment 16, measures of variability were requested by EMAB to help determine the appropriateness of including data/stations as background. DDMI has committed to revising figures and tables to address this, but it is not known at this time whether a revised version will be required. Please provide a discussion as to whether the assessment of variability influences DDMI’s interpretation of which sites should be considered background.

6. **EMAB comment 18**
EMAB comment 18 asked for a discussion or rationale for the use of medians for trend analyses presented in Figure 3-8. EMAB also asked that DDMI add details to the figures to help identify what is being presented. DDMI committed to revising the figures/tables but did not provide a response to the question about the use of medians. Please provide a response regarding the use of medians.

7. **EMAB comment 20**
EMAB comment 20 asked for two things; one being a clarification of which data (i.e., stations) from the NF,
FFA, FFB, and FF1 areas were selected for analysis and presentation in Figure 4-35. DDMI did not provide a clarification regarding this question. Please provide that clarification.

8. **EMAB comment 22**

EMAB comment 22 had recommendations for the ice-covered season DO data to be compared to the CCME 9.5 mg/L benchmark for early life stages, and for open water season DO data to be compared to benchmarks. DDMI committed to adding a paragraph detailing results for the open-water season but provided no response to the question of comparing ice-covered season DO data to the 9.5 mg/L benchmark. Please provide a response to the question about the 9.5 mg/L benchmark.

It is not known at this time if a revised version of the report will be required and whether reviewers will have a chance to view and comment on a revised paragraph, thus it would be helpful if DDMI could provide a discussion regarding what the overall findings of all the comparisons to DO benchmarks would be and whether that has any influence on the overall conclusions of the report. Please provide this discussion.

9. **EMAB comment 23**

EMAB comment 23 had a recommendation for DDMI to include a comparison of in situ pH data to laboratory pH data to validate the exclusion of “anomalous” data. In its response DDMI committed to adding a statement or paragraph detailing results of this comparison in a revised version of the report.

At this time, it is not known if a revised version of the report will be required and whether reviewers will have a chance to view and comment on a revised paragraph, thus it would be helpful if DDMI could provide a discussion regarding what the overall findings of these comparison and whether it has any influence on the overall conclusions of the report. Please provide this discussion.

10. **EMAB comment 28**

EMAB comment 28 asks DDMI to provide additional discussion to support the conclusion that the adjusted biomass measurements for zooplankton do not affect the conclusions reported in the respective annual reports. DDMI’s response explains that it did not influence the overall extent of effects calculation but did not comment on whether these effects to the zooplankton biomass influenced Action Level comparisons. Please confirm and explain.

11. **EMAB comment 34**

EMAB comment 34 noted a potential error in Figure 5-2 for the 2014 data, where the extent of effects does not match what was reported elsewhere. It was recommended that DDMI verify that data for all years are correct and to provide updated interpretations and conclusions. DDMI confirmed that the 2014 panel in Figure 5-2 was incorrect but did not comment on whether it confirmed whether errors were present for other years. Please confirm that DDMI has verified data and the relevant figure for all other years.

DDMI also did not explain whether this influenced any of the report’s conclusions. At this time, it is not known if a revised version of the report will be required and whether reviewers will have a chance to view and comment on modified text, thus it would be helpful if DDMI could provide a discussion regarding whether this error (and any potential others) has any influence on the overall conclusions of the report. Please provide this discussion.
12. **EMAB comment 42**
This comment from EMAB was asking about the lack of WOE analysis for 2014 and 2015. In its response, DDMI indicates that this analysis was not required in those years, as per the AEMP Design. Table 5-8 shows that the WOE analysis was done annually, until 2014. The change to include the WOE analysis only in comprehensive monitoring years appears to have been included in Version 3.2 of the AEMP Design. It is not clear that this change from Version 3.0/3.1 had been identified for consideration by the Board. Can DDMI clarify whether this change was a deviation from Version 3.0/3.1 of the AEMP Design? If so, can DDMI clarify how this change was identified for the Board’s consideration.

13. **EMAB comment 44**
EMAB comment 44 had a recommendation for DDMI to review and update Figure 5-13 and the associated text to help explain/support the conclusion that the elevated concentrations of TP at the MF stations are most likely related to dike construction, rather than dust deposition. In its response DDMI indicated that Section 5.2.3.2 explains what is being presented and that the figure will be annotated further to focus on the stations affected by dust deposition.

Board staff have read Section 5.2.3.2 and it is not clear how the figure is being used to present the influence of dust on TP concentrations. Is the distance from the diffuser equivalent to the distance from the dust source? If yes, can DDMI provide support for the effluent and the dust source being at the same location? It appears that the different symbol shapes on Figure 5-13 are indicating different sources of TP in the water. Can DDMI explain how these different sources were determined?

DDMI also indicated that the Figure would be annotated further; however, at this time, it is not known if a revised version of the report will be required and whether reviewers will have a chance to view and comment on a revised Figure, thus it would be helpful if DDMI could provide an explanation of how it plans to update this figure and why the updates will be helpful.

14. **EMAB comment 46**
EMAB comment 46 was about the greater number of exceedances of the normal range observed for soluble reactive phosphorus (SRP) concentrations for bottom depth samples. In its response, DDMI noted that top/mid/bottom data for NF and MF stations are presented in annual reports and that the “data do not show major disagreement in effect among depths”.

(i) Can DDMI clarify if this conclusion about no major disagreement is based on the data from the annual reports?
(ii) How is DDMI assessing/determining the absence of major disagreement? Please explain this conclusion.

15. **EMAB comment 49**
EMAB comment 49 addresses the change in laboratory for nitrogen analyses in 2013 and recommends that DDMI provide additional discussion of the implications of this change on the nitrogen monitoring results. In its response, DDMI indicates that a discussion was provided in the 2013 AEMP Annual Report. The current question is asking for a discussion of implications on results of the current Re-evaluation, which includes an assessment beyond 2013, and includes trends/patterns observed from 2014 to 2016. DDMI also indicates that Section 5.3.4.2 addresses the implication of greater variability and possibly biased results, however, these statements appear to be related to the ammonia concentrations, in which there were analytical issues (not about the change in laboratory).
Please provide a discussion on the implications of the laboratory change for all nitrogen results observed from 2014 to 2016 and how this may have influenced the overall temporal trends observed through the monitoring program.

16. **EMAB comment 50**

EMAB comment 50 asks DDMI to identify the trophic boundaries being applied. In its response, DDMI says they will be provided as requested, but does not provide them in the response.

At this time, it is not known if a revised version of the report will be required and whether reviewers will have a chance to view and comment on a revised document, thus it would be helpful if DDMI could provide an explanation of which trophic boundaries it would include and the reference source for the boundaries. Please provide this information.

17. **EMAB comment 54**

EMAB comment 54 asks DDMI to clarify the methods for nutrient analysis in sediments or to modify the text if there was an error. In its response DDMI says the “text will be revised to remove contradicting sentences.”

At this time, it is not known if a revised version of the report will be required and whether reviewers will have a chance to view and comment on a revised document, thus it would be helpful if DDMI could provide an explanation as to how this text will be revised (i.e., what are the contradictory statements that need to be addressed). Please provide this discussion.

18. **EMAB comment 58**

EMAB comment 58 notes discrepancies between the text and Table 6-5 regarding years in which low effects were observed for strontium, vanadium, and total nitrogen in sediments. In its response, DDMI indicates that text will be revised to match the results from Table 6-5 for vanadium and strontium. DDMI did not, however, indicate whether this change to the text influences any of the conclusions made about sediment effects. DDMI also did not address the potential discrepancy noted for nitrogen.

Please address the nitrogen aspect of EMAB’s comment. For all three variables (i.e., strontium, vanadium, and nitrogen), please indicate whether updates to the text also affect any of the interpretations made in the sediment section.

19. **EMAB comment 59**

EMAB comment 59 suggests that the results for chromium in sediments suggest the presence of a mine-related effect. This part of the comment was not addressed in DDMI’s response. Please address EMAB’s observation and discuss any potential implications.

20. **EMAB comment 60**

EMAB comment 60 provides a rationale for why trends in absolute concentrations of sediment quality variables (i.e., not normalized for fine particulate and TOC) may be worth analyzing and asks for rationale for their exclusion. DDMI’s response explains that the raw data plots are provided, not analyzed, but does not provide rationale for why they are not/should not be analyzed. Please provide the rationale as requested by EMAB.
21. **EMAB comment 61**  
EMAB comment 61 notes potential discrepancies in the correlation analyses provided in Table 6-6 and the resulting normalizations that were done for boron, lead, and tin data prior to trend analyses. In its response, DDMI says that Table 6-6 and/or the models will be updated but does not confirm whether discrepancies exist and whether this has any implications on the results of the Re-evaluation Report. 

At this time, it is not known if a revised version of the report will be required and whether reviewers will have a chance to view and comment on a revised document, thus it would be helpful if DDMI could provide an explanation of what, if any, changes are required. Please also provide a discussion of what the implications to the interpretation of results would be.

22. **EMAB comment 63**  
EMAB comment 63 notes that the conclusion about TN concentration being within the normal range for Lac de Gras does not match the results presented in Figure 6-2, which shows concentrations above the normal range for many years at one MF site and at several FF sites in 2016. EMAB asks that DDMI update any conclusions made based on this statement. In its response, DDMI explains that it will update the general statement about the figure to say that TN concentration were within the normal range at “most” stations, but does not explain whether this change affects any of the other conclusions related to TN. Please confirm and explain whether any other changes to the interpretation of results are required.

23. **EMAB comment 64**  
EMAB comment 64 suggests re-running the trend analysis for TN in sediment without the anomalous 2013 data. In its response, DDMI states that it will re-run the analysis. At this time, it is not known if a revised version of the report will be required and whether reviewers will have a chance to view and comment on a revised document, thus it would be helpful if DDMI could explain the outcome of re-running the analysis and whether the outcome has any influence on the interpretation of results presented in the report. Please provide this discussion.

24. **EMAB comment 69**  
EMAB comment 69 notes discrepancies in the results presented and explained for cyanobacteria (i.e., figure and table does not match interpretation in the text). In its response, DDMI indicated that the text would be reviewed, and appropriate corrections made but did not explain what these corrections would entail. 

At this time, it is not known if a revised version of the report will be required and whether reviewers will have a chance to view and comment on a revised document, thus it would be helpful if DDMI could explain what changes are required to the text and whether this would influence the interpretation of results presented in the report. Please provide this discussion.

25. **EMAB comment 74**  
EMAB comment 74 asks about including comparisons of critical effects size (CES) for all years in which an Action Level was exceeded, not just 2016. In its response, DDMI states that a “comparison to the CES of a historical result does not provide anything meaningful to the interpretation of the results and the intent of a re-evaluation. What is relevant is the current re-evaluation period (i.e., 2104 to 2016) and where the current magnitude of difference sits relative to the CES.”
(i) Please provide further explanation for the response provided by DDMI.
(ii) Could historical comparisons not indicate whether the risk to the environment was new during the 2014 to 2016 period, and/or whether this risk had increased?

26. EMAB comment 75
EMAB comment 75 notes problems with the discussion of results for temporal trends of fish variables and asks for an explanation of these in its recommendation. In its response, DDMI says that this will be added to a revised version of the report but does not provide what this updated explanation would be.

At this time, it is not known if a revised version of the report will be required and whether reviewers will have a chance to view and comment on a revised document, thus it would be helpful if DDMI could explain what changes to the text are required, and whether this would influence the overall conclusions related to mine-related effects to fish. Please provide this discussion.

27. EMAB comment 76
EMAB comment 76 had a number of questions related to the CPUE data, one of which was not addressed in the response provided by DDMI. While DDMI explained why a normal range was not appropriate for CPUE, it did not provide an explanation for how the temporal assessment provided in Section 9.2.2.2 was done. Please explain the temporal assessment of CPUE (e.g., statistical analysis, visual analysis?).

28. EMAB comment 77
EMAB comment 77 notes that the statements made in the text regarding differences in parasitism over time at the different sites do not agree with Figure 9-4 and Table 9-7. In its response, DDMI indicates that the statement is not referencing statistical differences but acknowledges that the use of “all sites” may be misleading because no comparison to 2007 is possible for the MF3 site. Based on the proximity of the points and the error bars on Figure 9-4, it appears that 2007 is similar to 2013/2016 at the NF area. Please comment further on the results for the NF area.

29. EMAB comment 80
EMAB comment 80 addresses the inability to calculate a critical effect size (CES) for the Liversomatic Index (LSI) because of a significant interaction between area and the covariate (i.e., carcass weight). EMAB notes that being able to calculate a CES is necessary for the evaluation of Action Levels 2 and 3 and recommends that DDMI “provide a discussion of how action level comparisons will be made in the event of "significant interaction" issues with data analysis.”

In its response, DDMI explains that in the future, “in the event that Critical Effect Size (CES) cannot be calculated for metrics with significant interactions, additional guidance from the EEM Technical Guidance Document (Environment Canada 2012) will be applied to attempt to calculate the magnitude of effect on fish health endpoints with significant interactions.”
(i) Please summarize what this additional guidance is and provide an explanation for why it was not applied in this report.
(ii) How would any of the conclusions regarding AL evaluation for LSI change if this additional guidance were applied to the data presented in the Re-evaluation Report?
EMAB comment 90

EMAB comment 90 addresses some missing normal ranges from Slimy Sculpin tissue metal plots (i.e., antimony, beryllium, and bismuth). The footnote for Figure 9-20 indicates that the normal range for bismuth was not visible on the scale of the plot; no footnote was provided regarding the absent normal ranges for antimony and beryllium on Figure 9-21. Please explain the rationale for these missing normal ranges.

EMAB comment 91

EMAB comment 91 notes that Section 9.3.2.2 of the Report discusses comparisons of mercury in Lake Trout tissue to baseline and that there is no description of what constitutes baseline in this case. In its response, DDMI explains that baseline data refers to “mercury concentrations measured in composited Lake Trout muscle tissue in 1996.”

In an earlier comment regarding 1996 mercury concentrations in Lake Trout (EMAB comment 82), DDMI explains that 1996 data were not used for temporal and spatial comparisons. As explained by DDMI, this data was not used because it was based on composite samples from multiple fish, rather than individual fish, and therefore not comparable to samples taken in later years. Please provide support for the use of 1996 data as a baseline for comparison in Section 9.3.2.2 given DDMI’s earlier statements about it not being appropriate for temporal analyses.

EMAB comment 95

EMAB comment 95 includes a number of recommendations for how DDMI could improve clarity in the presentation of the results for Lake Trout mercury concentrations, as well as a recommendation to address the apparent discrepancy between the text and Figure 9-36 regarding the conclusions about differences in mercury concentration in Lake Trout from Lac de Gras and Lac du Sauvage.

In its response, DDMI states that “text will be updated for clarity in the revised version of the report.” At this time, it is not known if a revised version of the report will be required and whether reviewers will have a chance to view and comment on a revised document, thus it would be helpful if DDMI could explain what changes are required to the text and whether this would influence the overall conclusions related to mercury concentration differences in Lake Trout from Lac de Gras and Lac du Sauvage. Please provide this discussion.

EMAB comment 98

EMAB comment 98 notes that the figures used to present the temporal trends in the key driver endpoints for the WOE analyses are confusing and highlight a number of potential discrepancies between the figures and the text. In its response, DDMI agrees that the figures are potentially confusing and suggests that they can be deleted in the future, “in favour of describing the key driver endpoints narratively in Section 10.4, and referring to individual endpoint ratings in the appendix tables.” It is unclear how DDMI will assess potential temporal trends without these figures.

(i) Will this assessment also be done narratively?
(ii) Has DDMI considered other ways of summarizing this information graphically?

EMAB comment 117

EMAB comment 117 recommends that DDMI provide details of the non-lethal fish sampling program field methods (i.e., description of sampling effort, target number of individuals captured, randomization process, and number of sites, etc.). In its response, DDMI states that “Further details on the non-lethal fish sampling
program will be added in the revised version of the AEMP Design Plan."

At this time, it is not known if a revised version of the Design Plan will be required and whether reviewers will have a chance to view and comment on a revised document, thus it would be helpful if DDMI could explain, with rationale, the study design details it intends to add with regards to the non-lethal fish sampling program. Please provide this discussion.

35. **EMAB comment 119**
EMAB comment 119 recommends, with respect to data/endpoints for the fish sampling program, that DDMI “Provide a detailed description of the metrics that will be incorporated into reporting and the methods for analysing these metrics, including action levels where applicable.” In its response, DDMI explains that “These methods were described in Section 4.8.4; however, further clarification will be added.”

At this time, it is not known if a revised version of the Design Plan will be required and whether reviewers will have a chance to view and comment on a revised document, thus it would be helpful if DDMI could explain what clarifications it intends to add. Please provide this discussion.

36. **GNWT-ENR comment 8**
GNWT-ENR comment 8 recommends that “DDMI should discuss why the relationship between chlorophyll a and phytoplankton biomass by area is “weak” but the relationship between chlorophyll a and phytoplankton biomass by year is “moderate to strong”. In its response, DDMI explains that the “relationship between chlorophyll a and phytoplankton biomass by area is “weak” compared to the relationship between chlorophyll a and phytoplankton biomass by year, which is “moderate to strong”, because there is more data (larger sample size) included in the “by year” correlation, and there is a greater range in the data values when data for all years/areas are included in the correlation.”

Please provide further explanation on this response.

In the supporting text for the recommendation (i.e., GNWT-ENR comment 4), the figure reference for the phytoplankton by area relationship (i.e., Figure 5-35) appears to have more data points than any of the individual years listed in Table 5-20. Please provide an explanation for this.

37. **GNWT-ENR comment 31**
GNWT-ENR comment 31 asked for clarification on how distance would be considered in the mixed models for assessing spatial and temporal trends in Lac de Gras. This was in reference to the analyses described in Section 4.3.4.10 of the 2014 to 2016 Re-evaluation Report. In response, DDMI explained that clarification on the use of distance would be added to the revised version of the Report.

At this time, it is not known if a revised version of the Re-evaluation Report will be required and whether reviewers will have a chance to view and comment on a revised document, thus it would be helpful if DDMI could explain what clarification it intends to add. Please provide this discussion.

38. **GNWT-ENR comments 36 and 37**
GNWT-ENR comments 36 and 37 ask about the statistical power of the biological action level 1 comparison. The GNWT-ENR asked that it be estimated for the proposed and the current biological action level 1 using data from the latest AEMP cycle (i.e., the 2016 AEMP Annual Report). GNWT-ENR explains that this would
provide context for assessing the proposed changes to the biological action levels. DDMI did not provide an estimate for either one and indicated that it would be the same for both, with the difference being the inclusion of more FF area data in the Action Level 1 comparisons. It would be helpful if DDMI could provide the estimates as requested by the GNWT-ENR.

(i) Please further explain how the statistical power of the proposed and current biological action level 1 would be expected to be the same.
(ii) If one includes more years of FF area data, would this not provide more statistical power?

39. GNWT-ENR comments 34 and 38

GNWT-ENR comment 38 asks DDMI to discuss the proposed changes to the biological action levels in light of the following statement made by DDMI in the Re-evaluation Report: “Therefore, from the perspective of evaluating the potential for aquatic toxicity in the NF and MF areas, the FF areas were considered suitable as “minimally affected” sampling areas in the statistical comparisons for evaluating Action Level exceedances.” Based on the other comments made by the GNWT-ENR, this appears to be looking for further rationale to support changing the action level comparisons to reference conditions (rather than to the mean of the FF areas) given that the quote from the Re-evaluation suggests that using the FF area mean is suitable.

In response to GNWT-ENR comment 34, DDMI explained that these changes were made in response to Board direction from Version 4.1 of the AEMP Design. The original direction on this issue came from the Board’s decision for Version 4.0 of the AEMP Design and was based on a response by DDMI during the public review which indicated that the comparisons being made by DDMI were to the Reference Conditions Report values, rather than the FF area means. The Board had asked that this be reflected in Version 4.1; however, this was not reflected within Version 4.1 despite being included as revised within the conformance table. It was thus not clear what comparisons were being made, and the Board’s direction from Version 4.1 was the following:

“The Board has thus decided that DDMI is to address the statistical comparisons for Action Levels 1 and 2 for biological components during comprehensive years as part of the 2014 to 2016 Aquatic Effects Re-evaluation. DDMI should clarify if comparisons are being made to the same year FF area means or to the reference conditions as defined in the approved Reference Conditions Report.”

This appears to allow for the possibility of considering the use of FF area means for biological comparisons. With that in mind, please provide further rationale for the proposed changes to the biological action levels (i.e., the appropriateness of comparing to reference conditions rather than FF area means).

40. WLWB staff comment 9

WLWB staff comment 9 was asking for confirmation that the lower bound for the adjusted total phytoplankton biomass was correct. Board staff understand the approach used for calculating the adjusted normal ranges. This request for confirmation was based on the observation that this lower bound was much lower than the non-adjusted lower bound. It is also much lower than the lower bound for the 2007 to 2010 data. Please confirm that the lower bound reported for the total phytoplankton biomass normal range is correct.

The Board requests that DDMI submit responses to the requests 1-40 as detailed above as soon as possible, and no later than 5pm on December 12, 2018. Should DDMI have any questions, please feel free to contact me at rfequet@wlwb.ca or by phone at 867-765-4589.
Sincerely,

Ryan Fequet  
Executive Director, Wek’éezhii Land and Water Board
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