Patty,

Below and attached for your use and information is a figure that shows how the CPK berm is planned and where FPK spigots are expected to be located for the CPK:FPK Trial. I was not certain that my explanations were providing you with an accurate image for the Board.

On the phone you asked about the elevation of the CPK berm tops relative to the PKC Dam. The CPK berm shown has a top elevation between 463 and 465m. By comparison the PKC Dam crest elevation is 465m.

Again let me know if you need anything else for the Board.

Gord
Please let me know if you have any further questions.
Gord

From: Patty Ewaschuk [mailto:pewaschuk@wlwb.ca]
Sent: Friday, May 27, 2016 1:33 PM
To: Macdonald, Gord (DDMI)
Subject: RE: PKC Facility Plan 3.0 - response to comments

Yes, I will call you within the hour.

Patty
416-432-6066

From: Macdonald, Gord (DDMI) [mailto:Gord.Macdonald@riotinto.com]
Sent: May 27, 2016 3:31 PM
To: Ryan Fequet <rfequet@wlwb.ca>
Cc: Patty Ewaschuk <pewaschuk@wlwb.ca>; Wells, David (DDMI) <David.Wells@riotinto.com>
Subject: RE: PKC Facility Plan 3.0 - response to comments

Patty,
I tried calling on 416.432.6066 but couldn't get you.
Can you try me on 403.261.6116 when you get a minute.
Gord

From: Ryan Fequet [mailto:rfequet@wlwb.ca]
Sent: Friday, May 27, 2016 12:40 PM
To: Macdonald, Gord (DDMI)
Cc: Patty Ewaschuk; Wells, David (DDMI)
Subject: FW: PKC Facility Plan 3.0 - response to comments

Hi Gord,

I will call you shortly about the CEMP as Sarah is off sick today, but please see the email below from Patty as I know you had mentioned you were filling for Dave since he’s off today - and this email is similarly time-sensitive.

Cheers,

Ryan Fequet, BSc.
Executive Director
Wek’eezhii Land and Water Board
#1-4905 48th St. | Yellowknife, NT | X1A 3S3
ph 867.765.4589 | fax 867.765.4593
✉ rfequet@wlwb.ca | www.wlwb.ca

All correspondence to the Board, including emails, letters, faxes and attachments are public documents and may be posted to the public registry. Perhaps the truth depends on a walk around the lake - Wallace Stevens.

From: Patty Ewaschuk
Sent: May 27, 2016 12:38 PM
Hi Dave,

We’ve reviewed DDMI’s responses to the public comments related to the PK Trial and Version 3 of the PKC Facility Plan. DDMI’s responses were thorough and clear, which makes for a more efficient review on our end, and a more informed Board decision.

DDMI’s response to EMAB-2 (and ENR-1) raised a possible concern for us. DDMI’s response says:

_During the trial, the CPK will initially be used to build a network of 3m to 5m high by 40m wide berms within and around the entire perimeter of the PKC Facility between 100 m and 150 m inside of the PKC Facility dams. This is expected to take approximately 9 month. FPK slurry will initially be deposited from select extended spigots outside of the potential future footprint of CPK placement. As the new CPK berms are completed, the FPK pipelines will be moved from their current location on the PKC Facility dams, to the newly constructed CPK berms from where FPK deposition will continue. Any additional CPK produced not required for berm construction will be placed in the area between the newly constructed CPK berms and the PKC Facility dams, within the PKC Facility._

I may be misunderstanding this, but this sounds like a major departure from the current deposition practices. A few questions:

1. Can you clarify what this network will look like – is this a grid? Or mainly a perimeter within each cell? Or…? It is a single ring of CPK (3-5 m high and 40 m wide) on the existing FPK beach. There would be access berms, from the PKC Dam to the CPK berm, made of CPK every 300m or so. Once enough of the CPK berm is in place we would begin to move FPK spigots onto the CPK.

2. Is it true that this is a major departure from current deposition practices, or is this in line with past practices? For the 1 year period of the trial we do not see this a major departure at all. The result would be a small section of PK beach composed of somewhat coarser material relative to what would have occurred without the trial. If the trial is not successful, deposition practices would return to current and the CPK berm would become buried in FPK beach.

3. Shouldn’t this change be described in Version 3.0 of the PKC Facility Plan? (in which case reviewers could have commented on this) If the trial is successful and DDMI intended to proceed on the basis of a revised CPK:FPK ratio then yes this change will be fully described in a revised PKC Facility Plan. We did not think this was necessary for the purpose of a trial as the deposition from the trial would have no material impact on the ongoing operation or closure of the facility if the trial was unsuccessful.

4. Does this deposition strategy change how the facility will be closed? Yes if the trial is successful and the changed CPK:FPK is implement over the remaining life-of-mine. Please see response WLWB-16. No with regard to the trail itself. See 2 above.

5. Are there any other geotechnical, water management, water quality or other implications associated with this change? Not with regard to environmental implications of the trial itself.

6. Do you think that the deposition plan described in the quote above matches the descriptions in Section 2.2.1 and 3.1 of the PKC Facility Plan (v3.0)? No Section 2.2.1 describes the North and South CPK Cells and the quote above describes the main PKC area. Yes Section 3.1 matches the above with the obvious exception that projections in Figure 4 are dependent upon the trial outcome. The existing figure assumes the current split.

7. Do you think the deposition plan described above is consistent with the PK deposition plan described in Section 11.0 of the approved design (2001)? Yes in the broad terms of design intent: coarser material deposited closer to the dams and finer material deposited in the center with slurry water reclaimed. But not with regard to specific descriptions. Please note that the Engineer of Record (Golder) is fully involved in this trial.

8. Do you think the deposition plan described above is consistent with Sections 3.0, 3.1, and 3.2 of the Phase 6 Design (March, 2013)? Yes in the broad terms of the design intent: coarser material deposited closer to the
dams and finer material deposited in the center with slurry water reclaimed. But not with regard to specific descriptions. Please note that the Engineer of Record (Golder) is fully involved in this trial.

We may have a couple other questions, but want to address this one first.

Thanks!
Patty Ewaschuk, P. Eng
Technical Advisor
Wekzechii Land and Water Board (wlwb.ca)
416-432-6066

Please note: All correspondence to the Board, including emails, letters, faxes and attachments are public documents and may be posted to the public registry. To keep up with the latest Land and Water Board news, follow us on Twitter.