

Review Comment Table

Board:	MVLWB
Review Item:	DIAND-GIANT ' Land Use Permit Application ' MV2019X0007 (1 of 7)
File(s):	MV2007L8-0031 MV2019X0007
Proponent:	DIAND - GIANT
Document(s):	New Land Use Permit Application - Cover Letter, Application Form, Proposed Permit Conditions, and Updated Project Description (5.41 MB) Technical Session Presentations (20 MB) Technical Session Agenda (5 MB) Technical Session Update (5 MB)
Item For Review Distributed On:	Apr 10 at 13:32 Distribution List
Reviewer Comments Due By:	May 30, 2019
Proponent Responses Due By:	June 25, 2019
Item Description:	<p>This is Review item number 1 of 7 associated with the Giant Mine Remediation Project. On April 8, 2019, an e-mail was distributed to the Giant Mine distribution list which provided a detailed explanation of the Online Review System (ORS) plan for the Giant Mine Remediation Project. If you did not receive an e-mail or require additional information, please contact Board staff identified below.</p> <p>History The Giant Mine, located in Yellowknife, produced gold from 1948 until 1999. After the mine owner (Royal Oak Mines Ltd.) went into receivership in 1999, the mine was transferred to Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND). Immediately thereafter, DIAND entered into an agreement by which Miramar Giant Mine Ltd. continued to operate the mine, with the gold ore shipped offsite for processing, from 1999 until 2004. Mining ceased in July 2004 and DIAND again took control of the site.</p>

The Giant Mine became "orphaned and abandoned" when Miramar Giant Mine Ltd. was assigned into bankruptcy.

On October 18, 2007, DIAND applied for Type A Water Licence, MV2007L8-0031 to cover the remediation of Giant Mine and ongoing maintenance and monitoring of the site. On March 31, 2008, the City of Yellowknife referred the Licence application to the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board (MVEIRB) for Environmental Assessment on the basis that the proposed activities to take place during the term of the Water Licence will have, in the City's opinion, an adverse impact on the environment within its municipal boundaries. On June 20, 2013, MVEIRB released its Report of Environmental Assessment (EA 0809-001 or REA) for the Giant Mine Remediation Project. The Minister of DIAND provided approval of the REA, including modified measures on August 11, 2014.

Since 2014, the Giant Mine Remediation Team (GMRT) has worked towards fulfilling the requirements of the 26 Measures set forth in the REA. Since the conclusion of the EA, DIAND has been undertaking care and maintenance activities at Giant Mine under section 89 of the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act (MVRMA).

On April 1, 2019, the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development - Giant Mine (GMRT) submitted the Post Environmental Assessment (Post-EA) Information Package to the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board (MVLWB or the Board). This additional information package included an application for a land use permit.

Board staff have determined that the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development - Giant Mine (GMRT) submitted a complete application for a type A land use permit (permit). The purpose of this Application is to support the remediation of the Giant Mine site which is located within the boundaries of the City of Yellowknife.

Instructions

Reviewers are invited to submit comments and recommendations using the Online Review System (ORS) by the review comment deadline specified below. If reviewers seek clarification on the submission, they are encouraged to correspond directly with the proponent prior to submitting comments and recommendations.

Reviewers may also wish to consider providing an overarching recommendation regarding whether they are in support of the submission, to provide context for comments and recommendations and to assist the Board with its decision.

Please provide comments and recommendations on the:

- Permit Application; and
- Proposed Draft Permit Conditions prepared by the GMRT.

Board staff would also like to note that further supporting documentation can be found in ORS reviews:

- DIAND-GIANT - Water Licence Post-EA Information Package – MV2007L8-0031 (2 of 7)
- DIAND-GIANT - Management Plans Group 1 (Standard) – MV2019X0007 and MV2007L8-0031 (3 of 7)
- DIAND-GIANT - Preliminary Screening Information – MV2019X0007 and MV2007L8-0031 (4 of 7)
- DIAND-GIANT - Closure and Reclamation Plan – MV2019X0007 and MV2007L8-0031 (5 of 7)
- DIAND-GIANT - Management Plans Group 2 (Water) – MV2019X0007 and MV2007L8-0031 (6 of 7)
- DIAND-GIANT - Management Plans Group 3 (Other) – MV2019X0007 and MV2007L8-0031 (7 of 7)

The documents that have been uploaded to this review are also available on our public Registry.

If you have any questions or comments on this review or other reviews, please contact Board staff below:

Shannon Allerston 867-766-7465 sallerston@mvlwb.com

Tyree Mullaney 867-766-7464 tyree@mvlwb.com

Kimberley Murray 867-766-7458 kmurray@mvlwb.com

General Reviewer Information:

The following organization has received this review by fax:

NWT Metis Nation

Tim Heron NWTMN IMA Coordinator (867) 872-3586

Contact Information:

Kim Murray (867) 766-7458

Shannon Allerston 867-766-7465

Tyree Mullaney 867-766-7464

Comment Summary

DIAND - GIANT (Proponent)				
ID	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response
1	General File	Comment (doc) ORS 1 - Attachment 1 - Letter from the City of Yellowknife - Municipal Services Recommendation		
2	General File	Comment (doc) GMRP Response to Reviewer Cover Letter Recommendation		
City of Yellowknife: Kerry Penney				
ID	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response
1	Definitions - Greywater	Comment The City and the Project have had past exchanges, with general agreement, that any waters that may have arsenic contact are to be managed on site. Recommendation As per the Waste Management Plan, sewage can be trucked off site, but greywater must be treated by the project's water treatment plant. The Waste Management Plan description of greywater and the definition within the permit are not quite the same. We recommend that the Waste Management Plan 'description' be amended to: a) reflect	June 25: The definition of greywater in the proposed Land Use Permit reads "all liquid wastes from showers, baths, sinks, kitchens, and domestic washing facilities but not including toilet wastes." The GMRP team will update the definition of greywater in the Waste Management Plan to mirror the above definition. Grey water will be treated by the water treatment plant and toilet waste will be trucked offsite.	

		the City position that arsenic contact water be treated on site and b) reflect the definition used in the proposed LUP.		
2	Traffic & Access	<p>Comment This project is occurring within the boundaries of the City of Yellowknife. It has the potential to have unintended consequences affecting the everyday well-being of the citizens of Yellowknife.</p> <p>Recommendation Working with the proposed timeline as a basis, the project will prepare a traffic and access plan to ensure that impacts to the movements of Yellowknife citizens are minimized. This should be updated every April, with a working meeting between Canada, GNWT and the City held to review the updates and make appropriate adjustments to plans.</p>	<p>June 25: During the active remediation phase the GMRP agrees to meet with the City and GNWT to review and update the traffic and access plans. This will be included in the next version of the engagement plan.</p>	
3	Land Use Permit Application, Part 3	<p>Comment While contractors are responsible for the ongoing work, CIRNAC is responsible for the administration and decisions occurring on site.</p> <p>Recommendation It is important that appropriate local, empowered decision making is present. The City of YK believes that the project must commit to having appropriate local staffing to address issues that may arise in a prompt manner. Each closure activity</p>	<p>June 25: The GMRP is committed to responding to issues that may arise at the site in a prompt manner. The GMRP will identify a local point of contact for all design and construction plan submissions.</p>	

		will have a construction plan submitted for approval. A required part of this plan must be a listing of contacts for responsible local staff.		
4	Land Use Permit Application, Part 6a	Comment MVEIRB EA Measures Recommendation The City notes that Measures and Suggestions are not yet complete. The project should provide a timeline when they expect these matters to be completed and an indication as to what mitigations or design changes have resulted. This will inform the review and assessment of the water license and land use permit, particularly for those aspects not part of the Environmental Assessment.	June 25: An update on the status of Measures and Suggestions from the Environmental Assessment has been provided in section 3.1 of the Updated Project Description located in ORS 2.	
5	Land Use Permit Application, Part 7, 2nd last paragraph	Comment Monitoring and Managing Recommendation This passage should be clarified to reflect that the monitoring and management is not simply about additional impacts from the remediation project, but also the whole purpose - to ensure that site stabilization is effective (e.g. addressing the consequences of past decisions and management not just as a result of the additive work).	June 25: The monitoring and management of legacy impacts at the site is addressed more thoroughly in the Closure and Reclamation Plan within Appendix 5.0A, Closure objectives. The GMRP does not consider changes to the application are required.	
6	Land Use Permit Application, Part 7, last paragraph	Comment "Prior to implementation of any closure activity for the GMRP, a Design and Construction Plan will be submitted for each component." Recommendation As noted in our	June 25: As proposed in Part E, Condition 8 of the draft Water Licence, detailed design and construction plans are developed for specific engineered components of the project. Each	

		comment on item 14, it's currently not clear what a design and construction plan will be submitted for. This passage discusses a closure activity and a component, which are separate items within the Closure Plan. Lists of 'closure activities' can be found for each mine component (organized by the objectives for each of the mine components).	Design and Construction Plan will be submitted to the MVLWB for review and approval.	
7	Land Use Permit Application, Part 9d	<p>Comment Overburden is not addressed as part of the Waste Mgmt & Monitoring Plan neither as a waste stream or otherwise. Storage and management does not seem to be part of the Closure and Reclamation Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation Overburden must be addressed as part of the management plan. Furthermore, the project must review best practices and establish a home for any uncontaminated salvaged organic materials to be used as part of the closure effort.</p>	<p>June 25: It is recognized that brush and trees ("cleared" material) and surficial organic soil or waste ("grubbed" material) are not specifically referred to in the Waste Management Plan. The GMRP is currently in the process of reviewing best practices regarding waste classification and disposal requirements for vegetation. The team is also in the process of reviewing existing site data pertaining to arsenic concentrations in overburden in order to identify which areas contain salvageable organic materials. It is the intent to salvage uncontaminated organic materials. An example would include its use in the rehabilitation of borrow areas.</p>	
8	Proposed GMRP Type A Land Use Permit	<p>Comment All Timelines</p> <p>Recommendation Obviously the board will match timelines with the</p>	<p>June 25: The GMRP notes that no response is required for this recommendation.</p>	

		plans found in the water license (e.g. We're not going to provide a recommendation for each in this sheet as well).		
9	Proposed GMRP Type A Land Use Permit #6	<p>Comment Given the size and scope of the project, the inspector should be given notice and discretion any time the activities under a design and construction plan are initiated.</p> <p>Recommendation Adjust the condition to "Prior to the commencement of the land-use operation and/or the initiation of activities approved under a design and construction plan"</p>	<p>June 25: The GMRP is of the opinion that the condition as currently worded does not restrict the Inspector from having discretion to complete inspections and recommends keeping the standard condition.</p>	
10	Proposed GMRP Type A Land Use Permit #9	<p>Comment It is important that the appropriate decision making power is within Yellowknife. Ottawa is not 10 hours away.</p> <p>Recommendation The Board should ensure that the person in charge of the field operation is on site, with sufficient decision making authority to be able to respond to the inspector.</p>	<p>June 25: The GMRP will identify and advise the Board and an Inspector of the person(s) in charge of the field operation as required in the Land Use Permit.</p>	
11	Proposed GMRP Type A Land Use Permit #14	<p>Comment Engineered Component is capitalized but not defined.</p> <p>Recommendation The use of 'Component' is haphazard within the closure documents. When possible, it should be reserved to correspond to Mine Components within a closure plan. Suggest that 'Engineered</p>	<p>June 25: An Engineered Component was defined in the draft Water Licence as any component, structure, or facility related to Water Use or the deposit of Waste that is designed by a Professional Engineer; this includes all facilities, earthworks, and any other Closure Activity requiring an</p>	

		Structure' be used in place of 'Engineered Component' and that a definition of Engineered Structure be included (if context and intent of the condition are to be properly understood)	engineered design or specification. The GMRP requests that this definition be added to the Land Use Permit.	
12	Proposed GMRP Type A Land Use Permit #31, 32	Comment Add definition for clean water. Recommendation Clean water should be water that has been treated, tested and is ready for discharge. Other mine water is of uncertain quality.	June 25: Clean water is not a term used to describe water that will be discharged. The GMRP does not feel that this definition should be included.	
13	Proposed GMRP Type A Land Use Permit #41	Comment Given that this project is occurring within the City limits, the level of concern and use is much higher than at remote sites. Notice of spills and upset conditions must be provided to impacted communities. Recommendation Any spill, along with detailed report following, must be provide to the City, YKDFN and NSMA.	June 25: Upon Water Licence issuance, all spills at the Giant Mine will be reported through GNWT's online spill reporting and tracking tool (as per the Giant Mine Spill Contingency Plan that was submitted to the MVLWB in April 2019). The reporting and tracking tool includes a searchable public interface that can be referenced at any time to find up-to-date information on spills reported at Giant Mine. Spills at Giant Mine can be found by searching 'Giant Mine' at: https://www.enr.gov.nt.ca/en/spills	
14	Proposed GMRP Type A Land Use Permit #48	Comment Modify to include auditing requirement to confirm waste stream segregation. Recommendation New language "The Permittee shall ensure all garbage, waste, and debris is disposed of as	June 25: The GMRP is of the opinion that the current wording achieves the same intent of the new proposed wording. Waste segregation and tracking is an important aspect of the project, which will be reflected in the	

		described in the approved Waste Management and Monitoring Plan.	Waste Management and Monitoring Plan.	
General Public: Ian McCrea				
ID	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response
1	Launch, retrieval, mast stepping and unstepping of keel sailboats facility at Great Slave Sailing Club	<p>Comment We (Ian and Rita McCrea) have been members of the Great Slave Sailing Club for over 20 years. We own a Hunter 32 sail boat which weighs 12000 lbs, has a mast 52 feet in height and requires over 5 feet of water to float. A consequence of the Giant Mine Remediation is the eviction of the Great Slave Sailing Club (GSSC) and its members from its location of over 40 years near the 'Townsite' portion of the former Giant Mine development. The GSSC's application for an expansion of the lease is being ignored by the City. The application was made to acquire more space for the relocation of boats to accommodate the remediation.</p> <p>Recommendation See Below</p>	<p>June 25: Please refer to the response to General Public: Ian McCrea #2.</p>	
2	See Above	<p>Comment Launching, retrieving, mast stepping and unstopping, and storage of sail keel boats is more complex and time consuming than for power boats of similar size. A large flat stable area close to 7 feet or more of water is needed for a crane. To economically</p>	<p>June 25: In the 2007 Water Licence application, the GMRP proposed remediating the townsite and associated areas to industrial soil standards. During the Environmental Assessment process, the City of Yellowknife (the City), who leases the</p>	

		<p>use the crane, waiting boats must be marshalled in the close proximity to the crane. Dry sailing - that is launching and retrieving just before and after and excursion is not practical.</p> <p>Recommendation The City and the GNWT withdraw their eviction of the GSSC and allow the modest expansion of property applied for by the Club to facilitate a staged collaborative approach to the remediation of the sailing club property: and</p>	<p>boat launch area from the GNWT, asserted that the townsite and shoreline areas should be remediated more stringently; that is, to residential standards for soils. This assertion was again echoed during the GMRP's 18-month Surface Design Engagement Process. The decision to remediate these areas to residential soil standards was made as a result of extensive engagement with partners, affected parties, and interested members of the public at these engagement sessions. The GMRP has shared these Project decisions publicly on many occasions, including meetings with the City and Sailing Club, as identified in the Engagement Log. To achieve residential soil standards, the GMRP will need to complete more extensive work than proposed in the 2007 closure and reclamation plan. This, in turn, means that access to these areas will be impacted more than originally proposed. The GMRP believes this short-term inconvenience will help make the area safer for the public and the environment for the long-term. The GMRP recognizes the stakeholder's desire for a staged approach to remediation in the area such that access to the area is maintained during active works. The GMRP has not</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

			<p>determined the feasibility of such an approach, as sufficient detail is not currently available. The GMRP will explore the possibility of staged solution during detailed design but notes that it is likely that at certain times no access will be permitted. The GMRP will continue to ensure there is as much lead time as possible to look at ways to minimize these impacts, as well as to give the sublease-holders time to plan alternatives for when land will not be accessible. The GMRP will continue to work to keep this inconvenience as short as possible; however, notes that the City is best positioned to help their sublease holders determine alternatives while the land is not accessible to the public in order to allow the areas to be remediated for residential soil standards to be met. As more design information becomes available, the GMRP will continue to meet with the City and the GNWT to determine what this means for the leased lands, as well as how to determine the appropriate avenues to address sublease holder concerns.</p>	
3	See Above	<p>Comment Until this summer we and fellow club members understood that the club operations would be interrupted by remediation to an</p>	<p>June 25: Please refer to the response to General Public: Ian McCrea #2.</p>	

		<p>industrial standard. We understand this would be achieved by capping the questionable soil and that could be accomplished in stages by remediating half the property at a time thereby allowing the club and its members to occupy the other half. The remediation could have been achieved in a year and should not have resulted in the eviction of the club. That suddenly changed in the July 2018 remediation plan.</p> <p>Recommendation The City and the GNWT withdraw their eviction of the GSSC and allow the modest expansion of property applied for by the Club to facilitate a staged collaborative approach to the remediation of the sailing club property: and</p>		
4	See Above	<p>Comment Until this summer we and fellow club members understood that the club operations would be interrupted by remediation to an industrial standard. We understand this would be achieved by capping the questionable soil and that could be accomplished in stages by remediating half the property at a time thereby allowing the club and its members to occupy the other half. The remediation could have been achieved in a year and should not have resulted in the eviction of the club. That suddenly changed in</p>	<p>June 25: Please refer to the responses to General Public: Ian McCrea #2 and #9</p>	

		the July 2018 remediation plan. Recommendation See Below		
5	See Above	<p>Comment The McCrea family supports the idea of remediating this contaminated site. We feel that the Giant Mine Remediation Committee should work with the GSSC and its members to plan a staged remediation of the property (with retention or restoration of the necessary wharf) which will enable the club to continue to occupy its property, or an increased area of the same property. We recommend that such a collaborative staged plan would enable the GNWT and City to withdraw its eviction order and allow the club and its boats to remain on the property. We understand this will result in interruption to the club operations however, we can recover from an interruption of one season. That translates into 18 months for remediation activities.</p> <p>Recommendation as soon as possible, the Giant Mine Remediation Committee work with the GSSC to develop and execute a collaborative staged remediation which would allow the club to continue to occupy the property and wharf with the minimum interruption in sailing operations</p>	<p>June 25: Please refer to the responses to General Public: Ian McCrea #2 and #9</p>	

6	Impact of Remediation Plan on the ability of owners to sell their sail boats	<p>Comment Two alternative locations under consideration by the City for a marina/boat launch, do not appear to be appropriate for safe, economical lifting in/out and mast stepping for medium sized and large sailboats. Given the steep approaches, limited marshalling room, and no apparent boat storage area; if the launching of medium to large sized sail boats is possible the cost, in our case may be ten times or more of the current cost. We can provide estimates based upon actual costs. We do not know if this is the forum for detailed financial calculations. This may make sailing unaffordable for people on modest incomes such as ourselves.</p> <p>Recommendation See Below</p>	<p>June 25: Please refer to the responses to General Public: Ian McCrea #2 and #9</p>	
7	See Above	<p>Comment Some of our fellow club members' boats are not mobile at all and are in a worse situation than us</p> <p>Recommendation See Below</p>	<p>June 25: Please refer to the responses to General Public: Ian McCrea #2 and #9</p>	
8	See Above	<p>Comment The uncertainty generated by this sudden change of plan (with no consultation with tenants) has made the larger sailboats unsaleable. Prospective purchasers will not likely take a chance at any price on purchasing a larger keel boat with no sense of if and where it could be launched, retrieved or if that can be achieved at an</p>	<p>June 25: Please refer to the responses to General Public: Ian McCrea #2 and #9</p>	

		affordable rate. Sale of sailboats sometimes takes considerable time. The current circumstances makes the sale of larger sailboats impossible at any price Recommendation See Below		
9	See Above	Comment A significant increase in the operating cost of our boat will make sailing unaffordable for us. But the current plan traps us by removing the option to sell our boat Recommendation That the Giant Mine Remediation Project either purchase the boats of those sailors affected or otherwise compensate them for loss of use and reduced resale value and disposal costs.	June 25: The change in remediation to residential soil standards will improve the long-term condition of the area. We encourage the Great Slave Sailing Club to contact the GMRP if they intend to submit a compensation claim. For further details please refer to the response to General Public: Ian McCrea #2.	

GNWT - ECE: Naomi Smethurst

ID	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response
1	26(1)(j) Protection of Historical, Archaeological, and Burial Sites	Comment The final report for the AIA of proposed project footprint has been submitted to the Culture and Heritage Division and is currently under review. Further AIA work may be required in advance of ground disturbing activities. The results and recommendations of the AIA study, outlined in Section 3.2.4 of the LUP Application, are under revision. Recommendation Retain the AIA Condition.	June 25: The GMRP supports the inclusion of the AIA condition.	

INAC - NWT Inspectors: Tim Morton

ID	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response
1	Scope of Permit - #1	<p>Comment Quarrying activity is not listed within the scope of the permit however it is listed within the application.</p> <p>Recommendation Ensure that quarrying is added to the scope to avoid the need to amend the permit or have unnecessary constraints on the project.</p>	<p>June 25: Quarrying is intended as part of the project at select locations within the site. Quarrying permits will be obtained as noted in section 5 of the Land Use Permit Application Form. The GMRP agrees with the recommended addition to the Permit scope.</p>	
2	Draft Land Use Permit ' Condition #6	<p>Comment The Inspector wants to ensure that this condition remains in the permit. Inspections will take place at the discretion of the Inspector.</p> <p>Recommendation Ensure that this condition remains in the permit.</p>	<p>June 25: The GMRP agrees that this condition should remain in the Permit and will coordinate with the Inspector.</p>	
3	Draft Land Use Permit ' Condition #8	<p>Comment Contact information should be (867) 669-2442.</p> <p>Recommendation Add the above contact information to all permits and management plans.</p>	<p>June 25: The GMRP commits to ensuring that the Inspectors' contact information provided is included in all future management plan submissions.</p>	
4	Draft Land Use Permit ' Conditions #31 to #34	<p>Comment The scope does not have construction of winter roads identified so these conditions are unnecessary. Further detail into the need for these conditions will be required if they remain in the permit.</p> <p>Recommendation See above.</p>	<p>June 25: The GMRP acknowledges that construction of winter roads may be necessary as described in the existing Land Use Permit (LUP) MV2016S0016 and it is requested that it be considered as part of the scope of the new Permit. In particular, under-ice</p>	

			drilling on Baker Pond and Yellowknife Bay, temporary access trail on Yellowknife Bay and removal of potential ice dams on Baker Creek are requested to be transferred to the scope of the new LUP. The GMRP considers conditions 31-34 to be appropriate for the new Permit.	
5	Draft Land Use Permit â€‘ Condition to be added	Comment Add the standard condition of ‘The Permittee shall not cut any stream bank, unless otherwise authorized by the Inspector’; Recommendation This will minimize potential affects to the nearby waterbodies.	June 25: The GMRP supports the inclusion of the proposed condition.	
6	Draft Land Use Permit â€‘ Condition #36	Comment The Inspector agrees with the proposed modifications Recommendation The Inspector agrees with the proposed modifications	June 25: The GMRP supports the Inspector's recommendation.	
7	Draft Land Use Permit â€‘ Condition to be added	Comment Add the standard condition ‘The Permittee shall seal all outlets of Fuel Storage Containers and store the containers on their sides with the outlets located at 3 and 9 o’clock, except for containers currently in use’; Recommendation This will help avoid spills from and fuel drums onsite.	June 25: The GMRP team supports the inclusion of the proposed condition.	
8	Draft Land Use Permit â€‘ Condition to be added	Comment Add the standard condition ‘Prior to the expiry date of the permit, the Permittee shall progressively dispose of all brush and	June 25: The GMRP team supports the inclusion of the proposed condition.	

		trees and shall complete all brush disposal”; Recommendation This condition is standard when working in areas that have not been previously disturbed. 		
--	--	--	--	--

INAC - Yellowknife: Dinah Elliott

ID	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response	
1	Draft Conditions	<p>Comment <table border="0" style="width:295pt"><tr><td style="height:60.0pt; width:295pt">The proposed definition of watercourse is - a natural body of flowing or standing water or an area occupied by water during part of the year, and includes streams, springs, swamps and gulches but does not include groundwater.</td></tr></table></p> <p>Recommendation It is recommended to included natural watercourses as modified historically and as a result of the remediation (i.e. Baker Creek) to ensure these watercourses&nbsp;are included.</p>	The proposed definition of watercourse is - a natural body of flowing or standing water or an area occupied by water during part of the year, and includes streams, springs, swamps and gulches but does not include groundwater.	<p>June 25: The GMRP considers the current definition to be adequate; however, the GMRP would accept the addition of Baker Creek specifically to the definition of a natural watercourse.</p>	
The proposed definition of watercourse is - a natural body of flowing or standing water or an area occupied by water during part of the year, and includes streams, springs, swamps and gulches but does not include groundwater.					

MVLWB: Shannon Allerston

ID	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response
-----------	--------------	--	---------------------------	-----------------------------

1	Previous authorizations	<p>Comment As noted in the Land Use Permit Application form and supporting documents there are a number of authorizations issued by the MVLWB for the site. It is Board staffs understanding that all previous authorizations are included in the applications currently before the Board.</p> <p>Recommendation Please confirm if the understanding is correct.</p>	<p>June 25: The GMRP intended that the scope of previous authorizations would be incorporated into the current applications and requests that the scope of MV2016S0016 be considered as part of the scope of the new Licence. In particular, under-ice drilling on Baker Pond and Yellowknife Bay, temporary access trail on Yellowknife Bay and removal of potential ice dams on Baker Creek are requested to be transferred to the scope of the new Licence.</p>	
2	Waste Disposal	<p>Comment In the supporting documentation it is mentioned that waste as well as sewage will be deposited in the City of Yellowknife Facilities.</p> <p>Recommendation Please confirm if the City of Yellowknife has agreed to accept the waste.</p>	<p>June 25: The City of Yellowknife has agreed to accept both sanitary sewage and municipal solid waste from the Giant Mine Remediation Project. Please refer to ORS 1 - Attachment 1- Letter from the City of Yellowknife - Municipal Services.</p>	
3	Equipment List	<p>Comment If this Land Use Permit Application is to cover all previous authorizations and activities, the equipment requirements may need to be updated based on the inclusion of other MVLWB authorizations.</p> <p>Recommendation If there are changes that need to be made to the equipment list please provide an updated list.</p>	<p>June 25: The GMRP will submit an updated equipment list following the technical session to ensure it is consistent with earlier applications.</p>	