



12 March 2020

**Jaqueline Ho, Regulatory Specialist**  
Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board  
4922-48th Street  
7th Floor YK Centre Mall  
PO Box 2130  
Yellowknife, NT, X1A 2P6

**Re: Response to Information Requests from Technical Session 24-25 February, 2021**  
**Pine Point Confirmation and Exploration Program Applications, MV2020L8-0012 and MV2020C0017**

Dear Jaqueline,

Pine Point Mining Limited (PPML) is pleased to submit the responses to the Information Requests (IRs) from the Technical Sessions held on 24 and 25 February 2021. Detailed responses to each IR are provided in Table 1 below and associated attachments.

PPML appreciates the effort of the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board and interested parties to review our applications and to attend the Technical Sessions, and look forward to working with all parties in the next steps of the applications.

Should you have any questions or need any additional information, please feel free to contact the undersigned at 416-209-2056 or [acwilliams@live.ca](mailto:acwilliams@live.ca).

Regards,  
**Pine Point Mining Limited.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A. Williams", is written over a horizontal line.

Andrew Williams  
*Environment Manager*

**Attachments:**

Water Quality Database for IR#1  
Detailed Response to IR#2  
Detailed Response to IR#4  
Updated RECLAIM security estimate

**Table 1: Information Requests Responses**

#	Subject	Information Request	Response
1	Groundwater Management Plan – Water Quality Database	PPML to provide the complete water quality database referenced in the presentation on slide 29 and discussed in the technical session. The database should be provided in Excel format.	See spreadsheet attached.
2	Groundwater Management Plan – Criteria for Determining Compatibility	PPML to provide the criteria/method that will be used to determine if water quality between the extraction and injection sites are compatible. The criteria/method should consider both groundwater and pit lake sources and the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifying parameters of concern;</li> <li>• Defining compatibility criteria;</li> <li>• Method for determining compatibility; and</li> <li>• Provide an assessment if the injection of water to the subsurface or pits is a deposit of waste as guided by the <i>MVLWB Water and Effluent Quality Management Policy</i>.</li> </ul>	See attached document.
3	Revised Water Withdrawal Plan	PPML to submit a revised Water Withdrawal Plan presenting the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A table with proposed water sources for which bathymetric information is available, also</li> </ul>	An updated Water Withdrawal Plan (Version 1.1) will be provided following this submission.

#	Subject	Information Request	Response
		<p>presenting the proposed water use for each source and estimated capacity;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A table with proposed water sources for which bathymetric information is not available (and requiring field verification of water depth before withdrawal), also presenting the proposed water use for each source and estimated capacity; and</li> <li>• Classification of each water source as either a lake, a pit, or an aquifer.</li> </ul>	
4	Waste Management Plan - Septic System and Wastewater Treatment Plant	<p>PPML to provide details on the proposed options for the management of sewage (all toilet wastes and greywater) including, but not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of sewage generation volume; and</li> <li>• Engineering designs for the storage, conveyance and treatment of sewage including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Treatment mechanism(s);</li> <li>– Treatment efficacy;</li> <li>– Location and timing of effluent discharge; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	See attached document.

#	Subject	Information Request	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Assessment and mitigation of impacts from effluent discharge to the receiving environment.</li> </ul>	
5	Closure Cost Estimate	<p>PPML to provide a revised RECLAIM estimate considering the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estimate for hydrocarbon contaminated soil work (GNWT ID-53);</li> <li>• Blasting for the mineralogical sampling (Open Pit worksheet) (GNWTID-54); and</li> <li>• The triggers of the staged security.</li> </ul>	An updated version of the RECLAIM security estimate is submitted with this document. All requested changes were made and are highlighted in yellow. PPML is not requesting staged security.
6	Draft Licence – Engineered Structure	The standard definition of Engineered Structure is any structure or facility related to Water Use or the deposit of Waste that is designed by a Professional Engineer. PPML to provide a complete list of Engineered Structures for the project.	Sewage Lagoon Septic system (tank, piping, absorption field)
7	Draft Licence – Construction Material	PPML to confirm whether any material on site would be used for construction of any structures.	Material used on site for any structures is thought to be limited to the redistribution of surface materials to form berms or to construct trenches.
8	Drilling Footprint	PPML to estimate the drilling footprint on brownfield vs. greenfield areas across the site.	It is anticipated that approximately 10% of the new drill holes will be in undisturbed areas (36 hectares [ha]), minimizing disturbance to greenfield areas.
9	Withdrawal Rate	PPML to confirm the withdrawal rate in cubic meters per day and cubic meters per second for aquifer testing.	Anticipated withdrawal rate will be up to 15,000 m <sup>3</sup> per day, for up to seven days per site (i.e., 105,000 m <sup>3</sup> per test) for up to seven separate tests.
10	Preliminary Screening	PPML to provide or estimate the following information to assist Board staff draft the	In addition to the mitigation described in the Application, mitigation has been added to the Water Withdrawal Plan (Version 1.1) to incorporate

#	Subject	Information Request	Response
		<p>Preliminary Screening:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PPML to discuss if there are additional impacts and mitigations associated with the updated withdrawal volume (up to 15,000 m<sup>3</sup>/day).</li> </ul>	<p>the change in the withdrawal volume (up to 105,000 m<sup>3</sup> per test). Withdrawal will now preferentially include pits that are unlikely to include fish. In these instances, pumping tests will be monitored to confirm that pits are not dewatered or overflow.</p> <p>For instances where a pump test includes a pit where fish are known or likely to be present, pit water levels will be monitored to confirm that levels stay within a range that continue to support fish habitat. Further, pumping rates will follow the Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) interim code of practice for end-of-pipe fish protection screens by installing suitable screens and not exceeding a pumping rate of 0.15 m<sup>3</sup>/s.</p> <p>PPML has also prepared criteria for determining compatibility of water between the source and receiving sites.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extent of land area to be disturbed (m<sup>2</sup> or ha).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each drill site is expected to be 30 m by 30 m (0.09 ha) in its maximum extent.</li> <li>PPML will seek to minimize the actual drill site area both to reduce environmental effects and reduce costs.</li> <li>It is anticipated that approximately 10% of the new drill holes will be in undisturbed areas (resulting in an estimated 36 ha of new disturbance), minimizing disturbance to greenfield areas. The remaining 90% will be infill drilling in previously disturbed areas.</li> <li>PPML will follow the Northern Land Use Guidelines for Access: Roads and Trails.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extent of permafrost area to be disturbed (m<sup>2</sup> or ha).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See above for an estimate of land area to be disturbed.</li> <li>The Project is located in an area of sporadic discontinuous permafrost with generally subdued topography, which NRC (1995) suggests that between 10% and 50% of the land area is underlain by permafrost, and the ground ice content in the upper</li> </ul>

#	Subject	Information Request	Response
			<p>10 to 20 m of the ground (% by volume of visible ice) is low (&lt;10%) (NRC 1995).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Permafrost has not been intersected by any recent core drilling in the area; however, it was detected at one location during a soil/vegetation reconnaissance survey in 2019 (Golder 2021).</li> <li>As a result, it is expected that the area of permafrost to be disturbed by the CEP Program will be small.</li> </ul> <p><u>References</u> NRC (Natural Resources Canada). 1995. The National Atlas of Canada, Permafrost. 5th Edition. [accessed 2 March 2021]. <a href="http://ftp.geogratis.gc.ca/pub/nrcan_rncan/raster/atlas_5_ed/eng/environment/land/mcr4177.jpg">http://ftp.geogratis.gc.ca/pub/nrcan_rncan/raster/atlas_5_ed/eng/environment/land/mcr4177.jpg</a>.</p> <p>Golder (Golder Associates Ltd.). 2021. Existing Environment for Pine Point Project. Pine Point Project. Submitted to Pine Point Mining Ltd. February 1, 2021. Available at: <a href="https://reviewboard.ca/upload/project_document/Volume%20%20-%20Description%20of%20Existing%20Environment.pdf">https://reviewboard.ca/upload/project_document/Volume%20%20-%20Description%20of%20Existing%20Environment.pdf</a></p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The estimated maximum dispersal distance of air pollutants identified (including dust emission, air and greenhouse gas emissions of metals and organic micropollutant if sludge produced by treatment of sewage is incinerated, and emissions associated with blasting).</li> </ul>	<p>As described in the Screening-Level Environmental Assessment for the CEP Program, some dust emissions are expected from drilling activities and use of roads, and air and greenhouse gas emissions will occur from use of industrial equipment and vehicles. Dust effects are predicted to be minor and localized, as most dust and particulates will settle near the source. The CEP program is expected to have considerably less air emissions than a mine and have a very small contribution to NWT greenhouse gas production.</p> <p>Relevant mitigation that will be implemented to at the Project includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roads and laydown areas will be watered to suppress dust.</li> </ul>

#	Subject	Information Request	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diesel use will be reduced with appropriately sized generators for power demands and use of the Northwest Territories Power Corporation substation connected to the Taltson Hydro.</li> </ul> <p>Travel will be via existing unpaved roads and trails. The amount of traffic is not expected to be greater than previous levels of activity in the area in the past 5 years, and significantly less than the activity associated with an operating mine. Walker and Everett (1987) and Everett (1980) reported that effects from dust deposition were confined to a 50 m buffer on either side of a road. Meininger and Spatt (1988) found that most of effects from dust deposition occurred within 5 to 50 m of a road, with less obvious effects observed between 50 m and 500 m from a road.</p> <p>For bedrock sampling, blasting will only be used, where required, to reduce excavator time by loosening the bedrock. Bedrock sampling is planned at five locations. While blasting may generate large amounts of dust depending on the location and charge size, blasting does not generate a large quantity of particulates smaller than 10 mm (EPA 1991; Richards and Brozell 2011). Dust deposition is expected to be limited to within 50 m of dust generating sources and each blast is expected to be small (less than 50 x 50 m). Most dust particles generated from blasting do not remain suspended in the air and are generally deposited in the blast area.</p> <p>The need for incineration on site has not yet been confirmed. If sewage waste is to be treated on site, the resulting sludge will be either transported to the Hay River Sewage Lagoon or possibly incinerated on site. Air emission modelling conducted at open pit mines in the NWT, which experience considerably higher levels of incineration than the proposed exploration program, suggest that annual peak concentrations of nitrogen dioxide and sulphur dioxide should generally not exceed the</p>

#	Subject	Information Request	Response
			<p>Ambient Air Quality Standards for NWT (ENR 2014). Furthermore, studies have shown that where annual peak concentrations exceed the NWT standards, effects are confined to 1 to 1.7 km from the mine (Golder 2011; Dominion 2014). If incineration is used for the CEP Program, it would be included in the Waste Management Plan, and the following mitigation would be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the incineration equipment used will be rated specifically for this use, as described in the CCME National Guidelines for Hazardous Waste Incineration Facilities</li> <li>• only appropriate wastes will be incinerated (i.e., non-hazardous combustible waste)</li> <li>• the incinerator will be properly operated and maintained for proper combustion</li> <li>• Stack testing would be included in the approved Waste Management Plan, in the instance that incineration forecasts exceeds 120 tonnes per year</li> </ul> <p><u>References</u>            Dominion (Dominion Diamond Ekati Corp.). 2014. Developer’s Assessment Report Jay Project. October 2014.            EPA (Environmental Protection Agency). 1991. Review of Surface Coal Mining Emission Factors. NC, USA. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park.            ENR (2014). Guideline for Air Quality Standards in the NWT.  <a href="https://www.enr.gov.nt.ca/sites/enr/files/guidelines/air_quality_standards_guideline.pdf">https://www.enr.gov.nt.ca/sites/enr/files/guidelines/air_quality_standards_guideline.pdf</a>            Everett KR. 1980. Distribution and properties of road dust along the northern portion of the Haul Road. In J. Brown and R. Berg (eds.). Environmental engineering and ecological baseline investigations along the Yukon River-Prudhoe Bay Haul Road. U.S. Army Cold Regions Research</p>



#	Subject	Information Request	Response
			<p>and Engineering Laboratory, CRREL Report, 80-19: 101-128.</p> <p>Golder (Golder Associates Ltd.). 2011. Fortune Mineral’s Limited NICO Developer’s Assessment Report.</p> <p>Meininger CA, Spatt PD. 1988. Variations of tardigrade assemblages in dust-impacted arctic mosses. Arctic and Alpine Research 20(1): 24-30.</p> <p>Richards J, Bozell T. 2001. Compilation of National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association Sponsored Emission Factor and Air Quality Studies. Arlington, VA, USA.</p> <p>Walker DA, Everett KR. 1987. Road dust and its environmental-impact on Alaskan Taiga and Tundra. Arctic and Alpine Research 19: 479-489.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of vegetation to be removed or compacted (m<sup>3</sup> or ha).</li> <li>• Indicate type(s) of vegetation to be removed or compacted: trees, shrubs, thickets, muskeg, Species at Risk plants, may-be-at-risk plant species.</li> </ul>	<p>The maximum size of each drill site is 900 m<sup>2</sup> and is estimated that 10% of the drilling will be at previously undisturbed sites for exploration. The remaining drill sites will be for infill drilling at previously disturbed sites. As this is an exploration program, PPML is unable to give specific areas of each to be disturbed. Mitigation will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CEP disturbance area will be minimized, as far as practical practicable</li> <li>• Previously disturbed areas will be preferentially used where possible</li> <li>• The Project will follow the Northern Land Use Guidelines for Access: Roads and Trails</li> </ul> <p>The CEP falls within the Level II Taiga Plains Ecoregion within the NWT, regionally within the Level III Taiga Plains Mid-Boreal Ecoregion, and includes the Great Slave Lowland Mid-Boreal and Slave Upland Mid-Boreal Level IV Ecoregions (ECG 2009). Vegetation cover in the general CEP area consists predominantly of closed canopy mixedwood, white spruce, and occasional birch and jack pine trees. Transitional areas support mixed black and white spruce stands with tamarack. Wetlands</p>

#	Subject	Information Request	Response
			<p>are often dominated by willow, dwarf-birch, or sedges. The most common and widespread vascular species in the area are black spruce, white spruce, prickly rose, Canada buffaloberry, and trembling aspen (Golder 2021).</p> <p>No species at risk plants are identified in the South Slave region on the NWT Species At Risk website.</p> <p>References:            ECG (Ecosystem Classification Group). 2009. Ecological Regions of the Northwest Territories – Taiga Plains. Ecosystem Classification Group, Environment and Natural Resources, Government of the Northwest Territories, Yellowknife, NT.            Golder (Golder Associates Ltd.). 2021. Existing Environment for Pine Point Project. Pine Point Project. Submitted to Pine Point Mining Ltd. February 1, 2021. Available at:  <a href="https://reviewboard.ca/upload/project_document/Volume%203%20-%20Description%20of%20Existing%20Environment.pdf">https://reviewboard.ca/upload/project_document/Volume%203%20-%20Description%20of%20Existing%20Environment.pdf</a></p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of aquatic habitat removed or disturbed for breeding, feeding, nesting, staging (m<sup>3</sup> or ha).</li> <li>• Indicate types of aquatic species: Species at Risk, fish, mammals (furbearers), amphibians, aquatic macroinvertebrates, insects, aquatic macrophytes.</li> </ul>	<p>There will be no aquatic habitat removed or disturbed for breeding, feeding, nesting, or staging for the CEP Program (i.e., 0 m<sup>2</sup>). Drilling activities will not occur within waterbodies or watercourses. Water withdrawals in fish-bearing waterbodies will follow the Water Withdrawal Plan to protect aquatic habitat. If any temporary water crossings are required (e.g., snow fills), regulatory requirements would be followed to prevent effects on aquatic habitat.</p> <p>In the regional area, a total of 34 fish species have been identified in Great Slave Lake, but many of these species are not present in waterbodies near the Project site. Fish species such as Burbot, Lake Whitefish, Inconnu, Northern Pike, Walleye, Longnose Sucker, White Sucker, Goldeye, and Brook Stickleback have been recorded in tributaries</p>

#	Subject	Information Request	Response
			<p>to Great Slave Lake (e.g., Buffalo River, Twin Creek) in the area of the Project (Golder 2021). No activity is proposed within 100 m of Twin Creek or within 500 m of the Buffalo River. Brook Stickleback have been observed in connected drainage channels and pits at the historical Pine Point Mine site.</p> <p>Inconnu (Upper Mackenzie River and Great Slave Lake populations) have been classified as Sensitive by the NWT Species at Risk Infobase (GNWT 2020). Inconnu have not been classified federally by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC) and are not listed on Schedule 1 of the Species at Risk Act (SARA) (Government of Canada 2021). Shortjaw Cisco have been documented in Great Slave Lake and are classified as Threatened by COSEWIC but are not listed on Schedule 1 of SARA (Government of Canada 2021). Shortjaw Cisco are found in deep (greater than 50 m), cool lakes (Scott and Crossman 1998; Richardson et al. 2001) and are unlikely to be found in tributaries to Great Slave Lake due to lack of suitable habitat.</p> <p>Beaver and muskrat are semi-aquatic mammals that may occur at the Project. Both species are not federal or territorial species at risk (Government of Canada 2021). Although ranges of four amphibian species overlap the Project, only two species (boreal chorus frog and wood frog) were detected during baseline surveys in 2011 and 2018 (Golder 2021). Northern leopard frog, which is a federal listed species, has not been detected in the area of the Project.</p> <p><u>References</u> GNWT (Government of the Northwest Territories). 2020. Species at Risk in the Northwest Territories 2020. Environment and Natural Resources, Government of the Northwest Territories, Yellowknife, NT. Golder (Golder Associates Ltd.). 2021. Existing Environment for Pine Point</p>

#	Subject	Information Request	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are harvesting areas present? If so, indicate type(s): Community Harvesting Areas, Special Harvesting Areas, Group Trapping Areas, etc.</li> <li>• Extent of overlap of Project area with harvesting areas identified above (fish lakes, trapping or hunting areas) (m<sup>3</sup> or ha).</li> </ul>	<p>Project. Pine Point Project. Submitted to Pine Point Mining Ltd. February 1, 2021. Available at:  <a href="https://reviewboard.ca/upload/project_document/Volume%203%20-%20Description%20of%20Existing%20Environment.pdf">https://reviewboard.ca/upload/project_document/Volume%203%20-%20Description%20of%20Existing%20Environment.pdf</a>            Government of Canada. 2021. Species at Risk Public Registry A to Z Species Index. [accessed 2 March 2021; updated 2 February 2021].  <a href="https://species-registry.canada.ca/index-en.html#/species?sortBy=commonNameSort&amp;sortDirection=asc&amp;pageSize=10">https://species-registry.canada.ca/index-en.html#/species?sortBy=commonNameSort&amp;sortDirection=asc&amp;pageSize=10</a>.            Richardson ES, Reist JD, Minns CK. 2001. Life history characteristics of freshwater fishes occurring in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut, with major emphasis on lake habitat requirements. Canadian Manuscript Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 2569. July 2001. 158 pp.            Scott WB, Crossman EJ. 1973. Freshwater Fishes of Canada. Bulletin 184. Fisheries Research Board of Canada. 966 pp.</p> <p>The area near the CEP Project area straddles Wildlife Management Zones D and U, meeting at the Buffalo River. Wildlife may be harvested according to the Hunting and Trapping Regulations for the <i>Wildlife Act</i>. The Buffalo River is a traditional fish harvesting area.</p> <p>The Hay River Reserve is located between the Hay River and the Pine Point area. Harvesting in the reserve requires permission from Katlodeeche First Nation. Barren-ground caribou may only be harvested by Indigenous rights holders between the Slave and Buffalo Rivers in the U/BC/01 hunting zone. The Bison Control Area extends west from the Buffalo River. Any bison sightings in this area must be reported to GNWT-ENR.</p> <p>There will be no overlap of the Project with fish harvesting areas. There may be a small overlap of the Project with wildlife harvesting areas; the maximum size of each drill site is 900 m<sup>2</sup> and is estimated that 10% of the</p>

#	Subject	Information Request	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If present, indicate types: places of significant cultural or spiritual value, heritage sites, important subsistence and harvesting areas (group trapping areas, camps, and log and timber harvesting areas, berry picking and medicine plant gathering areas), traditional trails, burial sites, sacred sites, archaeological or historic sites, artifacts and other objects of historical, cultural, or religious significance, historical or cultural records.</li> </ul>	<p>drilling will be at previously undisturbed sites for exploration. The remaining drill sites will be for infill drilling at previously disturbed sites.</p> <p>Please refer to the response to the line item below for further discussion of information about harvesting as provided in the Traditional Knowledge studies conducted for the Project in 2006 and 2007.</p> <p>A detailed record of important areas of land and resource use by the Indigenous Peoples in the vicinity of the Project can be found in Traditional Land Use Studies conducted by the Katlodeeche First Nation in 2007, and the Deninu Kue First Nation, the Hay River Métis, and the Fort Resolution Métis in 2006 (Swisher 2006a,b; Eagle Eye Concepts 2007). Archaeological investigations have been carried out for the exploration activities at Pine Point, the results of which will be provided through the regulatory process, as appropriate.</p> <p><u>Subsistence and Harvesting Areas</u></p> <p>The area in the vicinity of the Project is used by the Deninu Kue First Nation, Fort Resolution Métis, and Hay River Métis for hunting, trapping, medical plant and berry gathering, collecting firewood and also for employment activities associated with the Tamerlane 2005 Drill Program (Swisher 2006a,b). Community members stated they have walked or travelled through area of the Project or larger region in recent years, including actively snowmobiling in the South Great Slave region for traditional and work-related activities (Swisher 2006a,b).</p> <p>Trapping areas are typically rotated, and the area near the Project is viewed as part of a larger traditional use area. Community members from Deninu Kue First Nation, Fort Resolution Métis, and Hay River Métis either historically or currently fish in the South Slave Region, and fish were traditionally harvested for food, dog food, bait traps, and for trade (Swisher 2006a,b). Several community members were commercial</p>

#	Subject	Information Request	Response
			<p>fishermen on Great Slave Lake and at the mouth of the Rocher River, starting in the 1950s. Buffalo River was identified as a primary fish harvesting location, where Whitefish or Inconnu, were traditionally harvested. Twin Creek might also be used for fishing by some community members, where pickerel (i.e., Walleye), suckers (i.e., Longnose Sucker, White Sucker), and stickleback (i.e., Ninespine Stickleback) are present at the mouth of the creek. Polar Lake is generally not used for traditional purposes because it was a stocked lake (Swisher 2006a,b).</p> <p>K'at'l'odeeche First Nation community members reported use of the area near the Project for hunting and harvesting resources and the community has strong economic ties with the land (Eagle Eye Concepts 2007). Caribou, moose, and waterfowl (e.g., ducks and geese) are hunted for sustenance. Elék'eh is a muskeg area on the south shore of Great Slave Lake and east of Buffalo River, and supports beaver, muskrat, and other wildlife, and is an important waterfowl nesting area. Specific moose harvesting sites were identified along the southern shore of Great Slave Lake, High Point, Birch Creek, and Twin Creek. Hunting also occurs along the Buffalo River (Eagle Eye Concepts 2007).</p> <p><u>Heritage Resources and Culturally Significant Sites</u></p> <p>Although Deninu Kųé First Nation, Fort Resolution Métis, and Hay River Métis community members did not specifically know of anyone living in the area of the Project, they had observed evidence of old prospector and hunting cabins, and it was noted that people historically used the area seasonally to hunt, and historic cabins existed (Swisher 2006a,b). It was also noted that evidence of people using the bush (e.g., axe marks) was commonly observed while out on the land. Although there were no known gravesites in the vicinity of the Project, community members noted that they had the potential to exist in the area since historically, people were buried at the site where they died (Swisher 2006a). Previously recorded heritage resources in the area align with ITK, as a</p>

#	Subject	Information Request	Response
			<p>cairn/wood feature was identified as a potential historic grave (JfPo-3; Golder 2021). The area near the Project is currently used for traditional harvesting, berry gathering, and cutting wood, and community members indicated there is a high potential that culturally significant sites occur in the area. It was also noted that trappers from Hay River and Fort Resolution must have used the area because of evidence of old cans they had observed (Swisher 2006a). Within the Métis community and culture, traditional harvesting grounds are considered to be cultural sites, and community members stated that as part of a broader area, the area near the Project is recognized by the Métis as a cultural site used for traditional harvesting activities (Swisher 2006b).</p> <p><u>Additional Studies</u>            Additional studies of land use and ITK in the area around the historical Pine Point mine include: a study of post-industrial land use at the historical Pine Point mine (LeClerc and Keeling 2015); a paper regarding the integration of biophysical sciences, social sciences, and ITK regarding the land around Fort Resolution (Wolfe et al. 2006); and a report on boreal caribou and their species at risk status (NWT Species at Risk Committee 2012). Other sources of ITK regarding TLRU of Indigenous communities in the broader region exist in the form of baseline studies for other industrial developments (e.g., the Gahcho Kué Mine) and academic and community-based literature.</p> <p><u>References</u>            Eagle Eye Concepts. 2007. Katlodeeche First Nation Traditional Knowledge Assessment. June 2007.            Golder (Golder Associates Ltd.). 2021. Existing Environment for Pine Point Project. Pine Point Project. Submitted to Pine Point Mining Ltd. February 1, 2021. Available at:  <a href="https://reviewboard.ca/upload/project_document/Volume%203%20-">https://reviewboard.ca/upload/project_document/Volume%203%20-</a></p>

#	Subject	Information Request	Response
			<p><a href="#">%20Description%20of%20Existing%20Environment.pdf</a></p> <p>LeClerc E, Keeling A. 2015. From Cutlines to Traplines: Post-industrial Land Use at the Pine Point Mine. available at: <a href="https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214790X14000665">https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214790X14000665</a>.</p> <p>NWT Species at Risk Committee. 2012. Species at Risk Report. Boreal Caribou. December 2012.</p> <p>Swisher S. 2006a. Traditional Knowledge Summary Report. Pine Point Pilot Project. Fort Resolution, NWT. December 2006.</p> <p>Swisher S. 2006b. Traditional Knowledge Summary Report. Pine Point Pilot Project. Hay River, NWT. December 2006.</p> <p>Wolfe B, Armitage D, Wesche S, Brock B, Sokal M, Clogg-Wright K, Mongeon C, Adam M, Hall R, Edwards T. 2006. From Isotopes to TK Interviews: Towards Interdisciplinary Research in Fort Resolution and the Slave River Delta, Northwest Territories. ARCTIC. VOL. 60, NO. 1 (MARCH 2007) P. 75–87</p>