



P.O. Box 32, Wekweètì, NT X0E 1W0
Tel: 867-713-2500 Fax: 867-713-2502

#1-4905 48th Street, Yellowknife, NT X1A 3S3
Tel: 867-765-4592 Fax: 867-765-4593
www.wlwb.ca

April 15, 2021

File: W2020L8-0003 and W2020X0005

Mark Cliffe-Phillips
Mackenzie Valley Review Board
200 Scotia Centre
Box 938, 5102-50th Avenue
Yellowknife, NT X1A 2N7

Sent by email

Dear Mark Cliffe-Phillips,

Re: Kwetjjaà (Rayrock) Remediation Project – Notice of Preliminary Screening Determination – Applications for Type A Land Use Permit and Type A Water Licence – Remediation – former Rayrock mine, NT

The Wek'èezhii Land and Water Board (Board) met on April 15, 2021 and considered the Applications from Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada – Contaminants and Remediation Division (CIRNAC-CARD)] for Land Use Permit (Permit) W2020X0005 and Water Licence (Licence) W2020L8-0003 for the Kwetjjaà (Rayrock) Remediation Project (Project) in accordance with the *Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act* (MVRMA).

The Board conducted additional preliminary screening based on the public record for the proceedings. Based on the evidence provided, the Board is satisfied the screening has been completed according to section 125 of the MVRMA and has decided **not to refer** the project to environmental assessment. The Board's reasons for decision, as required by section 121 of the MVRMA, are attached.

If the Board does not receive notice of referral to environmental assessment, it will continue with the regulatory process.

The Board and staff look forward to continued communications throughout the pause period. Please contact Ryan Fequet at (867) 765-4589 with any questions or concerns regarding this letter.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Joseph Mackenzie".

Joseph Mackenzie
Wek'èezhii Land and Water Board, Chair

Copied to: Ron Breadmore, CIRNAC-CARD
Blind Copied to: Rayrock Distribution List

Attached: Preliminary Screening Reasons for Decision



PO Box 32, Wekweètì NT X0E 1W0
 Tel: 867 713-2500 Fax: 867-713-2502

#1-4905 48th Street, Yellowknife NT X1A 3S3
 Tel: 867-765-4592 Fax: 867-765-4593
www.wlwb.ca

Preliminary Screening Determination and Reasons for Decision

File Number	Type A Permit W2020L8-0003 and Type A Licence W2020X0005
Company	Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada
Project	Kwetj̄j̄paà (Rayrock) Remediation Project
Location	Former Rayrock mine, NT
Activity	Miscellaneous – Remediation
Date of Decision	April 15, 2021

1.0 Decision

In accordance with subsection 124(1) of the *Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act* (MVRMA), the Wek'èezhìi Land and Water Board (Board) met on April 15, 2021 to make a preliminary screening determination on new Project activities and areas for the Applications from Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada – Contaminants and Remediation Division (CIRNAC-CARD) (Applicant) for Land Use Permit W2020X0005 (Permit)¹ and Water Licence W2020L8-0003 (Licence)² for the Rayrock Remediation Project (Project).

The Board has determined that some Project activities and areas are exempt from preliminary screening, because they were previously screened. The Applicant has proposed new Project activities and areas. However, the Board has decided not to refer the proposed changes to the Project to the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board (the Review Board) for Environmental Assessment because, based on the evidence, it is the Board's opinion that the proposed changes to the Project will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment or be a cause of public concern.

The Board's determination, including its reasons for its decisions, are detailed in sections 3 and 4.

2.0 List of Defined Terms and Acronyms

Applicant	Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada – Contaminants and Remediation Division
-----------	--

¹See WLWB Online Registry (www.wlwb.ca) for [Rayrock – Type A Permit Application – Sep 21 20](#)

² See WLWB Online Registry [Rayrock – Type A Licence Application – Sep 21 20](#).

Applications	The complete application packages submitted by the Applicant for Water Licence W2020L8-0003 and Land Use Permit W2020X0005.
Board	Wek'èezhii Land and Water Board
EA	Environmental Assessment
GNWT	Government of the Northwest Territories
GNWT-ENR	Government of the Northwest Territories – Environment and Natural Resources
GNWT-Lands	Government of the Northwest Territories – Lands
MVLWB	Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board
MVRMA	<i>Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act</i>
Minister	Minister of Northern Affairs
ORS	Online Review System (www.onlinereviewsystem.ca)
Party	As per the MVLWB Rules of Procedures , an applicant, a person, or an organization participating in the regulatory proceeding for the Applications.
Project	Rayrock Remediation Project, which is the proposed development (as defined in Part 5 of the MVRMA). ³
Review Board	Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board
Standard Licence Conditions	MVLWB Standard Water Licence Conditions Template
Standard Permit Conditions	MVLWB Standard Land Use Permit Conditions Template
TG	Tłı̨chǫ Government

3.0 **Background and Scope of Screening**

The Rayrock Remediation Project (the Project) is the environmental remediation of historical metal mining and exploration properties including the Rayrock Uranium mine, the Sun Rose (Northland) Advanced Exploration site, the Horn Plateau (REX) exploration site, three Rayrock-affiliated drilling sites, the power line infrastructure between Rayrock and the Snare Hydroelectric Facility at Big Spruce Lake, and a Rayrock-affiliated storage area at the Barge Landing. CIRNAC-CARD submitted Applications for a Type A Land Use Permit (W2020X0005) and Type A Water Licence (W2020L8-0003) on September 21, 2020 and the Board completed a preliminary screening of the Project on January 14, 2021.⁴

During the technical session held for the Applications from January 26-28, 2021, it was determined that there were proposed changes to the Project, and that there were potentially additional new areas and activities. Under Part 1, Schedule 1, section 2.1 of the Exemption List Regulations to the MVRMA, project areas and activities that have already been subject to Part 5 of the MVRMA are exempt from preliminary screening. The new Project activities/areas require screening by the Board in accordance with subsection 124(1) of the MVRMA.

³ “development” is defined in Part 5 of the MVRMA as:

“any undertaking, or any part or extension of an undertaking, that is carried out on land or water and includes an acquisition of lands pursuant to the *Historic Sites and Monuments Act* and measures carried out by a department or agency of government leading to the establishment of a park subject to the *Canada National Parks Act* or the establishment of a park under a territorial law.”

⁴ See WLWB Online Registry for [Rayrock – Preliminary Screening – Determination and Notification – Jan 14 21](#)

In accordance with paragraph 125(1)(a) of the MVRMA, the Board must conduct a preliminary screening of the proposed changes to the Project to determine and report to the Review Board whether, in its opinion, the proposed changes to the Project might have a significant adverse impact on the environment or might be a cause of public concern. The details of the Board's analysis are set out in section 3 below.

Scope of Screening

The previously screened areas and activities are described in the Boards' January 14, 2021 Preliminary Screening Determination.

The new areas and/or activities that are being screened at this time are:

- New information gathered by CIRNAC-CARD regarding the location for the Confined Disposal Facility (CDF) location indicated that it would require additional blasting in a new area of the Mill Lake Drainage Basin; information regarding the blasting was provided in IRs #17 and 18-21 and during the public review of these IRs as referenced below;
- Dock expansion that had previously not been identified; information regarding the dock was provided in IRs #18-21;
- Indirect discharge of treated camp wastewater to the receiving environment; additional information regarding the discharge was provided in IRs #1-16, and 18-21 as referenced below; and
- New water sources for construction of the Tłjchq winter road; information regarding the water sources was provided in IRs #18-21 as referenced below.

Public Record and Regulatory Proceeding

As a result of the technical session held January 26-28, 2021, Information Requests (IRs) were distributed to CIRNAC-CARD for additional information. IRs were distributed on January 29, 2021 (IRs #1-16), February 9, 2021 (IR #17), and February 16, 2021 (IRs #18-21).^{5,6,7} Responses to the respective IRs were received on February 10, 2021, February 16, 2021, and March 19, 2021.^{8,9,10} IRs #17-21 were determined by Board staff to be related to additional preliminary screening and were distributed for public review to inform the preliminary screening process. IR #17 was distributed for public review on February 17, 2021. Comments were due March 2, 2021, with responses from the Applicant due March 9, 2021. The Board received comments and recommendations from GNWT-ENR. Board staff also submitted questions.¹¹ IRs #18-21 were distributed for public review on February 24, 2021. Comments were due March 11, 2021, with responses from the Applicant due March 18, 2021. The Board received comments and recommendations from Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC), Fisheries and Oceans (DFO), Government of Northwest Territories – Environment and Natural Resources (GNWT-ENR), and the Tłjchq Government (TG). Board staff also submitted questions.¹²

⁵ See WLWB Online Registry for [Rayrock – Technical Session – Information Requests – Jan 29 21](#)

⁶ See WLWB Online Registry for [Rayrock – Technical Session – Information Request – Feb 9 21](#)

⁷ See WLWB Online Registry for [Rayrock – Technical Session – Information Requests – Feb 16 21](#)

⁸ See WLWB Online Registry for [Rayrock – Technical Session – CIRNAC IR Response – Feb 10 21](#)

⁹ See WLWB Online Registry for [Rayrock – Technical Session – CIRNAC IR Response – Feb 16 21](#)

¹⁰ See WLWB Online Registry for [Rayrock – Technical Session – CIRNAC IR Response – Feb 24 21](#)

¹¹ See WLWB Online Registry for [Rayrock – Technical Session – IR 17 Review Comment Table – Mar 30 21](#)

¹² See WLWB Online Registry for [Rayrock – Technical Session – IRs 18-21 Review Comment Table – Mar 30 21](#)

In the review of IR #17, GNWT-ENR provided comments and recommendations regarding the information around the location of the Confined Disposal Facility (CDF) (GNWT-ENR comments 2-4). GNWT-ENR noted that it wasn't clear where CIRNAC-CARD was proposing to construct the CDF and recommended that additional details regarding general location and conceptual design be provided to be able to assess potential risks from CDF location and associated blasting. CIRNAC-CARD responded that the proposed CDF location remained in the Mill Lake Drainage Basin, and that the location presented in the Remedial Action Plan with the Applications was conceptual only. The Board notes that Figure 20 in Appendix A of the Remedial Action Plan indicates that the figure has a note that the "figure is conceptual and for illustrative/descriptive purposes [sic] only".¹³ As the proposed CDF location remains within the Mill Lake Drainage Basin as described in the Applications, the Board believes that CIRNAC-CARD's response is appropriate, and the location of the CDF does not require additional screening. The Board also notes that as described in the January 14, 2021 Preliminary Screening Reasons for Decision, the Board may choose to include licence condition requirements for submissions related to the CDF Design, construction, and/or monitoring. The Board may consider the need for an independent review of CDF submissions, as requested by the TG. Potential impacts and mitigations regarding blasting are outlined in section 3.0.

The Board did not receive any evidence to indicate that the period of notice given to affected communities and First Nations was not reasonable, as required by subsection 63(2) of the MVRMA.

The Board is also satisfied that the Tłı̨chǫ Government has been consulted in accordance with section 63 of the MVRMA.

3.0 Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigations

The IR responses and public review comments/recommendations and responses as described above, as well as previously submitted Applications materials,¹⁴ were considered regarding potential impacts and mitigations for changes to the Project. Table 1 below summarizes:

- the potential impacts and proposed mitigations for the proposed changes to the Project;
- the concerns that were identified during the regulatory proceeding and how the Applicant addressed those concerns; and
- the Board's analysis of the potential impacts and proposed mitigations.

¹³ See WLWB Online Registry for [Rayrock – Remedial Action Plan – Appendix A – Sep 21 20](#)

¹⁴ See WLWB Online Registry for [Rayrock – W2020L8-0003](#)

Table 1: Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigations for the Proposed Changes to the Project

Potential Impact	Activity	Proposed Mitigations <i>Description of measures to reduce potential impacts, including consideration of cumulative impacts and climate change.</i>	Board Analysis and Determination
Effects on wildlife health	Additional blasting for location of Containment Disposal Facility (CDF) within Mill Lake Drainage Basin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Applicant proposed the following mitigations in the Applications, IR responses, and responses to review comments for the IRs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Remediation of Mill Lake area will address risks to wildlife from Mill Lake due to the nature of Mill Lake being identified as a risk in itself (Land Use Permit Application). ○ In response to WLWB comment 1 for IR #17, the Applicant noted that the increased amount of blasting is not expected to have impacts than those previously identified and submitted to the WLWB and that details would be provided in the Quarry Management Plan. The blasting volume has increased from 5700 m³ (as proposed in Appendix C10 of the Remedial Action Plan) to a maximum estimate of 60,000 m³. • The Board previously considered applicable proposed and identified mitigations for effects on wildlife health in the Preliminary Screening Reasons for Decision from January 14, 2021: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Board may choose to include a licence condition requirement for the WMMP to mitigate threat of serious harm to wildlife and habitat (as per WRRB comment 3). The Board notes that the Tłjchq Agreement s 12.5.1 requires that the WMMP is reviewed by the WRRB. ○ Revisions to the WMMP through the WRRB or WLWB Boards' processes can be used to address any necessary changes or remaining uncertainty. 	Based on the described mitigations, it is the Board's opinion that the proposed activities will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment and will not be a cause of public concern.

<p>Changes in water quality</p>	<p>In water construction for dock expansion; additional blasting for location of Containment Disposal Facility (CDF) within Mill Lake Drainage Basin and blasting of bedrock with uncertain geochemical characterization; treated camp water discharge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Applicant proposed the following mitigations in the Applications, IR responses, and responses to public review comments for the IRs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dock expansion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ WLWB comment 2 on IR #19 asked CIRNAC-CARD to confirm if it wanted the dock expansion to be considered as part of the proceeding, and if so to describe all potential impacts and mitigations. In response the Applicant noted that it did not consider the expansion of the floating dock to be “in-water construction” but acknowledged that the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board Standard Water Licence Conditions definition of Construction as “any activities undertaken during any phase of the Project to construct or build any structures, facilities or components of, or associated with, the development of the Project” was “sufficiently broad that it is recognized that this work could meet the definition.” The Applicant noted that the expansion of the dock would have no impact on the aquatic environment and mitigative measures were not proposed for the installation or removal. ○ DFO comment 1 and GNWT-ENR comment 5 on IRs #18-21 asked for clarification on the method of anchoring the dock. DFO noted it was confident this work can be addressed within the regulatory process, and recommended the works associated with the dock expansion be included in the Request for Review package to be submitted to DFO. The Applicant responded that pilings would be used to anchor the floating dock and that work associated with this expansion would be included in the Request for Review package. Additional blasting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A Spill Contingency Plan was submitted with the Applications and is being proposed as a requirement of the Water Licence for Board approval. The plan accounts for storage of explosives separately and leaves the responsibility for 	<p>Based on the described mitigations, it is the Board’s opinion that the proposed activities will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment and will not be a cause of public concern.</p>
---------------------------------	--	---	--

		<p>storage/security/handling/use/removal of all explosives with qualified blasting contractor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In response to IR #12, the Applicant noted that residual nitrate, nitrite, and ammonia were possible from the “use of common explosive mixture for bedrock blasting” and were added to proposed Effluent Quality Criteria to mitigate increased blasting in the Mill Lake Drainage Basin. ○ In response to IR # 21, CIRNAC-CARD noted that the Quarry Management Plan will provide additional detail on the management of acid-generating bedrock. CIRNAC-CARD also noted that the CDF will be constructed with a lined cover and base to reduce the potential for water being present within the cell. The Board notes that in response to IR #16, CIRNAC-CARD has proposed the Quarry Management Plan be provided a minimum of 90 days prior to the commencement of quarrying activities, and that Board approval of the Plan would be required prior to commencement of quarrying activities. ○ WLWB comment 1 for IR #17 asked CIRNAC-CARD to describe the potential impacts and mitigations for increased blasting other than additional nitrogen EQC, the Applicant noted that the increased amount of blasting is not expected to have impacts than those previously identified and submitted to the WLWB and that details would be provided in the Quarry Management Plan. ○ Parties commented on the uncertainty regarding Mill Lake Bedrock quality and Potential Acid Generating (PAG) rock, and additional information requested in IR #21 (ECCC comment 1; GNWT-ENR comment 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14; TG comment 2; WLWB comments 3). In CIRNAC-CARD’s responses it was outlined that up-to-date samples had not identified any PAG and follow up humidity testing of samples previously considered uncertain were found to be non-PAG; that if PAG was identified it would be used within the CDF footprint and capped with a synthetic liner and non-PAG rock; that the CDF design was flexible enough to accommodate 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>increases in final volumes, and that based on current testing results there was low potential for an exposed bedrock faces from blasting to be PAG. CIRNAC-CARD also clarified that the geochemical criteria for determining PAG or non-PAG rock was the MEND Guidelines (Price, 2009), and that in the event PAG rock was identified on bedrock faces, the risk of impact would be evaluated and design would be adjusted to mitigate the risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Board also has standard licence conditions which are typically used to mitigate the described impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction Material – Geochemical Criteria • Construction Material – Source(s) • Design and Construction Plan <p>Camp Wastewater</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In response to IR #20, CIRNAC-CARD noted that camp wastewater would be indirectly discharged to the receiving environment via a sump, and that Effluent Quality Criteria (EQC) would apply before after treatment and before deposition in the sump. Board staff note that EQC were proposed in the response to IR #12 for treated camp wastewater. ○ GNWT-ENR comment 7 in review of IRs #18-21 requested clarification on the proposed final discharge location for camp wastewater. In response, CIRNAC-CARD clarified that the sump will be located a minimum of 100 m from the ordinary high-water mark of any water body, and that the Federal Land Use Inspector would approve the selected location. ○ TG comment 1 in review of IRs #18-21 noted that site management and treatment of wastewater could be discussed with the Kwetj̄j̄paà Elders Committee (KEC) for consideration of where treated camp wastewater could be placed within site geography. CIRNAC-CARD replied that KEC input and advice on the location will be considered by the Contractor if the information can be 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>provided to the Contractor as they are setting up the camp to avoid delays.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The Board also has standard licence conditions which are typically used to mitigate the described impacts:<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Discharge Location – Ordinary High-Water Mark	
--	--	--	--

<p>Changes to aquatic habitat; effects to aquatic species health</p>	<p>Withdrawal of water from a watercourse; in water construction for dock expansion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Applicant proposed the following mitigations in the Applications, IR responses, and responses to public review comments for the IRs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Withdrawal of water <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In response to IR #18, CIRNAC-CARD provided information for water sources to be used if construction of the Tłjchq Winter Road was required by CIRNAC-CARD, including maximum annual water withdrawal volumes. CIRNAC-CARD noted that it intended to use the same methods and water sources used by the Government of the Northwest Territories for construction of the Tłjchq Winter Road System historically. ○ GNWT-ENR comments 1-4 and WLWB comment 1 on IRs #18-21 requested clarification on water withdrawal as outlined in IR #18. Upon review of DFO 2013 and the <i>Technical Reference Document for the Method for Determining Available Winter Water Volumes for Small-Scale Projects</i> (Hutchinson 2020) CIRNAC-CARD proposed that river maximum withdrawal rates for each river would be a maximum of 10% of the instantaneous flow volume averaged for the location, and that if the available daily volume was less than 100 m³, the river would not be used. CIRNAC-CARD also confirmed that for smaller waterbodies, water would only be withdrawn until maximum annual volume was reached, and that <i>the DFO Protocol for Winter Water Withdrawal from Ice-covered Waterbodies in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut</i> (June 2010) would be strictly adhered to. • The Board also has standard licence conditions which are typically used to mitigate the described impact: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Water Source and Maximum Volume ▪ Maximum Under-ice Water Withdrawal Volume ▪ Water Intake Screen 	<p>Based on the described mitigations, it is the Board's opinion that the proposed activities will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment and will not be a cause of public concern.</p>
--	---	--	--

		<p>Dock expansion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ WLWB comment 2 on IR #19 asked CIRNAC-CARD to confirm if it wanted the dock expansion to be considered as part of the proceeding, and if so to describe all potential impacts and mitigations. In response the Applicant noted that it did not consider the expansion of the floating dock to be “in-water construction” but acknowledged that the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board Standard Water Licence Conditions definition of Construction as “any activities undertaken during any phase of the Project to construct or build any structures, facilities or components of, or associated with, the development of the Project” was “sufficiently broad that it is recognized that this work could meet the definition.” The Applicant noted that the expansion of the dock would have no impact on the aquatic environment and mitigative measures were not proposed for the installation or removal. ○ DFO comment 1 and GNWT-ENR comment 5 on IRs #18-21 asked for clarification on the method of anchoring the dock. DFO noted it was confident this work can be addressed within the regulatory process, and recommended the works associated with the dock expansion be included in the Request for Review package to be submitted to DFO. The Applicant responded that pilings would be used to anchor the floating dock and that work associated with this expansion would be included in the Request for Review package. ○ The Board also has standard licence conditions which are typically used to mitigate the described impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equipment: Watercourse Buffer • Habitat Damage ○ Additional potential mitigations identified by the Board: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As previously identified during the January 14, 2021 Preliminary Screening, in the response to an Information 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Request from the WLWB, DFO clarified that the Request for Review process to be used by CIRNAC and DFO with respect to the Rayrock project will assess the potential for harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of fish habitat for projects near water and that DFO ensures that potential impacts to fish and fish habitat are avoided, mitigated or appropriately offset.¹⁵ As noted by DFO and CIRNAC-CARD in review of IRs #18-21, the Request for Review process will include consideration of the dock expansion activities.</p>	
--	--	---	--

¹⁵ See WLWB Online Registry for [Rayrock – Information Request Response from DFO – Nov 25_20](#)

3.1 Consideration of Potential Impacts

Based on the potential impacts and proposed mitigations identified above in Table 1, the Board considered whether the changes to the Project might have a significant adverse impact on the environment. In general, impacts of the changes to the Project can be mitigated through the use of standard permit and/or licence conditions and/or project-specific conditions established by the Board as per the MVLWB [Standard Process for Creating New Conditions](#). These conditions may include requirements for management and monitoring plans that provide detailed information regarding the implementation of mitigation measures and the evaluation of their effectiveness. Parties will have the opportunity to consider the proposed conditions later in the regulatory proceeding and will be finalized by the Board following completion of the regulatory proceeding.

As discussed in Table 1, the Request for Review process required by DFO is considered mitigation measures for potential impacts to fish habitat, and CIRNAC-CARD has indicated information will be submitted to DFO for that process.

3.2 Consideration of Public Concern

In addition to considering the potential impacts of the changes to the Project, the Board considered whether the changes to the Project might be a cause of public concern. Based on the evidence provided during the regulatory proceeding, the Board did not identify any comments or issues that indicate that the Project might be a cause of public concern.

4.0 Conclusion

The Board completed a preliminary screening of the Project on January 14, 2021,¹⁶ however, potential changes to the Project were identified over the course of the Proceeding during the technical session held January 26-28, 2021. Accordingly, the Board has determined that Project activities that have already been subject to Part 5 of the MVRMA are exempt from preliminary screening under Part 1, Schedule 1, section 2.1 of the Exemption List Regulations to the MVRMA. The Board has conducted a preliminary screening of the proposed changes to the Project. The Board has reviewed the relevant evidence and based on the evidence, it is the Board's opinion that the proposed changes to the Project will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment or be a cause of public concern as set out in paragraph 125(1)(a) of the MVRMA. The Board has therefore decided not to refer the Project to Environmental Assessment and will resume the regulatory process pending the 10 day pause period as per subsection 125(1.1) of the MVRMA. If the Board does not receive a notice of referral to environmental assessment by April 25, 2021, the Board will continue with the Water Licensing and Land Use Permitting process as outlined in the current Work Plan.¹⁷

¹⁶ See WLWB Online Registry for [Rayrock – Preliminary Screening – Determination and Notification – Jan 14 21](#)

¹⁷ See WLWB Online Registry for [Rayrock – Work Plan – Feb 24 21](#)



Joseph Mackenzie
Chair, Wek'èezhii Land and Water Board

April 15, 2021

Date