

EMAB

February 1-3, 2011, Lutselk'e and Yellowknife

Present:

Doug Crossley, Chair, Kitikmeot Inuit Association
Ted Blondin, Vice Chair, Tlicho Government
Audrey Enge, alternate, North Slave Metis Alliance
Lawrence Goulet, Yellowknives Dene First Nation
Steve Ellis, Government of the Northwest Territories
Charlene Beanish, Government of Nunavut

Call-in:

Floyd Adlem, Secretary Treasurer, Canada (on and off as available)
Colleen English, Diavik (on and off as available)

Guests:

James Marlowe, LKDFN

Staff:

John McCullum, Executive Director
Michele LeTourneau, Communications Coordinator (and minutes)

.....

February 1, 2011

Meeting started in Lutselk'e at 11:00 a.m.

Opening prayer: Lawrence Goulet

Item 1: Approval of Agenda and Minutes

Agenda

Chair reviews agenda.

Minutes

Motion:

Approval of January 10, 2011, conference call minutes.

Moved: Ted Blondin

Second: Charlene Beanish

Noted that this version of the minutes have a Board member's clarifications included and underlined.

Carried

Item 2 – Arbitration update/discussion

Executive Director reviews basic issues that were decided by arbitrator. (In binder.)

Discussion:

Ongoing issue – An issue that has already come up with Diavik is the company’s position that the EMAB budget cannot exceed their contribution. According to the arbitration it can; however DDMI may not agree, in which case the EA requires DDMI and EMAB each provide separate budgets to the Minister so that he can choose. Query regarding whether EMAB can reduce its budget to match DDMI contribution. Noted that once EMAB starts limiting itself in what it can do in order to meet Diavik’s expectation of budget-equal-contribution then EMAB will not be doing everything it is expected to do. Also noted that if EMAB’s budget matches DDMI’s contribution and the arbitrator provides additional funds to EMAB, and they are not spent by March 31 they will be deducted from DDMI’s contribution for 2011-12.

Question: Is there a limit to carry-over of program funds?

Answer: Unknown.

Regarding EMAB appealing the arbitrator’s decision: The Executive does not recommend appealing. The Board agrees as it would be costly and uncertain. The key argument for Diavik retaining the \$300,000 is that the company did not put in writing that it would not claim the money back. (As per EA article 17.1.)

EMAB has requested a computation clarification. The arbitrator’s contract was extended to determine if there is or not a point to be clarified.

EMAB has/will receive \$6700 from both INAC and GNWT toward legal fees through contribution agreements.

ACTION: make sure terms of contribution agreements are dealt with before March 31.

.....
Lunch break: 12:00

Return: 1:35
.....

Item 3: Two-year Budget Proposal

See binder. (Status and possible reductions and options are detailed.)

Diavik has made it clear that unless EMAB crafts a budget with a bottom line not exceeding its contribution it will not agree, and invoke EA clause 4.8 (e) (iv).

Question: What are the disadvantages to EMAB if it matches its budget to the Diavik contribution?

Answer: The budget is the cost of carrying out the workplan – in order to reduce the budget we have to reduce or remove some activities EMAB had planned. At a more practical level, if EMAB is awarded anything through a computation clarification any unspent funds at fiscal year-end will go back to DDMI. Not matching the budget, which is allowed by EMAB as per the arbitration decision, allows EMAB more flexibility.

Discussion about budgeting techniques and options that might accommodate everything EMAB has to do and satisfy Diavik at the same time. Agreed to leave some items in budget with a zero allocation.

The Board agrees to go through a budget-reduction exercise. Noted that according to the EA, EMAB and Diavik must come to an agreement, or not, today.

EMAB members discuss line items that have been identified for possible reduction or elimination, as per outline in binder.

The Board decided to go in camera to discuss Management Services., The Executive Director and the Communication Coordinator leave.

Motion:

In camera.

Moved: Audrey Enge

Second: Steve Ellis

Carried

Motion:

Ex camera.

Moved: Ted Blondin

Second: Steve Ellis

Carried

Noted that EMAB has reduced pre-authorized expense amounts for Aboriginal Party members to reflect current expenditure levels, but that EMAB policy requires they be paid if they invoice.

ACTION ITEM: Make cuts to the budget lines (2011-2013 submission) now and revisit EMAB policy in future.

Noted that the capacity funding line item is the most contentious line of the budget for Diavik. The issue is about the link that EMAB makes to the EA and the fact that Diavik's position is that there is no link and that the program does not build Aboriginal Party capacity. Agreed to move capacity funds to variable costs and reduce by \$25K per year.

Several Aboriginal Parties to the EA have noted repeatedly that there isn't enough capacity funding to cover off all the work they need to do re: Diavik and the environment.

Budget reduced to match DDMI contributions. Noted that the Parties need to be made aware of the proposed cuts.

Budget	2011-2012	2012-2013
Fixed	493,800	498,600
Capacity building	125,000	125,000
Science	42,200	17,000
TK	57,000	48,000
Workshop	(Wildlife) 5,000	(Air Quality) 34,400
		(SOE reporting) 0
		(Strategic plan update) 10,000
Governance	3,000	0
Total	726,000	733,000

EMAB

February 2, 2011

Present:

Doug Crossley, Chair, Kitikmeot Inuit Association
Ted Blondin, Vice Chair, Tlicho Government
Audrey Enge, alternate, North Slave Metis Alliance
Lawrence Goulet, Yellowknives Dene First Nation
Steve Ellis, Government of the Northwest Territories
Charlene Beanish, Government of Nunavut

Call-in:

Colleen English, Diavik (on and off as available)

Staff:

John McCullum, Executive Director
Michele LeTourneau, Communications Coordinator (and minutes)

.....
Meeting started in Lutselk'e at 9:30 a.m.

Noted: A Board member wants to re-visit the new budget because yesterday the focus was numbers and not so strongly focused on considering EMAB's full responsibilities and activities.

Executive Director reviews the new numbers, which do not consider receiving any funds as a result of the arbitration clarification.

Noted:

- EMAB has received some partnership funding from INAC in the past, so it is reasonable to expect it may happen again in future; however, the Board has never received any from the GNWT. It may also be possible to tap into programs like CIMP.
- There is no requirement for the EMAB budget to match exactly the Diavik's contribution, as per the arbitration decision. That's a requirement Diavik is presenting as an alternative to their disagreeing with the EMAB budget and presenting budgets to the Minister. Even if the EMAB budget matches the contribution, Diavik has said it might not agree with the budget anyway and it will end up with the Minister. In particular Diavik doesn't want to see the capacity building program in the budget. The Executive will meet with Diavik on Tuesday February 8 to review the revised budget.
- EMAB is demonstrating effort and Diavik does not appear to be doing the same.
- If EMAB and Diavik budgets will go the minister anyway, EMAB should consider re-instating some amounts for important line items that were eliminated yesterday. EMAB knows it can make a rational case for these activities.

Motion:

Approve the revised two-year budget submission.

Moved: Steve Ellis

Second: Lawrence Goulet

Q: Are line-item amounts locked in?

A: No, the board can change them

Carried

Item 4 – Workplanning for 2011-2012

Background information in binder.

Discussion on which meeting can be cancelled, timing of Diavik site visit, and community locations for meetings.

Motion

Approve 2011-2012 budget, as presented in the two-year budget submission.

Moved: Charlene Beanish

Second: Steve Ellis

Carried with one abstention.

Motion:

Approve 2011-2012 Board calendar, as revised.

Moved: Ted Blondin

Second: Audrey Enge

Q: Can changes still be made?

A: Yes.

Carried

Item 5 – Capacity funding discussion/update

1) Update on funding

YKDFN: 2009-2010 reports approved; contribution agreement signed, and cheque processed.

NSMA: 2009-2010 reports approved; contribution agreement signed, and cheque processed.

2) Review of Capacity Building Program guidelines

The Board was going to review the “no proposals” provision under 2.5.7 and some members have suggested that other parts of the program should be clarified and/or that the entire program should be reviewed.

Based on the fact that the program was fully reviewed in 2008 and that 2009-2010 was the first year under the new guidelines, there will be no full program review. However, several members noted that the program should move to a proposal-based model. Rationale: To report on money already spent and relate them to the guidelines has created, in some cases, tenuous links. The no-proposal approach was the independent consultant's suggestion, which was a response to comments that the proposal approach is cumbersome. Noted: From an administrative perspective it is easier to evaluate activities compared to an approved proposal. Proposals are important to demonstrate the value of the projects; as well, they protect everyone.

ACTION: Put the discussion on the no-proposal policy for the Capacity Building Program on the agenda for the May meeting. ED to prepare a review of reporting for 2009-10 and a draft template for proposals.

Item 6 – EAAR discussion

Predictions, quoted in the EAAR are targets. In two cases, the prediction was re-worded for plain language purposes. The new wording in these two cases doesn't include the measurable targets in the original prediction.

Diavik representative agrees to change the wording to:

Water will remain at high quality for use as drinking water and by aquatic life (meet CCME thresholds);
Nutrient enrichment is likely from the mine water discharge, and will change the trophic status of up to 20% of Lac de Gras;

Item 7: Governance

Roles of Board members and staff/ relationship of Board members, and board, to Parties.

Executive Director notes that it is a legal requirement that a Director has a duty to act in the best interests of EMAB. He reads from *Duties and Responsibilities of Directors of Non-Profit Corporations*, published by the Canadian Society of Association Executives, a publication passed on to EMAB members attending the Whati governance workshop in 2003.

“Duty of Diligence: To discharge the duty of diligence, a director must act in the best interests of the corporation... As such, directors are accountable to the corporation to preserve the integrity of and reputation of the corporation...” ETC.

Discussion:

- Noted that that was the intent of the Environmental Agreement.
- Example: From a GNWT perspective, the appointed member does not work for the GNWT and does not speak for them. The member reports to the GNWT. The member does not take part in, for example, the GNWT's review of Diavik's EAAR.

- An appointee is not a representative.
- Noted that an exception would be Diavik, whose appointee acts directly as a representative, and that's a major problem. (Noted that this was not personally intended, but a matter of record.)
- Noted that this goes both ways: members look to the Diavik member to have answers re: Diavik at meeting. Information you wanted from Diavik should be requested in advance, and other Diavik personnel can provide info. Diavik personnel are available, with advance notice, to be at board meetings.
- In certain cases it would be important for an EMAB member to declare conflict of interest. The Board itself needs to be more vigilant about that. At the beginning of each meeting members should declare whether there are any items they may have a conflict on.

Q: Diavik: I there no expectation for Aboriginal members to report to their parties?

A: Yes. There is an expectation. KIA example: The member reports fully to KIA in writing, keeping them current. That is an expectation on their part. The issue regarding representativity is not reporting back to the Parties, it's that the Board members don't speak for their Party at EMAB meetings.

Minute-taking

Q: Why is minute-taking an issue?

A: A member came back from a chairman's conference with the clear understanding that minutes don't have to be long, can't mention names. What's needed is a summary, motion, seconded and passed. And general discussion. EMAB minutes are often 20 pages or more. This is too much information.

Discussion:

Noted that it is easier to review minutes if they come out soon after the meeting.

Noted that there is a need for all the information in order to figure out how a decision was made.

ACTION: Minute-taking should be thorough (summarized) but brief.

Re: Relationship between staff and Board: Individual board members don't micro-manage. The Board as a whole directs the Executive Director. The Executive Director's day-to-day dealings with the Board is through the Chair.

Item 8: EA Review

Current information/update in binder.

Q: Approve the SENES report or wait until every Party has responded?

A: EMAB needs to apply a deadline. The workshop was 49 weeks ago.

Deadline: Feb 20..

Lutsel k'e –

ACTION: ED to talk to chief or band manager re: SENES report on EA implementation.

Tlichio Government now has a body to work on all mine-related issues such as this. They will be responding to the SENES report.

Note that EMAB is proceeding on many recommendations raised by the EA implementation review.

ACTION: Approve review during March teleconference.

ACTION: Teleconference will take place March 1 at 1:30 p.m.

Community engagement

Diavik has shared its template re: community engagement with EMAB. Diavik has also stated that it cannot share information that it received, or individual protocols, from Aboriginal groups with EMAB due to confidentiality requirements.

ACTION: Executive Director will draft a release for Aboriginal groups to sign if they choose to share community engagement protocols with EMAB and send to the board members.

Communities are all at various stages in protocol development. The protocols identify the lead person for Diavik and the community for each of 13 topics.

Noted: The WLWB is also putting out an engagement protocol, which is confidential.

ACTION: Add the matter of the communication protocol onto the agenda for the teleconference.

.....

Break for 12:00

Started at 1:30

.....

Item 9: Reports

Noted that DIAND contribution for legal costs related to the arbitration needs to be followed up.
Financial Statement

- Motion:***
- Accept financial statement as presented.***
- Moved: Ted Blondin***
- Second: Audrey Enge***

Carried

Member reports

KIA is still interested in funding to help develop a TK monitoring proposal.

Tlicho Government/ Ted Blondin: There is a new mining committee (Kwe Beh) comprised of two chiefs and one member from Tlicho Assembly and some expertise. They have been meeting for the past three weeks. This committee will now deal with anything re: mining, including TK monitoring projects. The committee's activities might fit into the capacity building program guidelines.

Yellowknives Dene/Lawrence Goulet: Will report back to Land and Environment. Land and Environment office has moved again to the Detoncho building.

NSMA/ Audrey Enge: Request for WLWB to make a presentation at the May meeting on their role and an overview of their activities.

Government of Nunavut/ Charlene Beanish: Received water sampling data from INAC and passed off to our scientist. She is reviewing the data and will get back about the issues with monitoring on the Coppermine River.

The biggest concern is that the last data available is from June 2006.

Item 8: EA review (continued)

Cultural Awareness

DDMI was going to provide a description of their new cultural awareness program. The person who was working on cultural awareness for Diavik employees has retired. There will be a lull in next steps.

ACTION: Diavik will update EMAB at May board meeting.

Noted: The cultural awareness program for Diavik employees is for everyone, not specifically for environment staff.

Website

Website stats were presented in December – hits are increasing. Started development of Facebook page.

Item 10: Coordination with DCAB

Background in binder.

Discussion:

- DCAB has been up and down, whereas EMAB has been running really well. EMAB should not be taking on/inheriting something that is not working. There are politics and administrative problems involved. EMAB needs to maintain its stability and only engage in a joint office if it is beneficial to both DCAB and EMAB.
- EMAB will give the new DCAB chair time to assess their situation and for a new staff person to

- become familiar with the organization, and then can review the issue.
- DDMI sees two main areas for coordination: activities and office space/admin
- Concerns about ensuring that EMAB does not end up doing DCAB's tasks
- Noted that this issue was raised by DDMI based on EA clause 4.8(c) – is there a similar clause in the Socio-Economic Monitoring Agreement?
-

EMAB

February 3, 2011

Present:

Doug Crossley, Chair, Kitikmeot Inuit Association

Ted Blondin, Vice Chair, Tlicho Government

Audrey Enge, alternate, North Slave Metis Alliance

Lawrence Goulet, Yellowknives Dene First Nation

Charlene Beanish, Government of Nunavut

Colleen English, Diavik

Staff:

John McCullum, Executive Director

Michele LeTourneau, Communications Coordinator (and minutes)

.....

Meeting started at 9:30 in Yellowknife

Benn Armstrong has moved on at Rio Tinto. There should be a replacement in a couple of months. Mike Lowing is acting in the meantime.

Item 11: Air quality monitoring

Air quality: (Colleen English presents for Steve Bourn.)

Golder will do the work on air quality. They have received all the documents and are developing a model plan. The model plan will be used as a starting point to renew discussion with Environment Canada and the GNWT. After which Diavik will see if there's anything else to be added to the scope of the model. Steve will look at contract from 2008-2009 in terms of the scope and will also review the data to see what needs to be updated. This is to ensure Golder has the most current data.

Diavik has not received any indications that they can't get this done by May.

ACTION: Diavik to update EMAB on air quality at May meeting.

Letter to minister re: Air quality

Background for new members.

As usual, EMAB knows Diavik is working on a dispersion model. What EMAB still does not know is if Diavik will do what they are supposed to do as per the EA. The update today does not address the entire issue of an Air Quality Monitoring Program.

Letter to the Minister needs to make it clear that there is a difference in understanding. The letter should contain more of the history and make the section on community/caribou stronger. The letter will be a strong motivator for Diavik to increase their efforts.

Motion:

Approve letter to Minister of non-compliance re: Air Quality Monitoring Program, with changes, and send.

Moved: Ted Blondin

Second: Audrey Enge

Carried with 1 opposed

Item 12: Fish update

Introductions. Mark Hulsman, University of Alberta student, presents on the baseline monitoring at the m-lakes and West Island stream. Presentation available from office. They have done a lot of physical and biological sampling for the last two years and have one more year to go before construction starts. They found more fish species than expected.

Item 13: Wildlife update

Presentation by Jan Adamczewski.

Grizzly – ENR is proposing a workshop specifically on grizzly, Diavik to talk with Nicole McCutchen about that. EMAB would also be involved.

Caribou monitoring – DDMI is doing a power analysis to determine how often aerial surveys are needed to get good data – Jan supports reduction of frequency; don't need to keep showing year after year after year that zone of influence is larger.

Wolverine – ENR approach will be same as in the past

DDMI has had discussions with Susan Fleck, the Director of Wildlife. GNWT has international obligations regarding Grizzly bear and is doing research to meet them. Robert Mulders is re-analyzing grizzly satellite collar data from WKSS studies. He is also looking at Mathieu Dumond's work in Kitikmeot – March. GNWT is developing its own approach.

DDMI would like to piggyback on GNWT's work and align their monitoring. DDMI will not do grizzly monitoring in 2011. They will participate in the ENR research group process.

GNWT is considering the possibility of putting satellite collars on grizzly bears, and of looking at video observation methods.

Question: will EMAB be involved in ENR's grizzly workshop?

Answer: yes.

Noted that there were two workshops last year on revising the WMPs, but no major progress in terms of TK monitoring. EMAB needs to continue to push for TK to be included in the monitoring. Hoping some proposals will come forward from communities. Possibility of expanding TK Panels to cover all three mines.

ENR noted that they are developing agreements on caribou management with communities. One has been signed with YKDFN and one is in progress with the TG.

A concern was expressed that if Diavik re-focuses its grizzly monitoring on the more regional approach being taken by ENR their monitoring may no longer be able to verify the predictions made during the EA. The last analysis showed that the monitoring can't determine whether or not there is a zone of influence for grizzly. Changes to Diavik monitoring should focus on their EA commitments for monitoring before taking a more regional focus. TK might be able to address this.

Caribou... not clear that any new monitoring proposed so far gets at the reasons for the increased zone of influence

Noted that EMAB has a wildlife cumulative effects workshop planned... maybe we could tweak the approach for the workshop to also address some of these research questions. This could work as long as it stays focused.

we should do that.

Colleen provides presentation DDMI has been making to communities.

Caribou aerial surveys

Reduce frequency of aerial surveys. Some communities support this, others think they should be done every year. One approach DDMI is considering is clumped monitoring – monitor for 3 years, then take a break. The monitoring would be triggered by a significant change in Diavik's operations. Diavik is concerned that this makes it difficult to budget – they prefer a fixed interval.

Another option is to do it every second year – might miss peak flow. They are analyzing existing data to see what happens if they leave out every second year of data and will have that ready by March.

Caribou behaviour scans

Diavik didn't get much data in the past because there are very few caribou near the mines. Now they are cooperating with BHPB and this approach has been successful. Joint scans in 2009 had over 100 scans – this data will also be analyzed by end of March.

The main question is how often to do the surveys – there was a recommendation to change the objectives.

Grizzly monitoring

Diavik will use posts with barbed wire for hair samples – they still need to determine the study design including frequency. There may be opportunities to collaborate. They will review the studies to date, including the results of Mulders' analysis. In 2010 they had posts in all the plots where they used to

monitor for grizzly presence and did three hair collections. They did not do any monitoring in 2009 and will not in 2011.

Falcons

Diavik will align its monitoring with the national five-year survey.

Waterfowl

Diavik has eliminated the weekly surveys later in the season and will not do a statistical analysis of the data.

Dust/Vegetation

Diavik will tie in the data from the permanent vegetation plots with dust data to see if there is a difference between onsite and offsite plots. They will also report the results of the lichen study. They will take all this information and do a health risk assessment for caribou. If there is a difference in results near the mine and far away they will decide if they need to do more detailed studies to see where the dust levels become the same as background levels.

Proposed changes to WMP

Less frequent monitoring

Continue annual reports and 3-year analysis.

Cumulative Effects Presentation (Jan Adamczewski – ENR)

Started a project following a 2008 workshop. It is very difficult to identify specific cumulative effects caused by the mines. This project was sidelined when ENR had to respond to the drastic drop in Bathurst caribou.

The results so far seem to show that they can combine the models they were looking at, and include some TK information. They will continue to follow up.

They found some avoidance of active mines by caribou, but not of inactive mines. They couldn't really tell if the exploration camps had an effect because it's very hard to tell how much flying is being done. Part of the problem is that a lot of the data is from caribou collar locations and there are so few collars that the data is too weak. Right now there are nine collars on Bathurst caribou and they hope to put out 13 more in April. They are also doing a statistical analysis to determine the number of collars they would need in order to draw conclusions.

Lunch @ 12:45

back @ 1:40

Item 14: Closure Plan

Gord Macdonald presents on revised ICRP. DDMI plans to have a final design concept by 2015 and a final design by 2020. They expect the next complete ICRP update will be 2015.

There are a few big questions:

- Should caribou be confined to trails on the wasterock piles or allowed to roam freely
- Ways to deal with surface ponding on PKC
- Did a cost-benefit study of burying inert waste on site

- Studied North Inlet sludge to try to tell if it can be reconnected with Lac de Gras but won't have results until March
- Removed all references to A21 pipe – if they proceed they will prepare a separate closure plan for it.
- They will identify revegetation areas as part of upcoming research
- They have provided a cost estimate for closure as directed by the WLWB.

Randy Knapp of SENES presents the review for EMAB:

This is an impressive, well supported document that made a serious attempt to address concerns from previous reviews. There are still a number of issues though.

1. rock piles and seepage – the drainage from those piles is contaminated. There are high levels of metals and acidity, even in the Type 1 rock. Troubling. Really not discussed in the plan. A bit of a red flag.
2. Revegetation – he has harped on this since we started reviewing – no where in closure plan that deals with vegetation. No allowance in estimates etc. No allowance for till disposal. There's just no information. Lack of cost provision. Regardless of Diavik's comments we do need some provision.
3. We were concerned that the water in the pit would not turn over. Three levels. Surface would be suitable. It has been addressed through a model. Modelling does not address underground link to pit. No info on hydrology of flow. Needs to be addressed in future.
4. Closure costs. A number of items not covered. Relocation of till pile. Expect to use all till in reclamation of site. But there's no provision for removal of any of the material. 3.6 million tons is a lot -. should be there and is not there. No allowance for re-vegetation. This will cost many millions of dollars. Some allowance needed for some long-term treatment of seepage from waste rock pile. Unless there is info that this is not an issue then there needs to be some contingency. These could all increase costs substantially.

Does plan allow for monitoring after closure?

Gord - It does provide for monitoring for 8 years, until 2030.

Randy - 7 years – if everything goes as it should... that's fine. But if anything goes wrong DDMI will have to be monitoring well into future. Estimates at 10 to 30 years – there are low levels of sulphides in the rock and they will be exhausted fairly quickly.

How might climate change affect seepage from rock piles

Randy -With or without climate change is difficult to prediction. There will likely be more drainage and seepage, It's definitely a consideration. DDMI will use the data from the test piles to model this.

Noted that the elders would like to see as much re-vegetation as possible. DDMI does not plan to revegetate the waste rock.

ED makes a brief presentation on how the new plan addresses EMAB's comments on the previous version.

EMAB's biggest concerns are about community engagement and use of TK.

ACTION: ED to draft response for review by board.

Comments due 15th. Conference call on Monday the 14th. 10 a.m.

Item 15: Inspector report

There were a couple of tears in the PKC liner but no water seems to have gotten out of the PKC. Diavik has wells in the PKC dike to monitor and pump back any leakage. They seem to have fixed the leaky areas.

Item 16: security deposit update

Lorraine Seale – DIAND

There are three security deposits: water licence, EA and surface leases. They total \$184 million. The EA Security Deposit total is about 18 million

Next scheduled security exchange is March 31. They do this twice a year, based on schedule in water licence.

DIAND is currently reviewing the ICRP and will decide if they will provide a security estimate with their comments. There was an estimate in 2007 that was lower than the amount DIAND was holding. DDMI asked for a review. DIAND will do a review after there is an approved ICRP in place and there might be an adjustment after that.

EMAB noted the concerns about DDMI's security estimate that were raised in the SENES ICRP review.

Post-closure monitoring duration was raised. DDMI is proposing 7 – 8 years. It should be longer. DIAND is also concerned about post-closure monitoring.

What about progressive reclamation? Hasn't been much opportunity for that.

Item 17: Traditional Knowledge in monitoring

ED presents item from kit.

Response to EMAB recommendations – if DDMI hasn't responded by the March 1 conference call EMAB should consider a letter to the Minister saying DDMI is out of compliance with the EA.

TK panel draft terms of reference – defer to next meeting

TK panel workshop with SLEMA

ACTION: ED to follow up with email requesting each Aboriginal Party to identify two people for the TK panel workshop.

ACTION: conference call on TK Panel workshop in April

Motion to adjourn
Floyd