

Approved Motion # 02-05-03-03

**EMAB Board Meeting Minutes
January 11, 2005
EMAB Boardroom, Yellowknife, NT**

Floyd Adlem, Government of Canada, Chair
Florence Catholique, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation, Vice Chair (late)
Doug Crossley, Kitikmeot Inuit Association, Secretary-Treasurer
Lawrence Goulet, Yellowknives Dene First Nation
Eddie Erasmus, Dogrib Treaty 11 Council
Gord MacDonald, (alternate) Diavik Diamond Mines Incorporated
Doug Doan, Government of the Northwest Territories, RWED
Keith Hamilton, North Slave Metis Alliance
John Morrison, Government of Nunavut
John McCullum, Executive Director

Minutes:
Michele LeTourneau, Communications Coordinator

Meeting started at 9:10

Opening prayer: Eddie Erasmus

Introductions: Eddie Erasmus and Keith Hamilton.

Floyd Adlem is leaving the Board, possibly on a leave of absence while he sits on the MVLWB. He has requested up to a year. An election for Chair will be required at the next meeting.

ITEM 1 – Approval of Agenda and Minutes

Approval of Agenda

ED passes out revised agenda with seven new items for consideration. Items are placed on the agenda.

Motion # 01-04-16-11

Accept agenda as amended.

Moved: Doug Doan

Seconded: Doug Crossley

Carried: Unanimous

Approval of Nov. 16-17 2004 Minutes

Motion # 02-05-11-01

Motion to adopt minutes of Nov. 16-17.

Moved: Doug Crossley

Seconded: Gord MacDonald

Carried: Unanimous

Approval of Conference Call Minutes of Oct. 29 2004

Motion # 03-05-11-01

Motion to adopt minutes of Oct. 29.

Moved: Doug Doan

Seconded: Doug Crossley

Carried: Unanimous

Approval of Conference Call Minutes Dec 15 2004

No quorum so approval not necessary.

ED briefly goes over topic of discussion at that conference call – EMAB's recommendation re: MVLWB technical review of DDMI documents – originally followed ammonia amendment discussions.

ITEM 2 – Strategic Planning

Update on Community Engagement

Need to know where we go from here.

CC tables preliminary results report.

We will have to modify the process because timing is all off.

Approach to development of draft plan

ED notes that EMAB needs a work plan and budget for April 1.

Options:

1. Do a draft work plan 2005-2006 based on previous years. Strategic planning information would be used once all communities have provided information. Expected to be complete in time for preparation of 2006-07 work plan and budget:

2. Go ahead with a draft strategic plan with the information collected so far. Try to have something in place that we would modify when we have more info from final communities.

3. Prepare an interim work plan that covers only the fixed-cost portion of the budget. This would be revised once the strategic plan is developed, likely around the end of June.

Note: Visit to Tlichó communities could take place in early May.

We'd also then meet with NSMA

Discussion:

Doug D: It would be a disservice to do the strategic plan without having talked to all the folk. Option two not a good one to pursue. That's not to say ignore all the info that was gathered – but don't draft strategic plan.

ED explains to Keith the process – what we thought we'd do with Metis: meet with the executive and get direction from them as to how best consult their people. Keith notes, as new ED, that he'd like some reorganization time. April is probably a good time for an initial meeting. It will be up to political leadership to give direction.

Floyd notes that we can go into a (work) planning process much as we've always done. We're not finished community engagement and strategic plan yet so we proceed as usual at the moment. Modify work plan later on. Floyd opts for a combination of option 1 and 3.

Eddie notes that we should wait until all the communities have been consulted. Now that the Tlichó claim is done, the communities are open to meetings of other sorts. Sometime in mid-May would be good. Eddie can relay this message to people in communities.

Gord suggests that we get back to the communities that have already been consulted, follow-up on schedule change and give progress report.

ACTION ITEM: Letter from the Board on where we're at re: community engagement, indicating the Board member for that community is reviewing the preliminary report.

The strategic planning committee will be struck again, when it becomes necessary. It needs 3 new members.

Inclusion of Scientific Review

ED notes that a scientific review discussion goes with strategic planning, that it should be discussed as a part of that planning rather than on its own since it may involve re-allocation of resources

Floyd reviews the whole scientific panel/scientific review discussion for new members.

The Board will discuss the scientific review discussion paper under its own item number.

Board Calendar for 2005-2006

Calendar will be developed at next meeting.

ACTION ITEM: ED and/or executive will prepare a draft calendar.

DDMI letter on EA clause 7.6

ACTION ITEM: Board to read and comment on DDMI letter – ED to bring compilation of comments to next meeting and add item to the agenda for the next meeting.

ITEM 3 – MVLWB update

Floyd declares a conflict of interest and leaves the discussion.

Update: EMAB was concerned that MVLWB were assembling comments on documents for the MVLWB without having the DTC discuss them as a group and make a recommendation. They have agreed the DTC will meet and develop advisories to the MVLWB.

Bob Wooley (MVLWB ED) has been given authority by the MVLWB to disband the DTC. They are giving it one last chance to show it can be effective. MVLWB is concerned that issues are not being concluded at the DTC.

Gord notes that the closing date for comments on the DTC Terms of Reference is 14 January.

Doug D notes that our focus should be where the accountability is, not down the chain. DTC is not who we zero in on.

ACTION ITEM: Copy of ToR to Board for review. Give comments to ED.

ED on AEMP and letter from MVLWB on AEMP review and 2003 AEMP report review:

Chair of DTC pointed out the annual AEMP report does not require approval. Two questions: is the AEMP in general effective and in good shape? 2) Are the reports themselves in good shape?

On the 2003 AEMP report our consultants raised a number of items that are part of the water licence that aren't being done and a number of points about issues such as quality control MVLWB gave the report to DDMI and has said they feel DDMI's commitments in their response deal satisfactorily with all comments. ED has given these comments to Neil Hutchinson at Gartner Lee to assess.

On the AEMP itself MVLWB has stated it will not require any changes to the AEMP following the independent review. Rescan, which reviewed the report, made many recommendations. EMAB also asked Gartner Lee to assess Rescan's recommendations and make comments. No reason was given by the MVLWB for rejecting the recommendations.

Q: How much synchrony between Rescan and our consultants' report?

A: In some cases they agree and in some cases disagree.

ACTION ITEM: ED to write a letter requesting rationale for the decision that's been made re: rescan report.

On another track: report itself. 2001 2002 2003.... DTC has not reviewed AEMP report for 2003 as a group.

Neil does say there's no evidence that the quality of the water is changing – but there are some things that are not being done.

Eddie raised a question about Experts group to be set up under the mediation agreement to review toxicity testing protocol – we don't know where that's at.

Keith says that he's flabbergasted that the AEMP report does not require approval.

Doug D notes that a similar thing is going on with WEMP. There's no implicit approval.

WEMP is a legal obligation re: Environmental Agreement.
AEMP is a legal obligation through legislation.

Doug C notes that there is no way for closure if Diavik is doing a good job and no way of rectifying things if they're doing a bad job.

It's an issue of transparency and clarity.

There should be at the least a letter accepting or not accepting the report.

ACTION ITEM: Write a letter to MVLWB looking for a commitment that they write a letter accepting or not accepting the AEMP report and other submissions not requiring formal approval.

More discussion to be had later.

ITEM 4 – Status of DFO Habitat Compensation

Julie Dahl and Ron Allen arrive

Introductions all around

Discussion and next steps.

ED recaps issues so far. DFO will, despite community consultations and EMAB recommendation, require DDMI to proceed with enhancing the pristine m-lakes.

John Morrison offers a message from Peter Taptuna and Monica Angohiatuk: – DFO held a consultative process on local enhancement projects. They are very disappointed that DFO has chosen to modify or do research on pristine lakes when the suggested community projects would improve fisheries. Their feeling is the application of this policy is contrary to their wishes. TK is being ignored. In short, they feel DFO is being arrogant in the application of this policy.

Julie explains that there has been a commitment to go ahead with one of the suggested projects.

Julie notes that she's just seen a letter from KIA to Nunavut on three projects involving ATV crossing to build small ATV bridges. Then they wanted a full-blown bridge. The focus is on trying to get the focus back on the ATV bridge.

Discussion on what issue exactly is being discussed.

Doug c: On fish habitat restoration – people may not necessarily have a sense of what DFO might be trying to achieve and what resources are available.

Ron Allen: Half of the efforts are off site – which is not our policy and not our preferred way of doing it. If it's in the watershed – there is a connection. If it's not in the watershed – we have to discuss what it is DFO sets out to do and how to measure successes. With lakes m-1,2 and 3 there is an opportunity to see if some things work and what doesn't with less other factors and variables.

Julie: The meeting in communities were initial meeting to get them thinking about projects. They had hoped people would follow up with suggestions later. We've not gone into the details, but we're gathering project ideas.

Doug D: DFO has agreed to move half the compensation off-site but hasn't gone into the details yet?

Discussion on scope of works and consultation.

Julie: We followed EMAB's recommendation, we delayed the work. We've worked on this for three years. We have moved our position. We've stated: we are willing to work with the communities. We are trying to move from policy to community driven projects. It's not going to happen all at once.

John Morrison: People will never understand mucking about with pristine lakes.

Julie: We need the research for the future.

John Morrison: What's the point of (researching) enhancing pristine lakes if that's never going to be option?

Julie: With other locations there are too many other factors affecting results and success measurement (variables).

Discussion –

On half and half scenario – pristine vs. island lakes, DFO would gain some further consideration from communities. Island lakes not seen as pristine. Do the work there and do the work on the island.

Doug C: We still stand by the recommendation of not working on pristine lakes.

Julie: We are moving towards your position.

ED: We don't want to see pristine lakes touched. The island lakes would be a better choice. If DFO is correct that by allowing off-site work for one island lake they are moving half the required habitat units off-site it would be much better to work on that lake and move the habitat units from the three mainland lakes and other island lake off-site. People are more concerned about disturbing pristine lakes than number of habitat units, so the less lakes disturbed the better.

Discussion

Gord notes that the research is already being done – that we don't need m-lakes research. The research already being done by Diavik fulfills research requirements.

John Morrison requests a copy of the report on DFO research (Ulu project, 2001) done in the Kitikmeot. Ron Allen will see to it.

Next steps.

Thanks to Ron and Julie for coming.

Break at 12:00

Back at 1:20

Florence joins the meeting.

Floyd clears up misunderstandings re: his appointment to the MVLWB. It was not a DIAND decision but a personal one.

DFO discussion con't

Keith: Next step – reiterate in writing EMAB's position, also saying you've come part of the way but not far enough.

Gord: Get the m-lakes off the table. The science is there, like for like, communities are in.

Doug C: The science point of Gord's is good. But we had in writing island lakes would be the choice.

Discussion:

- We need to recognize their effort.
- Gord offers to help draft the science part of the letter.
- ED doesn't remember scientific research being part of the policy.
- Agreed it's not part of the policy. Let's be careful not to fall into their fallacy.
- Like for like is on the island – *that's EMAB policy.*
- Our position is still not to disturb pristine lakes.
- DFO has already backtracked earlier commitments.
- There are two issues intertwined: one – doing habitat work offsite. The other – pristine lakes or not pristine. They have listened to us on off-site.
- What are the prospects on changing their mind on pristine lake issue.
- So respond thanking them for their movement on off-site, but we still disagree with disturbing pristine lakes.
- Work on lakes can't start until there is a plan that covers both on-site and off-site work
- Reminder that at the last meeting we talked about kicking it up a notch. Minister? Media?
- Start a dialogue at a much more senior level: big issue here for aboriginal communities in the north.

ACTION ITEM: Write a letter to Ron Allen – thanks for your movement, but still opposed to touching pristine lakes. *Use TK Panel report to back up.*

ACTION ITEM: Letter to Minister: DFO has changed their positions again. They are using justifications outside the policy in order to work on m-lakes. The longer this issue goes unresolved, the longer until implementation. Expectations have been created in communities re: off-site. Use TK panel report to back up.

ITEM 5 – Update on Security Deposits

Welcome to David Livingstone and Eric Yaxley

Good news: Diavik has paid everything it was supposed to:

- 12.92 m under EA
- 50m under water licence
- 11.08 million under land lease
- 1.5m for Fisheries Authorizations

We're right on track. 25 million in march is on track. No major divergence from plans. In '06, DIAND will do a review. 213 million plus 3 million in 2013 –then it starts to decrease.

Until Diavik steps away from the site and the Parties are happy, there will be money in the bank. Also if further monitoring is required after closure.

As production is ahead of schedule security will reflect that – that’s the reason for 2006 review. DIAND is working on coordinating security deposits better.

Until the work is actually done the security amount won’t be reduced.

The east side rock pile is the first big reclamation work. Diavik wants to start work on that once it’s complete.

Florence: Will there be an opportunity for communities to be involved in plans etc? And who who will define “completion”?

David: That will be discussed at A&R workshop. There will be consensus – among the regulatory bodies. Probably achieved through a water board-type hearing.

There is no interest on the security as they are letters of credit. In fact, Diavik pays a carrying charge.

BACK to DFO letters

The TK panel on No Net Loss report can be referenced by John in his action item letter writing to back up our position.

Return to ITEM 3

Scope of action re: acceptance of reports by MVLWB.

Discussion:

- Keith applies a tax metaphor: acknowledgement of receipt, then notice of assessment.
- We can start talking about it at regulators workshop on Thursday. Follow up with a letter.
- There are lingering issues that haven’t been addressed.
- ED says MVLWB already said they would send letter of acknowledgment for AEMP. But they keep fudging on doing the review at DTC
- Speak of AEMP as an example then move to other reports
- Or, start general, get an agreement, then say oh by the way what about this report?

ACTION ITEM: Write letter regarding acceptance of reports, using AEMP as example.

Reviewing of reports by MVLWB

Discussion on draft recommendation for the MVLWB to review their systems:

- What to hang this recommendation on? Can't be mediation because that was confidential.
- Issues raised by various parties.
- Philosophical discussion: what is MVLWB/DTC – DTC is the only source of technical expertise for the MVLWB.

There will be a federal review/audit of Mackenzie Valley Act coming out April 1.

Changes to recommendation:

- add a sentence – EMAB thinks DTC is valuable.
- add "timely"
- Expand from DTC to all methodologies/processes – include this in your analysis

Motion # 04-05-11-01

Send recommendation to MVLWB, with discussed amendments

Moved: Keith Hamilton

Seconded: Florence Catholique

Carried: Unanimous

Dividing of RWED into two separate entities as of April 1

Floyd suggests a letter from the Board requesting that Doug Doan remain as GNWT representative.

Doug D: there will be someone on environment side that will be more plugged in than me.

Discussion on continuity and expertise.

ACTION ITEM: Write a letter to Minister of RWED requesting that Doug D remain on EMAB for transitional period until January 1, 2006.

ITEM 6 -- WEMP

Chair explains for the new members the WEMP presentation at last meeting and the reason for it i.e. alternative to providing report earlier.

Question regarding statistical analysis report discussed at last meeting. Methods have been agreed to by EMAB's consultant and RWED and report is expected in February.

Q: Did the presentation achieve objective of providing enough info to allow for changes to next year's WEMP?

Chair tables RWED letter on this.

Gord: Was a full assessment the intent? He thinks not.

Chair: Is there a reason for data to be collected on a calendar year?

Gord: Could be a different annual basis instead of a calendar year e.g. October to October.

Discussion on changing dates.

A change would cause glitch in some data.

ACTION ITEM: ED will meet with Diavik and RWED to discuss whether a change in the reporting period might work.

Fencing work plan

ED goes over letter to Scott Wytrychowski re: fencing at site and goes over discrepancies between site report from TK group and Diavik work plan.

ACTION ITEM: Send the letter to Diavik indicating changes needed.

ITEM 10 –

Florence states she would like to attend IEMA reclamation workshop.

Winter Road Trip

We'd go up on a Thursday and travel back on Saturday because there's space in accommodations at site.

Discussions on logistics.

March 10 (Thursday) stay Thursday and Friday night. Fly back Saturday later.

NOTE to Erik Madsen: Gord has committed you to help out with logistics for road trip and take care of accommodations.

Reclamation Workshop

Dates: February 1 to 3

Two financial issues – honoraria / will pay for only two members.

Florence

Maybe Lawrence if he's in town.

Motion # 05-05-11-01

To enhance honoraria to \$350 from \$200 for two EMAB members if required.

Moved: Doug Crossley

Seconded: Eddie Erasmus

Carried: Unanimous

Break at 3:53.

***EMAB Board Meeting Minutes
January 12, 2005
EMAB Boardroom, Yellowknife, NT***

Floyd Adlem, Government of Canada, Chair

Doug Crossley, Kitikmeot Inuit Association, Secretary-Treasurer
Lawrence Goulet, Yellowknives Dene First Nation
Eddie Erasmus, Dogrib Treaty 11 Council
Gord MacDonald, (alternate) Diavik Diamond Mines Incorporated
Doug Doan, Government of the Northwest Territories, RWED
Keith Hamilton, North Slave Metis Alliance
John Morrison, Government of Nunavut
John McCullum, Executive Director

Minutes:

Michele LeTourneau, Communications Coordinator

Resumed at 9:10.

ITEM 7 – Discussion Paper on Scientific Review Panel

Eddie tables Tony Pearce's comments on ED's discussion paper.

Chair recaps discussion with Tony at last meeting (see minutes of Nov. 16-17).

Discussion:

- This should be considered during the strategic planning discussion rather than as a separate issue
- This has financial implications. It is possible to go back to Diavik under clause 4.8 f – EMAB would have to be in a totally defensible position. There are a few chinks: such as capacity building money. Until we get all our ducks lined up, going back to Diavik for money is not on.
- Floyd is not opposed to more scientific review. EMAB has been focused on communities. If government and the Board itself don't have capacity to review all these reports, is it EMAB's job to fill the hole? With the fencing issue for example – we did all the work, paid it all and passed it on to Diavik. It's a slippery slope.
- If the MVLWB can achieve what we ask (rigorous and timely review) etc. That's their job.
- EMAB's job is to assess how well MVLWB does their job.
- EA says EMAB should review these reports.

- If it's being done appropriately, there should be no duplication.
- EMAB should review for oversight, for quality control or as necessary to communicate the findings to the members and communities.

Doug C: If we can find in our budget money for this, then I'm all for it. The approach we've taken is of looking at main ticket item. Maybe at every second or third meeting, we can have upcoming reviews as agenda item. But I don't think we need to do everything. We could overkill the issue and go broke doing it. That's my fear. We need to be sure we are using our funds effectively.

KIA had a lively teleconference about this – one view was “you guys should be doing more science.” But we don't have an endless pot of money. It might happen at the expense of Traditional Knowledge and community involvement. If we want both there has to be prioritization.

Priority setting – strategic planning – that's the place to discuss a scientific review panel. We go through the list of reports and ask if this or that report is critical. Are we reviewing enough reports and are we reviewing them in the right way with consultants year after year rather than a set panel?

Capacity money – is that being well-utilized?

Doug C: Another comment that I've heard -- in KIA, in public – some people have mentioned to me that Diavik is getting an easy ride as a result of the approach we've taken eg: community rather than science.

It's partly up to us to correct that perception – talk about Diavik cooperation, fixing things when they need fixing.

Doug D: That's a question related to what we heard in communities: that yes KIA wants more technical, other people want real information about issues.

When ED wrote the discussion paper and researched in past documents and minutes, he found no formal decisions that EMAB's priorities were wildlife, water and fish, or that EMAB would be strictly an observer and only get involved in reviewing where regulators identify a problem.

Gord: EMAB's job is to explain the answers. Before there wasn't enough data but now we're moving into having results. It's about explaining the results to communities.

Where do we go from here? Let strategic planning go its course? TK panels are ad hoc – science may be the same.

Set priorities in strategic plan, based on community info, then budget accordingly.

There's an opportunity to set some money aside at the next meeting, reallocate from capacity funding, for example.

ACTION ITEM: Add the science discussion paper to strategic planning process.

Q: The question of whether or not EMAB should intervene – was that part of community engagement?

A: No. But that can be part of strategic planning.

In the interim, regarding science, we continue with standing offers. We can revisit work plan

Eddie: The land is important. None of the Aboriginal communities have funds to look into what's happening. Our people are always saying that these mining companies are destroying everything and the mines are getting away with it. We don't know what's going on there.

Doug C: The ammonia issue was a frustration. They wanted to review the issue and gain their own comfort level – what impact on water? We as a board encouraged DIAND to provide intervenor funding for the parties. That didn't happen. There was not an awful lot that they could do re: studies and impact on the Coppermine River. There's a frustration with us. We did do an assessment. It was explained to communities but I think the communities think we should have done more.

The scientific review need is coming to a head. RWED announced a significant decline in caribou herd and nobody's come up with why. They've gone from 400k to 187k. Why? The uncertainty there is frustrating – might speak to a need for science.

We don't have enough data to say why.

We have to be careful too; we must recognize that there are a number of communities that essentially lapsed their capacity funding. That can be used to address some of these issues. We have to get our act together – if capacity funding isn't working then we have that resource to put elsewhere.

Break at 10:00.
Back at 10:22

ITEM 6 – WEMP

Joint Letter with IEMA on cumulative effects

ACTION ITEM: Send joint letter.

ITEM 9 – Report

Financial statement/budget revision

Doug C.: 75% into the fiscal year. Right on track with 75% expended.

Q: Who's using capacity funding?

A: KIA will ask. Lutsel K'e will use. Dogrib Treaty 11 – no. Yk Dene are working on it.

Q: Do we have a carried forward surplus?

A: Yes. Mostly capacity funding and unspent community engagement funds because we haven't visited all communities yet.

DIAND has some funding – \$30,000 for a project. How about workshop on cumulative effects?

Idea: identify proposals and park them until we find funds.

Outstanding action items

Discussion on intervener funding – should it be part of strategic planning? Should Aboriginal members consult with their parties first?

Every party has the right and responsibility to intervene. Repetitive for EMAB to do it.

Inspector's report

November 2004 SNP Report

•October 31st – November 25th

Ammonia:

Max. average: 2.47 mg/L

(last month: 1.07 mg/L)

Max. grab: 3.07 mg/L

(last month: 1.33 mg/L)

•pH control system installed in late December - but not functioning due to safety concerns & developing SOPs

November 2004 SNP Report

Toxicity Testing:

•Required acute toxicity tests were performed.

•Toxicity results showed no effects of the effluent at any concentration for both tests.

•Round whitefish gametes were not available for concurrent testing.

Saw two foxes in waste transfer area

Break at 12:00.

Back at 1:38.

Introduction of Susan Fleck, Director, Wildlife and Fisheries, RWED

Susan speaks of her past – executive assistant to three past ministers. Also, she's a biologist. She's happy to be in wildlife and to go to regions. She knows a bit about what EMAB does. She will continue to keep informed.

Report tracking

Chair notes success re: DFO report reviews.

Correspondence

ED goes through outstanding correspondence items. Noted that some items are taking more than a year so the chart should show the year as well as the date of EMAB's request

ACTION ITEM: Send a follow-up letter to DIAND seeking status of Coppermine River monitoring.

Issue – intervener funding

Letter from minister reviewed – David Livingstone will be in touch.

ACTION ITEM: Talk to David later about minister’s letter regarding intervener funding.

Issue - Meeting of the Parties

Chair recaps the last meeting of the Parties. DIAND committed to calling another. We followed up. They said get a hold of Diavik and meet with Joe Carrabba. Diavik had also committed to doing a discussion paper on cumulative effects – clause 4.11

Much discussion on what this clause is about exactly.

Meeting is not EMAB’s responsibility.

ACTION ITEM: Letter to DIAND – get rid third paragraph and add “bringing up this issue because of our own commitment to chair and let us know if at some point you want to fulfill this commitment of yours.

On subject of EMAB/DCAB merging – that is Party business not EMAB business.

Gord: But from an operational point of view, it does have to do with EMAB. Diavik want EMAB’s input.

Doug C: It’s premature to seek EMAB input without first getting Party input.

ACTION ITEM: Letter to DDMI: Add that it’s premature to seek EMAB input on discussion paper.

Florence’s request to attend conference

ED runs through written analysis of request based on policy.

Keith: NSMA also received invite and discussed it concluding that it’s a meeting to discuss a meeting – why would they spend time and money?

Discussion.

The board reviewed the request with the parameters of the policy and did not support it.

Agenda for regulators meetings

Discussion on how the meeting with regulators would proceed the next day.

Board member reports

Gord (Diavik): Nothing

Keith (NSMA): Spoke yesterday about NSMA situation.

Doug D (RWED): Encourages the Board to build relationship with new Wildlife and Fisheries Manager, any time they have a new senior manager, there is an opportunity to make that relationship work. The RWED split is targeted for April 1.

Doug C (KIA): Written report handed out. He and John Morrison will continue to work with Peter Taptuna to get the capacity funding report and proposal in.

John M (Nunavut). Also involved in DFO issues. Also support an interagency, especially with Tahera coming online. Nunavut Government supports concept of single Board to monitor all mines.

Lawrence Yk Dene: Chiefs are busy with treaty entitlement. Having problems getting land and environment people together. People are working, trapping, working at mines. Hard to get people together for monthly meetings. Wish to set up winter road monitoring station again.

Eddie (Dogrib Treaty 11): Explains where the Tlicho Agreement is at – it's in front of the senate. Have had first and second reading, then going to senate committee in February. Then a 3rd reading. Then the royal assent. Then an effective date. Tlicho will become law and there will be a Tlicho government.

Floyd (Canada): How to elect a new chair. Open up to nominations next meeting. It should be straightforward. It's the first thing to do at the next meeting. ED can run that. David Livingstone will attend as alternate. Or they may appoint him and Eric Yaxley will be the alternate.

Doug D says Floyd has been a great leader both as Chair, and perhaps even more as Vice-chair from day one. The board will miss his leadership. It was a privilege working with him. Hopes Floyd will come back to EMAB.

Agenda for regulators' workshop

Discussion about agenda.

Start with powerpoint?

Make the meeting a regular event.

ITEM 10 – IEMA update.

Sean updates in place of Carole Mills, who is away.

Reclamation workshop – date and venue set for Feb. 1-3 at the ski club. Invitations have been distributed. Planning committee is establishing agenda and guest speakers. EMAB is invited to bring two funded Board members, but more are welcome. Two society members per community are funded to attend.

Water license – process did not lead to a water licence renewal. Currently Board is seeking comments on length of extension, A public hearing or hearing by way of written submission is planned for January 24.

New manager hired – Kevin O'Reilly will take over from Carole Mills. Starting January 24 and he will attend the reclamation workshop. Carole will return to DIAND.

Environmental workshops – still planning to host in March but no progress to report.

New director – Dr. Ward Wilson of UBC, reclamation specialist is confirmed is confirmed by DIAND.

Dogrib communities – based on meeting with Lands Protection Committee, it is most likely that a director and staff will visit Dogrib communities in spring.

Meeting adjourned at 3 p.m.