

Environmental Monitoring Advisory Board

DRAFT Minutes – May 23, 2019; 10:30 to 11:40 am

Conference Call

Present:

Sean Richardson, *Director*

Arnold Enge, *Director*

Laurie McGregor, *Alternate*

Gord Macdonald, *Director*

Tlicho Government

North Slave Metis Alliance

Government of the Northwest Territories

Diavik Diamond Mines

Absent:

Jack Kaniak, *Director*

Julian Kanigan, *Secretary-Treasurer*

Kitikmeot Inuit Association

Government of the Northwest Territories

Staff:

John McCullum, *Executive Director*

(minutes)

Janyne Matthiessen, *Environmental Specialist*

(minutes)

Environmental Monitoring Advisory Board

Environmental Monitoring Advisory Board

Guests:

Loretta Ransom, GNWT

Sean Sinclair, Diavik

Zsolt Kovats, Golder

Rainie Sharpe, Golder

Megan Cooley, North-South Consultants

Thursday, May 23, 2019 EMAB Review of 2018 AEMP Report
Call to Order
Meeting called to order at 10:30 am by the Executive Director. Agreed that ED will Chair the call.
Presentation by Diavik
Sean Sinclair presented the Diavik 2018 AEMP Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Noted the report was done under Design Plan Ver 4.1.• Included TK Camp fish palatability results; quality of fish was good• More dust than recent reports; likely due to A21; this affected results from some other variables• Phosphorus loads were within water licence limits• Extent of effects was less than previous year

Discussion

Q: Where is everything at in terms of revising AEMP to accommodate new EEM requirements in MMDER?

A: Planning for 2021, when EEM requirements come into effect. GNWT is looking into equivalency possibility with the federal government. Still in planning stage.

Q: Is there a standard methodology for which fish are prepared for the TK camp fish tasting?

A: No. Methods vary for catching fish (e.g. from shore, dock or boat, using poles or nets). Cooking methods also vary and depend on community preferences.

End of Diavik Presentation

Presentation by North South Consultants

Megan Cooley presented the NSC review results.

- Report was well done; improves every year

Discussion during NS presentation

Q (from Diavik): Should the report be updated for Diavik commitments or leave that for future reports. Note: this question is because the WLWB directive came out less than a week before the report was finalized.

A: Don't need it for this year but definitely include it moving forward.

- NSC will remove reference to add these results for 2018

Comment back from Diavik (Sean): We will definitely do that moving forward.

Dust

Discussion between Diavik and NS about equipment blank bag sampling details. Diavik will add detail in future reports. In brief there is one blank for the snow core tube and another for the bag the snow core goes into.

Comments on benchmarks

- Could be useful to incorporate changes based on the CCME guidelines to aquatic life.
- Diavik has been thinking the same thing. Usually the updated benchmarks are incorporated into design plans.

Question on difference in spatial trends in phytoplankton versus zooplankton

- Phytoplankton density decreased with distance from the mine
- No trends observed for zooplankton
- This is not an unusual plankton finding but there are ways to find out why this is occurring.
- Diavik (Sean) is not sure why; this is something that would be addressed in more detail in the 3-year reevaluation reports under Weight of Evidence.

Eutrophication

Q: Can Diavik reflect more on eutrophication indicators in dust deposition areas (specifically MF3)

A: Can not answer with anything of value right now. Will get back to EMAB

Action Item: Diavik to provide a response to question on dust effect on phosphorus results at MF3-2

Comments on 2017 nitrogen concentrations

Q: Do high N concentrations recorded in 2017 at LDG 48 remain an anomaly?

- Noted that there is a typo in report. LDG 48 having higher N concentration in 2018 is a typo. N concentration is actually the highest in Lac du Sauvage (LDS 4).

A: 2017 N findings are an anomaly.

- Noted that this section could use a re write.

Suggested to discuss details of plankton used as a eutrophication indicator

Q: Phytoplankton and zooplankton show different trends - discuss

A: More details can be included in 3-year AEMP reevaluation report.

Suggested that would be beneficial to have all TSP data presented together somewhere

Diavik agreed – suggested this be covered in the summary section of the report

Q: Are nutrients diluted as they pass through Lac de Gras; reference to readings at outlet from Lac du Sauvage and outlet from Lac de Gras

A: Nutrients are consumed within Lac de Gras before flowing through to the Coppermine river. Not diluted but nutrients are consumed.

Comment: Nutrient levels are reduced regardless of what causes it.

Comment on how to address fixing typos:

Q (from Diavik): EMAB is using a new approach by addressing typos outside the comment table so Diavik doesn't have to provide a response. How should typos be addressed. Does EMAB want a version 1.1 or just in the responses.

Phone Line Cut Off briefly

Consultants sign off call

Typos (cont.)

- Comments on typos won't go in as formal recommendations but are noted to be fixed for the final version of the report. WLWB suggested method to record typos in an appendix rather than addressing them as recommendations. This way they do not require a formal response.

General Questions and Comments (later initiated as action item)**

Q: When responding to submitted comments of this (AEMP) report should we provide a new version 1.1. of the report.? Or, would sticking with version 1.0. and providing responses to the comments be sufficient? Creating a new version 1.1. would take a lot of work but can be done if it is more useful/preferred.

- Would be up to WLWB
- Regardless of how it's done all responses to comments should be in one place and attached to the report. Could be an appendix or Ver 1.1.
- Diavik (Sean) is not suggesting that they would take this approach for something like a design plan, but only for a one off report like the annual AEMP.
- EMAB would be fine with either. We will note in cover letter to WLWB that EMAB would be satisfied with keeping V 1.0., with comment responses attached.

Board Discussion & Decisions of what to send in to WLWB

- Draft comments were sent out
- A couple of EMAB comments have been added related to the TK Camp
 - Comments on cysts/worms
 - There is some discrepancy between the main report and the appendix regarding fish parasites. Should be made more clear.
 - There is also reference to scientific results in the TK section. In the past EMAB has suggested that TK sections should strictly relate to TK
 - Some disagreement here on if the TK report should or shouldn't address scientific findings if they are supported by TK.
 - Noted that mercury results for fish were presented in the TK section. They were presented in a basic way which is not useful for year-to-year comparison. Recommended to do a more detailed analysis

Q: Is everyone comfortable with submitting the excel file?

A: would remove third recommendation about mercury sampling and analysis since WLWB has already removed this requirement

A: Yes, it has been raised by EMAB before. Should we continue to stress it to WLWB?

A: Opinion is that it should continue to be brought up, however we should not bring it up here.

- Confirmed that mercury analysis comment and recommendation (row 36) will be removed.

Some discussion on whether EMAB should recommend that Panel report not address scientific aspects of AEMP report. Comment is in line with statements EMAB made on the 2015 AEMP report.

EMAB will note that it would be satisfied if the 2018 AEMP report includes an appendix with Diavik responses to EMAB's comments and recommendations.

Motion: *Submit EMAB comments (excel spreadsheet) and cover letter to WLWB as amended.*

Moved: Laurie McGregor

Seconded: Arnold Enge

Motion carried.

Adjourned at 11:40 am.