

WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



Minutes – April 18-19, 2023

Yellowknife Boardroom and by teleconference / Zoom

Present:

Charlie Catholique, *Chair*

Jack Kaniak, *Vice-Chair*

Violet Camsell-Blondin, *Secretary-Treasurer*

Ryan Miller, *Director* (by phone)

Adrian D'hont, *Alternate*

Gord Macdonald, *Director* (by phone)

Lutselk'e Dene First Nation

Kitikmeot Inuit Association

Tlicho Government

Yellowknives Dene First Nation

North Slave Metis Alliance

Diavik Diamond Mines

Absent:

Kelly Fischer, *Director*

GNWT

Staff:

John McCullum, *Executive Director*

(minutes)

Mohannad Elsalhy, *Environmental Specialist*

(minutes)

Environmental Monitoring Advisory Board

Environmental Monitoring Advisory Board

Guests:

Sean Erasmus, Observer, YKDFN (in person)

Brian Kopach, MSES (Day 1 & 2 – by phone)

Bill Slater, Slater Environmental (Day 2 – by phone)

Megan Cooley, North-South Consultants (Day 1 & 2 – by phone)

Jennifer Kirk, Arcadis (Day 1 & 2 – by phone)

Randy Knapp, Randy Knapp Consulting (Day 1 – by phone)

Imran Maqsood, GNWT-ECC (Day 2 – by phone)

Celena Hoeve, GNWT-ECC (Day 1 – by phone)

Nicole Goodman, Diavik (Day 1 – by phone)

Tuesday April 18, 2023

Meeting started at 9:05 am at EMAB Boardroom and by teleconference

Chair begins meeting with moment of silence.

Item 1: Approval of Agenda

Chair reviews agenda.

Item 7: Inspector's Report cancelled.

Item 15: WMMP Addendum motion rescheduled for the next meeting.

Bill Slater Presentation on FCRP rescheduled for tomorrow.

WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



Motion: to approve agenda for April 18-19, 2023 meeting as amended

Moved: Jack Kaniak

Seconded: Adrian D'Hont

Motion carried

Item 2: Conflict of Interest

No conflicts declared

Item 3: Minutes of Previous Meeting

Board reviewed minutes of previous meeting.

Motion: to approve February 7-8, 2023 meeting minutes:

Moved: Charlie Catholique

Seconded: Jack Kaniak

Motion carried.

None against, no abstentions.

Review of Action Items

No outstanding recommendations

Item 4: Finance

ED presents item in the kit.

Two-year budget status

- EMAB received Diavik's payment of \$563,100 for 2023-24 as agreed.
 - And an additional \$10,000 for the Water Licence Amendment for Natural Drainages as agreed.

ED presents Variance Reports for the previous and current fiscal year.

- For WL Amendment and FCRP there are still some invoices to come in for work up to March 31'23.
 - There is some budget allocated for these projects in this year's budget.

2022-23 Audit Update

- The audit is scheduled to commence in early May, as per usual.

TK Fish Camp Workshop Proposal Update

- There has been no progress since the previous update provided during the February Meeting.

Motion to destroy old financial files

Suggested Motion: To get rid of financial documents dated before April 1, 2016, following government regulations.

WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



After discussions, a motion was put forward and adopted.

Motion: to destroy hard copies of financial records dated prior to April 1, 2016, as per federal and territorial regulations.

Moved: Violet Camsell-Blondin

Seconded: Jack Kaniak

Motion carried.

None against, no abstentions

Item 5: Update on TK Working Group

ED presents item.

- No details to provide, wondering if there are updates from the Parties.

Discussion:

- TK WG met on March 23. Discussed governance.
- Suggested hiring a 3rd Party with a technical background as staff.
- No community will lead; didn't want group to be based within a Party.
- Suggestion that EMAB could house the TK WG with meetings in a neutral/ independent place.
- YKDFN representative noted that Diavik did a good job and received/ considered inputs from attendees.

Q: Did YKDFN take minutes for that meeting?

A: No.

Q: Who attended the meeting?

A: Diavik – Gord and Sean S.; YKDFN – Ryan and Sean E.; TG – Violet and Brett; LKDFN – TasTsi; NSMA – Marc; KIA – Skye.

Q: Did Diavik take minutes?

A: Yes, but they are for internal use only.

- EMAB hopes that if any Parties have minutes, they will share them with EMAB.
- TKWG has a bi-weekly conference call scheduled.
- Elders should be involved in TKWG.
- Maintaining sufficient funding is important.

Q: EMAB submitted a letter to the Leadership of Communities asking for EMAB to have observer status at the TK WG. Did any Board member raise that or have any feedback?

A: No

Q: Could EMAB office house the TKWG staff/office?

- EMAB is tight for space.
- An individual selected by the communities should take the notes/minutes, not EMAB staff.
- If TKWG would like to use EMAB office they should make a formal request for EMAB to consider.
- TKWG should give an update to EMAB Board on March 23 meeting.
- It would be good for EMAB to be kept up to speed on TKWG.

Break



Item 5 (cont'd)

- It would be good for the TKWG to have its own office run by a third party; this is better than the way the TK Panel was administered.
- Each member of the TKWG should be asked if they want to share the meeting notes.

Action Item: EMAB to ask each member of the TKWG if they want to share meeting notes with EMAB.

Noted that Diavik is proposing four TK monitors on a 2 and 2 rotation plus a coordinator, possibly starting in January.

Item 6: A418 underground closure update

Nicole Goodman from Diavik makes a presentation.

- Materials will be removed from the underground to the satisfaction of the Inspector and managed on surface as per the approved Waste Management Plan such as fuel, lubricants, loose debris and garbage.
- No storage tanks will be left in A418.
- Mobile equipment will be moved to A21 underground.
- Areas with hydrocarbon spills will be cleaned to the satisfaction of the Inspector.
- A21 Underground workings are currently in construction.
- DDMI is removing additional items from the A418 beyond legal requirements for reuse in the A21 Underground (Business Case Removal)
 - like pump systems, electrical systems, escapeways, refuge stations.
 - These items will remain underground once fluids and hazardous materials removed.
- Examples of materials to be removed: Fire Extinguisher, Hydrocarbon Socks and Fluorescent Light Tubes.
- Examples of materials to stay underground: electrical racks that have been stripped of hazardous materials and salvageable parts as well as miscellaneous inert items (stairs, piping, hoist, etc.). All hazardous items have been removed.
- During the decommissioning process, removal requirements will be reviewed by the Inspector every two weeks or as deemed necessary by the Inspector.
- Prior to flooding of any underground level, verification of adequate decommissioning will be completed by the Inspector.

Discussion:

Q: Are any materials from A418 deposited in Landfill?

A: Hazardous materials are taken offsite, materials that are safe can be deposited in the landfill or left underground.

- Elders don't want any equipment buried in landfill.
 - Diavik follows all legal requirement.

Q: How much material will be left underground?

A: A full report will be filed.

- Concern about materials degrading underground.

Q: Are the copper cables taken out?

WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



A: Some cables are taken out, some are kept because there is no economical reason to remove them.

Q: How about contaminated soil?

A: All contaminants are cleaned up to Inspector's satisfaction.

Q: will the surface of the pit lake be monitored?

A: Water surface is still 500 meters below ground level.

- Diavik samples regularly.
- Degradation of materials underground is minimal due to lack of oxygen.

Q: Does any contamination remain after a spill cleanup?

A: The spill is scraped up and contaminated materials disposed. Socks and spill pads get the rest. There is no visible sheen

Q: How fast does the water rise?

A: It depends on the depth and whether the area is narrow or wide. At bottom it rose 2-3 meters per day. Slower now.

Q: How does the inspection work with water rising?

A: For each inspection, the inspector looks at the area that will be flooded up to the next inspection. Pumps are not removed until Inspector is satisfied.

PK to Pits Presentation

Gord from Diavik makes a presentation on placement of PK into A418.

- Diavik has started to deposit PK by pipeline to A418 instead of PKCF.
- PK pipeline deposition point: Starts ~130 m below the top of pit/dikes.
- PK flow path prior to descending into the SLR: When complete, Diavik estimates PK solids will be visible but still be in the SLR (vertical wall portion).
- PK cascading down the SLR: the SLR is what is being filled with PK solids. PK is filling the underground tunnels below the bottom of the SLR.
- Closure expectation of PK in A418: PK is permanently stable at a depth of ~220 –360m below lake level (i.e., 3-4 'Con Mine headframes' deep).

Discussion

Q: what is the ice seen on the sides of the pit?

A: Water from LdG seeps through the sides of the pit through cracks, and freezes.

Q: Seepage occurs 24/7?

A: Yes. It freezes on the pit walls, but seepage continues. Top of PK will reach about 200 meters below the lake surface.

Q: What is the contribution of the PK to rate of water rising?

A: PK is mostly water, so It is more than the water from seepage. Once the water level comes up to a certain level, then Diavik starts pumping that water to the treatment plant.

Q: what will seepage contribute once the pits are flooded?

A: Once pits are flooded, they will be the same level as LDG so the pressure gradient will be the same on the inside and outside of pit and there won't be any seepage. Might be a tiny amount of diffusion.

Q: could groundwater diffusion affect salinity and the chemocline?

A: increased salinity would make the chemocline stronger.

LUNCH



Item 8: Review of draft intervention: Water licence amendment – Natural Drainages

Jennifer Kirk and Megan Cooley join the meeting.

ED presents item.

- The intervention includes comments and recommendations from Slater Environmental, North-South Consultants, Arcadis Canada and Randy Knapp, as well as from staff.
- WLWB deadline for interventions is Tuesday April 25.
- The hearing is scheduled for the week of May 29 in Behchoko.

ED gives a summary of the proposed intervention recommendations.

- Instead of approving breaching all collection ponds, only approve the first two.
- The discharge from the ponds is a waste as defined by the Waters Act.
- Require Diavik to submit decommissioning plans for each pond.
- The discharge should be regulated with thresholds for each contaminant of potential concern.
- Require Diavik to include TK in its Surface Water Action Level Framework (SWALF).
- Diavik's Water Quality Model shows all discharge from collection ponds will be diluted to safe levels, and will not be toxic to aquatic life, wildlife or humans.
- EMAB does not agree with some of the changes Diavik is proposing to closure criteria for protection of fish, wildlife and humans.
- Monitoring needs to be done at more locations and more often
- Surface Water Action Level Framework is not adequate as proposed
- Pond Decommissioning Plans need to be improved.
- Closure AEMP needs to be improved.
- Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment should be improved.
- Specific comments on draft licence.

Board decides to go through the intervention in detail and discuss each recommendation with its rationale.

ED presents recommendations with their rationales one by one.

Discussion:

Q: Why does EMAB only recommend WLWB to approve only pond 2 and 7 to be breached first?

A: Allows time to collect and analyze information. Diavik already proposed to breach ponds 2 and 7 in 2023. The next 2 are proposed for 2025 so they can be dealt with in the WL Renewal in 2025.

- Discharge should be mixed before sampling; note that EMAB is recommending plume delineation and depth-integrated sampling.
- No comment on annotated Decommissioning Plan.
- Concern that Diavik hasn't developed a TK Monitoring Plan as part of the FCRP. The TKMP has been in development since 2012. When will it be ready?
 - TK Monitors must be independent and be able to identify problems right away.
- Comment that meeting AEMP Benchmarks does not demonstrate meeting cultural use criteria.



- Diavik clarification – no intention of using AEMP Benchmarks in place of cultural use criteria; Diavik comment was in relation to modelling.
- TK Monitoring is more beneficial in the long term – it’s about how the land is healing. Doesn’t need to be in place right from start.
- Not sure how long it will take before the land is available for cultural use. TK Monitoring will inform this. Contamination may stay for a long time.

Q: When will collection ponds be pumped out?

A: Spring

Q: Will Diavik clean out the sludge?

A: Not much sediment in ponds

- Sediment should be removed.

Q: Has Diavik considered passive treatment of discharges?

A: ICRP 4.1 looked at using wetlands; Diavik decided it was not practical.

- Consider some kind of filter.

BREAK

Item 9 – FCRP Review

Jennifer Kirk, Megan Cooley, Brian Kopach and Randy Knapp join the meeting.

Randy Knapp presents his review.

Three main concerns:

- I. The Dry Cover Option for the PKCF.
 - The plan is conceptual, not an engineered detailed plan. Engineer admits it may not be feasible.
 - Thermal modelling and stability of the cover remains uncertain.
 - EFPK is slimy; doesn’t support weight; likely need some kind of geotextile to prevent EFPK piping up through rock cover
 - EFPK may continue settling up to 2050; could lead to a pond forming.
 - It may not be possible to keep the EFPK frozen.
 - EFPK contains very large amounts of water; animals can’t walk on it.
 - Settlement and climate change concerns.
 - Dams are stable.
 - EFPK could liquefy and flow through discharge spillway
- II. Long Term Care and Maintenance
 - No fund from Diavik for maintenance costs after 2050. This assumption may be wrong; landowner might end up responsible
 - Possible costs could include:
 - Rebuilding the PKC spillway as a result of damage or need to lower it because of settlement in the PKC.



- Additional rock to either the NCRP or PKC to assure long-term freezing or to address greater than expected settlement.
- Possible failure of sloped surface of PKC
- Monitoring costs beyond 2050.
- Cleanup of spilled PKC in the event of catastrophic failure.
- Need to keep a holdback for at least 50 years to cover possible additional costs.
- III. Minimal budgets for revegetation and site restoration
- Diavik budget is \$700-\$800K. This is not a material effort.
 - revegetation and site restoration should be done to best of company's ability
 - noted that TG technical team agrees with this

Discussion:

Q: could seismic activity increase?

A: dams are stable; slope of PKC is stable as long as there is enough strength in the EFPK. Diavik's calculations use the upper end of strength testing

Q: What should be the amount of holdback?

A: Hard to say right now. Diavik submitted a long-term care and maintenance budget with ICRP 3.1. This has been removed, but could be an example.

- Noted that seismic activity has been experienced in Kugluktuk. EMAB should recommend a holdback for long-term maintenance and monitoring.

Megan Cooley presents NSC review.

Key concerns are related to:

- Runoff Monitoring – don't decrease sampling frequency until flow is understood
 - Sample at stream mouths
 - More frequent sampling of pit lakes and North Inlet
- Surface Water Action Level Framework – concern about time lags between triggers and actions; runoff may have stopped flowing
 - not clear how some actions will be applied
 - not clear what "effects threshold" refers to
- AEMP – should collect at least a year of data before any discharge
- Site Water Quality Model – some source terms are questionable
- HHERA
 - Metals in Lake Trout
 - Metals in Slimy Sculpin.
 - Mercury in Lake Trout

Jennifer Kirk presents Arcadis review.

- Major changes to closure criteria SW1 and SW2 (water that is safe for humans, wildlife and aquatic life)
 - Removed Drinking Water Guidelines and replaced with Recreational Guidelines
 - Removed AEMP Benchmarks and replaced with SWALF

WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



- Diavik should meet Drinking Water Guidelines at discharge point
 - Diavik should add numerical criteria to criteria for aquatic life
- SWALF (humans)
 - Trigger for human health leads to a risk assessment, which could take a year
 - Need a faster response
 - Diavik proposed an early warning trigger; this is an improvement
- SWALF (wildlife)
 - Also need a faster response for wildlife triggers
 - May need to prevent wildlife from drinking
- SWALF (aquatic life)
 - Need an early warning trigger for aquatic life
 - Toxicity test for aquatic life is not appropriate; should be lower threshold and more species should be tested
 - Mixing zone lengths need to be defined
 - Aquatic life could be impacted if SWALF is followed
 - Diavik's proposed AEMP triggers are too hard to interpret; AEMP results should inform SWALF
- HHERA
 - Haven't reviewed data; could be risks if data are not representative
 - Some results raise questions about reliability of modelling
 - Include metals in sediment in closure criteria

Discussion

Q: What would you suggest for the effects threshold at the end of the mixing zone?

A: Meet AEMP Benchmarks plus no chronic effects at the end of mixing zone shown by toxicity tests on multiple species.

- Concerns about cumulative effects eg. dust. Dust will settle into sediment.

Brian Kopach from MSES presents their review.

Main concerns:

- Performance monitoring of closure objectives.
 - Reliance on incidental wildlife observations could limit ability to assess performance and environmental monitoring criteria.
 - SW5 - Revegetation
 - Measure community structure; Diavik is only proposing to measure this once.
 - SW8 - Predation – incidental observations are not adequate
 - SW10 - Safe passage for wildlife – incidental observations are not adequate
 - M8 – daily monitoring is good
- Effects monitoring
 - ZOI should decrease over time
 - Need to continue behavior scans
 - Only incidental monitoring of wolverine
 - No criteria to assess changes in vegetation

WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



- Suggestion to use remote cameras to monitor Caribou and other wildlife; better than incidental observations.

Discussion:

- Climate change leading to invasive species. Need to monitor.
- Remote cameras might be useful when people are no longer there
 - Community monitoring would be helpful
 - Cameras are good for observations but not for estimating populations

Item 8 – WL Intervention (cont'd)

Continue review of WL intervention to recommendation 8.18.

Discussion on the remaining recommendations is rescheduled for tomorrow.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm

Wednesday April 19, 2023

Chair opens meeting at 9 am (EMAB Boardroom and by teleconference)

Chair reviews the agenda. Revisions:

- Item 8 – draft intervention – continue review started on April 18 at 9am.
- Item 10 – workshop – push back until review of intervention completed.
- Item 9 – Bill Slater will present FCRP comments at 1:30 pm.

Item 8 – Review of WLA draft intervention (Cont'd)

- ED re-starts review at recommendation 8.19
- Discussion
 - Concern Rec 8.19 may limit ability to adaptively manage closure criteria.
 - Agreed that EMAB wants to avoid adjusting AEMP Benchmarks, and avoid moving goalposts during closure, so leave Rec 8.19 as is.
 - Section 11.3 – reference Recs 6.3 and 6.8.
 - Rec 12.2 – reference specific sections of Water Licence being referred to.

Suggestion for two motions:

- One to approve submission of intervention as amended.
- Another to approve submission of consultants' reports.
- Some discussion on how best to do this.

Motion: to approve draft intervention for submission to WLWB with noted amendments.

Moved: Ryan Miller

Seconded: Violet Camsell-Blondin

Carried

Gord opposed; no abstentions



- Review of corrections made in NSC review dated April 7'23

Q: Does the WLWB require submission of consultants' reports?

A: They are additional evidence to support EMAB's intervention

Motion: to submit consultants reports circulated to Board on April 6 and corrected NSC report dated April 7, 2023.

Moved: Gord Macdonald

Seconded: Jack Kaniak

Carried

None opposed; no abstentions

Item 11 – Air Quality Guideline Update

Imran Maqsood from GNWT-ECC joined the meeting by phone

ES presented item and introduced Imran

Imran provided an update:

- The Guideline and “What We Heard” documents are complete and finalized.
- The documents are in the process of being approved by Cabinet.
- Once they are approved, ECC will provide a notice of review of the Diavik EAQMP.
 - Approval expected in May.
- Discussion

Q: What happens if Committee wants changes?

A: Committee has approved document.

Q: Any effect of federal strike?

A: Don't know. Cabinet meeting is April 20, so will know better after that.

BREAK

Item 12 – A21 Underground Update

Gord presented an update:

- A21 underground is going forward after amending water licence.
- Impacts on closure:
 - Delay flooding of A21 until same time as A418 and A154.
 - Operations will go until March 2026, instead of mid-2025.

Q: Will this affect timing of water licence renewal (current licence expires Dec 31, 2025)?

A: Not sure; renewal might cover both end of operations and closure.

Q: Any effect on FCRP?

A: Not sure if WLWB will require an amendment; pit closure will follow same process as for other pits.

Q: Could mine life extend further?

A: Not likely beyond March 2026.

Q: Robot-controlled mining in A21 underground?

A: Yes, same as for A154.



Item 10 – Workshop on Future of EMAB

ED presents item

Discussion on approach to workshop.

- Suggested that selected consultant can present to Board when ready – that would be a better time to comment.

Q: What are the costs?

A: RFP used strategic plan budget amount.

ED presents consultant ranking sheet.

Item postponed until after Item 13.

Item 13 – WMMP Update

Brian Kopach from MSES joins meeting

ES introduces item

Brian presented the item (see slide presentation)

- ZOI Review
 - Mostly requesting clarifications.
 - Diavik proposing to use Boulanger methods; they are scientifically defensible.
- Behaviour
 - ENR directed that Diavik collaborate with EMAB – don't know how this will happen.
 - Diavik wants to replace scanning with analysis of collar data.
 - There wasn't enough collar data to compare behavior close to mine and far away.
 - Need to know constraints on Diavik data collection e.g. temperature, staff availability.

Discussion:

- Diavik would do one post-closure ZOI report that would cover all years of closure – identify trend.

Q: Report says Diavik will present data every year.

A: Incorrect – one report

- Noted that TG and other Indigenous groups have trained people who can collect wildlife data.
- Diavik could provide funding for Indigenous groups to monitor; good way to involve community people in monitoring.
- Noted Diavik has not communicated with EMAB about collaboration on caribou behavior monitoring.
- Noted that drivers at the mine are supposed to report sightings to Dispatch. Dispatch does not pass these sightings on to Environment Dept.

Item 10 (cont'd.)

Motion: to accept staff recommendation for consultant.

Moved: Gord Macdonald

WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



Discussion:

- MNP approach is also interesting; would like more discussion.

LUNCH

Item 10 – Workshop on Future of EMAB (cont'd)

Discussion:

- Approach of doing interviews before workshop is good; could this be added to Shelagh's proposal?
- Noted that there are procedural issues with changing a consultant's proposal after it is submitted. If there is a particular approach EMAB would like then should issue another RFP.
- Budget is a consideration; lowest price.

Motion: to accept Shauna Morgan's proposal for the workshop on the Future Role of EMAB.

Moved: Gord Macdonald

Seconded: Violet Camsell-Blondin
carried

Item 9 – FCRP Reviews (cont.)

Bill Slater presents his review

- Includes reviews from Justin Straker on post-closure landscape and CoreGeo on climate change predictions.
- PKC
 - Settling of EFPK could affect ability of water to flow to spillway.
 - Pond could form.
 - EFPK could migrate upward into rock cover; no filter material.
 - Diavik should reconsider PKC design.
 - Thermal predictions for PKC need to be updated with current climate change predictions.
 - PK consolidation model doesn't represent conditions; should be revised.
 - Potential erosion of inner wall of PKC dikes.
 - PKC dams will need to be monitored for very long term.
- Monitoring proposed for 5 years – this may be OK for some parts of mine, but others will need much longer, particularly those that might be affected by climate change.
- Concern landfill may not be designed to contain contaminated soil.
- Need a contingency plan if North Inlet sediment rehabilitation doesn't work.
- Frame Lake fish compensation: fish from Frame Lake are unsuitable for consumption.
- Revegetation and closure landscape.
 - Dust closure criteria not adequate.
 - A neutral landscape would be revegetated.
 - Diavik revegetation plan is inconsistent with standard mining practices.
 - Criteria for revegetation of 10 stems / square meter and proposed monitoring plan would mean 310 total stems would show revegetation success.
- Climate Change

WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



- Diavik is relying on old predictions; should consider worse predictions than they did.

Discussion:

Q: Suggestions for monitoring timelines?

A: Lots of uncertainties; the longer you monitor, the less the uncertainty; climate change uncertainty will remain until climate change is stopped.

Q: Views on dry cover compared to wet cover for PKC?

A: No concern about concept of dry cover; depends on implementation.

Item 14 – TK Issues

ED presents item from kit

- i) Fish Camp video
 - Diavik will release to communities that sent participants to fish camp, but leadership must sign a non-disclosure agreement first.
- ii) 2021 Fish Camp follow-up fishing
 - Diavik will provide EMAB with a copy of the follow-up report at end of May.

Q: Status of Fish Camp Follow-up Workshop proposal?

A: By next meeting

Discussion on Diavik response regarding February '23 spill (unscheduled)

Gord raised this item. Board members had not read letter, so it was presented on screen.

Discussion:

- Board member saw spill during a recent site tour – everything went where it was supposed to i.e. into North Inlet.

Q: Why did it take five weeks to report the spill?

A: Reporting of spills at Diavik is done by the Environment Group. The Pipeline group noted the spill but didn't relay the information because they didn't deem it a spill since it all reported to the North Inlet, where it was supposed to go. This was a mine water spill, not tailings or sewage.

Also noted that GNWT online spill reporting is not working – spill had to be reported on paper. GNWT misclassified the spill, then issued a media release with the mis-classification.

- Suggestion for PKC cover to lay down additional rock in layers.
- Noted this method is called dry-stacking; works better in warm, dry climates. The EFPK and cold conditions would make it hard to do at Diavik.

Item 17 - Board Member Update and Community Concerns (Roundtable)

Jack – trying to set up an EMAB presentation to KIA Board; possibly in May.

- KIA continues to be in flux.

WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



Violet – did a site visit to Diavik on April 12, followed by a Closure workshop in Yellowknife

- Elders identified some concerns; site visits are valuable. Boots on the Ground participants also attended site visit.
- Many TG citizens want to speak at the WL hearing.
- Keeping leadership updated on Diavik, closure and TK.
- Continuing to engage with Diavik.

Adrian – thanks everyone for participation.

Ryan – TK Fish Camp raised many concerns about water quality and fish health at Diavik.

- Many Elders think the land around Diavik is dead and that the FCRP is not meaningful.
- Elders see any contamination as too much.

Charlie – recent passing of Ernest and Albert Boucher; concern about losing Elders to cancer.

- Concerns about effect of Cosmos 954 satellite crash in LKDFN area in 1978. People have noticed big changes since then; caribou started getting parasites after the crash.
- LKDFN Assembly May 2-4.
- Very busy; small community, many issues.

Meeting adjourned

Request to find a way to just use Zoom for future meetings

Next meeting June 26-29, 2023