

# Environmental Monitoring Advisory Board

DRAFT Minutes – February 26-27, 2019

EMAB Boardroom, Yellowknife, NT

---

## Present:

Napoleon Mackenzie, *Chair*  
Charlie Catholique, *Vice-Chair*  
Gord Macdonald, *Director* (by phone)  
Jack Kaniak, *Director*  
Sean Richardson, *Director* (by phone)

Yellowknives Dene First Nation  
Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation  
Diavik Diamond Mines  
Kitikmeot Inuit Association  
Tlicho Government

## Absent:

Julian Kanigan, *Director*  
Arnold Enge, *Director*

Government of the Northwest Territories  
North Slave Metis Alliance

## Staff:

John McCullum, *Executive Director*  
(minutes)  
Allison Rodvang, *Environmental Specialist*  
(minutes)

Environmental Monitoring Advisory Board  
Environmental Monitoring Advisory Board

## Guests:

LeeAnn Malley, GNWT  
Jan Adamczewski, GNWT Ungulate Biologist (Day 1)  
Marc Casas, IEMA (Day 1)  
Randy Knapp, Knapp Consulting (by phone, Day 2)  
Megan Cooley, North-South Consulting (by phone, Day 2)  
Friederike Schneider-Vieira, North-South Consulting (by phone, Day 2)  
Bill Slater, Slater Environmental Consulting (by phone, Day 2)  
Jamie Steele, GNWT Inspector (Day 2)  
Tara Bailey, Arcadis (by phone, Day 2)  
Jennifer Kirkaldy, Arcadis (by phone, Day 2)  
Steve Bourn, Diavik (Day 2)

Tuesday, February 26, 2019
<b>1. Call to Order</b> Chair called the meeting to order at 9:30 am and opened with a prayer.
<b>2. Approval of Agenda</b> ED noted the following revisions to the agenda: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Added a travel expense policy supplement to the Financial Report item</li><li>• Lake Trout Mercury Review on Day 2 is being postponed</li><li>• Winter Road Monitoring item postponed. JV staff could likely come to an EMAB meeting in May.</li></ul>

### 3. Conflict of Interest

No conflicts of interest were declared.

### 4. Minutes of Previous Meetings

Board reviewed the December 3-5, 2018 meeting minutes. ED pointed to one change regarding the closure discussion and a typo/grammatical error under the air quality discussion.

**Motion:** *To approve the December 3-5, 2018 meeting minutes, as amended.*

**Moved:** Charlie Catholique

**Seconded:** Jack Kaniak

Motion carried.

ED read email motions into the minutes.

#### Action Item Review:

Q: Will Action Plan be sent out by email? A: Still hoping to get more input from rest of Board. After meeting staff will circulate the Action Plan.

**Action Item: Staff to circulate Action Plan after February 2019 meeting.**

### 5. Financial Report – to Jan 2019

ED presented Variance Report from kit.

#### Discussion:

- The budget has been updated to February 14, 2019
- Under Oversight and Monitoring, quite a bit of funding was transferred to the Water Licence Amendment Application Review
- EMAB will request that Diavik agree to roll unspent ICRP review funds over to next year. Also request roll-over of any unspent funds for review of Water Licence Amendment Application, since the application review will continue next year. ED will send out letter after meeting.
- Underspent on Involving and Supporting communities. Expecting these funds will go back to Diavik
- Breaking even on communications, underspent on Governance, underspent on Meeting Expenses
- Expect to return about 31k to Diavik if roll-over of funds is approved

Q: What is the year end for EMAB? A: March 31, 2019

Q: What was hold up on ICRP Version 4.0? A: WLWB took a long time to review the plan and received RFD December 2018

ED presented draft budget April 1, 2019 – March 31, 2020.

#### Discussion:

- Will be looking for a motion to approve the budget since EMAB's next meeting isn't scheduled until the next fiscal year
- Water Licence Amendment does not include the potential for roll over from this fiscal year

Q: Does this budget include the rollover? A: No, rollover is not included in line items

Q: Would we want to spend all that money in the ICRP? A: Can only spend it for that line item, so if we don't end up spending, it would go back to Diavik

Q: Is this for discussion or approval? A: Approval. If we want to spend money, we should have an approved budget in place.

**Motion:** *To approve the budget for April 1, 2019 – March 31, 2020*

**Moved:** Charlie Catholique

**Seconded:** Jack Kaniak

Motion carried.

Board Calendar Review:

- Did not have Charlie's schedule when making the calendar
- Could approve at next meeting once Charlie's schedule is worked in, or by email motion.

Auditor RFP – ED has list of auditors that it will be sent to.

Q: Who is EPR? A: Reasonably new company that IEMA is using. Not too many auditing companies are local

Travel Expense Policy Supplement. Discussion:

- Request from a member to be flown to EMAB meeting from Vancouver. Some Board members raised concerns. EMAB policy is not very clear about flying board members to meetings in this situation ie. from outside the NWT or Nunavut and from a place where Board member is not ordinarily resident.
- This was an issue with a previous Board member who moved to Victoria; little documentation on end result. Appears Party was asked to cover cost.

Q: Does this issue need to be brought up to the Parties? A: It is EMAB's travel policy, so not required.

Q: Is there something in the EA that we should follow? A: Not sure how much it relates. Just specifies where the board members have to be from (one member or alternate must be from NWT or Nunavut); does not say anything about travel costs. Up to EMAB to set bylaws, budget and what we pay for.

Comments: It is in EMAB's interest to have a member from each Party present at each meeting

- EMAB should cover cost from home community, if in NWT or Nunavut
- Issue is for members/alternates flying from a community that is not their home community, and is outside NWT or Nunavut
- Members can participate by conference call
- Alternate can attend; member/party should demonstrate why alternate can't attend before EMAB considers covering travel cost.
- If alternate wasn't available and EMAB needed representation, Board could decide to fly them to the meeting on a case-by-case basis
- Might not be an alternative to flying someone in. If alternate cannot make it, should fly them in so there is representation. Vacation/out of the country would not be applicable.

- ED will draft policy and approve by email motion so if this comes up again there will be something in place

**Action Item: Send letter to request that EMAB be allowed to roll over ICRP and Water Licence Amendment funds from this year to next year's budget.**

**Action Item: Order new swag before year end**

**Action Item: ED to draft policy for Board Member travel for approval via email motion.**

**BREAK**

**6. ED and ES Performance Review**

Board went in camera.

**Motion:** to approve Executive Director's recommendation for Environmental Specialist salary increase following performance evaluation, as of anniversary date

**Moved:** Gord Macdonald

**Seconded:** Jack Kaniak

Approved

Noted that evaluations should be completed and approved as closely as possible to their anniversary date. Concern that salary increases shouldn't be retroactive.

Suggestion to put evaluations on a fiscal year basis rather than anniversary.

Executive Director's performance evaluation should have been completed. Board should set a date and approve evaluation by email motion or conference call following the recommendation.

**Action Item: request Personnel Committee complete evaluation of Executive Director and make a recommendation to the Board by March 15 for approval by email motion.**

**15. Qualifications for post-closure monitoring (moved from Wednesday)**

Discussion:

- Diavik reads this request as EMAB and communities being interested in being involved in post-closure monitoring. Development of qualifications listing is ongoing. Diavik rep is happy to take any questions back to Diavik
- Qualifications between operations and post-closure monitoring would not be that different
- Tliche Government is looking to make sure their wilderness monitoring training program is adequate and covers all the necessary areas
- Having safety training is necessary, in addition to field skills
- ED to write email to Gord with request for Diavik Training Dept. to send a representative to the next meeting
- There is an opportunity for post-closure monitoring to be outsourced. Doesn't have to be Diavik employees. This is more of an opportunity in post-closure world than operations
- Bring in someone from Communities group as well. Winter Lennie is current contact for communities at Diavik
- This information is important to all the communities.

**Action Item: ED to request Diavik make someone from Training Group and Communities Group available at the next EMAB meeting to provide information and answer questions about post-closure monitoring qualifications and possibly business opportunities from outsourcing.**

#### **10. WEMP Recommendation Letters**

ES reviews follow-up letter to Diavik.

- Noted that there is not much point in re-iterating a recommendation to Diavik without providing additional rationale or Diavik will just repeat its response.
- Re: WEMP Program Description – EMAB should be more direct about why it doesn't accept the response; re-iteration is not enough.
- Also remove reference to re-iterate under Caribou Behavioural Studies.
- Under adaptive management section change or remove "continues to recommend"

ES reviews letter to GNWT

- Broaden recommendation on closure criteria beyond wildlife and forestry to include other relevant departments/sections (ideally, name them). The more specific the letter is about who the recommendation is aimed at, the more likely there will be a response.
- Add GNWT to recommendation on developing a WEMP program description.

**Action Item: ES to revise letters and provide to Board for approval by email motion, or at meeting if there is enough time.**

#### **LUNCH**

#### **7. Draft five-year Action Plan**

ED presented item from kit.

Discussion:

- Oversight – section is OK as is
- Community Involvement – does community involvement in monitoring include summer students working at Diavik? Yes.
- Looking to Board for guidance on what report card on performance means. Refers to a suggestion GNWT sent in but has to refer back to comments. ED will look for LeeAnn's email to define it more clearly.

Q: Does this provide enough information to put forward for approval? Any further feedback?

Q: Did it seem like the parties are less interested in meeting with communities compared to the emphasis EMAB puts on this? A: Doesn't seem to be. These are responses regarding how the Board member should update communities. There was a separate question about EMAB community updates and all Parties felt these were useful. Tlicho is interested in updates from all the monitoring agencies. NSMA wanted an annual meeting on the engagement plan. Expectations vary. Survey respondents were the land environment managers so there may have been some bias. KIA requested

every 2-3 years. Getting into the communities is more of a capacity issue at EMAB's end rather than disinterest from communities.

**Action Item: ED to review suggestion for report card on performance from GNWT's input and add some detail**

**Action Item: ED to prepare a table, similar to previous strategic plan, for Board review and approval**

## **8. TK Recommendations Review**

ED presented item from kit, however has not been able to do any more work on it since the December meeting.

Discussion:

Q: How much time is this taking up? A: In total, a week of half-days. Originally started the review thinking it could be handed off to a consultant. The scope of review is not something that requires special expertise. It seems important that at least for a first go to have EMAB's perspective looking at it first. If it becomes too much work, we can look at other options.

Noted that if there are too many delays the Board should look at another approach.

Noted that the KIA Board will meet in Kugluktuk in July

## **9. ENR Caribou Surveys Update**

Jan Adamczewski, GNWT-ENR joined meeting to present on 2018 Aerial Caribou Surveys. Marc Casas from IEMA sat in.

Discussion:

- Worked with ENR since 2007. Vast majority of time goes to barren ground caribou
- Flew Bathurst and Bluenose East surveys in June 2018 – mostly visual with photos on June 8 at peak of calving.
- Range is based on cumulative collar data. Also use collar data to define area to survey.
- When herds reach low numbers, range contracts. Bathurst is now wintering north of tree line
- Red area (highest density of calving Bathurst caribou) is very rocky country – seems like calving grounds switched from low flat areas/valleys, but now it is in rocky areas. Since 1996 rocky area has been consistent on where Bathurst calve (Hood River) as herd has gotten smaller, main block gets smaller. Photo block is 25/30 km<sup>2</sup>.
- None of the squares had high caribou density (more than ten)
- Extra time and effort taken to make sure all the caribou were counted. Flew a very large area from east of Bathurst Inlet all the way to Bluenose East calving area using visual surveys – this information was used to define the area for aerial photography. Use of air photos makes surveys much more accurate than in the past.
- The air photos show calving females, then they use sex ratios of bulls to cows (from fall surveys), and cow to calf ratios to estimate total number of caribou.
- Current estimates: Bathurst – 8200; Bluenose East – 19,300. Bathurst is less than half of the 2015 estimate and Bluenose East is almost exactly half of the 2015 estimate.

- Vital signs for herd: pregnancy rates are good; calf survival is low and adult female survival is low. Taken together this is not good for population stability.

Q: Could the 470k number include more herds than just Bathurst? A: There was enough survey coverage in 80s and 90s to show those numbers were from the same population.

Q: Would there have been a much bigger error bars, possible its an overestimate? A: Should be showing an estimate of variance. Basic survey method has stayed the same and variance has gotten smaller with more recent surveys.

- There is still one outfitter in Nunavut. Community is allocated 30 bulls which they choose to give to outfitter
- Previous incentive wasn't enough to impact wolf harvesting. Significantly upped amount in 2019
- Winter season dictates access to wintering grounds so wolf harvesting program will end with winter
- ENR will increase survey frequency to every two years.

Q: Is there a different way mines should be monitoring the different herds that have been coming closer to the mines recently? Don't know if you can really distinguish the herds, can't think of anything that they should be doing differently

- Geofence collars trigger 30km within the mines and 10km of the roads
- This data is being looked at by a grad student as UNBC, Angus Smith.

Q: What is best way forward for monitoring the ZOI at the mines? A: Mines used to use twin engine helicopters for surveys, which causes stress to animals. Talked to De Beers about using a drone program, Andrea Patenaude would be better to answer this question

- Tlicho Elders identified high Bathurst numbers in the 1940s, low numbers after and then an increase to the 1980s. Same thing in Quebec with the George River herd. What drives it is always going to be a combination of things, climate change is likely doing many things to caribou at all times of the year.
- Harvest should be halted for three years.
- Management zone around the Bathurst so they are currently not being harvested. Beverly is being harvested, Bluenose East not as accessible so harvest is limited

Q: Has ENR looked at Diavik's 2017 WMP Report? A: No, ask Andrea. Last report reviewed was the comprehensive report

- Bluenose West is stable, Porcupine herd is doing well at over 200k and increasing, Qamanirjuaq is still doing okay too. Not every single herd is declining.
- Climate change effects might not occur uniformly. There are some weather trends you can get from remote sensing, drought has increased a lot east of the Mackenzie River, which leads to poor feeding conditions. But for porcupine herd, the drought index has dropped.

Q: More of a climatic impact in the Bluenose East and Bathurst areas? A: It is hard to say at this point. There are other things keeping the other herds at higher numbers. Mackenzie River is a bit of a divide; vegetation on the west is far more diverse. Barrens has more simplified vegetation and more extreme weather. Porcupine herd has had more subtle population changes and these habitat features could be why. Bad summer feeding conditions could lead to low pregnancy rates

**Adjourn for the day 4:00pm**

**Wednesday, February 27, 2019**  
**EMAB Board Room 9:00 am**

**10. Water Licence Amendment Application – PK into pits update & next steps**

Megan Cooley, Friederike Schneider-Vieira, Bill Slater, Randy Knapp, Gord Macdonald, and Sean Richardson joined the meeting by phone.

Randy Knapp Presentation:

- Thought Diavik answered the IRs
- Worst case was what if the pit mixes, will this cause issues, particularly dissolved oxygen (DO)? This was addressed by Diavik
- Agrees with Diavik's assessment that there are no long-term effects to fish if mixing occurs
- In the last set of IRs Diavik no longer included the removal of slimes, this would have made placement of PK in the pit a more desirable option and would have allowed the facility to have a dry cover

Clarification: Scope of application still includes deposition of remined slimes but does not include the removal from the PKC.

Bill Slater Presentation:

- Review took a different approach. Looked forward to licencing and the types of conditions that would make sense
- Some uncertainties remain: sources of loads to the pit, porewater, PK density and monitoring and response
- Porewater – new data is less representative; noted that this data is for “fresh PK” as identified at Technical Session
- PK Density - lower PK density takes up more volume therefore less water produced but calculations indicate more water produced which is counterintuitive. Of the view less water should be produced. Couldn't replicate Diavik's calculations. Diavik response - not really density, if less PK more water. Bill is willing to discuss this further if he is missing something. Gord will have a look at the report.
- Re-mining of slimes – noted that Diavik still plans to do an assessment of feasibility. This is good.
- Additional Licence Conditions
- Post-closure monitoring – any reduction of frequency of monitoring should be tied to performance, not amount of time that has passed ie. don't just reduce because two years have gone by.

North-South Presentation:

- A lot of information provided by Diavik so far. Key concerns have been addressed for the most part.
- Approach and areas of concern were similar to Bill's review; what follow-up work or monitoring they would want to consider?
- Porewater – similar to SEC comments. Diavik noted that “fresh PK” results in better water quality than unsaturated, but there is a limited amount of data.
- DO – Diavik should do a mass-balance calculation



- Diavik should do a desktop exercise to see if there has even been a mixing event similar to Diavik's situation.
- Monitoring in the pit lake – include more than one station, performance-based monitoring, habitat enhancement
- Fish movement – monitor fish movements in pit lakes, particularly deep water areas, to see what areas they use and if they avoid unfavourable conditions

Continuation in the afternoon:

- Proposing to put together the intervention and put in front of board
- Consultants gave clear answers
- Now process is an EA which EMAB will be invited to engage on.
- MVEIRB is asking for input on the scope of Environmental Assessment (written - March 19, in person March 7 to March 18).
- Is Board going to be an intervenor and comment on scope and workplan?
- Staff will be in touch end of next week with Board about process to move forward

### **11. Inspector's Report**

Jamie Steele joined meeting to give presentation on Diavik inspections.

Discussion:

- Winter Road Activities – did a pre-inspection in January to assess Diavik's spill response capabilities. Potential for large scale spills with trucks coming on the ice road. Capacity for dealing with a large-scale spill is high and feels there is a small chance for an incident with fuel transfer
- Truck parking area is very clean
- Expecting 82 million litres of diesel with no spills reported
- Some oil rags and plastics in the burn pit
- Stockpile of gasoline from A21 project, it is being stored in the WTA and drums are starting to get damaged and one is leaking. Area where they are stored is lined
- Fuel stations – no concerns at the three stations
- Burn pile and gas drums will require follow-up
- Saw six caribou on winter road and a couple fox on the winter road
- Some caribou on Diavik site near wind towers

### **12. EAQMP Assessment**

Tara Bailey and Jennifer Kirkaldy, Arcadis joined meeting by phone and gave a presentation on their draft review.

ES updated Board on status.

Review of Program

- Looked at CSR and Environmental Agreement to see original objectives of the plan
- Monitoring data reflects underground data which could be why levels are on the relatively low side for an active mine site. Much of airborne dust is related to traffic and hauling ore and this would have occurred regardless.

- There is no TSP data from open pit mining ie. A21. If they leave monitoring stations in locations they are now, they won't capture the results from open pit mining
  - Looked at dustfall measurements going back to 2002 – can correlate with A154 TSP monitor (very close to dustfall gauge).
  - Dustfall predictions in model were lower than what was predicted at site. Expect they don't have particle characteristics exactly correct
  - Diavik should include a better description of what activities occur on site on a year to year basis. Would help reviewers understand how and why levels are changing across the site
  - Modelling appears to have used monitoring meteorological data from 2002. From wind data in 2017 EAQMP it does appear that winds may have shifted. There is variability from year to year. 2002 to 2017 is a long period of time. Would be beneficial to have Diavik go back and look at QA procedures for meteorological data (is instrument still oriented properly to north).
- Warrants investigation
- TSP stations may no longer be sited properly for current activities, particularly A154 station.
  - Difficulties with monitoring program
    - Diavik had an optimistic goal of 90 percent data capture, other programs use 75 to 80 percent which Diavik would have managed in a couple of years.
    - Lack of dedicated staff. Original program said they would be looking at the alarms daily. Appears this happens weekly/monthly. When they upped their activity levels they had better success with the data
  - Instrumentation – some other sites are having more success and possibly instrumentation resources. Report summarizes programs at some other similar sites. In her experience with monitoring programs they always had redundant equipment to swap out; this is a common practice.

#### Review of Diavik letter re: assessment of TSP Monitoring

- Updating model – not needed yearly, but should be updated in response to major changes in activity
- Existing locations not very useful for monitoring TSP from A21
- Data on TSP is below GNWT guidelines (missed some – see memo). Only three 24-hour exceedances of GNWT Guidelines
- Missing results are distributed randomly – this is not a strong argument; it doesn't mean much
- Model predictions have been conservative – yes, but no surface mining data. Predictions were low for dustfall
- TSP data not valuable – true because data are not available in real time, which makes mitigation of day to day high dust levels difficult. Program is not designed for adaptive management
- In general, Diavik would have to dedicate adequate resources to make this program work.

Yellow haze – temperature inversion, atmosphere sets up a boundary layer so there is not enough vertical mixing in the air and it is being trapped. NO<sub>2</sub> is a primary pollutant in this haze. Passive sampling would collect monthly samples. A continuous monitoring system would be similar to TSP but would come with similar issues.

Q: Does Arcadis tend to agree with Diavik's conclusions about discontinuing TSP or what can we do to get better information?

A: Might be fair to close the A154 but the communications building is closer to the A21 pit. This would also give Diavik redundant equipment to use. First suggestion before they abandon TSP monitoring all together. They need more dedicated resources to the monitoring; would like to see them looking at the stations more frequently. Agree that modelling should be redone if the model does not capture the key inputs

- Important to verify EA predictions – communications building may not be the best location for capturing what is happening on site

Q: Does Arcadis have a recommendation for continuing TSP monitoring?

A: Arcadis has not made a recommendation on this. They don't know where the new activity is taking place.

Q: Did you consider all the sources in the model?

A: Don't have a good understanding of all activities being planned for the site (only had CSR report), Figure 13 shows sources which they considered in their model. At the very least Diavik should be recommending new dustfall locations near the new mining initiatives (this has been done)

Q: Is there other equipment that would be easier to use? Similar equipment is being used at other mine sites and not having the same type of challenges. Doesn't appear to be so much of an instrumentation issue; may need better ongoing training.

- TSP monitoring data is not being used to mitigate dust. Visual observations can be useful, but unless information is formally recorded, you can't know if it is effective. This could be a good addition to a monitoring program.
- How to proceed in a way that is responsible?

Q: Diavik underpredicted dustfall; could this correlate with underpredicted TSP? A: Not likely, they are quite different calculations

- Meeting to discuss report – LeeAnn and Aileen, Sean Sinclair, EMAB
- Noted that if the intent is to discuss TSP, Diavik would need its consultants.

Q: Any reason GNWT wasn't ccd when Diavik's updated design plan was distributed? Improved communication on air and wildlife.

A: Typically Diavik sends reports like this to EMAB to distribute to Parties. Does not send reports to one specific Party only.

**Action Item: Staff to develop an agenda to discuss Diavik's air quality monitoring program**

### **11. Lake Trout Mercury Review**

**Item postponed**

**LUNCH**

### **13. ICRP Update**

Steve Bourn, Diavik joined the meeting.

Gord made presentation on Diavik Closure Engagement Requirements. Five areas:

- Revegetation
- North Inlet
- Contaminated Soil
- Closure Objectives
- SSRBCC

How does EMAB want to approach these?

ES presented item from kit with WLWB Reasons for Decision. Next version of ICRP in June 2019. Final Closure Plan in 2020.

Discussion:

Q: Licence amendment includes changing term to 2025, so final closure plan would be due in 2022. WLWB has said it would allow this through administrative change if needed.

Q: Did the WLWB specify who Diavik should engage? A: Depends on the item, some are EMAB specific and some are directed to all reviewers.

Discussion

- EMAB needs to make sure WLWB understands that EMAB doesn't speak for the Parties, it reviews and recommends.
- Q: What type of engagement is EMAB comfortable with doing? A: EMAB is a recommendation board, we are not a party that comes up with solutions, would rather leave up to WLWB to come up with solution. Communities speak for themselves.
- EMAB could help clarify the outstanding issues. In a similar situation with the SSRBCC Reports, EMAB didn't want to put consultants in the position of speaking on EMAB's behalf: Diavik provided revised report and EMAB responded with points they agreed and disagreed with.
- We are okay to clarify what the points of disagreement/agreement are but not comfortable defining a solution.
- From Diavik's perspective, it would be helpful to get this in writing from EMAB via a letter to WLWB
- As an EMAB member, Gord would like to see dialogue between consultants on SSRBCC issues.
- Diavik present view on topic. Allow questions. Reverse and EMAB presents to Diavik. Allow questions. Find areas in common or disagreement. Diavik is looking for EMAB's view but this is challenging with a board
- The process would be like scoping negotiations without doing the negotiations step.
- Conflict of interest – discussions on EMAB's position would have to happen without Diavik member present, then meet with Diavik

Q: Direction in EA regarding dispute resolution between EMAB and Diavik? A: This is not a dispute in the same way. Not willing to negotiate but we will give a very specific definition of what the issues are.

- Cooperative approach amongst parties – this doesn't mean we are a solution board expected to negotiate to a consensus
- WLWB is actually asking parties and Diavik to come to an agreement.
- Need to go back to communities, when Diavik first proposed the mine, everything was expected to returned back to normal, green landscapes
- Diavik will be going to the communities to engage on some of these issues before the plan is re-submitted

- Diavik should have to work with communities very closely on topic of re-vegetation. Need meetings like the way this project started to talk about all the closure things
- People will want it back to the way it was
- Contaminated soil is an issue – options to leave on site will not be good for communities. Will cost a lot to take off site, and Elders will want this. Napoleon thinks best option is to bury contaminated soil in PKC because it is lined, or take it off site.

Q: Where is on-site burial common practice? A: It is typically managed on site to an acceptable level and then mixed in with other soil – there is a limit you have to get it to. This is a type of conversation that we could be having to further the discussion on building consensus. Stuff that doesn't meet the target is of concern. Recreational contact would be closure criteria. However, this is likely not achievable in the time frame Diavik has.

Board will meet without Diavik member present to develop position, then meet with Diavik to share.

**Action Item: Diavik will provide revised SSRBCC report to EMAB ASAP, ED will get an estimate from EMAB's consultant to review the report**

**Action Item: Staff put together information that would help present EMAB's opinion on each of the issues the WLWB/Diavik identified that need engagement. Send to the Board and prepare for a meeting March 26-27. Ask Julian if he wants to be included in the proposed meeting.**

**Action Item: ED to draft letter to WLWB, copied to Diavik, on EMAB's approach to developing consensus**

#### **11. Water Licence Amendment (cont.)**

**Action Item: ED to continue to develop intervention based on consultant reports**

**Action Item: staff to review joint MVEIRB/WLWB review process and report back to Board**

Noted that MVEIRB wants comments on scoping document by March 19

#### **• Board Member Update and Community Concerns (Roundtable)**

Charlie Catholique – LKDFN

- Land-Environment Manager has left; Ray Griffith acting
- Hiring people to monitor caribou and hunting at Artillery L.
- Internet is slow on-site so accessing email can sometimes be hard

Jack Kaniak – KIA

- KIA Board Meeting in July in Kugluktuk and wondering if EMAB could have a board meeting there at the same time; would like to update KIA Board
- Or EMAB staff could assist
- Does not have a specific date
- Asked staff to provide a two-page document on this board meeting

Napoleon Mackenzie – YKDFN

- Concerned about not having caribou / meat
- Wolves continue to hang around Dettah (puppy was taken)

LeeAnn Malley – GNWT

- Environmental Agreement not too many updates; expecting EAAR draft in May, might ask Diavik to submit it sooner as they've asked GNWT to do a more technical review
- Amendments – draft revised EA is still in legal review; then to INAC to look at it. Assuming they agree with changes, it can be circulated to parties.
  - Changes similar to Ekati EA revisions
- Mat. leave starting April 20; no replacement named yet

Sean Richardson – Tlicho Government

- Would like to apologize for not being able to be present
- Would like meeting dates sent in outlook calendar

Note: if parties would like funding for the Environmental Assessment, there are a couple of programs that allow parties to have funding for participating in Environmental Assessments - Northern Participant funding program is new since December 2018

**Action Item: Send two-page summary of meeting minutes to Jack**

**Next meeting – currently May 22-23; also ICRP meeting March 26-27**

**Meeting adjourned – Jack Kaniak**