

Approved Minutes

EMAB meeting – May 20-22, 2008, Yellowknife

May 20, 2008

Present:

Doug Crossley, Chair, Kitikmeot Inuit Association

Florence Catholique, Vice-Chair, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation

Floyd Adlem, Secretary-Treasurer, Canada

Claudia Haas, North Slave Metis Alliance

Lawrence Goulet, Yellowknives Dene First Nation

Eric Christensen, Diavik Diamond Mines

Staff:

John McCullum

Minutes:

John McCullum

Meeting started at: 9:25

Opening Prayer: Florence Catholique

Item 1 – Agenda and minutes

Agenda

Chair reviews the agenda.

Motion:

Accept the agenda as presented.

Moved: Floyd Adlem

Seconded: Lawrence Goulet

Carried: Unanimous

Minutes

Motion

Approve minutes of March 25-27, 2008, as amended.

Moved: Floyd Adlem

Seconded: Florence Catholique

Carried: Unanimous

Motion

Approve minutes of May 2, 2008 conference call.

Moved: Florence Catholique

Seconded: Lawrence Goulet

Carried: Unanimous

Item 2 – Adaptive Management Plan update/discussion

Chair introduces item.

Executive Director needs direction for a draft letter to the WLWB and suggests a conference call on June 2 or 3 to review the draft. He also wants to check whether the meeting notes can be sent out.

The letter should be balanced and acknowledge the work DDMI has done on the AdMP.

Action Item: prepare a draft letter to send to the WLWB with the Jacques-Whitford review attached. Expand on the key points in the May 18 email and the flipchart notes

Action Item: send out draft meeting notes to other participants in AdMP workshop.

Break

Item 3 – Aboriginal Involvement follow-up

ED reports on training meeting from May 16.

Board discussed whether EMAB needs to be involved in training for environmental monitoring. It's not a significant task of the EA, not part of the mandate. EMAB should definitely not be leading the charge. ECE is responsible for education – they should be the lead. DDMI can do training on-site, but can't certify.

Agreed that EMAB will organize one more training meeting to follow up the May 16 meeting. Some discussion on whether MTS should take the lead – they bring together federal and territorial government and mining companies but are proposal-driven.

Action Item: Respond to Minister of ECE's letter indicating EMAB believes they should take the lead in improving delivery of environmental monitoring training and outlining work done to date.

Action Item: Send training meeting notes to DCAB.

Agreed to wait until presentation on NRTP assessment before following up on ECE response regarding NRTP and inclusion of BEAHR in high schools.

Noted that ENR does involve community people in wildlife surveys but that Lutsel K'e doesn't get invited because of additional costs of bringing people to Yellowknife.

CBM orientation for EMAB members

Action Item: ED to contact Gord Macdonald to request a briefing on the new CBM rules soon and to request some written material prior to the briefing.

Annual Report

Action Item: Decide whether EMAB needs to contract someone to prepare the Annual Report and/or organize the CBM camp after Communications Coordinator's June 4 medical assessment.

Northern Regulatory Improvement Initiative Update

Neil McCrank has not reported to the Minister yet.

Lunch

Item 4 – Strategic Plan review

ED reviews comments received on revised draft strategic plan. Note to add air quality and reclamation to list of EMAB priorities.

Agreed not to approve plan until all board members are present. Everyone needs to know what is in it and buy in.

Review of Tait and Michele/John lists of objectives and outcomes. Agreed to adopt Michele/John list with amendments.

Appendix showing links to community engagement should be changed from questions to topic areas and re-formatted as per ED comments.

After a long discussion on the vision and mission statements the following were developed:

Vision – Working with the people for the environment of the Diavik mine

Mission – To monitor and provide guidance to Diavik and regulators to ensure that the Diavik Diamond Mine is developed, operated and reclaimed in a manner that:

- Protects the environment
- Advocates for Aboriginal Involvement
- Respects the public interest
- Protects the way of life and well-being of Affected Aboriginal Communities

Action Item: Make changes to strategic plan and circulate. Board will do prioritization at next meeting.

Break

Item 5 – Inspector's Update

Jen Potten and Marty Sanderson attended. Jen presented the results of her March 27 drilling inspection which looked very good. She did site tours on April 2 and April 23 – 24. She will do a follow-up drill site inspection on May 26 and a site inspection on May 28.

She plans to do monthly inspections as well as review the spill reports, inspect the blasting procedures and inspect the dust suppression.

Item 6 – IEMA / SLEMA update

Zhong Liu from SLEMA made a powerpoint presentation:

- De Beers re-ran its water quality model and expect ammonia loadings and concentration to increase by 25% due to increased blasting. The original amount of explosive use was miscalculated
- The Environmental Agreement report was satisfactory
- The benthic sampling time change was approved
- Highlights of the annual water licence report
 - Effluent is compliant except zinc, which has been out for a few months

- The water level in Snap Lake may be within natural variation. Minewater flow is back to original predictions.
 - TDS has increased by 87%
- If LKDFN would like SLEMA to visit their community they should make a request

Kevin O'Reilly from IEMA made a presentation:

- BHPB has submitted the renewal application for Sable, Pigeon and Beartooth pits (Sable and Pigeon have not started production). BHPB wants to make the EQCs for the two licences the same, which would increase those in the renewed licence.
- The WLWB has suspended review of the adaptive management plan until some required reports are submitted. One key one was the Long Lake water quality modeling report which was submitted in mid-April.
- Ekati's closure plan review is almost done. IEMA feels the research plan is inadequate – more detail is needed with a schedule
- They will meet June 3-5; the following meeting will be in Lutsel K'e in mid-September

Adjourn for the day

May 21, 2008

Present:

Doug Crossley, Chair, Kitikmeot Inuit Association
Florence Catholique, Vice-Chair, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation
Floyd Adlem, Secretary-Treasurer, Canada
Claudia Haas, North Slave Metis Alliance
Lawrence Goulet, Yellowknives Dene First Nation
Eric Christensen, Diavik Diamond Mines

Guests :

Petr Komers, MSES
Colleen English, DDMI
Gord Macdonald, DDMI
Steve Bourne, DDMI
John Virgl, Golder
Molly Kirk, Golder
Jen Potten, DIAND
Myra Robertson, CWS
Graham Veale, ENR
Chandra Venables, ENR
Jan Adamczewski, ENR
Bruno Croft, ENR
Robert Mulders, ENR
Dean Cluff, ENR
Steve Matthews, ENR
Sarah True, ENR

Staff:

John McCullum

Minutes:

John McCullum

Item 7 – Wildlife

Chair asked everyone to introduce themselves

Colleen English presented the 2007 WEMP report results (powerpoint presentation available on request).

Q&A

Why is there a higher level of attractants at the landfill compared to the waste transfer area (WTA) but much higher wildlife presence at the WTA? The landfill is much less accessible to wildlife. They expect presence at the WTA will drop once the incinerators are enclosed in a building.

Does DDMI discourage nesting around the mine infrastructure? Yes, in consultation with ENR.

DDMI plans to review and update the Wildlife Monitoring Program – a number of changes have been made since 2002 and the document has not been updated to reflect these. They will also review the program and will distribute to EMAB and communities for comment.

In 2008 they will conduct the Permanent Vegetation Plot assessment. They will continue the aerial caribou surveys and try to increase the number of behavioural observations to 60. They will continue the wolverine track surveys but propose to amend it to once a year in April. They will discuss the wolverine DNA sampling with all interested parties. They are proposing to decrease the waterfowl surveys to once every three years.

It was suggested that it might be a good idea to continue the waterfowl surveys annually to avoid possible problems as experienced in the Alberta tar sands recently.

It was noted that track surveys are very weather dependent, and if you only do them once a year weather could severely affect results. DDMI tries to sample under consistent conditions and have changed the method to random four km. transects. It was pointed out that since the purpose of the survey is to assess the effect of distance from the mine on presence of tracks, any effect of weather would be equal close and far from the mine. The DNA sampling was raised as a good way to overcome the limitations of the track surveys.

There was a question about a problem getting the wildlife research permit for some surveys including caribou and wolverine. This was due to miscommunication and late submittal of the application and is not expected to happen again.

Will the causeway to A21 be breached now that it may not be developed? DDMI will make a decision in consultation with DFO within six months. It might provide better habitat if left in.

There was a question about incentives/penalties in relation to reducing attractants at the landfill. The main problem is with contractors and the disincentive is that if they can find out who put the waste in, they have to fix it.

Question about why caribou avoid the area. Could it be noise, smell, an effect of the rock piles? DDMI will start monitoring noise this year. They don't know how to monitor smell. Noted that aerial surveys capture the combined effects on caribou (doesn't address cause).

The Lutsel K'e representative requested that information be sent to her regarding the change in the southern caribou migration in 2007.

The 2007 WEMP results should be presented to the communities.

Query regarding analysis of vegetation change resulting from dust effects. This is done in the Permanent Vegetation Plots (PVP) every two years, so will be done in 2008.

Revisions to the Wildlife Monitoring Program

DDMI will meet with ENR, communities, BHPB and others to discuss areas of concern. The revision will be a long term process. It will begin in 2008 – DDMI will generate a document for discussion. It was suggested that DDMI discuss the process for involving communities in the revision soon. This should be initiated through a letter from EMAB.

Action Item: EMAB to contact DDMI regarding discussions on process for revising WMP.

Molly Kirk from Golder Associates presented the environmental effects analysis on wildlife (powerpoint presentation available on request).

Question about the effect of aircraft on likelihood of seeing a moving caribou or a bedded caribou. This affects all observations equally whether close or far from mine.

For caribou migration north to the calving grounds (northern migration), movement was most likely close to the mine from 1996 to 2001 and most likely further from the mine from 2002 to 2006. For caribou migration south after calving (southern migration) movement was most likely further from the mine – it was also more likely when there were lots of insects and/or little wind. In general there was a higher likelihood of finding nursery groups closer to the mine.

During the northern migration caribou were more likely to be found further from the mine; this varied from year to year. The zone of influence (ZOI) for this effect was 29.7 km. and this was consistent from year to year. During the southern migration there was the same pattern but the ZOI varied from 22 to

36 km depending on the year. Habitat was important in determining where caribou were found. When they included the effect of big lakes (caribou tend to avoid lakes during open water) the ZOI decreased to a range of 16 to 30 km depending on the year.

Although their data went beyond the edge of the ZOI they didn't include that data in their analysis.

So there is a spatial effect of the mine on both northern and southern migration.

Analyzing the satellite collar data there has been a slight increase over time in the number of caribou within 150 km. of the mine but there is a lot of variability.

There was some concern that the information is not being presented in a way that the average person can understand and that this would be a particular concern where translation is needed. It was suggested that it might be better to present the information in a map form. The consultant agreed that they should provide a plain-language summary that would be suitable for translation.

Action Item: DDMI to provide a plain-language summary of wildlife effects analysis report suitable for translation.

Do these data reflect the decline in the Bathurst caribou population? No, but they are not showing absolute numbers, just presence/absence of groups of caribou, so a single caribou is recorded the same as a group of 1000. It was suggested that it might be valuable to show absolute numbers as well, since there is a lot of concern about caribou population levels.

They are seeing feeding behaviour and nursery group are more likely near the mine and that the ZOI is larger than originally predicted (3 to 7 km was original prediction)

This information is about the effect of Diavik. To get an idea of the effect of all activity on caribou the data would have to be combined with data from many other sources.

For grizzly bears the models have low explanatory value, meaning that it is likely that other factors need to be considered. They found that bears were more likely to be closer to the mine during construction and further away during operations.

For falcons, nest success has declined over time - this may reflect a regional trend. Nest occupancy was higher closer to the mine before construction than after.

Waterfowl results are very difficult to interpret without a control site. They are discussing comparing the Diavik data to a CWS regional database.

Future research considerations:

Caribou – do more activity budget work

Grizzly – look at other explanatory variables

Falcons – regional monitoring

Waterfowl – multivariate analysis and use of regional information

Noted that for activity budget work you need a good control area and it is important that the sampling periods take into account rest, feeding and movement cycles.

The CWS representative offered to provide examples of analysis using GIS and Kriging, which will show hot spots.

Petr Komers did a demonstration intended to show that caribou deflected by the mine may be “bunching up” at the edge of the ZOI. He has seen similar patterns in other situations. This changes the interpretation of the ZOI and makes the data past the edge of the ZOI important – baseline conditions would be well past the point where the bunching up takes place. From a management perspective there will be increased pressure on habitat where caribou are bunching up.

Noted that this effect would be compounded by similar patterns around other mines. The bunching up would depend on how many caribou are wandering through the area. Noted that caribou are never randomly scattered, they are always in clumps.

It is ENR’s job to monitor caribou outside the ZOI, such as their calving ground surveys and collar data.

Lunch

Petr presented the MSES report to the board. He noted that it is a bit different this year, with a series of questions for DDMI to answer.

The point was made again that DDMI/Golder’s statistical information is not helpful to the board as presented.

How will ENR deal with this information? ENR should attend when DDMI presents this information in the communities.

Petr said that the statistics generally show that the mine is deflecting caribou, grizzly and falcons. Is that acceptable to EMAB?

Agreed that EMAB needs to get ENR’s written response to the 2007 report.

Suggested that EMAB recommend that ENR respond to DDMI's results and to the larger issue of cumulative effects.

Petr commented that the information provided is useful and that he is not aware of any wildlife monitoring program of this quality in Alberta. He has noticed that there are some recommendations that have been made every year but never responded to:

- He's not sure why DDMI wants to increase behavioural observations – much more effort will be needed to get reasonable results. It would be better to increase the search-and-count effort from the air in the predicted ZOI. DDMI has been saying for years that they will increase the behavioural observations, but never do.

It was suggested that a single meeting each year with ENR and DDMI on wildlife is not enough. There needs to be follow-up.

It was suggested that EMAB should try to go to the mine to observe the caribou migration. Noted that we have already missed the northern migration for 2008 – the caribou will already be north of Diavik.

Noted that behavioural observations could be a good way of involving Aboriginal people in monitoring.

A lot of effort will be required to show a difference in behaviour compared to the work already done. The effect of the mine on energetics (the amount of energy caribou use moving compared to the amount of energy they take in by eating) is likely very low. To get the most bang for the buck, Diavik should focus on the original predicted 3-7km ZOI – this is the area that they could do some mitigation in. And with the current data they can't verify the prediction of a 3-7km ZOI.

What about the difference in aerial survey methods between Diavik and Ekati? It's not ideal, but the data are compatible. You need different data

collection depending on the scale you're working at. If you're looking for regional effects then it is fine to have a large distance between transects. If you're looking for project-specific effects then you need more detailed data collection.

Any comments on the wolverine studies? Petr doesn't find the track studies are very useful – the results are very variable. The DNA sampling program provides much more useful information.

Generally the WMP is very good – the waterfowl monitoring is weak because they don't have a control site.

Question about Migratory Birds Act. Where nesting habitat is destroyed a permit is required.

On the statistical analysis, there might be better ways to define the ZOI using different analytical methods, such as breakpoint analysis.

Motion: To accept the MSES report for 2007

Moved: Floyd Adlem

Seconded: Claudia Haas

Carried unanimously

Motion: To recommend that DDMI respond to the questions and recommendations in the MSES report for 2007.

Moved: Florence Catholique

Seconded: Lawrence Goulet

Carried unanimously

Motion: To recommend that ENR provide a response to the 2007 Wildlife Monitoring Program Report and respond to the MSES report for 2007, including the recommendations.

Moved: Florence Catholique

Seconded: Floyd Adlem

Carried unanimously

Agreed to address the WMP revision process later.

Break

Presentation on CIMP

Christa Domchek from DIAND made a presentation on the CIMP program (powerpoint presentation available on request).

They will be updating the NWT Environmental Audit in 2010. There is a five-year draft workplan coming. They are trying to standardize monitoring protocols. They are also trying to work on linking TK and science. They are trying to improve communication of information. They would like to do trend analyses but data are collected differently – standardization is needed.

There were questions about the relationship between land claim authorities and CIMP. At the same time, information needs to be collected in the same way if it's going to show the big picture.

Noted that cumulative effects needs study at different scales. Bathurst caribou use the entire North Slave region and go well beyond, into Nunavut.

Cooperation is needed.

Presentation of cumulative effects on caribou

Jan Adamczewski from ENR made a presentation on the Cumulative Effects on Caribou workshop from February 2008 (powerpoint presentation available on request). The general conclusion from the workshop was that it was OK to develop a pilot project using the various simulation models but that decisions need to be made soon to ensure the health of the caribou population. It will be important to use TK in this process.

ENR hopes to have a workshop report out this summer and do a demonstration project on the models by fall/winter 2008. This would include assessing the effects of the current mines and simulating new mines with the intent of predicting thresholds. They want to update the NWT Caribou Management Strategy.

Jan also talked about the CARMA program (circum-arctic rangifer monitoring) which is looking at standardizing caribou monitoring protocols including survey methods and condition studies. Right now it describes various survey methods and gives guidance on condition surveys.

ENR hopes that once the models are developed they would be able to include information from the mines, which would require that the data be collected in a standard way. The information collected must be helpful in assessing population level effects so includes condition as well as population size, calf survival rates, cow/calf ratios etc.

Adjourn for the day

EMAB meeting

May 22, 2008

Present:

Doug Crossley, Chair, Kitikmeot Inuit Association

Florence Catholique, Vice-Chair, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation

Claudia Haas, North Slave Metis Alliance

Lawrence Goulet, Yellowknives Dene First Nation

Eric Christensen, Diavik Diamond Mines

Guests :

Colleen English, DDMI

Gord Macdonald, DDMI

Steve Bourne, DDMI

Jen Potten, DIAND

Graham Veale, ENR

Staff:

John McCullum

Minutes:

John McCullum

Meeting opens at 9

Item 8 – Aquatic Effects Monitoring Program

Chair asks everyone to introduce themselves.

Gord Macdonald from Diavik presented a summary of the 2007 AEMP results (powerpoint presentation available on request).

Reference areas – they had four reference areas but have changed the designation of FF2 (near outlet of Lac du Sauvage). In time they expect to see the effects of effluent on all reference areas.

The weight-of-evidence report, which pulls all the other information together, is showing a moderate nutrient enrichment effect on the lake.

They hope to include TK in future reports, but don't have any studies or methods in place yet.

The fish monitoring (slimy Sculpin) has also shown low level effects on fish health but moderate effects levels of certain metals in fish tissue – barium, strontium, uranium, which are expected because they are found in the groundwater, and mercury, which was unexpected, and not seen in water or sediment. They will be using a lab with a lower detection limit for mercury to see if they can find it. The mercury in slimy sculpins seems very localized near the diffuser.

There have also been detectable levels of mercury in lake trout through fish tissue sampling done during the fish palatability studies. These levels have been increasing over time. They will check the levels in trout again this year.

DDMI did not accept Golder's recommendation for re-defining high-level effects on fish – they will propose accepting Bruce Kilgour's recommendation that avoids having to assess reversibility of an effect.

Benthics are showing a eutrophication effect as are algae. They don't know exactly where the effect changes from moderate to early warning to none. Golder recommended that some mid-field sites be added to see where the transition takes place but DDMI doesn't want to be changing the effects criteria often so is proposing to re-assess after three years. They noted that the location of the transition will probably continue to move as time goes by.

Dust monitoring – they will continue the verification test regarding methodology. In one case the two gauges gave very similar results; in the other the gauge with dust collected monthly had about half the amount as the other, so it is most likely they are over-estimating dustfall.

DDMI is working on linking the dike monitoring studies with the AEMP studies.

Question and answer session:

- Restoration – only thing is working on fish habitat in A418
- Any plans to set benchmarks for parameters showing low level effects? DDMI would have used a benchmark if one existed.
- What effect did the reduced number of summer samples have? Less samples increases the level of uncertainty – they were still able to clearly identify effects.
- What will DDMI do to follow up the effects as set out in the AEMP. DDMI has followed those steps, but not explicitly. They don't see much value in showing that they've followed each step in each case.

Alice Legat and Karin Clark from the WRRB arrive.

Break

Ammonia update – the ammonia levels DDMI is observing are much higher than those predicted by the WLWB Experts' Panel (almost double in some cases). The final revisions to the AMP are in front of the WLWB. They are not seeing a big change in ammonia dues to revised blasting practices. It's difficult to separate the effect of one part of the AMP from the others.

Air Quality Monitoring

What is the status of the Air Quality Monitoring Program?

DDMI's first step is to get the modeler to sit down with ENR and EC. The contractor is ready to go but they are not prepared to commit to a specific schedule other than to say it will happen sooner rather than later.

What is the status of the air quality sampler that DDMI said would be enclosed and operating by fall 2007? It was just a small portable unit and is no longer operating.

What is the status of the lichen study? The study on vegetation change resulting from dust is done every two years using the Permanent Vegetation Plots (PVP), so will be done in 2008. It was suggested that the PVP work be correlated to the dust monitoring and the lichen study.

Noted that a peer review of the lichen study is now complete and will be circulated for response.

Action Item: Circulate peer review of lichen study for response.

Suggestion for EMAB to visit Diavik during the northern migration. It was generally felt that it was too late for this year.

DDMI has submitted its response to EMAB's comments on the 2007 AEMP report and DDMI's request to reduce sampling.

Item 11 - Reports

E.D. reviews financial statement to March 31.

Motion: Accept financial statement as presented.

Moved: Lawrence Goulet

Seconded: Claudia Haas

Carried unanimously

Member reports

Lawrence – not much to report

Florence – completing capacity fund report; SAO has left and Florence is acting SAO; very appreciative feedback on the AdMP workshop; she needs a new fax machine.

Claudia – NSMA has hired two summer students and is planning to hire two elders. They might send a student to the CBM camp. At the end of the summer they will present to the community on what they've learned. It was suggested they be introduced to EMAB members.

Eric – working with underground engineers to plan for an EMAB tour

Doug – recently elected KIA President has resigned. Temporary president, until elections are held in the fall, is Raymond Kayaksark. Doug has done some preliminary work for the EMAB meeting in Kugluktuk. KIA will have an expanded CBM proposal this year.

Next meeting will be June 24 – 26 in Kugluktuk. Travel from Yellowknife on Tuesday morning and return Thursday afternoon. There was interest in receiving a presentation on the Bernard Harbour arctic char project and in meeting with the Grizzly Club as well as a presentation from Natalie Griller on the youth/elders camp and fish camp.

Lunch

Item 8 – AEMP (continued)

Floyd Adlem joins the meeting

North-South participants (by conference call): Leanne Zrum, Megan Cooley, Craig Fazakas

Chair introduces item – comments have already been sent to WLWB because of May 5 deadline. This is to review the highlights of the report and ask any questions that may have come up as a result of DDMI's presentation in the morning.

Leanne reviewed their report. The summary document was a good non-technical presentation of the information in the detailed appendices. The main issues are: nutrient enrichment, the effect of changing FF2 from a reference to an exposure site on the sampling design and the mercury in the sculpins.

Many of the recommendations Golder made in the appendices were not carried forward by DDMI – they should provide a rationale in each case for transparency.

The reduced sampling led to some uncertainty. It will be important to have a complete program in 2008. It would be very difficult to agree to reducing the sampling without ever having had a complete year of sampling.

There are two main things to consider. The water and sediment do show some increased levels of metals, but these are not at levels that would cause toxicity in the biota (plankton, benthics, fish). The biota show changes but these are likely due to nutrient enrichment, which was predicted in the environmental assessment. Still need to keep looking for a link between the mine and the mercury in the fish. It is possible that by increasing nutrients in the lake more mercury may be available to be taken up by fish. Or mercury could be being mobilized by global climate change.

Item 11 – Reports (continued)

Review of outstanding action items.

Item 9 – NRTP review presentation

Kerry Robinson from Aurora College made a presentation on the NRTP review (powerpoint presentation available on request).

Questions and answers:

- Is Aurora College affected by GNWT budget cuts? Yes – they are still figuring out the possible effects.
- Discussion on transition from BEAHR to NRTP.

- Access year requires grade 11. Pre-technology program is equivalent.
- Adult basic education allows community residents to upgrade to Grade 12 in the community by working with adult educators. This is also equivalent to the Access program
- Can NRTP be delivered in the communities? The main problem is the Grade 12 entrance requirement. AC is already having trouble getting enough qualified students in the two communities the course runs in now.

Kerry reviewed the recommendations most relevant to EMAB. One recommendation is to expand the NRTP advisory committee and an invitation has been extended to EMAB. It would require about half a day each month with about 2/3 of the meetings by teleconference. Any travel expenses would be covered by AC.

Noted that the entrance requirement is a problem – there is lots of interest in the program. Another issue is that people want to stay in their community.

AC will put BEAHR under the NRTP program as a way to deal with the bridging problem. It would be difficult to provide NRTP in communities – too few students.

Pointed out that there are lots of people with good land skills and TK who would like to take the program, but their academic qualifications are low. The problem is that math and biology are needed to do the job so people need to have those.

EMAB will discuss the invitation to participate in the NRTP advisory committee at its next meeting.

Item 10 – Capacity Funding Review recommendations

Allan Twissell reviewed the report. There seems to be a strong feeling that the program is needed, especially in the area of environmental monitoring.

It was suggested that Allan provide samples of statements of intent, principles and goals based on the research and discussion by EMAB for EMAB to consider in relation to recommendations 2-4.

Did the report factor in the higher costs associated with isolated communities?
No, this is something for EMAB to consider.

Agreed to adopt the report in principle with the proposed changes. Allan will revise the report and submit by June 27, then send to communities with a 2-week period to respond. EMAB can finalize the report at the next meeting.

Motion: to accept the Capacity Building Program Review Report as amended.

Moved: Floyd Adlem

Seconded: Claudia Haas

Carried unanimously

Action Item: circulate revised capacity fund review report to communities with a 2-week comment period.

Motion: to accept the Executive Director's performance appraisal as presented, including recommendations.

Moved: Floyd Adlem

Seconded: Florence Catholique

Carried unanimously

Motion to adjourn: Floyd Adlem

Carried

Closing prayer – Lawrence Goulet