

**Independent Environmental Monitoring Agency
71st Meeting of the Board of Directors
Yellowknife, NWT
November 16-18, 2010
Summary of Discussion**

Revised: December 13, 2010

Directors

Bill Ross

Tim Byers

Audrey Enge (Nov. 17-18)

Laura Johnston (by phone on Nov. 16 for 'New Business' only, and Nov. 17-18)

Jaida Ohokannoak

Tony Pearse

Kim Poole

Guests

Kathy Racher, Wek'èezhìi Land and Water Board (WLWB)

Staff

Monica Krieger, Communications and Environmental Specialist

Ryan Fequet, Wek'èezhìi Land and Water Board (WLWB)

Kevin O'Reilly, Executive Director

John McCullum, Environmental Monitoring Advisory Board (EMAB)

NOVEMBER 16TH

Meeting commenced at 9:00am.

AGENCY BUSINESS

➤ **Information Updates**

Bill – Was interviewed by Maia Adams (*Plaza Watch* magazine) for an article about diamond mine sustainability.

Jaida – Worked on presentations for the Annual General Meeting (AGM) and Environmental Workshop. Participated in conference call with Kevin and BHPB staff regarding the working capital deficit. Worked with Kevin on the transfer of contributed services.

Tim – Reviewed the 2008-09 Fay Bay Monitoring Program Report and the Wek'èezhìi Land and Water Board (WLWB) Response Framework for Aquatic Effects Monitoring. Attended the 13th North American Caribou Workshop in Winnipeg Oct. 25-28.

Tony – Represented the Agency at WLWB public hearing on the Interim Closure and Reclamation Plan (ICRP) Sept. 28-29 in Behchokö. Reviewed the revised Wastewater and Processed Kimberlite Management Plan (WPKMP).

Kim – Participated in the Oct. 5-6 Community/Traditional Knowledge (TK) workshop as part of the diamond mines Wildlife Effects Monitoring Program (WEMP) review. Noted that the J.L. Polfus thesis on woodland caribou that Tony distributed is very useful, as there is almost nothing published on comparing TK and science-based models. Was notified of a meeting today between BHPB and GNWT-ENR re: grizzly and wolverine hair snagging techniques.

Kevin – Discussed the King Pond discharge issue with INAC inspector Jason Brennan. Gave update on Agency activities at Sept. 23 Environmental Monitoring Advisory Board (EMAB) meeting. Participated in the ICRP hearing and the TK WEMP review workshop. Worked on

presentations and logistics for the environmental workshop and AGM. Worked with Jaida on the transfer of contributed services and working capital deficit. Met with Outcrop on the timeline project. Gave a presentation about the Agency to the Ontario Mining Action Network (OMAN) in Thunder Bay mid-October.

Monica – Prepared summary of discussion from last board meeting. Attended ICRP hearing, TK WEMP review workshop, and update at EMAB meeting. Assisted Kevin in preparing presentations and logistics for this week's board meeting, environmental workshop and AGM. Continued work on communications tools, including meeting with Outcrop on the timeline project. Researched and prepared Agency application for YMCA Eco-Internship Program. Provided photos to Maia Adams for the *Plaza Watch* magazine article.

➤ **Financial Report**

- Follow-Up From 2009-10 Audit Management Letter

A conference call took place between Kevin, Jaida, Eric Denholm (BHPB), and BHPB financial staff to discuss the working capital deficit. This occurred because the timeline project is considered a capital asset under accounting principles. All agreed that the best course of action was for BHPB to cover this cost with a cheque that is untied (i.e. not reimbursable at year-end as is the case for the Agency's core funding).

BHPB also agreed that the Agency should take over contributed services (office rent, cleaning, photocopier lease) for better control of expenses. A new lease with Bromley and Son for the office space has been prepared. BHPB will send a letter terminating the current arrangement, and the new lease will be effective January 1, 2011.

The Board of Directors move that the Agency enter into a new lease with Bromley and Son for the Agency office space.

Moved by Tony Pearse. Seconded by Kim Poole. Carried without objection.

Kevin noted that the photocopier lease costs approximately \$80/month including a service contract. BHPB has been asked to inform Xerox that the Agency would like to take over this arrangement.

- 2010-11 Year-to-Date (YTD) Expenditures and Variance Report

Jaida reviewed the 2010-11 YTD expenditures, with spending for all categories on track except for the Separate Fund. Expenditures here are higher than forecasted because of the ICRP issues. A number of documents are still expected for review before the end of March, as well as two additional board meetings and a community visit. The remaining consultation and communications budget will go towards Annual Report costs and the community meeting. Outside contracts included the Bill Tonn review of the 10-year Panda Diversion Channel (PDC) Monitoring Program Report, and there may be additional expenses for further peer reviews. Management and administration costs are on track.

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS

➤ **ICRP Public Hearing September 28-29, 2010**

Briefing notes of the hearing were distributed by Kevin and Tony. Directors and staff discussed the fairly aggressive line of questioning from BHPB's lawyer regarding long-term monitoring obligations for pit lakes. It was agreed that the closure criteria in the approved final ICRP will clarify what BHPB is expected and required to do. Once it meets those criteria, there is no further liability to the company.

In the past BHPB has said that the proposed fish barriers would likely be boulder fields that would still allow some drainage. Tim mentioned a Grande Cache Coal project where they built fish barriers because of selenium issues, and fish still managed to get in. Tim also noted that the justification for a fish barrier at Cell E of the Long Lake Containment Facility (LLCF) was not defended well by the company at the hearing. BHPB stated that the Cell E fish population has research value, but once reclamation is completed there would no longer be a scientific need to keep a distinct fish population.

At the public hearing, it was stated the WLWB decision was expected by the end of October.

➤ **Diamond Mine Wildlife Monitoring Program Review**

Kim, Audrey, Kevin and Monica attended the Oct. 5-6 Community and TK Workshop and a summary was distributed by email. A final report was to be prepared by the facilitators (Joe Handley and Joanne Barnaby) but has not been released yet. The companies were supposed to make decisions on WEMP changes based on this workshop as well as the technical one held in June. There is some urgency as the process for issuing 2011 wildlife research permits will begin in about a month.

Action Item #1 Kevin to request an update from Eric and Keith McLean (BHPB) on the status of the workshop report and the research permit application process, as well as clarification of next steps with a copy of this email to Susan Fleck (GNWT-ENR).

➤ **Wastewater and Processed Kimberlite Management Plan (WPKMP)**

Tony and Laura reviewed the amended August 2010 WPKMP (approved by the WLWB on June 28, 2010 with the condition that BHPB revise the plan as per instructions provided by WLWB staff). Agency comments on the original February 2010 draft provided 23 recommendations for improvement, which the WLWB staff addressed in their instructions to BHPB. However, Tony and Laura's conformity check showed a number of instances where there is a large gap between what the WLWB requested and what BHPB provided, which raises questions about the WLWB process for approval of documents.

There was a discussion about how prescriptive boards can or should be in respect of internal company management plans, but Directors agreed that some details need to be explicitly provided (e.g. recent monitoring data should be included or at least referenced as informing the WPKMP). The WLWB will develop guidelines for management plans that should provide greater clarity around the level of detail required in the future.

These issues were discussed further with WLWB staff later in the meeting.

➤ **Review of 2008 Air Quality Monitoring Program (AQMP) Report**

BHPB sent a response letter Oct. 22 acknowledging the Agency-commissioned review of the 2008 AQMP by SENES Consultants. A table was attached with reviewer comments and BHPB responses, and BHPB has committed to issue an addendum or revised report. Directors and staff discussed the Environmental Workshop on Air Quality to be held the following day with presentations to be given by BHPB, the Agency and Environment Canada. Bill noted the Agency's main message is that significant improvements have been made in air quality monitoring over the past few years, but some outstanding issues remain (i.e. methodological issues and continued use of the old incinerator).

Kim mentioned that Anne Gunn is promoting a dust-caribou study looking at ash in fecal pellets at distance from infrastructure. This could be done more on a regional basis, and possibly in conjunction with lichen monitoring sites.

➤ **Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Discussion Paper and Workshop**

As per the BHPB response to the Agency's Annual Report recommendation, a "pre-2012 EIR" workshop is to be held no later than spring 2011. The Agency has committed to prepare a discussion paper based on the review of the 2009 EIR. The Agency's position is that EIRs should not be just a determination of whether predicted impacts have occurred, but focus on the issues of today (in particular those few areas where there have been significant departures from predictions or unpredicted impacts). As well, there are major differences between the Agency's and BHPB's ranking of significant residual effects. For example, the Agency feels that changes in water quality downstream of the Long Lake Containment Facility is a greater concern than numbers of parasites in slimy sculpin, in terms of significant overall effects of the project.

There are four purposes to the EIR as defined in Article 5.2(a) of the Environmental Agreement:

- 1) Report on longer term effects of the project;
- 2) Report on results of environmental monitoring programs;
- 3) Report on the actual performance of the project in comparison to results predicted in the Environmental Impact Statement; and
- 4) Evaluate how BHPB's adaptive environmental management has performed.

BHPB has generally focused primarily on the third point. The Agency suggested in 2006 and 2008 to shift the focus more towards long-term effects and how the adaptive management system is working. The issue of "false positive" impacts was also raised (e.g. BHPB claims in some cases that the current or final state of environment at Ekati is better than it would have been without the mine). The Agency discussion paper will be based on these comments, and designed to push for changes in focus and process for the 2012 EIR with support from the other Parties.

Action Item #2 Bill and Kevin to draft ideas for the EIR discussion paper and circulate to Directors for comment.

➤ **Honoraria Increase**

Directors reviewed background information on honoraria rates and inflation. It was noted that BHPB's contributions to the Agency are tied to the Canadian Consumer Price Index (CPI) and increase accordingly every year, and that the Agency's honoraria rates were set in 1997 without any changes since then.

The Board of Directors move that effective April 1, 2011 the honoraria for Directors be increased by 10% (to \$660/day) and tied to Canadian CPI increases for each subsequent year.

Moved by Tony Pearse. Seconded by Tim Byers. Carried without objection.

COMMUNICATIONS DISCUSSION

• **Website Update**

Monica presented the Agency website which continues to be updated and improved. There was a discussion about the slow internet speed (especially upload speeds) in comparison to other providers, and how this prolongs the time required to make changes.

Action Item #3 Kevin to contact Tamarack Computers with concerns about the internet connection speed.

- **Timeline Project**

Monica presented the timeline project to date. More entries are needed as well as associated documents and pictures, which will take time to research and upload to the site. Monica and Kevin met with Outcrop Communications on Nov. 8 to discuss additional programming changes, which are now being completed. The timeline will be a separate website, accessed via a link from the main Agency website. It can be hosted by Outcrop or by Cold Mountain Computing (the main website host). The quote from Outcrop is far higher, and staff have requested additional information on how that cost is derived.

All agreed that non-Agency photos will not be used on the timeline unless explicit permission has been given. Also, suggestions on the timeline will be accepted but the Agency will retain full control of the content. Some discussion occurred on the title "Ekati Timeline" but no alternatives were suggested. All agreed that "Ekati History" would not be appropriate as it suggests only past events are documented, when in fact it looks to the future as well.

Action Item #4 Monica to continue work on the timeline, including requesting access to BHPB photos and videos. Tim and Jaida to review the final version prior to public release.

- **Newsletter**

Monica presented a new issue of the Ekati Monitor newsletter, a copy of which is in the Environmental Workshop and AGM folders for participants this week. Directors had several suggestions for the next newsletter including: consistent naming of the company (BHPB not BHP); no page numbers in the table of contents; moving issue number and date to front page; and providing equivalencies for figures (e.g. 3 million carats = how many coffee cans). This twice-yearly publication will occur in the spring and fall.

Action Item #5 Monica to email newsletter to distribution list, post on the website, and have copies available in the office.

- **Photo Use Agreement**

Kevin presented the draft Photo Use Agreement, a recommendation from the risk management plan. There is a risk of third party liability if someone uses an Agency photo for a purpose the Agency has not approved or received indemnity for. There is also the issue of BHPB corporate identity, so that a photo of Ekati is not used to sell another product or technology. This agreement is a way to limit or reduce the degree of risk to the Agency for third party liability, track the number of requests for photos, and build a catalogue of other publications where our photos are used. The website will state anyone wishing to use an Agency photo should contact us and enter into an agreement for its use. Jaida suggested some additional wording be added to the agreement.

Action Item #6 Kevin to finalize Photo Use Agreement, including any other suggested language or provisions as appropriate. Monica to post final version to the website with introductory paragraph.

- **Peer Review Policy**

Several ideas and options for the Agency's peer review process were presented and discussed. Directors discussed Bill Tonn's review of the Panda Diversion Channel (PDC) 10-Year Monitoring Program Report and the SENES review of the 2008 AQMP, both of which were sufficiently critical of BHPB that the Agency offered the company an opportunity to respond. There was mention of a past instance where a peer review was commissioned, but the final product was unsatisfactory to the Agency and was not released.

Directors agreed that the peer review process would generally be as follows:

- 1) Inform all Society Members when a peer review is commissioned.
- 2) Require the reviewer (as a condition of the contract) to engage with relevant parties and attempt to resolve questions around methods and issues of clarity, to the extent possible.
- 3) Once the report is received and approved by the Directors, release it to Society Members.

However, reviews will continue to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. There may be times when the party that submitted the document would be provided an opportunity to respond to the final report before it is released. All attempts would be made to minimize time delays between commissioning the report and its actual release.

Action Item #7 Kevin to prepare a draft Peer Review Policy and circulate to Directors for comment.

- **Policy on Access to Information**

A draft policy on access to Agency information was presented. It covers requests for Agency materials from Society Members, public, and the media as well as Directors and staff. There was a discussion about taking items off site, especially if it is the Agency's only copy of a document. This could be done only at the discretion of the Executive Director, who would need to have some assurance that the item would be returned within a reasonable period of time to allow for copying or its direct use.

The Board of Directors move that the Policy on Access to Information is accepted with the noted changes.

Moved by Tony Pearse. Seconded by Jaida Ohokannoak. Carried without objection.

- **Agency Communications Strategy**

A draft communications strategy is not yet completed due to other pressing priorities including website updates, further timeline project development and a newsletter for presentation to Society Members at the AGM tomorrow.

Action Item #8 Monica to finalize the draft Communications Strategy and circulate to Kevin and Directors for comment.

NEW BUSINESS

- **2008-09 Fay Bay Monitoring Program Report**

Tim discussed his review of this report. Monitoring was implemented following the spill of processed kimberlite (PK) from the Long Lake Containment Facility (LLCF) into Fay Bay in May 2008. The report states that PK deposition of greater than 5 mm (the level of concern for aquatic life) covers only the shallowest part of Fay Bay, which is not accessible to fish during winter because of ice cover. Tim questioned why areas of 1-5 mm PK deposition are not also a concern. These depths of PK covered almost 1/3 of the total impacted area, and were at greater lake depths (which would be accessible to fish under ice). As well, eggs could suffocate at less than 5 mm.

There was a discussion about what type of fish may be present in Fay Bay and what life stages may have been affected by the deposition of PK. It was noted there are no maps in the report showing fish use in different areas or depths of the lake. For example, Figure 2.3-24 (estimated

depth and distribution of PK in Fay Bay) could be overlaid with a map of fish habitat or substrate types as a tool to indicate what type of impacts there may be for fish.

Action Item #9 Tim to contact Eric Denholm (BHPB) for information on why 5 mm of PK deposition was selected as the level of significance.

Action Item #10 Kevin to contact Bruce Hanna (DFO) to determine if any baseline studies were conducted for fish in Fay Lake.

➤ **Aquatic Effects Monitoring Program (AEMP) Response Framework**

Laura and Tim discussed their review of the WLWB draft “*Guidelines for Adaptive Management: A Response Framework for Aquatic Effects Monitoring*” (October 17, 2010). At one point this document was called the Watershed Adaptive Management Plan, and it is unclear why the WLWB has moved away from using the term “adaptive management”.

Deadline for comments is December 6, 2010. This item was discussed further with WLWB staff later in the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30pm.

NOVEMBER 17TH

Meeting commenced at 9:00am.

MEETING WITH KATHY RACHER AND RYAN FEQUET, WEK'ÈEZHÌI LAND AND WATER BOARD (WLWB)

➤ **Revised Wastewater and Processed Kimberlite Management Plan (WPKMP) and Guidance on Management Plan Content**

Tony and Laura discussed differences between what the WLWB directed and what BHPB provided in the revised version of the WPKMP. For about half of the items, BHPB did not provide the information requested, and there is a noticeable decline in both volume and quality of information compared to previous versions. A particular concern is the lack of detail on key areas such as the management of extra-fine processed kimberlite (EFPK). Most information on this topic is now in the Reclamation Research Plans, not in the WPKMP or the closure plan. Tony emphasized this was a critical issue for closure, and recommended that WLWB staff review the Robertson and Haley report (2000) for further details on its significance.

Tony and Laura felt that reformatting and reorganization of this plan made it difficult to compare to previous versions. It was noted that this version no longer has the phrase “Controlled Document” at the bottom of pages as seen previously. This is thought to be related to ISO14001 certification, and the Agency wondered if it could be related to the loss of information and quality of reporting. Ryan responded that Diavik’s management plans have a specific format and version numbers instead of just by year, and the WLWB have asked BHPB to do this as well.

WLWB staff were questioned on the internal conformity checks when documents are submitted. Ryan said that BHPB was required to do further revisions during the conformity check (e.g. stage volume curves and scheduling were not included), but the revised version did not go back to the WLWB. It was agreed that a letter from the Agency on the WPKMP and the overall issue of management plans would be helpful.

The Directors noted there was ambiguity regarding when revisions were to be submitted (for example, “in this version” or “in the revised version” compared to “in a revised version”). The Agency had assumed that all changes requested would come in the revised August 2010 version, not in future versions of the plan. In the Agency’s view, the WLWB should be more explicit in how directions are provided to the company. Ryan noted that the WPKMP is only required to be reviewed annually, not necessarily updated. Updates occur only if there are significant changes or if the WLWB requests it.

There was a discussion about the need for guidance on management plan content including the kinds of information should be included and how to determine when a plan is acceptable. Kathy stated the WLWB will be developing guidelines in 2011 on how to review management plans, as the issue has arisen with Diavik and Snap Lake as well. Directors agreed these guidelines would be useful and the Agency volunteered to help in developing them.

Action Item #11 Kevin to draft a letter to WLWB identifying concerns with the revised WPKMP and offering suggestions on further revisions.

Kathy mentioned that Land and Water Boards of the Mackenzie Valley will also be reviewing the Water and Effluent Quality Policy during the second week of December.

➤ **King Pond Pumping Issue**

Kathy discussed the September 2010 issue of whether BHPB could pump Misery pit water into King Pond at the same time it is pumping from King Pond into Cujo Lake (receiving environment). The Board staff agreed with INAC inspector Jason Brennan’s interpretation of the water licence that this was not permitted, and supported his stop order. The water licence refers to King Pond as a settling pond so concurrent discharge into and out of the water body does not seem consistent with its purpose.

Ryan noted a meeting is planned between WLWB staff, the inspector and BHPB, and a revision to the WPKMP may be required on the operation of King Pond to clarify this issue. BHPB stopped pumping when requested by the inspector and is not pumping right now, which provides time for the issue to be dealt with in the off-season. The Agency indicated that the most important issue is that water pumped to the receiving environment meets water licence criteria, and that pumping into the pond may stir up sediment. The solution could be as simple as more frequent sampling at the outlet when pumping out as this is required on a biweekly basis under the current water licence.

➤ **Aquatic Effects Monitoring Program (AEMP) Response Framework**

John McCullum (EMAB) joined the meeting for this discussion about the WLWB draft “*Guidelines for Adaptive Management: A Response Framework for Aquatic Effects Monitoring*” (October 17, 2010). Laura suggested several changes to the definitions and terminology (e.g. using new terms such as “monitoring response plan” and “response framework” instead of the previous term “adaptive management” is confusing). The guidelines should also clearly distinguish between escalating levels of seriousness of effects and associated actions. The determination of significance should be defined in the environmental assessment phase but is usually not, which makes it more difficult in the regulatory phase. Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board (MVEIRB) staff are also reviewing these guidelines to ensure consistent language is used.

Kathy clarified that the term “action levels” is used instead of “triggers” to be consistent with the language in the 2009 guidelines for designing AEMPs in the NWT. “Benchmarks” are used to define action levels where the potential exists for adverse effects, as established in the general literature or as set in standards. CCME guidelines or other criteria can be used to set a value below a significance threshold.

Kathy said that Environmental Effects Monitoring in the Metal Mining Effluent Regulations have biological benchmarks (e.g., benthic invertebrates or fish). Two times the standard deviation is used as an action level at which the company has to investigate what is causing the change. She added that the WLWB wanted its guidelines to be useful but generic enough to apply in all cases.

Laura suggested several other changes to the document, including reordering sections of information and expanding on several figures. Appendix 1 and the definition of adaptive environmental management do not reflect anticipating and preventing problems instead of reacting to them. For Ekati, this is particularly important because it was the principle on which the company applied and was given approval for the mine. It was meant to be learning by doing, but also purposefully collecting and using monitoring data on key components to assess effects and make appropriate management responses. Using “range of natural variation” of an undisturbed ecosystem may be a useful description of natural variability. As well, the document should be clear what is an actual suggestion for triggers or benchmarks to be used and what is simply an example.

John noted that Diavik’s AEMP defines significance levels or effect levels, and questioned whether these guidelines would create a separate set of effect levels. Kathy replied that information from the environmental assessment is used to determine the significance threshold. In Diavik’s case, there are low/medium/high effects levels. However, a different set of levels for actions would be developed using this framework. John also questioned whether the levels should incorporate a safety factor as do CCME protocols.

Kathy suggested a possible future workshop to discuss concepts and definitions, including all groups who were on the distribution list for this document. Meetings are also planned with diamond mine representatives, Golder Associates, and the Chamber of Mines. She thanked the Agency for its thorough analysis and constructive comments, and is open to further suggestions.

Action Item #12 Kevin to draft Agency comments on the Response Framework by November 30, to allow time for Director review prior to the December 6 deadline.
--

OTHER BUSINESS

➤ YMCA Eco-Internship Application

Monica discussed the opportunity for the Agency to host a post-secondary graduate intern through the YMCA of Greater Toronto (draft application was circulated to Directors). If approved, the only direct cost to the Agency would be adding the YMCA as an additional insured on the liability policy. The YMCA pays the wages and the interns are responsible for their own living costs, including travel to Yellowknife if coming from elsewhere in Canada. The internship would be for approximately three months (December 2010 to March 2011).

Action Item #13 Staff to proceed with application to host an intern through the YMCA program.

➤ Future Board Meetings

The dates of future Agency Board meetings were reviewed and approved as follows:

January 19-20, 2011 (possibly combined with an Environmental Agreement Implementation meeting)

March 2011 in Kugluktuk, preferably the week of March 14 (date to be finalized after further discussion with Luigi Torretti and confirmation of dates for school break)

Week of May 9, 2011 for Annual Report writing workshop

Action Item #14 Tim and Laura to research options for location of Annual Report writing workshop: Winnipeg area or St. Eugene Mission (north of Cranbrook, BC).

Meeting adjourned at 12:00pm for the Environmental Workshop on Air Quality in the afternoon.

NOVEMBER 18TH

Meeting commenced at 2:30pm following the AGM.

AGM DEBRIEFING AND REMAINING BUSINESS FROM BOARD MEETING

Directors and staff felt the Environmental Workshop and AGM were successful. There were no motions or explicit directions to the Agency, although several action items arose during the discussions.

Action Item #15 Kevin to draft letter to BHPB requesting a status report on the new incinerator, including a schedule for when BHPB intends to commission and have it in operation. This will be part of the Agency's follow-up letter with recommendations from the Environmental Workshop.

Action Item #16 Staff to confirm whether Agency Annual Report brochures were sent to Kugluktuk and Cambridge Bay (Kitikmeot Inuit Association representatives indicated they had not been received the last two years).

The issue was raised again this year of community capacity building and lack of participant funding, in particular Aboriginal governments' inability to participate meaningfully and effectively in Ekati-related processes such as the ICRP hearing. It is part of the Agency's mandate to convey concerns expressed by Aboriginal Society Members. The Agency met with Neil McCrank in 2008 on northern regulatory reform, noting several issues of concern including the importance of participant funding in relation to closure at Ekati. The input was not reflected in McCrank's final report, and the Agency sent a letter to Minister Chuck Strahl with no response.

Action Item #17 Kevin to draft letter regarding capacity building and participant funding for Aboriginal organizations using the ICRP process as an example, to be sent to BHPB, WLWB, GNWT and INAC.

➤ Election of Officers

Agency Bylaws specify that election of officers shall occur every year.

The Board of Directors move that those currently holding Executive positions (Bill Ross as Chairperson, Tim Byers as Vice-Chairperson and Jaida Ohokannoak as Secretary-Treasurer) continue until the 2011 AGM.

Moved by Tony Pearse. Seconded by Kim Poole. Carried without objection.

Meeting concluded at 4:00pm.



Summary of Discussion Approved by
Jaida Ohokannoak, Secretary Treasurer.