

**Independent Environmental Monitoring Agency
82nd Meeting of the Board of Directors
Yellowknife, NT
June 25-26, 2013
Summary of Discussion**

Directors

Bill Ross
Tim Byers
Jaida Ohokannoak
Arnold Enge
Kim Poole
Laura Johnston
Tony Pearce (on teleconference for part of the meeting)

Staff

Kevin O'Reilly, Executive Director
Jessica Simpson, Communications and Environmental Specialist

Meeting commenced at 9:00 a.m.

AGENCY BUSINESS

➤ **Information Updates**

Bill – Reviewed the draft Agency 2012-13 Annual Report and came to Yellowknife for the Environmental Agreement implementation meeting held on May 23, 2013. There was also a meeting on the Agency's comments on the Interim Closure and Reclamation Plan (ICRP) Progress Report on the same day.

Laura – Provided comments on the 2012 Aquatic Effects Monitoring Program report and the draft Agency Harassment Policy. Reviewed and provided comments on the draft water licence renewal wording.

Tim – Reviewed all of the above documents mentioned by other Directors and participated in the May 23 meeting on the ICRP Progress Report by teleconference. He also reported that Dean Cluff with Environment and Natural Resource, Government of the NWT collared three lactating wolves on the Ekati mineral claims block this summer.

Jaida – Reviewed the draft 2012-13 Agency financial statements, the plain language sections of the Agency's 2012-13 Annual Report and participated in the May 31 teleconference where the statements were approved.

Kim – Provided a brief update on the Bathurst caribou herd. There was no aerial calving ground distribution survey due to poor sightability conditions so it will be difficult to determine current trends in population size.

Arnold – Reviewed the draft Agency Harassment Policy and was quite involved in activities for the Diavik Environmental Monitoring Advisory Board (EMAB).

Kevin – Assisted with hiring and orientation of Jessica Simpson as the new Communications and Environmental Specialist, managed the audit and sought approval of the financial statements, and assisted with the preparations for the 2012-13 Annual Report meeting. Participated in and provided a report on the June 12 Inter-Agency Coordinating Team (IACT) meeting and site visit. Comments were prepared and submitted for the draft water licence renewal wording and the 2012 AEMP. Participated in the two meetings held on May 23 regarding the ICRP Progress Report comments and the Environmental Agreement.

Jessica – Worked mainly on the 2012-13 Annual Report. A further report on communication activities was provided later in the meeting.

➤ **Financial Report**

Jaida and Kevin reviewed the 2012-13 Year-to-Date Expenditures and Variance Report. The Agency expects to run a small surplus for 2012-13.

➤ **Harassment Policy**

The Agency's Harassment Policy was reviewed by the Directors. Jessica also had an opportunity to review the Policy. The Board resolved to approve the Policy.

Moved by Jaida Ohokannoak. Seconded by Arnold Enge. Carried unanimously.

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS

➤ **Water Licence Renewal**

There was a discussion on thresholds for metals in fish tissue. Tim observed that a number of intervenors wanted thresholds for metals in fish written into the water licence but this was not done. Bill speculates that this might not be within the jurisdiction of the WLWB as it might be something better regulated by Department of Fisheries and Oceans, or Health and Welfare Canada. Arnold mentioned that Rio Tinto is including metal ions in their fish palatability study.

Laura thought the concept of thresholds would likely be revisited in the context of the Response Framework. Overall, Laura was happy with the outcome of the water licence renewal. The Agency did not get everything we wanted, but it was a fair balance.

➤ **2012 AEMP Comments**

Tim had requested assistance from Environment Canada staff on interpreting the AEMP dioxins and furans sampling results. Anne Wilson agreed that there appears to have been some problems with the bounds and detection limits used for the TEQs (Toxic Equivalent Quantity). It was agreed that Tim should pursue this issue with the company.

It was noted that DDEC was supposed to respond to the reviewer comments by June 17 but had not done so to date.

➤ **2012 Waste Rock Seepage Report**

The Waste Rock Seepage Report was released by SRK in April. Tony provided everyone with a summary of the report in an e-mail. Tony presented the report via teleconference.

One of the main concerns is that there is no follow-up to the recommendations that are made to the company. The recommendations are often added to or moved through year to year because there appears to be little progress or even a method to track progress. It would be helpful to everyone for DDEC to summarize their follow up methods. Comments are due on the report by June 28, 2013 using the WLWB on-line review system and comment table format.

Action Item #1: Kevin will work with Tony to ensure Agency comments on the 2012 Waste Rock Seepage Report are submitted to the WLWB on time.
--

➤ **Interim Closure and Reclamation Plan Progress Report**

As there were some significant new issues that arose in the May 23 meeting with DDEC, Bill reviewed these matters in some detail.

Jay pipe is seriously on the table to extend the life of the Ekati Mine. Helen reported at the ICRP meeting that acid generation from the walls at Misery pit may take place for 50 - 100 years, which means that the company will need to carefully consider how it will deal with this issue during pit closure.

At Pigeon Pit there is also schist rock present. However, unlike Misery where schist can be separated visually, this is not possible at Pigeon, so the company is looking at how to manage this waste rock.

The ability to revegetate processed kimberlite is much less optimistic than it appears to have been a couple of years ago. The ICRP progress report seems to indicate that revegetation is possible right now. This is contradictory to what was heard from the company in May. It might be that with more research, revegetation potential could change.

At the Environmental Agreement implementation meeting, when asked about progressive reclamation, Eric indicated that it may be best done at the time everything closes because then there should not be competition for equipment. This appears to be contrary to the requirements for progressive reclamation in the Environmental Agreement and water licence.

The ICRP progress report came out in early 2013. The Agency reviewed the document and made some comments that were critical of the lack of progressive reclamation and of the lack of progress on the reclamation research plans because we are anxious that this work might not be complete in a timely manner. BHPB contacted the Agency to meet and talk about our concerns in the report which was the purpose of the May 23 meeting. The Agency, GNWT, WLWB, DFO and AANDC were represented. There were good exchanges. The consistent message from the company is that none of the delays are critical at this point.

Helen also mentioned that it is important to understand that closure research is different from other design work in that allowances for adjustments while doing research are necessary. This is where there is slippage, because everything needed to be rescheduled. Bill stressed that (a) this is precisely why more research is needed in a timely manner, and (b) the Agency needs to know how close the company is getting to the information that it needs and why it believes it is that close. Helen is convinced that the company will get the information required on time. She also assured the Agency that next year's ICRP progress report will contain the requested information. The Agency continues to stress the need to resolve the uncertainties in setting clear closure objectives and measureable criteria. It was clear from the meeting that AANDC shares some of the Agency's concerns with the delays in closure planning.

Helen committed to provide the Agency with the requested literature reviews it has conducted on closure planning. Nothing has been received to date.

Helen also raised the relinquishment process as an issue of concern for the company. There is a mutual desire for a clear process, where the security would be adjusted downward as reclamation is completed.

The Agency is of the view that there is already a process in place to review financial security through the Environmental Agreement every two years and at least annually through the water licence.

Directors also expressed concern about the lack of use of Traditional Knowledge (TK) in closure planning. An annual general overview through a community visit will not allow the company to carry out this important work. There are also opportunities to use TK in monitoring and post-closure monitoring. The Agency is not aware of any company efforts on this front.

It was mentioned by DDEC staff that the company will be bringing community people to the mine to talk about revegetation this summer. The Agency was asked if there are people from the communities that we would recommend to participate in this initiative. It was also suggested that the Agency not actually recommend people, but direct the company to people in the communities who would know who to recommend instead.

Action Item #2: Kevin to send Helen a list of community contacts to assist DDEC in identifying appropriate individuals to participate in a summer workshop on use of Traditional Knowledge in revegetation for closure planning.

The Directors also discussed the IACT site tour note provided by the Executive Director. DDEC indicated that the new owners did not buy the project to simply close it down. Consultations have begun with Aboriginal leadership about extending the mine life. The company is saying if the communities are not interested in extending the mine life, then it will not happen. It was mentioned that Diavik had some experience in moving the heavy equipment between its mine and the mainland on barges.

➤ **Security Review**

The company submitted its estimate of reclamation liability to the WLWB in March 2013. It is not clear to the Agency exactly how this will be reconciled by the WLWB considering that some financial security is already held under the Environmental Agreement. The new owner has also publicly reported that it has a letter of credit facility it has negotiated in the United States for up to \$265 million.

The Agency is concerned about the length of time that it has already taken to attempt to sort out financial security and the lack of a collaborative process. The Agency was in agreement with the process proposed by the company and approved by the WLWB, that would allow for face-to-face meetings and frequent exchanges of information and views. Although the WLWB allowed for submissions on the cost estimate produced by the company, it is still not clear how the security will be distributed across land and water related liabilities and across the various available instruments.

The Agency has sought clarification on these issues several times with both AANDC and the WLWB. It was also the understanding of the Agency that AANDC had retained some external expertise to review financial security at Ekati but none of this information has been made available publicly. It was agreed that the Executive Director should informally contact AANDC to clarify how financial security would be set and held under the Environmental Agreement.

Action Item #3: Kevin to call Robert Jenkins about financial security at Ekati including the next steps and if and how security will be held under the Environmental Agreement.

➤ **GNWT Letter on Zone of Influence Wildlife Monitoring**

The Directors reviewed the May 2, 2013 letter received from ENR that appears to relieve Ekati and Diavik from conducting any monitoring related to the Zone of Influence (ZOI) for caribou avoidance of the mine infrastructure. Essentially, this means that there will not be any more aerial surveys done for caribou monitoring in the foreseeable future. In the letter ENR mentions that they are looking forward to reviewing how other parties to the environmental agreements respond to this move to omit the ZOI requirement for caribou in favour of supporting other research and monitoring activities.

The Agency does not support this decision by ENR. The Agency remains concerned at the lack of progress in determining the possible causes of the ZOI and possible methods to reduce it through more effective mitigation. It was agreed that the Agency should indicate these concerns to ENR and all of our Society members.

Action Item #4: Kim to work with Kevin in drafting a response letter to ENR for all the Directors to review.

➤ **Bathurst Caribou Range Planning Workshop**

GNWT ENR invited the Agency to participate in a multi-stakeholder workshop to begin planning for the entire range of the Bathurst caribou herd. The workshop is to be held July 4-5, 2013 in N'dilo. It was agreed that Kevin and Jessica should go the workshop on behalf of the Agency (Kim Poole was unavailable due to prior commitments). [Note that the workshop was subsequently postponed until 12-13 November 2013.]

➤ **Communications Update**

Jessica reviewed her communications efforts to date including the distribution of the Agency newsletter. It was suggested that the covering letter that is sent out with the newsletter to our community contacts, be reviewed to ensure that there is a clear request to distribute or place them in a prominent location.

There was some discussion on the Agency's overall information management needs and how to better organize the resource centre. This included the need to better network the Agency's computers and to improve our web hosting service provider. A student or part-time assistant could be considered to assist with digitizing material that could also be added to the timeline website. There may be an opportunity to work with the company too in better archiving older project materials. The Directors agreed that it would be worthwhile to pursue a phased, invitations Request for Proposal for the Agency's information management needs. It was also agreed that the Communications Update should be placed earlier in the agenda for the next Board meeting.

Action Item #5: Jessica to work with Kevin in drafting a Request for Proposals on the Agency's information management needs.
--

BRIEFINGS BY VISITORS

➤ **Fisheries and Oceans (Bruce Hanna)**

August 23 will be Bruce's last day with DFO. Stu Niven will be the lead for DFO on Ekati but has not been able to move to Yellowknife yet. The Directors expressed their appreciation for the work that Bruce has done over many years on Ekati. Pete Cott will also be laid off by DFO. DFO now has no engineers left in its habitat section and offices in western Canada have been reduced from 16 to 5.

DFO recently approved the Pigeon Stream Diversion (PSD) that included some design changes based on lessons learned from the Panda Diversion Channel (PDC). Ten years of monitoring will be required for the PSD. The security deposit for the PSD Fisheries Authorization is \$325,000. All of the Authorizations are in the process of being assigned to DDEC from BHPB. DFO is looking at a small project on the Stagg River to replace a perched culvert with a bridge, as habitat compensation for the Carrie-Desperation stream that will be covered by the expanded Misery waste rock pile. DFO is meeting with Lukas Novy, DDEC on July 10 to discuss pit lakes reclamation and habitat issues. DFO recently issued a scientific collection permit to DDEC for some baseline work in Lac du Sauvage.

Tim asked Bruce about DFO's review of the 2012 AEMP report. Bruce indicated that the report was good but there were some gaps in fish sampling. Bill asked about the delay in widening the PDC and implications for the Fisheries Authorization. Bruce did not know when the work might take place. He thought it would be more helpful to do the remaining habitat work in the PDC sooner than later and to allow closure of the Fisheries Authorization.

Bruce was asked about the habitat compensation fund related to Ekati. He thought it was still around \$1.5 million and said that there is a proposal to do some contaminant

work on Frame Lake to determine whether habitat enhancement efforts might to worthwhile.

➤ **Wekeezhii Land and Water Board** (Ryan Fequet, WLWB Regulatory Manager)

The recent Board meeting was delayed partially due to a low number of current Board members. The Board is waiting for the GNWT nomination which then must be appointed by the federal minister. Regarding the ICRP annual progress report, the Board recently met and discussed this item. The Agency will attempt to incorporate the decision in its upcoming Annual Report as one of the recommendations dealt with progressive reclamation of the Old Camp.

The WLWB also recently set the financial security for Ekati at \$263 million. There will be a detailed Reasons for Decision released shortly. Mark Cliffe-Phillips is working with AANDC to clarify how the security will be implemented.

There was a workshop yesterday on the Diavik Response Framework. It is a good document that will likely be approved by the WLWB over the summer. There was good participation at the workshop that included AANDC, the inspector and EMAB representatives. The work on the Diavik Response Framework should feed into guidelines that will be developed by the full Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board (MVLWB). MVLWB staff recently met with AANDC and GNWT staff to try to finalize the closure and reclamation guidelines. AANDC wants to make sure that GNWT is supportive of the guidelines as devolution is set to take place soon. The three issues that required some further attention from the last draft were engagement (largely resolved as the MVLWB dealt with this matter through a separate set of guideline and a policy), the prescriptive nature of the language in the document (everyone is now on side with this), and setting financial security (still working on this with AANDC).

Ryan also mentioned that the MVLWB had issued a standard list of terms and conditions for land use permits and a process that should be used to develop new conditions. Bill asked how devolution will impact the WLWB. Ryan said that all inspectors will become GNWT employees, except for inspections related to certain contaminated sites as AANDC will manage these ones including inspections. There are some discussions about how to better coordinate inspections under various federal and territorial legislation.

The Directors asked about the status of the water licence renewal. The new water licence has been sent to the Minister and a letter was received back saying that there was a need for an additional 30 more days to review it. The WLWB built in this time to the work plan in case the Minister required additional time. During the water licence renewal process, the one thing that was not an issue was the timeline. It appears that a

work plan with realistic or generous timelines is helpful as it allows for a much better licence in the end if the process is not rushed. The WLWB also found that having an early exchange of technical issues helped to resolve many concerns. Another factor that really helped the process was the quality of technical data that BHPB presented.

Bill brought up the Agency's continuing concern about setting appropriate and timely financial security. BHPB had put forward a detailed and collaborative work plan that was approved by the WLWB. There was some initial collaboration and discussions at various stages, then it fell to pieces. In the end a number came out, some opportunity for input was provided, but that level of collaboration and discussion was not provided. The Agency wants to be sure that we will be able to reassure our Society Members that there is sufficient security to ensure proper closure but the Agency cannot do that at this point in time. Ryan said that the WLWB has been thinking about financial security as well.

Action Item #6: Kevin to contact the WLWB Executive Director to see if a letter to the GNWT may be helpful in moving along a nomination to the WLWB.
--

➤ **Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada Inspector (Marty Sanderson)**

Marty is the new inspector for Ekati. He was with GNWT for 10 years as a renewable resource officer and then went to AANDC as a mineral claims inspector. He also worked as a resource management officer and has done inspections at Snap Lake and Diavik. It is not clear what will happen with his position during the upcoming devolution process.

Marty has completed two inspections at Ekati on May 15 and June 6. Marty typically breaks his inspections into "packages" because the mines are so big, and there is a lot to cover. Specifically, he looks at fuel handling, storage containment facilities, spills, waste handling, disposal, and contaminated materials storage areas. The last inspection was done around freshet to see how the company conducts its spring clean-up at the site. Some minor spills and issues were found but the company responded well.

Although there was no opportunity to go up to Ekati with the previous inspector, they reviewed the last three inspections together carefully to ensure there was proper follow-up on any residual matters. Marty can also contact Jason if he needs any more information.

The Agency noted how the number of inspections of Ekati declined over the last few years. Marty mentioned that there was a shortage of staff and that some staff were

called off to other matters. Some new hiring is underway which should relieve some of the pressure. Marty plans on visiting Ekati once per month.

➤ **Snap Lake Environment Monitoring Agency** (Dave White, Executive Director)

Dave shared some highlights from recent SLEMA activities including the following:

A TK workshop with the elders and the Board was held last week on the theme of wildlife. ENR staff gave an update including Karin Clark, who discussed her new position and what it entails.

- The AEMP is being reviewed; DFO and SLEMA have jointly hired a contractor to do a review. A technical workshop was held and the SLEMA comments will be posted soon. The WEMP results back to 1999 are being reviewed. SLEMA is seeking wildlife expertise to assist.
- De Beers will not be carrying out aerial caribou surveys. The company says it will contribute to other Bathurst caribou work. SLEMA would prefer something that is TK based instead of the aerial surveys. There was a discussion on the utility of the aerial surveys. Kim explained that aerial surveys at Snap Lake are less likely to provide robust data as the mine is at the edge of the Bathurst caribou herd's summer range. The Agency does not support the permanent elimination of aerial surveys in the Lac de Gras area, particularly when there is no alternative put forward or further work on the cause of the zone of influence.
- De Beers wants to raise the North Pile to almost 50 m. The company has still not begun paste backfill operations. The last review of this situation was conducted two years ago. SLEMA is concerned with how the North Pile will be capped or revegetated to prevent dust issues.
- SLEMA and De Beers had a falling out over the SLEMA budget negotiations last year, but the working relationship has been steadily improving. The SLEMA analyst is now at site and will go underground.
- Tim asked about a Response Framework and general water quality issues at Snap Lake. Dave mentioned that a Response Framework is part of the review of the overall AEMP and SLEMA will copy its comments to the Agency. The company is also considering additional water treatment options, including reverse osmosis, in light of rising Total Dissolved Solids levels in Snap Lake.

➤ **Environmental Monitoring Advisory Board** (Mark Fenwick, Executive Director)

Highlights from Mark's presentation and the discussion appear below:

- As of September 2012, there are four wind turbines on site that run almost continuously. They generate 1.69 million KW of power with only 30 hours of down time. In the winter, there were icing issues that led to automatic shut downs, but those issues have been fixed. The energy generated from the turbines is enough to displace 2.9 million litres of fuel per year. That equals 45 semi-transport loads of fuel. The payback period is expected to be six to seven years. The wind turbines will be one of the last things removed during remediation because they will continue to provide an energy source.
- Last summer Diavik ceased all open pit mining. All operations are now underground. Diavik had placed development of the A21 pipe on hold pending the sale of the mine. Now that Rio Tinto is not selling the mine, A21 may come back.
- The comprehensive air quality monitoring program has finally started at Diavik.
- There is an ongoing concern about the wildlife monitoring programs because there is a lack of baseline data which helps to determine the ZOI.
- Two dead wolverines were found inside waste dumpsters at the site. It is not clear how this happened but investigations are ongoing.
- The 2012 AEMP report was reviewed by EMAB and there were no major concerns. WLWB just held a well-attended technical session on the Response Framework. There will be nine identified action levels for a number of aquatic, biotic, and sediment related variables.
- Phosphorous removal is working better than expected as the two water treatment plants are working at about 50% capacity.
- Diavik has proposed a new format for the Environmental Agreement annual report. Last year it was an informative 117 pages. This year it is a 16 page PowerPoint presentation.
- EMAB and Diavik are in another dispute regarding the EMAB budget and work plan. Each has now submitted a budget and work plan to AANDC for a decision. In the meantime, Diavik has only provided funds to the amount it believes EMAB requires (\$150k less than the amount set out in the Environmental Agreement). There is no indication when AANDC may make a decision but the uncertainty is beginning to affect EMAB's operations.
- Bill asked whether EMAB has a position on the dropping of aerial caribou surveys. Mark said that it is difficult to know what the zone of influence may be for Diavik due

to its position on a small offshore island and the poor baseline data. EMAB has not taken a formal position on the elimination of the aerial surveys.

- Kim asked if there was any bird monitoring in relation to the wind turbines. Mark said that he understood that the company would be looking for any bird mortalities around the turbine footprint. Kim indicated he would be interested in seeing the results
- Diavik was a popular place for grizzly bears last summer. There were 18 bears on site in one day. Deterrent measures were used to move the bears when necessary.
- Tim asked whether Diavik had done any work to consider the cumulative effects on Lac de Gras water quality? Mark mentioned that the company has done some sampling at the south end of Lac du Sauvage. Relatively high mercury levels were found in Lac de Gras and the company wanted to see if this was a regional phenomenon. Testing in Lac du Sauvage found similar levels.

➤ **Dominion Diamond Ekati Corp.** (Bob Overvold, Eric Denholm, Claudine Lee)

Bob introduced himself as the new Manager of Environment and Communities, having been hired two months previously. Eric said that the transition to the new owner of Ekati has been smooth with most staff remaining. DDEC has moved most of its senior Executive level employees to Yellowknife.

Claudine stated that the incinerator stack emission testing would begin the next day. Preliminary results were fine. More detailed analysis needs to be done off site. A draft incineration management plan is being reviewed internally now and should be out for formal review in the fall. The incinerator building on the inside looks very good but the company has not yet decided how to deal with the exterior which has accumulated soot. The company has brought on a new advisor, Andrew Houghton, who has a lot of air quality experience. DDEC is also preparing a response to the SENES review of the 2011 Air Quality Monitoring Program report commissioned by the Agency. No date has been identified for the response. There was a community tour with a focus on air quality that began yesterday at the site.

The Agency asked how often DL-10, a dust suppressant, is applied at the mine site, particularly on the Misery road. Claudine said that it is applied once per summer, with supplemental road watering. The Agency noted that road watering is only effective for a few hours and asked if the company had considered another application of DL-10 part way through the summer. Eric said that the company could consider this and that some analysis of the monthly dustfall data might be helpful. Bob indicated that he liked the idea of evaluating the effectiveness of dust suppression. Eric committed to look into the

dustfall data to determine what the source of the dust particles may be that seem to coincide with the zone of influence for caribou avoidance of the mine site.

Claudine said that the company was in the process of responding to the comments on the 2012 AEMP. Tim commented that the results section of the report was good but the description of the fish sampling methodology was not. There was no rationale presented for the sample sizes. Claudine agreed and said that some difficult decisions had to be made in the field and should have been explained better in the report.

Bill said that the Agency would like to come up to Ekati for a site visit on September 16-17. If Brian from Rescan is still on site, it would be very helpful to have a briefing from him on the grizzly bear work and the camera study. Kim raised some questions about the camera study in that the objectives are not clear, and deflection may be happening outside of the range of the cameras and this not detected. Claudine said that the 2012 grizzly bear DNA results should be available by the end of June and that the company would put together a memo about this. The bear work is going ahead this summer with the first sampling session completed last week. Kim asked about the 2010-11 wolverine DNA sampling program results. Claudine expects that the report should be release shortly.

Claudine said that the technical and plain language versions of the annual reports were distributed. Kevin mentioned that he had been in touch with AANDC about when the formal review period would begin and end. He will follow-up again as this has not yet begun.

Bill asked about the Cell B revegetation and pilot study. Eric said the company is still studying how to proceed and will be conducting some design work over the winter, including rock structures. The final design plan will be submitted to the WLWB. The company is continuing to work with Harvey Martens and a new consultant Wilf Heatheridge. DDEC has also had some discussion with IW Kuhn, an experienced reclamation contractor. Bill indicated that the Agency had heard that the chemistry of the processed kimberlite (PK) in Cell B appears to be changing. Eric said the reclamation research report for 2012 had been delayed but it would show that the salt content of the PK at surface is increasing, and this may make revegetation a real challenge. The source of the salt is not clear but it is suspected to be water from the processing plant. Tim wondered whether the PK might begin to attract wildlife as a potential salt lick. Claudine said that there was no evidence of that happening yet.

Bill asked about whether the company would be installing any additional thermistor cables in the waste rock piles, particularly Misery and Fox where freezing does not

appear to be happening. Eric said that more cables are on the list of things to do. Geotechnical drilling was done in the LLCF last winter and the LLCF pilot study is now a priority, so the cable installation would likely happen after that.

Tim requested some additional information and clarification on the dioxin and furan sampling results as presented in the 2012 AEMP report. It was agreed that a teleconference with Rescan, Environment Canada, DFO and the Agency would be the best means to resolve any outstanding concerns. Claudine committed to get back to the Agency on this.

There was a general discussion of some preliminary plans for the company to extend the life of the mine. There have been some consultations with the communities but when there are firmer plans, the company will be consulting with other interested parties, including the Agency.

OTHER BUSINESS

➤ Future Meetings

Future meeting dates were discussed. The date of future Agency Board meetings and other activities were agreed upon as follows:

- September site visit, September 16-17, 2013

There was some discussion of potential topics for the Environmental Workshop including wildlife as a theme. It may be possible to work with DDEC to arrange the following presentations:

- 2012 grizzly bear DNA sampling data and results (Rescan);
- 2012 camera study and results (Rescan);
- ENR wildlife monitoring guidelines;
- Wildlife deterrence methods (DDEC);
- ENR analysis of wolverine hair from the diamond mines and Daring Lake and wolf collaring;
- Community presentations on any monitoring programs or special studies; and
- Agency presentation on testing dust as a potential cause of the Zone of Influence.

Meeting adjourned at 5 p.m. on June 26, 2013.

Summary of Discussion Approved by

Jaida Ohokannoak, Secretary Treasurer.