

**GIANT MINE OVERSIGHT BOARD (GMOB)
SEMI-ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PARTIES
May 15, 2018, 10:00 a.m. (MT)
Northern United Place, Yellowknife NT**

IN ATTENDANCE:

Present	<u>Giant Mine Oversight Board</u> Kathy Racher – Chair Ken Froese – Director Ken Hall – Director David Livingstone – Director Ginger Stones – Director Ben Nind – Executive Director Letitia Pokiak – Office Administrator <u>North Slave Métis Alliance</u> Nicole Goodman <u>Yellowknives Dene First Nation</u> Johanne Black William Lines <u>City of Yellowknife</u> Kerry Penney <u>Alternatives North</u> Gordon Hamre Todd Slack <u>Government of Canada (INAC)</u> Natalie Plato Aaron Braumberger Katherine Ross <u>Government of the Northwest Territories</u> Lisa Dyer
Regrets	<u>Giant Mine Oversight Board</u> Tony Brown – Director

Welcome and Introductions

Kathy: Good morning, everyone. You'll see today that we're doing the thing with the microphones again. The reason is so we can make a recording of our meeting. I don't know if you saw the notes from our last meeting. They were very helpful, because they were transcribed, and I

found it was much easier for us than trying to do minutes that adequately captured what everyone had said. So we're going to try that again. I'll get you to speak into the microphone and turn it off when you're done speaking.

Welcome everyone. I guess it has been six months since we have all been in a room together at the same time, but it feels like it's approximately the same weather, which is kind of sad. I was hoping to wear a nice sunny outfit today, but oh well. We're back in boots.

So let's start off doing a roundtable of introductions. I'm Kathy Racher, the Chair of GMOB.

Letitia: Letitia Pokiak, Office Administrator for GMOB.

Ben: Ben Nind, Executive Director of GMOB.

Kerri: Kerri Penney, City of Yellowknife.

Ken H: Ken Hall, Director, GMOB.

Gordon: Gordon Hamre, Alternatives North.

Todd: Todd Slack with Alternatives North.

David: David Livingstone, GMOB.

Johanne: Johanne Black, Yellowknives Dene.

William: William Lines, Yellowknives Dene.

Nicole: Nicole Goodman, North Slave Métis Alliance.

Katherine: Katherine Ross, Giant Mine Remediation Project Team

Natalie: Natalie Plato, Giant Mine Remediation Project Team for INAC or CIRNAC, Federal Government.

Lisa: Lisa Dyer, Director of Environment with Environment and Natural Resources and also part of the Project Team.

Ken: Ken Froese, Director with GMOB.

Ginger: Ginger Stones, GMOB.

Kathy: Okay, thanks everyone. There's lots of cord if you want to pull it closer to feel like a rock star. Go for it. I think Ben passed out a couple of things by email before the meeting, one

of which is the agenda today. This agenda looks very similar to previous agendas, except we did add an item. It's Status of the Application of the Calls to Action, Truth and Reconciliation Commission. We labeled it that, because it was an Action Item from the last meeting, but really it's about talking about reconciliation and progress on reconciliation. I think you were mentioning it was the City's recommendation to have that as a standing agenda item. So when we get to that point, we'll talk about how we want to talk about that.

Agenda Approval

Kathy: Are there any issues with the agenda? Is there anything you want to add or ask questions about? Anybody?

(Pause)

Okay, not hearing anything then, I'll ask for a motion to approve the agenda.

There's a motion from Ken Hall. Anyone can second.

Natalie and Lisa.

So we have an approval for the agenda.

Approval of Minutes from Semi-Annual Meeting of November 17, 2017

Kathy: The third item: Approval of the Minutes of Semi-Annual Meeting on November 17, 2017. The good news about this particular set of minutes is that there is a transcription of the minutes, although when I first looked through them, I noted all my corny jokes and weird pauses and stuff were perfectly captured in the minutes. Ben told me I wasn't allowed to take them out.

(Laughter)

Anyway, did anyone have an issue with the minutes from last time?

(Pause)

No? Well you guys probably didn't make as many corny jokes as I did. Okay, then can I get a motion to approve the minutes from November 17, 2017?

From the City of Yellowknife. Anybody else?

A seconder? Ginger, from the Board.

Review of Action Items

Kathy: Okay, Number 4 is Review of Action Items from the last meeting. There are 10 of them. We were talking about this before the meeting. What we meant to do, but somehow it slipped through the cracks, was send these Action Items out in advance and ask people what the status was. Since we only have two hours today, I didn't want to spend a long time going through the Action Items. What we're going to recommend is that we follow-up with each of the parties by email right after this meeting to check on the status and then share that with the group, unless there is something in particular somebody wants to bring up right now. Let me know if that approach is not okay with you, and if there are any particular Action Items you would like to bring up at this time.

(Pause)

Okay, I'm not hearing anything or not hearing any great disappointment in not going through all of the Action Items in detail either. But we will follow-up with you because it's important to have a record of what Action Items were done and what were not.

Meeting Organization: Appointment of Chair

Kathy: After all that, I see we're already on Agenda Item 5: Meeting Organization. So this meeting I started talking because we organized the meeting I guess, but officially we need to appoint a Chair, noting that a member from any party can be the Chair of this particular meeting...and my feelings would not be hurt at all. Are there any takers for the position of Chair for this meeting?

David: I nominate Kathy Racher to Chair the meeting.

Lisa: I second the motion.

Kathy: Seriously, nobody else?

(Laughter)

Okay, well we'll carry on. Maybe next time. Get a hold of me before the meeting and we'll have a plan.

Meeting Records/Secretariat Function

Kathy: Alright then, and in terms of Meeting Records/Secretariat Function, of course we are recording it, and we will have the meeting minutes transcribed. Okay, are we all good with that?

(Pause)

Status of Application of the Calls to Action: Truth and Reconciliation Commission

Kathy: Alright, let's get into the heart of things. Item 7 is a roundtable, so this is really an opportunity for us all to ...Oh my gosh, look at me go. Way to go. It's Item 6, thank you very much. This is why you shouldn't have appointed me Chair.

I also meant to say as Chair too, just in terms of meeting rules and procedure, I think I mentioned this last time, we want to have a good discussion today. This meeting is an opportunity for us to check in with each other on an official basis, although we do attend a lot of meetings together, and to talk about the highlights, priorities, and in this case reconciliation efforts as well. I just want to remind everyone to be open-minded and respectful in the idea that we're all trying to work on something together going forward.

Item 6: One of the Action Items from the last meeting was that the parties will voluntarily review and share linkages between their organizational mandate and operations and the Calls to Action as laid out in the National Truth and Reconciliation Report.

As an organization, GMOB – well, GMOB meaning Letitia – initially has gone through all of the 94 Calls to Action and picked out a few for discussion by our Board as what would be relevant for us in the context of our mandate of oversight for the Giant Mine. We haven't come to any startling conclusions. We don't have any documents or whatever to share, but it did really help us to get thinking about ways in which our recommendations, or even just our normal processes, contribute to reconciliation.

We didn't talk a lot about exactly what we would do with this agenda item in our meetings, but we thought it might be good to acknowledge how there are small and big actions to be taken for reconciliation, and that everyone has a role to play. We wanted to hear from each of the parties on how you are approaching reconciliation or what it means to you. We can go around the table and hear from you all, or if you have any recommendations for GMOB on what we could be doing better in the spirit of reconciliation. I think it was the City of Yellowknife's suggestion, so I'm going ahead and starting with you. You okay speaking to that first?

Kerry: I think it was Mark's suggestion. Specifically with respect to the Project, I don't have any direct application. The City considers the Calls to Action that affect municipal government in everything we do. The City of Yellowknife has provided training to almost all City staff. We have one session left where we spend a day out at the Chief Drygeese Centre and do the blanket exercise and meet with survivors of residential schools. So almost every City staff member has done that training to date, and then we'll offer it on an annual basis for new staff.

Another example was with the Arctic Indigenous Wellness Foundation. The City could have taken one of two approaches, and City Council kind of blessed the approach that was more in the spirit of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Calls to Action. We made some changes to bylaws and facilitated their project on City land, because they were not able to access the GNWT lands until the hospital was finished.

In all of our business, the City tries to consider the recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, but it can't speak to anything specific about the Giant Mine Project today. But it's always a consideration for us.

Kathy: Thanks. Thanks for that. That's really great that you do that every year and renew that awareness every year. Alternatives North, do you have anything you would like to add?

Todd: This was a matter of focus at an Alternatives North board meeting a few months ago. One of the board members was going to reach out to the Yellowknives recognizing that Alternatives North is what it is, that our best ability is to support other groups with how we can help promote reconciliation.

To that end, when I read the TRC, I see three areas of overlap, and I don't know if this is what you're hoping for. The three areas: You can pick and choose from the 94 recommendations, but it's pretty easy to make connections between a couple.

There is the literal history, like the mining history that's both environmental and social - what happened at the mine site, more or less itself. That would be within this Project's overview I guess.

The second level of that is the consequential or the tangential impacts. Here's where I get way outside my comfort zone, but to me at Treaty signing, the essential portion of the NWT hadn't seen a lot of contact-related events. So with Treaty, and Treaty was a consequence, although the Commissioners were pretty straightforward in their original report. It was a consequence of the Klondike mining. They had never intended to sign Treaty, but then they got pulled in, and they're like, "Hey there might be gold up there too."

So the Treaty was entered into, and with that you started to see real government coming North. Here in the Yellowknife or the North Slave region, I don't think we saw a lot of government until mines really started to come in. Down south in the Fort Smith area, you had government coming in with all the consequences of that. Then after Treaty, you had residential schools and the consequences the TRC dealt with. Up North you had contact with whalers and the Arctic Ocean, and then the DEW Line. That's their sort of evolution of history.

So I think that there is probably a really interesting and maybe something revelatory that makes the relationship that the Yellowknives and Tłı̨ch̓ô had with the land and how that was affected as Yellowknife was established. Then that is slightly different than what I think

TRC got at. I stand to be corrected, and this is all off the top of my head from last night and this morning.

Then the third item is how to relay that to newcomers to the Territory. I've only been here 15, 18 years, right? You saw how poorly I just described some of the things that I think about, and I know relatively little in that time. But if there was better education for anyone moving to the Territory... I know GNWT is talking about direct emigration from other countries, helping people understand and assimilate to local cultures, and some sort of cross-cultural training... I don't have anything solid, but I think these are the themes that can be captured from this Project and the intent behind TRC. That was my thinking, and if I said anything really dumb, I'm sure the record will capture it. We'll get at it next year.

(Laughter)

Kathy: Thanks, Todd. For the first blush, I didn't hear anything really dumb, just for the record. I really appreciate those ideas and thoughts, and you having put thought into it to share with us. So thank you. William or Johanne, would you like to add something?

Johanne: Thank you, Todd. I really do like what you suggested, but that's something that we've been trying to get at for many years in terms of telling the correct history of the Yellowknives Dene and the relationship that they've had with the Giant Mine Project, which wasn't a good one. I'll say this again: The Yellowknives have never really gotten anything out of that project other than death and destruction. There is the need to recognize the impacts that the Yellowknives have had with that project, but also there is a need to tell the history of the Yellowknives Dene and the relationship that they've had with that development project.

The other thing that I'd like to talk about in terms of reconciliation is that there is also a really strong need to incorporate Traditional Knowledge into the Project, into the planning of all the developments that are going to be happening there, which is lacking at this point in time.

When it comes to the water licensing stage, you can rest assured that when it comes to that point in time, if TK has not been done in this point in time that leads up to that, we'll be really, really pointing that out in terms of the disparity that is associated with the Yellowknives Dene and the Project. So that's what I'd like to say.

One of the other things too is that there is a need for us to really maybe talk about reconciliation in depth, not maybe at this level but at another level, and what that means for the Project. How do we achieve that together? I'm sure that we won't be able to come across with anything at this level here, but at some point in time, this discussion is very important and it should be had.

One thing I'd like to say right now, which is near and dear to me – sorry – is our Elders. They are at that point and time in their life where they are very...how do you say that? They're

very vulnerable at this moment, and they're not going to be around very long. They are very...what do you call that...delicate at this point in time in their life. They're not going to be around for the next two years. So it's time we start talking about this. Thank you.

Kathy: Thanks, Johanne. Yeah, they're not here in the room today, so you're right. We can't have that in-depth discussion, but I appreciate hearing your thoughts. Go ahead, William.

William: Just on a side note, I have a question to the Project if there is any update on the blanket exercise training. I know that you've been attempting to set it up for the past 8 months it feels like. If we could get an update on that, that would be good.

Kathy: Okay, well why don't we take Nicole first, and you can update as part of this, if that's okay William. The thing I forgot to say that David is about to remind me is please say your name when you hit the button for the transcriber. Nicole?

Nicole: Nicole with the North Slave Métis Alliance. I'm not sure what I can add. Johanne, that was really well said. Institutionally, we're still struggling for a lot of basic recognition of rights, and I think because of the level of engagement, the Giant Project Team is one of the organizations that we have a better relationship with. I'm looking forward to seeing more incorporation of TK and also moving forward with socioeconomic benefits. That's all.

Kathy: Okay, thanks Nicole. Now from the Project and you can answer William's question as you're talking.

Natalie: Thanks, Kathy. That was one of the items I was going to mention, the update on the blanket exercise. So the Project Team is certainly committed to the blanket exercise, and we had it scheduled the week of June 4th. Then we realized Craig Wells, our Director is off on leave – extended leave – and won't be back by then. As well, Brad Thompson, our Project Lead from PSPC is off on extended leave at that time too. So we thought those were two key individuals we did not want to miss on the blanket exercise, William.

So we're working with a trainer to reschedule when they're back, but we're absolutely doing it. We want to get everyone on our team to participate, especially our southern team members as well, not just the Yellowknife group. So it's a bit of a challenge to get everyone here in Yellowknife, but we did want our two leads to be in that blanket exercise. The day of June 4th now, we're working on. We don't know when Craig will be back, and that's part of our challenge. We're hoping it's soon. We do miss him. I know Brad is off all summer on a family vacation. Anyway, we're certainly doing that blanket exercise, and that was one of the ones I wanted to talk about, as I think it will be a very good training and learning exercise for the Project Team.

With the other activities, recognizing that we can use socioec benefits to meet some reconciliation targets, we heard from the Yellowknives Dene that they wanted a Socioec Officer. We have funded that, so we look forward seeing that person come on board this

year, as well as some capacity at the Yellowknives Dene as well. Similarly at North Slave Métis, we had increased capacity as well, so we've given that capacity as well.

Of course, the Project as a whole is a reconciliation exercise to repair the damage that has been done, and make sure it is done safely, environmentally friendly, and conscientiously. I think those were the three items I thought I would mention at this time. Thank you.

(Pause)

It's Natalie again. Just to follow-up, we did do some reallocation of funding from the Yellowknives Dene, and there was \$50,000.00 that went to the TK study last fiscal. We're just working on finalizing the amount for this year as well. So we recognize that the TK study needs to get done and will get done. What didn't get done last year with the amount we funded, Lisa will talk to that. Thank you.

Lisa: Lisa here. I'm looking directly at David as I say this. The things that the GNWT are focusing on in regards to the Project to support reconciliation is first Traditional Knowledge gathering to be able to support the Project. I think we chatted...when was it? I'm trying to remember. It was last Thursday we chatted about trying to get together this week. I'd like to meet with Johanne and William to talk about how we can get the funding in place and support the Traditional Knowledge that is being gathered. That is very important, and that's something we are definitely are committed to assisting you with.

We also are committed to assisting, hopefully through the Traditional Knowledge study, being able to assist getting the history of the Yellowknives Dene First Nation down, getting it recorded for you with respect to the history from your perspective associated with mining in the Yellowknife area.

Then the third aspect that is not necessarily part of the Project Team but to support the work that the Project Team is doing, is we are working within the Government of the Northwest Territories in the different departments to look at what programs can be aligned to support opportunities associated with the Giant Mine Remediation Project. The goal is to maximize the benefits to Indigenous people as well as Northerners to be able to participate in that Project.

For example, we know that the Project is going to be having certain activities occurring, so can we support through the Education Department training programs? We're looking at how specific programs that already exist within the GNWT can be aligned to support the Project and support participation in the Project.

Natalie: There was one item I wanted to address, and it was about the Elders, although you say it is a discussion at a higher level. I can report that Matt Spence, the RDG, has met with the Chiefs, I believe within the past couple of weeks. I don't know the exact date. But they agreed to form an Elder's Committee to get the stories and capture the stories from the

Elders. That will be happening at the RDG level and with the Chiefs and the Elder's Committee. So it will be happening outside the Project.

That's more in response to the recommendation on the apology and compensation. I think they had an Elder's Committee scheduled for this week, but Matt was called out of town. I'm not sure when that has been rescheduled, but that is the update I have on that item. Thank you.

William: Lisa, that's good to hear that you're looking at different ways for different opportunities. Right now within the Yellowknives Dene, we have a newly-formed department, the Dechinta Naowo department. I'm sure Natalie is familiar with it. Anyway, they do lots of training, and they work towards getting our members ready for the workforce. I'm sure that money found for different opportunities can be fed into that department very well.

Johanne: Yeah, you did mention that you're looking at building some training opportunities, but maybe utilizing some organizations in the Yellowknife area to conduct that training on your behalf is the wish of the Yellowknives Dene, to conduct that training if at all possible. I know Margaret does have a proposal into you to conduct some training opportunities, but if we can make it a robust program and the Yellowknives conduct a good portion or majority of the training, that would be really great. It would go towards the reconciliation. Thank you.

Kathy: Thanks for that. Does anyone have any specific recommendations for GMOB in terms of what we can do? I think it's in our minds – reconciliation – when we're making our recommendations certainly. But if there is anything operationally or anything you think we could be doing better in this vein, we'd love to hear your ideas.

Johanne: One of the things I'd like to mention as well, is that the proposal that we sent in has to deal...A part of the TK proposal that we did send in was to do some training in terms of what Traditional Knowledge is and how it can be incorporated into the Project. The reason why we included that is because we also see the need to let the Project be aware of what Traditional Knowledge is, because they are struggling with that.

We recognize that in terms of all the plans that have been delivered for the Project, it's lacking that. They seem to think that when they come to the community for the SDE session and hearing a little bit of TK here and there, that's good enough. It's not. That's not the way you do TK work. So I'm hoping that if we do find the funds to assist the Yellowknives in doing the comprehensive TK study, it will be a part of that program as well. Thank you.

Kathy: Thanks, Johanne. That does make sense. Todd, you had something else?

Todd: I'll look to the room to outsource collective memory. Is there not a measure or suggestion for the Project to develop an educational module? No? Okay, so I'm getting a nod.

Natalie: I believe it's a suggestion. We were working with Toxic Legacies. [Sandlos and Keeling] was at this outfit out of Memorial. They were developing a component, and I believe they finished it.

Todd: Yeah, sorry. I hadn't really thought about this until I saw the agenda. This conversation...There might be an opportunity to build off the residential school module. I don't know if it was ECE or the Boards that developed it, and I'm not arguing the same scope here. But the comprehensiveness of that module that they deliver is really good. Whoever did that maybe would be able to provide either starting points or whatever, but there's an opportunity there that they put all that time and effort and have experience in developing that module. Perhaps there's an element for the Giant history, Giant land use, that they could look to develop that as well. So if it's a measure of suggestion, GMOB could help start that, or you guys have your own experiences too. Yeah, there's an opportunity there.

Kerry: Yeah, it was ECE as far as I know. What the City of Yellowknife did was contract a consultant who tailored that project to provide a course for City of Yellowknife employees. So it definitely has been done before where a group has taken what was developed by the Government of the Northwest Territories and tailored it for their own use.

Kathy: Okay, thanks. That's a very specific suggestion that we will check out. No, I mean it's good to have specific suggestions.

Todd: Rather than general rambling?

Kathy: Yeah, other than just do better. Sometimes it's helpful to have avenues to go, but I think we've thought of a few ideas as you have talked to us. Do any Board members have anything to add at this time?

(Pause)

Our general way of doing things is we take in information and then sit down as a group and talk about it. So you've given us a lot of ideas and information. For me, I think it's useful to explicitly have this on the agenda and have an update. It feels like across the country, reconciliation and how that process goes is ever evolving. So to me it's useful. I'll ask for the group to concur whether it's useful to keep having this on the agenda, because I think things will evolve over time. Does that sound okay to everyone? Go ahead, Johanne.

Johanne: I'll go back to what Todd was talking about in terms of materials and curriculum, and all that kind of stuff. Right now we did have John Sandlos and Arn Keeling working on curriculum development. They have taken it as far as they could take it, and then they passed it off to us. We've contracted that work out.

At the present time, right now we still...*(sigh)*...we're not teachers. We don't have the expertise within our organization, within our band to develop that type of curriculum.

We're struggling at the present time with that. So any ideas that you have in terms of getting that ball rolling again and getting into the schools will be very helpful with the Yellowknives Dene. I think it takes a coordinated approach on that one. We're looking at everybody here to help us with that.

Because in reality, the story doesn't only capture the Yellowknives Dene. It captures all Northerners. This is us. In terms of the next generation, which is your kids and our kids, we do have the need and a responsibility to them. So if we could try to get that achieved that would be very, very great. Thank you.

Kathy: Okay, thanks for that and for putting that out there. We will definitely follow-up with you to see where this is at. I want to look up some of the links and talk directly to you about that. Anything further?

(Pause)

No? Okay, thank you for sharing all that. I learned a lot. We will keep on working on things.

Roundtable Individual Party Highlights: Priorities for the Next Six Months

Kathy: Okay, so Agenda Item 7 – are we okay with that? Here we are looking at highlights from each party. I'm sorry. Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa: I was just going to suggest that maybe we have Natalie give an update first, and then I can add to that from the GNWT perspective as Co-Proponents for the highlights.

Kathy: You wanted to go first just to...

Lisa: We would go after the Government of Canada if you are going in order.

Kathy: Oh I'm sorry. Okay.

Lisa: Sorry if I'm not being clear.

Kathy: Right. You want to go together is what you're saying? We'll do INAC and then GNWT?

Lisa: That's absolutely what I'm asking. Thank you.

Kathy: Am I on it now?

Lisa: Yes, thank you.

(Laughter)

Kathy: Okay, I think I've got it now. We will do that then. We put in bold in the agenda that we were trying to ask about priorities for the next six months, your priorities for the next six months. For us, hearing that is very useful to know how to schedule our time and to know what's most important to all of you. So if we have a limited amount of time to work on things, what's important to all of you is really helpful to know - how we can plan our work to help you achieve what your priorities are. With that, the Yellowknives Dene are first on the Highlights and Priorities.

Yellowknives Dene Highlights and Priorities

William: I'll start off, and Johanne can add in after I give my priority list. So outside of the regular items like the site tour and all our summer activities, the main priority in the background, at least for myself, is ensuring that there is the inclusion of Traditional Knowledge in the Project.

Last year, we got \$50,000.00. That was about a quarter of what we needed. This year, the Project is saying it is a crunch year, so we're unsure if the Project is going to fund it. GNWT has committed roughly a fifth of what we need, so we're still unsure of where the funds are going to come from for that work. There is a big lack of certainty on our end of whether it's going to get done in time to be included in the water licensing process.

We would very much appreciate some form of commitment from the Project to ensure that work gets done before we start rolling into the water licensing process. So for me that's number one. Johanne, do you have anything to add to that?

Johanne: My only comment would be... William is absolutely right. That is a priority for the Yellowknives Dene. Also, we've had a big discussion this morning in terms of reconciliation. This is one of the ways you achieve reconciliation, ensuring that the voice of the Yellowknives Dene is included in the planning processes for Giant Mine. When it comes to Traditional Knowledge, it is very lacking at this point. We do have to agree on that one. Mahsi.

Kathy: Okay, thanks. It's good to have a good strong statement. We asked for a priority. You gave it to us, and that makes sense. So in terms of the water licensing process, I think it's sort of the pre-engagement on the package this year. Then the process in front of the Board will run next year. So that's when you're looking to have the study done, by next year, yes? I'm seeing nodding heads.

William: Well, to get it done as soon as we can so that it is implemented into the package. If we could get it done right now, and it's thrown into the pre-engagement, the sooner the better on our end.

North Slave Métis Alliance Highlights and Priorities

Kathy: Okay, thank you. The next group is North Slave Métis Alliance. What are your priorities in the next six months-ish?

Nicole: I would say that our top priority moving forward is socioeconomic stuff. Our leadership has had some really good meetings so far with Parsons and the MCM team. We're very encouraged by that. Parsons has come forward approaching us. That's a really good attitude and really good spirit. We feel positive about that.

I'm looking forward to the QRA. We had some really good community interest in that. People are quite interested in talking about the overarching disaster scenarios that capture people's imagination.

We are also planning on doing our own Traditional Land Use Study this year. Shin is dealing with that. It's not me, but I know he is hoping to roll it off of the Archeological Impact Assessment and use that as a springboard to get that going. So it's good timing to be able to parcel those two things together at once. That's it.

Kathy: Okay, thanks Nicole. I realized I should have asked if there are any questions for the Yellowknives or the NSMA before we move on, although we don't have to be too formal. We can bring things up at any time. Are there any questions from the Board members or anyone else for Yellowknives or the NSMA right now?

(Pause)

Okay, the next then is the Government of Canada.

Government of Canada and GNWT Highlights and Priorities

Natalie: I have a number of priority items for the next six months, but hopefully most of you will already know these because we have been speaking about them often. So hopefully none are surprises.

Starting with our onsite work and the Site Stabilization Program, we're beginning the backfill of the C509 stope complex. That's a high priority for the next six months to get the contractors on site and start working to begin filling that stope. That will be the last piece of work under the Site Stabilization Program. I think everyone is familiar with the Site Stabilization Program. It's the emergency work that could not wait for the full remediation project.

In addition to onsite work, we are also putting some submersible pumps in from surface that are the Akaitcho pumping site. Right now our existing pumps are at the 750 level, and

they are accessed by going underground for maintenance and routine work. In an effort to reduce our underground footprint, we are seeking some wells from surface at Akaitcho. That job will be finished in the next few months. That will then reduce the footprint of our underground access requirements, so we won't have to go into the north end of the mine. It just makes it safer for workers as well to be able to do it from surface.

So those are the two big onsite projects we're working on right now and for the next six months.

In terms of getting prepared for remediation, Nicole already alluded to our QRA or our Quantitative Risk Assessment. We've already kicked it off at the Working Group. We did a presentation and talked to people about how they want to be engaged in that process. That will begin at the end of this month, and it will take us over the next six to eight months to complete that QRA. I have December in my head, but I could be mixing up dates.

The next item is our water license pre-engagement. We plan to release our post-EA water license package in the coming weeks and have a public engagement session on June 5th to let everyone know what's in it and see how they want to be pre-engaged in terms of technical sessions in the fall. This would be in advance of our January 2019 submission of the official package to the Board. So it's the pre-engagement phases that we'll be in the next six months.

We are also doing an Archeological Impact Assessment, as Nicole alluded to as well, working with the North Slave Métis and the Yellowknives Dene to do a comprehensive archeological impact in advance of the water license package.

We hope there's capacity of everyone willing to kick off our stress study, which is one of the subcomponents of the HHERA to look at stress. We definitely want to kick that off in the next six months.

We will continue the Measure 6 work that has started recently on the Long-term Funding Options Analysis. We will continue and hopefully be wrapped up by December.

The Health Effects Monitoring Program, or as Ken likes to call it, the Arsenic Testing Program, is continuing as well. It's a priority for us as well to finish the second round of sampling and start getting results in and back out to people.

Then as well, we will continue the talks on socioec, developing our approach and talking to stakeholders how the socioec benefits will roll out in the coming months when we start advancing into remediation.

Those are just a few of the things. Those are most of the priorities I think. Then of course, hand-in-hand with that, is working on the design and finalizing designs for water license submittal involving the actual technical remediation details. Thank you.

Kathy: Okay, any questions for Natalie? I think I have questions of the Project Team, so I might hold my questions until you've both spoken. Are there any questions for Natalie right now? Go ahead, Todd.

Todd: Maybe I misunderstood. I was looking at these challenges like, "Hey, what can GMOB do? What do we want GMOB to do?" I know you guys had a big meeting yesterday for a fair part of the day, but for the Parties' knowledge, are there things that you would hope to see better or see more of from GMOB to help you guys do your work? It's mostly an opportunity to talk about the challenges or the priorities. It's up to you, but if you're covering ground already, I apologize. I would just be interested to know how this body could help the process as well.

Natalie: We certainly didn't prepare that as our priorities, but off the top of my head, certainly having the storefront is helpful to us where we don't have a walk-in available. We heard from GMOB that communication is certainly something that the Project Team struggles with, so that is something we'd certainly be interested in exploring, better ways to facilitate communication through the storefront.

Kathy: Okay, anything else before we move on to the GNWT? Go ahead, Lisa.

Lisa: Some of the priorities for the GNWT over the next six months and over the year are we want to increase capacity to support the Project. So we are looking at bringing on an additional person. Right now it has been Erika that has been dedicated full-time. We acknowledge that to be able to better coordinate and assist the Project Team as well as coordinate efforts within the GNWT, we need additional capacities. We're looking at bringing on a second full-time person to be dedicated to the Project.

When it comes to priorities, as I mentioned of course, our priority is to continue the support that we give to the Project. Some of the areas that we have been heavily focused upon, based upon the resources we've had, is helping out with the Human Health Effects Monitoring Program, helping to finalize the Closure and Reclamation Plan as well as preparation and engagement for the water licensing.

The second priority for us is that coordination within the Government of the Northwest Territories so that we work very closely with the different departments. We have established a working group so that we can keep people informed of what is happening with the Project and look at how the different programs within the GNWT can be leveraged to maximize benefits from the Project. So that's another focus.

Then, our priority is to work on the Traditional Knowledge study. Hopefully we've tentatively made plans to meet with folks this week to be able to move that initiative forward.

At some point maybe later on, I want to give the updates on the Project. I can also provide an update later on. I don't want to confuse it with what's happening with the Project, but the GNWT is focusing on moving forward some work on legacy contaminants. That's outside the Project work, but it's also a priority of the GNWT. Maybe after as an add-on item, I can provide a bit of an update on that initiative as well, because I think people are very interested in what work is happening there and the priorities on moving that forward over the next six months.

Johanne: Lisa, we had a discussion this morning regarding reconciliation and the Truth and Reconciliation Report. I know as part of that report, there is some talk in there about how to reconcile the past in terms of socioeconomics with First Nations. I'd like to know where you're at with that, because I know you're basing a lot of your dollars that are getting generated for GNWT out of Giant Mine as well.

There is the need to work with the Yellowknives as well to ensure that a lot of the socioeconomics come to the Yellowknives. But you have a part to play in that too, and it's not just INAC. It's also GNWT. I know you're working with CanNor to develop some training plans or socioeconomic plans or those types of measures, and maybe getting the NWT population ready for employment and socioeconomic opportunities for that. At which point in time will you be coming to the Yellowknives and working with us to ensure that gets done, and focusing a lot of your efforts in terms of trying to achieve a good relationship with the Yellowknives towards reconciling what was lost for us?

Lisa: Obviously I am working with a group of people through our working group, so that is something we can discuss a little bit more as reconciliation through the working group. I am happy when we meet this week to talk a little bit more about how we can consider reconciliation moving forward in respect to the GNWT program. Maybe that's something we can add to the discussion when we talk about Traditional Knowledge.

Johanne: Thank you.

Kathy: Working group...there are so many working groups. Which working group specifically are you speaking to?

Lisa: We have an internal socioeconomic working group.

Kathy: Okay so that's internal to the GNWT.

Lisa: Correct.

Kathy: Okay. It is hard with all these different hats. You speak to INAC as a whole and the Project Team, and you speak for the Project Team and GNWT. Anyway, I'm starting to get the layers here.

Lisa: I have about five different hats on a given day.

Kathy: Are there any questions? Go ahead.

William: Lisa or Natalie, can one of you provide a commitment that you will find funding for the Traditional Knowledge component of Giant Mine? That wasn't mentioned in either of your talks.

(Pause)

Natalie: So we just had a little sidebar. We'll have to talk about that and meet with you, and get back to you on that.

Kathy: I may have blanked out for a second. William, you were asking about Traditional Knowledge and getting more certainty about that? Was that what you specifically asked?

William: Yeah, I'm looking for certainty that the work will be funded, because at this time we don't know if we're going to get the funds to be able to carry out that work.

Kathy: Yeah, that was going to be my question too, addressing that uncertainty that was raised. What you're saying is you don't have the answers today, but you're working on it. It sounds like there will be a meeting this week to discuss it further as a group? If you could just clarify...

Lisa: I commit to meeting with the Yellowknives Dene First Nation and discussing how we can look at funding opportunities for the TK study.

Kathy: I guess part of that is the timing aspect so that there will be sufficient time to roll the information into the water licensing process. I think GMOB would like to hear about how that's going as an update at some point.

Lisa: As I said, we are committed to looking at how to make this project go forward. I have not had the opportunity to review the proposal, so that's why I want to meet with you guys so I can understand what the proposal is. Then I can look at how we can secure funding for that. But I can't commit at that time, because I haven't reviewed the proposal yet. That's my hesitation, not that we're not committed to working with you. But I need to do a little bit of homework first.

Kathy: Okay, thank you for that clarification. Another question I had: You talked about a public meeting to introduce the water license application package. I just wondered what that was going to be like. Are you going to go over all the things that will be in the package? Is that the plan? I'm sure there is a list of 15 things or something that will be in the package. I just wanted to imagine what that meeting would look like.

Natalie: Great question. We haven't completely finalized what it will look like, but it will go over all the components of what the Remediation Plan will look like. So it won't be that different to the public forum we did in March where we announced a lot of the big components of the Reclamation Plan. It will be similar, but we'll just try to get more people involved and gather feedback on where they would like more engagement on specific technical sessions.

I think that was actually a recommendation coming from GMOB that we should do that and really try to narrow the focus for the technical sessions we would like to have in September. So it's more of an introductory, get-out-there, explain-what-it-is to people and then get some people talking on where we should focus our energies.

We did drop some fliers. Ben, I think you got some folders that have the dates and things. He said he would put them out at the public meeting tonight. Thank you.

Kathy: Go ahead Johanne.

Johanne: I have a question to Natalie regarding the components that are going to be part of the water licensing package. Is TK included in any of those?

Natalie: I don't have my water license experts here, so I will have to get back to you on that.

Johanne: I can acknowledge that when it comes to your experts, they haven't come to us to ask us what we hope to see out of those planning processes that include TK.

Natalie: I know along the way, we've met with GMAC for specific components, as an example for the outfall location. We consulted with GMAC and took their recommendation on where to locate the outfall. So in that respect of those specific items, TK is incorporated in terms of our engagement with GMAC and the Yellowknives Dene.

Kathy: I was going to say that as we're going through the package, we'll start at the working group level and we'll take this here to go through. I was just going to say, I would personally like to know as we're going through the many components of the package where you or anybody else sees how TK is or should be involved. It would be helpful for me to understand better, so I'm going to make that a priority going forward to listen for that and to try to think of ways where if it hasn't happened where we can get that.

Natalie: I would echo that as well. When we're going through these sessions whether at GMAC, working group, or public sessions, if there are specific items that you want us to look at, then please raise them. We're certainly open and receptive to that. Thank you.

William: I think the point Johanne is trying to make is that the public engagement sessions that happened with YKDFN, while they are good, they are not an end-all fix-all for Traditional Knowledge. Just because you come to GMAC does not mean that all of Traditional Knowledge is included in the design process for whatever component it is. I guess what

Johanne is trying to say is that until there is some form of a comprehensive Traditional Knowledge report or work done, then in our eyes it is not good enough.

Kathy: Thanks for that clarification, William. I think I understand. Thank you. Are there any other questions for INAC or GNWT at this time?

(Pause)

Okay, then we'll move on to the City of Yellowknife for your highlights and priorities for the next six months.

City of Yellowknife Highlights and Priorities

Kerry: One of our priorities for the next six months will be the continued work to coordinate an approach to the Project. We've had numerous meetings with different people from the federal government and some from the GNWT with respect to planning of projects. For example, in 2021 when the Project is going to be ramping up, the City could be in the middle of building a \$45 million dollar aquatic facility.

From our perspective, it's necessary for the GNWT, the feds, and the City to work together so that we can stagger these projects to expand the ability for residents to be able to work on the various projects, to expand the length of time that there is work, and to ensure that we have capacity in the North instead of having all the projects happening at the same time and have southerners to come fill the jobs.

Following up on that, capacity building is a huge priority for the City. We've been having some meetings with the federal government about actual plans and the work that will actually be done on the ground. Time goes very fast. We're already in May 2018. We're having a lot of meetings, and we haven't actually seen anything come to fruition yet, so that's a huge priority for the City.

The City is currently working on our part for a post-secondary feasibility study that also involves work with the GNWT, because we will need changes to the GNWT legislation. Even if that study comes back with glowing recommendations, we're hampered by current legislation, so we're working at that level. As well, the economic impacts – all those play together.

The City would like to see as much benefit for residents as possible. We're currently undergoing our Community Plan Engagement over the next year. That looks at ways the City should grow over the next 10 to 15 years. We have to account for increased workers, where they are going to live and stay, and even things like daycare to ensure we are at full capacity in all respects to accommodate all projects that will be happening in the next 5 to 10 years.

So we have some pretty lofty priorities. And of course, there is the number of hours in meetings to attend all the Giant Mine engagement. So that's it for us. It's going to take longer than six months, but that is from the City.

Johanne: I have quick questions for the City. We all know when it comes to the City of Yellowknife, the City of Yellowknife is named after the Yellowknives Dene First Nation. There is a direct linkage between what the City of Yellowknife does and how it impacts the Yellowknives Dene. A lot of the socioeconomic planning and planning that you're going to be doing should include the Yellowknives Dene and not just people outside of those two communities of Ndilo and Dettah. At which point in time will they be coming to the Yellowknives Dene to begin some of these planning processes?

Not only that, but my question also has to deal with the history of the Yellowknives Dene. At which point in time will the City be working with the Yellowknives Dene to tell that history and make it public? That's one piece that's missing from the whole City. The only story that is being told is through the flag that is hanging within the City limits. That's the only story that is being told. There is no recognition of who we are within the City, and that has to happen.

So my question to the City would be in terms of reconciliation with the Yellowknives Dene. Where are they in that? I know that a lot of the work that comes out of the City, we don't have the capacity to deal with that either. Reconciling that there is a need to work with the Yellowknives but also assisting us to help work with you to get some accommodations met for the Yellowknives would be very, very great and would be very welcoming as well.

Kerry: Yeah, we fully recognize that there are capacity issues outside of this, that we can engage with YKDFN. I recently attended a council-to-council meeting with all the members of YKDFN and the City of Yellowknife Council, Chief, and Mayor. Our Heritage Committee is working directly with YKDFN in ways we can recognize and include YKDFN in things that the Heritage Committee does or plans to do. For example, our economic development and tourism initiatives, we've tried to include YKDFN on all those committees in an advisory capacity.

However, we do recognize there are some capacity issues. It's a lot of work for a few people. I'd love to chat with you outside of this. We've had some internal discussions about how to engage better, recognizing the capacity issues. So I would like to connect outside of this to discuss ways that we can facilitate that so that it's meaningful and we get the outcome we all want.

Johanne: Thank you. I will touch base with you after this. Thank you.

Kathy: Thank you. Are there any other questions for the City of Yellowknife, for Kerry? Go ahead.

Ken F: Kerri, I'm encouraged to hear your commitment to planning for the economic impacts and staggering projects, and all that kind of stuff. One of our concerns as a Board, and mine personally, is how does this Project make the community better? In 10 years or 15 years when we look back as a large group, can we say we're in a better spot than we were in 2018?

I think we had some discussion about this yesterday here, needing a champion to say what the vision is and to develop that vision with the community – with the business community, with the YKDFN, with NSMA, with Alternatives North – and say, "What do we want this community to look like in 10 years, 15 years, and for the next generation?" It is a lofty goal, and it's a challenge. Yet, it's an exercise in questions that need to be asked. So the Chamber of Commerce, the collaborative committees understanding Traditional Knowledge and where that fits in...I guess I'm just encouraging you to keep pushing that, to keep blowing ahead on that. Thanks.

Todd: I'm delighted (?) with what we're talking about, but I think that's a real good point – that planning aspect. If I can be direct on this, my personal hope for this site is different than what I heard William say. My sense is that you don't want to see anything out there. I like anything positive, more structures that would involve further skiing or any kind of that stuff, biking... who knows. I grew up in southern Ontario, eh? I told this story on the record before to you guys. I played baseball on an old chemical plant. I golfed on an old municipal dump. It's unfortunate that I was surrounded by these old sites that were flat un-useful.

That vision that you're talking about, we all have our different ideas, but reconciling where it's going to go... We've been avoiding it in the short term, because getting to the licensing stage, the environmental stabilization. But I think that collectively, whether you want to call it reconciliation and we all agree, or that we work to establish constraints with opportunities at a minimum and then just kick down the road a bit with more understanding of what is possible and what is impossible.

I think that's a useful initiative to start. That's going to be a forever-one, trying to figure out what our interests are, the land use planning aspects. This came up both in the criteria and at the hearing. Sooner or later – I guess I had the same conversation yesterday – sooner or later, somebody's got to start working on this issue and doing it together. If it's through the City planning then great, whomever. Whether GMOB wants to take that on, then great. I'm going to bet that you don't. Yeah, I think that's one of those things that we've got to get to work on.

Johanne: I really like that you brought that topic up because...

Todd: I don't deserve any credit.

(Laughter)

Johanne: Sorry. Both of you brought that up. One of the things that I've been struggling with is that one piece there in terms of what the site will be used for in the future. I know that William is pretty adamant in terms of how he thinks the site should look, but he's going on based on what the Elders are telling him. So he's working on behalf of the Elders.

I also recognize that the Elders have their own visions. There is also a need for us to work with the Elders in terms of how we really incorporate the Elders' visions for that site but also modernizing it as well. How do we get them buy into maybe utilizing that site for other activities so we never lose the message out of Giant Mine?

Right now, you hear this 'gray and ugly' that the Yellowknives are pushing for. We want the site to be gray and ugly. We seem to think that if we keep it that way, it'll promote the stories that will go into the future generations, so future generations will always ask why that site looks like that. That was the thinking behind it.

Knowing that's the thinking behind it, I also recognize that there also needs to be more work with us – the Project, Alternatives North, the City – in terms of how we can utilize that site and maximize the opportunism that could be available to us there. So I'm trying to change William's mind...

(Laughter)

He's basing it all on the Elders, right? Sorry.

Todd: I don't know that it's necessarily changing minds. Sorry, I'm going to take that big example. If the idea is about ensuring that the educational or the knowledge component is passed on, maybe there are other ways to do that rather than 'gray and ugly,' but still achieve that result. Getting at those interests is a starting point.

Johanne: I agree, and I've been looking into that matter. Right now, I can say that we've also made contact with...who's that person?

William: I can't remember whose name it is.

Johanne: He's a landscape architect. We're developing a relationship with that landscape architect to come work with the Yellowknives in terms of what the visions are for the site. That's something that we are well aware of, Todd, and it's something that we're struggling internally in terms of the visions of the Elders – incorporating those visions but also tweaking them as well. We're working on it. We see that this 'gray and ugly' is useful, but maybe enhance it. Thank you.

Ken F: It's Ken here with GMOB. The visions for the site are crucial, and looking at how to use the site in the future for the communities collaboratively would be wonderful. Another aspect of what I've been considering is a vision for the community relates to the broader social

side of social economics, which is more within my professional activity I guess, and that's the community wellbeing.

There are many aspects of social economic development that are not just jobs and not just building the economic base for the community, but building the educational, the healthcare, the emergency services, the cohesiveness, and the resilience of the community. Those are fluffy terms in some ways, but they are extremely important. I remain convinced that the \$1 to \$2 billion dollars that will be spent on this project can be leveraged in many ways to look forward to those kinds of goals. So think lofty goals and aim at lofty goals. Consider any progress forward to be a success I guess.

Ginger: I was really encouraged by the comments from the City as to how they were looking at the other projects coming forward and trying to see how they could de-conflict some of the impacts. But there is an alternative way to look at it, and that is how the benefits from each of these projects can create a cumulative bigger bang than each of them individually. That goes with not only scheduling, but also the building of a workforce that goes from one project to the next. Maybe in the training programs, one can lead to a training program that assists the next one down the road, and the next one down the road.

So initially it's like seed money that in turn helps build into the future. It's going to take a lot of coordination and leadership to keep that in mind every time one of these individual projects comes forward, because every proponent is acting in their own best interest as opposed to thinking of how we can align our interests with the interests of the community down the road. It will be I'm sure, quite a challenge, but it's one worth always having in the back of your mind. How do we leapfrog this project onto the next one?

Kerry: The three governments have committed to having a planning meeting in attempt to scope out upcoming projects' timing and put them in a calendar or spectrum. We haven't set the date yet, but we did have a meeting and commit to that. What Ginger is referring to, Industry Canada apparently calls superclusters. We also had a commitment from CanNor to set us up with Industry Canada to learn a little bit more about superclusters. They were quite excited that Giant Mine could grow into this way-bigger community benefit than just Giant Mine, leveraging all these other things that we've talked about this morning.

So we are on this, but unfortunately, it doesn't move quite as fast as we'd like. Scheduling can become quite of an issue. But we are excited and hopeful. We don't want the legacy of a plaque. It would be way better to look at all the people that are working or how many people are educated. Look at what we did. We don't want a statue or a plaque to say, "This is Giant." So the City is really focused on the benefits, and we are trying to make those as big as we possibly can.

Alternatives North Highlights and Priorities

Kathy: Okay, thanks everyone. Alternatives North is up next.

Todd: We're not going to talk about what we're doing. It's about what we think GMOB should be doing. The short-term priority, and everyone has hit upon it, is this idea of socioeconomic impacts. GMOB has been on-point with this already. I caught your interview this morning. This was one of the first things you said. It just seems like all these other issues - the stabilization part is moving along, but nothing is going to affect as many people in the short-term as this. We're going to run a billion dollars - well not 'we,' - but you guys are going to run a billion dollars through this town. I want to see as much of that stay here as possible.

Everybody has got a copy of our letter to the bosses about three weeks ago, maybe more. Anything that GMOB can do to help support that effort, either through collaborativeness... The expediency of this matter may require a little more stern approach than what we've seen in the past, a little more prodding. If you guys had to do that as a party, I'm sure Alternatives North will be 100% supportive.

I also thought about some of the positive events over the recent days. GMOB, the recommendations that have been put out this year and last, there are obviously no complaints on that. The expertise is...you guys are doing the job. I like the fact there doesn't seem to be...Through the Project or the parties or GMOB or the working group, I'm not picking up a lot of silo-ing. There is still some information like issues and making sure it's being done in a transparent manner. But yeah, there doesn't seem to be a lot of BS between the groups or "this-is-a-matter-for-here." We've talked about a lot of different issues today, and it's been really good about that.

There has been a lot of support on the water license, and I'm sure that will continue. We're looking to all you guys to help understand the mountain that's coming and the aspect for challenges as well. At one point it was priorities and challenges, or positives and challenges.

So the challenge - and I wrote this yesterday but you talked about it this morning. It's about the information transfer, and the Project suffers from this as well. There is a lot here. One of the things that I really like, and I mentioned this before - this is in a personal sense and this is not Alternatives North - is the infographics that the City puts out - simpler topical, thematic aspects as opposed to the newsletters that were traditionally used. Yeah, so that's a suggestion to the challenge. I don't know how far that will get you or anywhere at all.

The other one that we see emerging out of this water license submission idea to the Project Management Phase...You talked about the EM in the recommendations. We point to a couple of other things in Section 5 of the Agreement, which are the overarching trend analysis, and I understand that we're at the start of that. But start to develop what those are going to look like or try and make mistakes. If it doesn't work, let's change it. But as we get to that water license stage we need to keep our eye on the next step, what's after that.

Then my personal one – and this is not a six-month priority – is the Measure 6 suggestion. I don't have to repeat it here. This is what I see as the long-term guarantee of success for this Project. The GMOB has been supportive on that effort. Yeah, and whether additional expertise is needed for these priorities like the economic side of things or the socioeconomic side of things... Like if I had a ton of money, Ginger Gibson might be handy for that. She wrote the manual for that to help develop best practices.

I don't know. Like I'm trying to be positive and creative and offer suggestion anytime I have a bone to pick. So that's the end of our thing. Gordon, do you have anything to add?

Gordon: No, that's fine.

Todd: Okay, cool.

Kathy: Are there any questions or comments? Go ahead, Natalie.

Natalie: Can you just elaborate on Ginger Gibson? I'm not familiar with her or what she does.

Todd: Oh sure.

Natalie: Thank you.

Todd: Ginger Gibson runs a consulting outfit most of the time, but I think she's an adjunct professor. She wrote the IBA Toolkit and does a lot of socioeconomic stuff. It started out with the Tl'chô but she's around all kinds of First Nations and Inuit groups at this point.

Johanne: I have another suggestion. If it will be work involving the Yellowknives Dene in terms of socioeconomic planning for them, I would recommend we look at other places to do the socioeconomic planning instead of Ginger Gibson. That's just my suggestion. Thank you.

Todd: Johanne. What are you thinking there? Do you have people in mind? What do you want to get at?

Johanne: I don't have anybody in mind, but instead of sourcing it out to somebody directly, we should just look around and scope it out.

Todd: I'm sorry. I'm not saying 'yes' to this or 'no' to any other. I'm just saying this is a person in that field that could do the work. Yeah, it's GMOB's decision.

Kathy: Yeah, so I think your suggestion was if we felt we needed some additional expertise to find a specialist. That's basically what I heard.

Johanne: And if you could work with the Yellowknives in terms of identifying who the specialist may be, that would be great as well.

- Todd: Yeah, and I'm not saying you guys don't have it. You all have big brains and everything. But in my experience, the economic side of things can often use a person who does economic type of things.
- Kathy: Yeah, we have Ginger and Ken Froese to help us with that. My science background is almost virtually useless to help with these things, so they have been educating me. We'll take that under consideration for sure.
- Todd *(Inaudible)*
- Kathy: Are there any other questions or comments for Todd? Yeah go ahead, Johanne.
- Johanne: My question, I guess, is regarding Ginger Gibson and why her name would have come up in this. Yellowknives Dene First Nation recognized that Ginger Gibson works mainly with the Tlîchô, and the Tlîchô have always stated that they have a hands-off approach to Giant Mine only because they recognize that the Yellowknives Dene are the ones who have been impacted. My fear is if we bring Ginger Stone... I mean Ginger Gibson...
- Kathy (or Ken F): It's too late for Ginger Stones. She's in.
- (Laughter)*
- Johanne: Yeah, sorry. I meant Ginger Gibson. Ginger Gibson...I'm fearful in terms of somehow her working on that measure and then possibly feeding some of that information over to the Tlîchô, and basically loading them with the information rather than the Yellowknives. That's my fear. Whether that fear is legit, I don't know, but that's my fear.
- Todd: I can speak to that real quick. Ginger has worked – and whether it is her or not – the suggestion is that she does the work in this field. She wrote the IBA Toolkit. She has negotiated socioeconomic stuff. She helped the Yellowknives and Tlîchô collaborate for Gahcho Kue's IBA and negotiate the socioeconomic aspects of that. Don't think of this as her necessarily. She is a consultant and works for everybody. Pick somebody else. The importance is not the person. The importance is the outcome. The outcome would be that we're better able to ensure the socioeconomic benefits accrue to both the Yellowknives and Yellowknife. That's the goal, and how you get there is GMOB's decision. That's my recommendation anyhow.
- Kathy: I understand the recommendation, and I also understand the concern about the relationship between the Tlîchô and Ginger. I totally get it. Point taken. Where are we on the agenda? It's about us now. It's about us now for 10 minutes.

Kathy: Agenda Item 8 has us talking about our activities, annual report, research program update, and the annual public meeting. We just have 15 minutes left. You're going to hear about the recommendations if you come to the public meeting. Presumably you've all read them anyway.

I think we've handed out in advance by email – I say handed out, but I mean electronically – a report of our activities over the last year. Basically it shocks me to see the number of meetings we've been to, but I'm sure everyone at this table has been to all those same meetings, so I shouldn't be shocked. This Activity Report just talks about what we've done and what we're thinking is going to happen this year in terms of our work plan going forward. We're relying on some of the information from the Project Team on the Project schedule and the engagement schedule.

Certainly in terms of our own priorities going forward, we've heard some suggestions here, but we'll keep on the socioeconomic front. The Quantitative Risk Assessment: We'll be fully engaged with that. We continue to be engaged in the long-term funding aspect of the Project, the Measure 6 work, and we're going to dive deep into the water license application package as well. So we have expertise on our Board to deal with most of those things, so we'll keep going on all of those things. We'll take the recommendations that we heard today here into account going forward.

I don't know if I want to go into any more detail on the Activity Report unless anyone has any specific questions. Go ahead, Ginger.

Ginger: If you could look at Page 4 of the Activity Report where we're trying to develop our strategy for what we're going to do in 2018 and 2019, you'll see it's all yellow. Any help that we could get from the Project to figure out where these milestones will land for us so that we can plan and make sure we have the resources available to provide the deliverables or their comments...Some of them may be ongoing throughout the year, but if there are specific elements within here that you know. When you think like Measure 6 is going to actually land or some of these other items or some of the bigger pieces, if we could get feedback on that maybe through Ben so we can have some way to plan our activities then that would be greatly appreciated.

Natalie: Yep, certainly Ginger. We will do what we can to help you out.

Kathy: I take it when we get the water license package, we will have a look through it and be able to take a stab at what we think our priorities are in terms of engaging. A lot of the deliverables in here are bits - that will become bits of the water license application package, so we'll know better. Todd, did you have something to add?

Todd: One suggestion on this and one for the Activity Report: So the GMOB website under Administration as an example, my suggestion is the things that you guys are running all year

long don't necessarily have to go in there. But if you were going to schedule and say hey, once a year we're going to look at this, then put that in there. We're all aware of the website, but if you're going to do an improvement, an annual review, or annual update, whatever, that's what I would be interested in as an external party.

Yeah, sorry, if I'm starting to step on the Board...I'm trying to provide suggestions. I recognize the party independence of the Board.

Kathy: Are there any other comments on the Activity Report? Todd?

Todd: Sorry, I didn't run both of them up here. I have two thoughts here, and both are take-it-or-leave-it obviously. In terms of the Activity Report, I'd like some transparency on who is attending and participation. That might be useful. Like let's say I had a question about Item X. This guy was here for that one. I would either contact Ben, or maybe I should be just contacting Ben only and let him farm it out rather than contacting the directors. Anyway, I think I solved that one myself.

Then the second suggestion is for the different themes. If someone tasked to be the lead on it, it would just be interesting to know, like water quality stuff. I can only assume you're going to be the lead, as an example. Yeah, a suggestion.

Kathy: Okay, Ben is nodding his head. He understands. Yeah, I would encourage you when you have a question or want to know who you should talk to, to talk to Ben. Because there's the person who goes to the meeting – we try to get the best person to go to the meeting, but sometimes it's more than one Board member working on something in the background. So they may not have gone to the meeting, but they're still involved in a significant way. Then we'll be able to help you out with that and direct your questions to the appropriate people. Okay, thanks.

GMOB 2017 Annual Report

Kathy: In terms of our 2017 Annual Report, we went over it a bit yesterday with the Project Team, and we asked them if they had any particular questions about understandings and recommendations. Are there any comments or questions from the other parties on the recommendations or what they mean? We did have that pre-meeting before we released it, and we talked about some of them at that time. But are there any other questions on our Annual Report?

(Pause)

I would say too, for the suggestions on how to make that better, we're definitely open to that as well, if not at this meeting then anytime.

- Todd: Does the Project have any sort of hot-button things just out of interest?
- Kathy: No, I think we've had better communications in the last year, so I don't think anything was a shock and surprise. It's more of an articulation. In terms of the Research Program update, Ken do you want to give us a very brief summary for the group?

GMOB Research Program Update

- Ken F: Yes, the Research Program is being developed. It's a process that takes time and effort. We have been working with a group at the University of Waterloo called TERRE-NET. They are a multi-campus, multi-university networking research group that is funded now by NSERC, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

That group was identified to us through a research workshop that we held in Ottawa with a number of academics and research institute professionals from across Canada. The TERRE-NET network is focused on mine waste remediation, and they have many world-class experts in that type of research. We have had very good discussions with them, and we are pushing forward with those discussions. At this point, no agreement has been formally signed with them. Anything more?

- Todd: Again, I'm perhaps mixing negotiations and implementation. Early on, Andrew Applejohn was involved. Are you working with him? Is he part of the picture here? Is there a desire to have him just in terms of rolling out the research or developing the Research Program?

- Ken F: I'm sorry. I don't know who that is.

- Todd: He's a Science Advisor for the GNWT. He did some of the early presentations to the negotiators. That's where it's coming from.

- Lisa: Andrew Applejohn works for me, and he is the Science Advisor for the GNWT. He is responsible for the Knowledge Agenda and Implementation of the Knowledge Action Plan, and looking at how the GNWT can work with other institutions to maximize research initiatives in the NWT. So he is a resource if that's of interest, because there are many. I know Kathy is a wee bit aware of some of these things, but there's always an opportunity to chat with him to talk about leveraging partnerships. He's been working with several different networks and universities doing research in the NWT. So it's an avenue that's always open.

- Kathy: I have spoken informally to Andrew about what we're up to. I think we've got a good lead here with TERRE-NET. They are a network that specifically doing what we want to have done, and they have a specific expertise. Like I said, we're not in signed agreement with them. We're still courting. We're still developing a relationship to see how best it will work.

But certainly I do have informal discussions with Andrew on this occasionally. I know that he would be happy to help us at any time, especially as a local resource.

Todd: Yeah, and I'm not saying you need it or necessarily want it. I just hate silos. So I'm making sure that whatever offshore research is that there is a connection...offsite, not offshore. Blah, blah, blah.

Kathy: You're "blah, blah, blah" will be captured by the transcriber, I'm just saying.

Todd: So will all my "uh's" and "er's."

Kathy: That's right. Are there any other questions about the Research Program? Sorry there is not more to report at the moment, but that's all we've got.

GMOB Annual Public Meeting

In terms of the Annual Public Meeting, the doors will open at 6:30. It will start at 7:00 downstairs at the United Place. It's a similar format to last year, so we'll have a presentation that will be translated, allowing questions from the audience. The members of the Project Team will be there, and they are willing to take questions from the group as well on the Project if necessary.

We had thought about having someone from Public Health there as well, because a lot of health questions often come up. We were unable to secure somebody, but we are committed to taking down those questions and finding a follow-up mechanism. Lisa is going to help with that should those questions arise. We don't want questions to fall off the radar even if we can't answer them in the moment.

In the same sort of thing, we hope that people will come after the presentation and talk to other Board members or talk to each other about some of the information. Are there any questions about the meeting this evening?

William: I don't exactly have any questions, more of a suggestion. For the next Annual Public Meeting, could it be hosted in Dettah?

Kathy: Thanks, William. We'll talk about that as a Board. What's the best venue there?

William: At the Chief Drygeese Center, the Hall. Right now we don't have any funding to get our members to Yellowknife to attend these meetings. So at least if the meeting is hosted in Dettah, it'll be a lot easier for our membership to attend the meeting, specifically the Elders.

Recently we tried to apply for funds through our Annual Contribution Agreement to have membership attend your guys' meeting. However, that was struck out, as it is not a Giant

Mine Remediation Project initiative. It's a Giant Mine Oversight Board initiative. So we don't have any funds to get transportation or membership there.

Johanne: One of the constraints imposed upon us is how we get the Elders to these meetings. They need an interpreter first of all, to understand what is being spoken about at those meetings, which is not included in any of the planning that you're doing for these meetings.

The other issue is that the Elders don't have a bus service in the evenings to attend, and they are on a pension amount. They can't afford a \$60.00 cab ride as well. Those are the constraints imposed upon the members to attending this meeting, especially for the residents in Dettah. Thank you.

Todd: Can I ask, if the meeting were held earlier, let's say before the winter road closed, would that be a problem from your perspective? Like it's totally selfish.

Johanne: Yeah again, it's the Elders that we really like to attend these meetings. Having them paying for them to attend on their own dime is something that can't be achieved by them only, because if they pay \$40.00 to get them a cab ride, even on the winter ice road...

Todd: I meant in Dettah.

Johanne: Oh sorry.

Todd: *(Not on microphone)*: I know it's a paved road now. It's way easier, but if it's a winter road, it's...*(inaudible)*.

Kathy: I think what Todd was saying is that if we had the meeting earlier in the year in Dettah, it would be easier for Yellowknife residents to go if it was on the ice road, but there's not a problem with it being earlier in the year. I don't know that we could achieve that. We would have to discuss that, but...

William: I don't have a problem with it.

Johanne: Yeah, I don't have a problem with it.

William: Yeah, I mean as long as it is hosted in Dettah, it'll make it easier for Yellowknife residents to attend, sure.

Ben: So Johanne, just to your point of translation, we have translation at this meeting.

Johanne: That's great, but we're having a hard time getting Elders there tonight. So they might be there translating for nobody, because there is no way for them to get to these meetings.

Additional Agenda Items and Next Steps

Kathy: Okay, thanks. Point taken. Okay, Additional Agenda Items and Next Meeting/Next Steps: Do we have additional agenda items? You wanted to speak briefly about the offsite contamination efforts?

Lisa: So I'll try to provide clarity. As I mentioned earlier, I have several hats, so I am part of the Giant Mine Remediation Project Team, but I also am working on another initiative that is separate from the work of the Giant Mine Remediation Project Team, and that is legacy contaminants in the Yellowknife area. What we mean by legacy contaminants are contaminants from previous industrial operations such as the mines, mainly the ones that contributed to offsite - Con and Giant.

I have been kind of lead on this. We've been meeting with the INAC and with Matt Spence who is the RDG and talking about how we could advance looking at legacy contamination, because it has been one of those things that has come up in many of the public meetings. The public has more confidence about what's happening on the Giant Mine site, but still there is concern about legacy contaminants.

What we did is we worked with INAC, and I can't say CIRNAC yet. It doesn't roll off my tongue, so you'll have to bear with me on this one. What we agreed is that we need to first of all define what the issues are. INAC provided us with funding, and the GNWT specifically through my office put together a contract to do a Human Health Risk Assessment of legacy contamination. We hired CanNorth who did the work on the Giant Mine Project. They did the Human Health Environmental Risk Assessment, and part of the reason we use them was because they had a body of knowledge and had looked at a lot of the information.

We are working with them right now to do some...They did an initial gap analysis, and what they found was information offsite that is lacking - water samples in and around the Ingraham Trail area, and as well fish samples. There are not many fish samples to look at from the lakes. We're specifically looking at arsenic, although they are also looking at mercury.

What we have done is the GNWT in partnership with INAC – and again I'm just going to stress when I'm talking about INAC here I'm talking a group separate from the Project Team. We're going to go out and do a water sampling program in lakes that are used around the Yellowknife area, specifically along the Ingraham Trail, because that's an area that has been identified, to be able to gather and fill in that gap.

The other thing that we want to do is to gather additional fish samples. So what we will be working on is doing a community sampling event. We're going to ask people going out and gathering fish throughout the summer to bring in their samples. We're still defining that program, and we'll be rolling that out hopefully in the next couple of months. Sorry, by the

end of this month we'll have more details if people want to take a sample and submit it, how they can do that.

The first stage of what we did on Thursday is we had a meeting. There is a survey that we're asking people to contribute to letting us know how they use the area around Yellowknife. That information is being used to develop scenarios. So if we're looking at what people's risks are, how do they use the lakes? How do they use the areas? Then we can develop reasonable scenarios of what your exposure would be to be able to look at what the risks are. So for that survey, we had around 35 show up to the meeting on Thursday. They contributed in providing information into the survey.

That survey is going to be available until the end of May for people to contribute to. We are going to be coming back and meeting specifically with the Yellowknives in June. I don't think we've nailed down a date yet, but we'll do that hopefully when we meet this week. This will be to work directly with the Yellowknives together and get information on their use.

So really what we're trying to do is get a better understanding outside the mine sites, the risks to residents and fill in those information gaps. Hopefully that provided some clarity. One of the things we've noted is that it's confusing right now for the public, because we have some aspects of looking at residents through the Giant Mine Project, through the Human Health Monitoring Program, and through the Risk Assessment done there. We have health advisories done through the GNWT, and then we have another initiative that is looking at risks. So it is confusing to the public.

I like Todd's suggestion of the infographics. We're going to try to develop an infographic to try and explain the initiatives that are happening and how they fit together, because it is a little bit confusing for the public right now. If there are any questions I'm happy to answer them.

Ken H: Thanks, Lisa. Is Newmont involved in this, the current owner of Con Mine? Is it involved in the legacy issue at all, or is this purely a government initiative. Thanks.

Lisa: Currently it's just a government initiative. This is kind of the start of the program. Really what we want to try and do is define what the risks are and gather enough information to be able to reasonably define risks. Then we would be looking at working with other parties. But no, Newmont is not involved in this, because we are looking specifically offsite.

William: Lisa, I've got two things on the list here. The first one, for the fish sampling program, do you guys collect it yourself outright or do you do a community based approach? The major thing for the YKDFN is to include all parts of the fish: the skin, the oils, the muscles, the flesh, and the eggs. For a lot, if not all of the sampling programs that happened, they just looked at the flesh, whereas everyone in the YKDFN will eat just about every part of the fish except for the bones, and some people eat some of the bones. We try to use every part of the fish, so just to sample the flesh to us is not an accurate reading.

The second thing on the list is for the hotspots in Ndilo. I know we talked a little bit about this at the meeting on Thursday, and you said it's not your responsibility. It's the Government of Canada. We understand that, but I'm wondering if it would be possible...Since it's not your jurisdiction, would it be possible for the GNWT to provide an in-kind donation to the Yellowknives Dene and we could put up the signs ourselves? That way it's not your responsibility, but we will take care of putting up the signs and maintaining them. However, we don't have the funds to do so.

Johanne: Currently right now in terms of hotspots, nobody in our community knows where they are and what risks are imposed upon them. Signage would help out.

Lisa: As I said, I am working with the RDG of INAC, and I will bring that concern back to him, and I will express that you are looking for assistance to be able to put up signs.

Johanne: We're also looking for you for assistance to provide those signs. You do have signs that are up and within the Yellowknife area to create awareness of the risks. So we're asking GNWT to provide the same signs for the Yellowknives as well, in-kind.

Lisa: Thanks for that. So the clarification is that similar signs that are around the City of Yellowknife that were put up by the Department of Health. You're looking for similar support for that in your communities.

Johanne: Yes. Currently there is no signage within our community to let people know the hazards that exist in our community. We can't afford those signs, but somebody should help us with that. It's not our legacy. It's not our contamination, but yet our kids are playing in it.

Lisa: I will bring that concern up to Health. They are the ones that are responsible for the signage, so I will bring that issue up with our Health Department and the Chief Medical Health Officer.

Johanne: That's great, because a lot of times when we bring this up, it's always deflected off to somebody else, and nobody wants to be responsible.

Kathy: Thanks for that. Todd, it looked like you were going for the button at some point. You're out? He's out. Nicole?

Nicole: Lisa, I'd like to also have a meeting with you about that if I could. I had been talking with Erika, but it seems like she has been out of town for quite a while.

Lisa: I'd be happy to meet.

Kathy: Okay, thank you.

- Lisa: Thanks for an opportunity just to provide some clarity.
- Kathy: Sure, no problem. In terms of the next meeting, we have already started thinking of a date, and the date was – I'm looking at Ben, and he's looking at me like I'm crazy. It was the week of November 12th for our next meeting. We thought we would set this up sooner than later just so that it's done. Are there any obvious conflicts? That's the week before the Geoscience Forum. It's not during the Geoscience Forum. November 12th is a holiday right? So definitely not.
- William: I may be attending a training center a week before the Geoscience Forum. I'm not 100% sure on the dates, but I'll get back to Ben as soon as I can. I'm fairly certain I remember it would just finish and then Geoscience would be right after it. So let me get back to Ben on that, but the week before Geoscience might not work for us, or for myself at least.
- Kathy: Yeah, thanks. If you could get back to Ben right away, and if those dates don't work, we'll Doodle Pool this soon so we can just set the dates and put them in all our busy schedules. Okay, are there any last comments before we end the meeting for this time, this half-year?
- Lisa: Thanks again for a fabulous job of chairing, Kathy. I will nominate you again next year.
- (Laughter)*
- Kathy: I really must try harder to...not to do...anyway, thank you. What I meant to say was thank you, Lisa.
- (Laughter)*
- Okay, well with that, I want to thank all of you. Obviously everyone was really prepared. I can speak on behalf of the Board members. I think we've learned a lot. These meetings really, really help us out to touch in with everyone at the same time and have a good discussion. Thank you very much, and we'll see you at the next meeting after we have a motion to adjourn this meeting, as Ginger just reminded me.
- Lisa: I would like to make a motion to adjourn this meeting please.
- Kathy: Can I get someone to second?
- William: I second that motion.
- Kathy: Thank you, William. Okay, meeting adjourned. Thanks everyone.

MEETING ADJOURNED



Dr. Kathleen Racher
Chair, Giant Mine Oversight Board



Date

Motions; GMOB and the Semi-Annual Parties Meeting, May 15, 2018

Motion: Moved: Ken Hall moved to approve the agenda.

Seconded: Natalie Plato.

Motion carried.

Motion: Moved: Kerry Penney moved to approve the minutes from November 17, 2017.

Seconded: David Livingstone.

Motion carried.

Motion: Moved: David Livingstone move for Kathy Racher to Chair the meeting.

Seconded: Lisa Dyer.

Motion carried.

Motion: Moved: Lisa Dyer moved to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded: William Lines.

Motion carried.

Action items; GMOB and the Semi-Annual Parties Meeting, May 15, 2018

1. **Action item:** GMOB staff will look into the residential school educational module developed by the Dept. of Education, Culture and Employment (ECE) to determine whether one can be used to create an element for the Giant Mine history and Giant Mine land use. (page 11)
2. **Action item:** Lisa Dyer, GMRP/GNWT committed to meeting with the Yellowknives Dene First Nation to discuss funding opportunities for the Traditional Knowledge study. (page 18)
3. **Action item:** Kerry Penney, City of Yellowknife, committed to meet with Johanne Black, YKDFN, to discuss how they can work together, in effort to include the history of the Yellowknives Dene with the history of the City of Yellowknife and make it public. (page 21-22)
4. **Action item:** Todd Slack, AN, suggested that GMOB look into hiring a consultant to look into the socioeconomic side of things, to develop best practices on how to ensure the socioeconomic benefits accrue to both the Yellowknives Dene and Yellowknife. (page 26-28)