

NWB – Nanisivik

Notes on a Meeting – Day 3

**There were present:** Dionne Filiatrault, Bill Tilleman, Stephen Lines, Ramli Halim, Martin Van Rooy, Bill Heath, Bob Carreau, Eric Denholm, Rita Becker, Gladis Lemus, Joel Holder, Linda Tingley, Jeff Holwell, Norm Cavanagh, Stephanie Hawkins, Brent Murphy, Stephen Harbicht, George Hakongail, Stefan Lopatka, Derrick Moggy.

General Intro Comments

BT: Addressing crossovers with the license application. Left open for discussion. Deciding when to go to hearing, and asking if participants understand the purpose of today's meeting.

SH: Some of us will be competing with NIRB hearings. Doris is the week after.

BT: We have to plan it out.

DF: Location of hearing? No hotel in Arctic Bay.

BT: Bus transportation in Arctic Bay?

DF: Confirms the possibility.

BH: Site visit is required. It will take a couple hours.

DF: I will get Imo's reaction to this.

BT: That's a good idea. Split the hearing between Nanisivik and Arctic Bay. Parties are identified.

BT: Addresses draft list of issues and how much time required for Canzinco to answer the list and for interveners to respond.

**DRAFT LIST OF ISSUES:**

- 1) Commitment to undertake inspection under concentrate storage shed and the industrial complex including confirmatory soil sampling;
- 2) Mine stability issues

a) Requesting an update on NRcan analysis using current mine Conditions with the provision of a professional opinion on the future risks associated with mine stability issues

BC: This can be done pretty quickly. We'll say two weeks. We are looking at the opinion of an expert.

BM: We are looking for more.

JH: You would be granted a kind of conditional approval.

BM: We are looking for a validation of conditions.

b) Provision of Detailed design closure plans for the mine portals stamped by a professional

BM: We would start the process but not necessary before the hearing and we would recommend a conditional approval.

MV: What exactly are you looking for?

BM: A measure of security although we agree it is low. We have no professional confirmation on this. There can be subsidence over time. Long-term stability of the portals.

SH: Who responsible for portal closures? Mine safety or DIAND?

BC: There is more than one safety body.

MV: We have to follow the Mine H&S act.

RH: Add visual inspection of portals.

RM: We are not looking for quantitative analysis which would take 2 years. Look at existing ground conditions and compare to study of 8 years ago and if no changes it would be alright.

BT: Portals?

BC: We would address that in two weeks.

BM: Shouldn't be closed for 2 years and wouldn't stop hearing or approval.

3) Inspection of PCB storage facility

Shaw: Include confirmatory sampling.

BC: We understand that.

- 4) Additional testing of building material to be disposed of prior to disposal through burning or underground placement

BT: Didn't take much time yesterday.

BC: We understand GN's concern. In 2 weeks we can give sampling protocol.

GL: Include PCB.

- 5) Identification of Contingency Plan for alternate disposal for PCB

BT: What's this one about?

GL: Related to 3 & 4

BT: Is this 2 weeks?

ED: Develop protocol in two weeks.

- 6) Revisit the continued presence of the dyke at the toe of the landfill

BT: What would you propose?

ED: In two weeks a description of our approach.

- 7) Confirmatory soil sampling for nitrate and nitrites, at ANFO plant after remedial work is implemented

BT: Is the plant or is it gone?

BC: It's there.

BT: So sampling after plant is removed and you'll commit to this. Again in two weeks.

- 8) Twin lakes quarries boundaries more clearly define if expand and no less than 50 m from water

BT: Two weeks.

- 9) Ensure that future water sampling at the landfill includes BTEX analyses

BT: Ok with this one.

10) Provide implementation schedule

BT: Ok?

BC: Yes, we will submit something in 2 weeks. Mentions level of detail.

BT: Agrees with detail.

RH: We have to see it fit together. Time chart so we can see flow of activities. Are some continuous, other intermittent.

BC: Acknowledgment.

11) Schedule as to when report on additional geochem analysis

BC: Yes.

12) List of work proposed for Spring/summer 2004 (active reclamation, monitoring)

RM: That's more with implementation schedule. Goes with #10

13) List potential amendments needed for ongoing work (i.e., change boundaries pits)

ED: Inserted to other regulatory approvals.

DF: We have to keep in mind other potential requirement from other regulators.

BT: Heads up on this and cooperation. New applications have to be screened. Are we going outside of the leased area?

BC: Yes to the extent we can foresee we will.

ED: This is for interest, not exhaustive.

14) Follow-up by Parties:

- a. GN: report on alternative use (note: decision needed before portal seals in place if no use determined) and socio economic impact assessment, municipal water license;

BT: Ok for GN & DIAND in a couple days?

GL: Something concrete for that time.

SH: Can we get a list of other infrastructure that needs to be addressed?

BT: We've been waiting for two years. So it's unlikely. But maybe we can get an update.

BH: We've been waiting for five. Everything from two years ago is still there. Not all is in the same condition.

GL: I appreciate what you're saying.

BT: DFO needs to check agreement regarding the port.

b. DIAND: status report on Strathcona monitoring Committee (outline future needs)

15) Summary table of check/balance (volumes of waste /storage capacity)  
Update Table 8 WDP

BC: Murray will discuss with Stephanie and done in two weeks.

16) List of commitments made at Technical meeting by CanZinco: i.e. monitoring at Kuhulu lake, road assessment;

ED: Rephrase question to monitoring at Kuhulu lake.

BT: Ok and in two weeks.

17) Clarification no issue related to disposal pit water/wash water.

DF: We never received confirmation.

BT: Taken off the list.

18) Clarification of water supply ownership;

BT: This is a GN issue.

GN: We will include it as part of 14a.

19) Map of dock area lease properties and sampling done within/outside DFO lease boundaries.

DM: We need to go back and check maps.

BC: A DFO commitment.

DM: We have to see where the sampling was done and follow up.

SH: The EEM would have some sampling info.

20) Clarification on pore water/talik issues related to WTDA;

DF: Significant discussion on 1<sup>st</sup> day and I didn't want to miss issues on this.

RM: There is no issue so strike it from the list.

BT: Ok.

21) Parties clarify community consultation/reporting roles to update on remediation work ongoing/completed (NWB, DIAND, GN, NTI, DFO, etc)

BT: Can be assigned to 3 different parties. But the responsibility of everyone. Can we take this off?

DF: Take it off

BC: We'd like to see what something from the parties

BT: What about Patrick?

DM: What's the outcome of this?

BT: Ongoing consultation to let the community know what's going on after the mining company moves out.

BH: What about informal communication?

BT: An idea.

GL: Is this taken off?

BT: You just need to do it.

DF: It's an information request to all parties.

BT: Removed from list.

22) Addendum response to each plan/submission to address all comments written submission (GN, EC, DIAND, Acres), technical meeting discussion.

DF: Is there a need to have comments/questions consolidated to support plan?

BC: We have full intention to have a document and issue a final report that includes these things after license is issued.

BT: We all agree with that.

DF: That deals with 23.

23) Errata to address mistakes in Documents submitted

24) Clarification of East Adit contingency options (remediation/equipment availability)

BC: Ok.....two weeks.

MV: What's required?

ED: Need to keep using facility. Ties back to implementation schedule.

DF: That's right. Logistically how is it going to happen?

25) Monitoring of Portal area

ED: Considered as part of 2b.

BT: Yes removed.

26) Background on ice lens below complex;

BC: Clarify.

DF: Background info that was provided orally.

BC: Is that an issue?

SH: Is there something that has to be done to fill in cavern?

BC: It's a bonus, it speeds up permafrost aggradations. We can provide you with the information.

RM: It's info people are looking for.

MV: It really isn't related.

RM: Except for migration of contaminants. It's all at the same structure.

27) Discuss issue of contingency measures if issue of Hydrocarbons sumps of the complex;

RM: Related to #1, so remove from list.

BT: Ok.

28) Clarify cover variance between complex and concentrate shed

29) Cover variance 1.25m vs. 2.2m, identify source rip-rap material and contingency

BC: We discussed this. Contaminated area receives 2.2m.

DF: 28 & 29 were discussed and don't have further issues.

RM: For 28, it's contingent on what happens in 1. number 29 is clarified.

BT: GN is ok?

GL: Yes.

DF: Strike from list?

BT: Removed.

30) Status/process for review of operational license plans under review. (i.e., annual report, geotechnical inspection report, MMER pre-design report)

31) DIAND to submit Compliance Report

Shaw: An addition?

DF: It's the compliance report. I don't know when the last was submitted.

Shaw: It can be prepared.

BC: Can we get a consensus. Discuss specifically discuss reclamation? Do a roundtable.



GL: I would not agree.

BC: Be specific, let's put them down.

GL: What are the peripheral things?

BC: The conditions of the license, anyone of those.

GL: May I defer my answer?

DF: Other reports go through other review. I feel that we should keep it as focused as possible. We will make the reports available and we have all had the opportunity.

GL: I agree. As long as it is unrelated.

Shaw: Dealing with section G items. They should come in as separate entities.

BT: 30 is off.

SH: I thought if it was related to and it was still in?

BC: Anything specifically we will discuss them.

SH: We don't have to discuss unrelated items.

DF: Status report of EEM.

ED: Isn't EEM under a different function? Not being approved by the water board.

SH: It's approved by EC.

DF: It's status report, ID of issues, could come from EC.

SH: Yes.

BT: EC is on EEM.

32) Can the NWB sign off an uncertain reclamation plan given the ownership issues of assets?

DF: May not be a question. We spoke of this Stephanie.

Shaw: A question Patrick rose. Could the NWB sign off on a plan with these uncertainties?

BT: 32 is removed.

Break-

Resume time: 1032

MV: Status of facility as a training center.

BT: Up in the air.

BH: We hoped it wouldn't come to demolition the town. And we're waiting for GN on that.

BT: We are issue 4c. will we be ok with scheduling? Submissions are filed 15 days before hearings. Parties need time to reply. Translation. Busy summer. August is out. We can't go there in August. June 1<sup>st</sup>?

BC: Week of May 31<sup>st</sup>..

BT: Logistically we've pushed it tight. You tell us.

BH: Nanisivik is not the easiest place to do work. If it's pushed too long we could lose the entire season.

DM: I'm limited. I'll try and accommodate.

MV: Would work good.

SL: Our concern is the Arctic Bay residents and their opportunity for input. For our own purposes we will meet the time.

DF: Patrick is going up on Friday to update.

SL: Will they have time to prepare? If so, I see we can move ahead with the schedule.

SH: I do not see burning issues for us. The only area is the translation component and we can get over that we will be alright.

BH: Our documents?

DF: No, intervention statements.

BC: What sort of submissions?

BT: Keep it for the week of may?

NC: Are we going to get a chance to respond? What time frame for that?

BT: They don't allow for it but I believe all have a right to respond. Yes there is a right of reply but logistically will be one week before the hearing. But that's not good for Canzinco who won't be able to prepare for those replies.

NC: Unless the board waves translation it won't fit in the timeframe.

LT: What were suggesting regarding a submission being made at the hearing?

BT: right now the submissions would be due on the 17 May. Canzinco will file 20 or 21<sup>st</sup> May. Therefore, your response would have to be done at the hearing. Canzinco would be at a disadvantage and turns the table back to them.

BH: Of the 30 issues on the list, we could confirm those by 14 May. Get final submission for 20 May. Use 31 May to deal with oral submissions and start hearing on Tuesday.

BT: How long will the hearing be? Shouldn't be 5 days.

Shaw: Could we move it to the next week?

BT: Doris hearing next week.

DF: No way it can be done.

SL: If weather comes in reps won't make it.

BT: Community probably won't focus on tech issues. It should hold for that week starting on Wednesday.

BH: Commercial flight is only Saturday and Wednesday after..

BT: Wednesday night? Wednesday part of tech hearing at night.

BH: At nanisivik, it's closer airport.

BT: Any objections?

NC: Unclear. Initial responses by 17<sup>th</sup>? The earliest we can have it is 25<sup>th</sup> May.

BC: Your response to our submission?

NC: Our submission to the water board.

BC: Are there other things we have to talk about?

NC: I don't think so but could be, on the socio-economic front. We have to put a response to DIAND.

BC: If there is any response.

BC: Comprehensive list by Friday 14 May.

BT: Canzinco submits latest by 20<sup>th</sup>. Everyone gets a week (27<sup>th</sup>). Translation is problem at that point so we will talk to the board. Give us a one page summary as well.

BC: Canzinco will submit by 14<sup>th</sup>.

PD: That'll give a week to the parties.

Break – 5 minutes to discuss

Resume time: 1126

NC: If Canzinco follows through we would submit by 28<sup>th</sup> along with one page summary.

BH: And then we don't start hearing until 3 June. If we're all together in nanisivik we can go through questions on the Wednesday night.

NC: No objections. But we would carry those to the hearing.

BC: Any issues that come up, call us. We need to know if something big comes up before.

NC: We don't see that there are any big issues but we want to make sure those involved can see.

DF: GN?

GL: Same timeframe that we were looking at. ....something about a letter.

BT: GN comments on HHERA.

PD: You may or may not respond. The board will judge the comments to be valid or not. Canzinco doesn't have to respond, but the board will.

DF: Detailed exec sum. If it is less than two pages, the board will have it translated. Final hearing Thursday, Friday. Tech meeting Wednesday. For scientist & engineers to discuss. Has to be within the public forum. Our board

would become formal. Keep it as informal as possible. Canzincos might want to take the lead. Thoughts on that.

PD: Good idea for you to meet. Whatever is said must be reported during the hearing.

BH: Reminds of last tech hearing.

Shaw: Would be more items of clarification, exchange of info.

DF: Right.

BT: Site visit? Where is the hearing at?

DF: We have date & time.

BT: Staff want it in Arctic Bay for the local people. Site visit?

DF: Could happen Thursday morning. Afraid it'll be a whole day deal.

BH: Reality is that there's not much going on.

BT: A good video presentation.

BC: People from arctic bay are very aware of site. For those techs that haven't visited I request you attend tech meeting to visit site. Light outside until 12 midnight.

DF: A good photographic presentation for community members and putting into context would be useful. Regarding the techs, it's up to them. We could avoid the site visit.

BT: Presentation style.....party by party. Or. By issue? Or by major infrastructure component?

BT: Usually done by party.

ED: Is helpful to the board to go by report seeing as it has to make its decision report by report.

PD: It's easier.

NC: It goes back to the final reclamation report. It makes more sense to present it as one.

SL: I agree to present it as one.

The NWB does not guarantee the accuracy of the content and information contained in these notes and is not responsible for the misinterpretation of statements made by interveners. The notes are only intended to give a general idea of the topics discussed at the meetings and are not an official record of proceedings.

DM: I agree.

GL: I don't know. A combination might be more efficient?

BT: We'll take it back to the board.

BT: Any other concerns?

BC: What's the answer?

BT: We'll go to the board and issue the letter tomorrow.

BH: Accommodations....asking early is better.

DF: That'll be in the letter. Numbers of people attending etc. you'll know as soon as next week.

BT: Thanks for the offer.

BT: Any other concerns

No

BT: Thank you and look forward to seeing you at the hearing.