A BRUCE OTT: Bruce Ott, AMEC. Thanks for the question, Martha, it is a good one. I certainly brushed over that in my brief presentation. We would expect a minimum of five years of relatively intensive monitoring following operation. That might need to be extended if there is some issues or liabilities that arise during the operation.

MARTHA AKOLUK: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Are there any other questions from the floor? Ramli?

ACRES INTERNATIONAL QUESTIONS LICENSEE:

Q RAMLI HALIM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ramli Halim from Acres International. The first question is I was wondering if Tahera can help me clarify the mine life, I think one mentioned about eight years, and some of the graphs mentioned nine years.

A GREG MISSAL: Greg Missal with Tahera Corporation. Ramli, essentially we are defining the mine life as eight years. I think in some of the graphs they happened to include a year of construction, so essentially one year of construction, eight years of mine life is what you see when you see something that might seem like it is a nine-year mine life.

Q RAMLI HALIM: Okay. Mr. Chairman, the next two questions actually related to the divider dike. I understand that Tahera is planning to have a final design on the divider dike, and I have seen on some of the slide, the new slides that Tahera presented yesterday, and they have additional information about the divider dike.

The first question about the divider dike is related to the critical and the importance of this dike itself. During the life or during the operation of the mine, the west dam basically is a critical dam because it is containing the tailings water. However, after the mine is ceased operation, the tailings itself, the one that is located on the eastern portion of the dike became an important part because it will be left intact, and the divider dike, it will become part of the tailing dams that will be left over after the mine operations is completed.

My question is actually we just want to find out if in terms of the construction of the divider dike, whether the divider dike will be constructed in a dry or it is -- I noticed that it is made of rock fills other than just water and what kind of foundation preparation, and is there any problem with the talik condition? Because there will be

water on one side, on both sides before eventually it is going to be all freezed out, and I was wondering if this is going to be included as part of the design of the divider dike with all the stability analysis built on it.

A CAM SCOTT: Cam Scott, SRK. Ramli, a lot of those questions were addressed somewhat in a memorandum which we prepared following the technical meetings in late October. In essence, what the memo indicated was it provided effectively the design criteria for the divider dike in terms of its objectives, provided a preliminary design insofar as the main body of the structure and the zoning and transition and so on.

We acknowledge that there is some information yet to be gathered insofar as foundation conditions. The current expectation was that there would be some work over the course of this winter in terms of probing through the ice to get a handle on -- a better indication of the foundation conditions there, and as well as studies later, subsequently over the first phase of rock placement will likely be done over this coming summer, through the wet, as a first phase, waste rock only. And during that period of time, we would gather more information on the foundation. And as other

materials become available to -- like coarse processed kimberlite and some waste rock, to get a better handle on those properties with a view to defining the actual design details on the filter and the transition.

So, again, more work to be done, a schedule has been prepared, and a program of investigation has been prepared. Does that answer your question?

Q RAMLI HALIM: Mr. Chairman, yes, I think.

VICE-CHAIRMAN: Please state your name before you speak.

Q RAMLI HALIM: Ramli Halim, Acres International.

The second question is again about the divider dike. The crest on the drawing, probably that's the drawing that you have, it mentioned initially at elevation 520, and I just want to find out that during the life of the pond, the PKCA, what's the chances that actually the water level, particularly during a flood, that is going to raise above that and whether the divider dike will be designed to allow some kind of overflow?

A CAM SCOTT: Cam Scott. The intention is to have sufficient free board to be able to accommodate issues such as floods. There

will be effectively a swale or a means of overflow over the top of the structure as well to deal with those short-term infrequent events.

But the expectation is as the beach rises and -- the divider dike will be raised as well over time. The current thinking is the first phase would take it to approximately 517 this coming here and be raised accordingly, depending on what happens on the tailings -- or the fine processed kimberlite deposition.

RAMLI HALIM: Mr. Chairman, Ramli Halim, Acres International. I don't have any further questions at this time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are there any questions from Environment Canada to be addressed to the applicant?

ENVIRONMENT CANADA QUESTIONS THE LICENSEE:

Q ANNE WILSON: Good morning, it is Anne Wilson with Environment Canada. Thank you.

A question on the regulation versus monitoring of nitrate. In the previous submissions that had been proposed to have a regulatory limit, and I'm sorry if I missed this last evening, but I see now it is just for monitoring. Can I have just some understanding of why that would be changed?

A GREG MISSAL: Greg Missal with Tahera. I

apologize, Anne, if I didn't say that clearly or correctly, but it was nitrate that we are saying monitoring and nitrite that we would like regulated. Does that help?

Q ANNE WILSON: Anne Wilson. No, I was clear that it is nitrate that you are proposing to monitor, and I thought initially that was proposed for regulatory limits.

A KELLY SEXSMITH: Kelly Sexsmith. The proposed criteria that we laid out in the documentation was intended to come up with criteria for all the parameters that have -- various parties have expressed interest over the process of the NIRB hearing and the water license submission. They do not necessarily represent parameters that we feel should be regulated at the site, they merely present limits that could be used if the Nunavut Water Board chose to regulate them.

In the case of nitrate, the issues -- it has not been included in any other water license except for Snap Lake, and in the case of Snap Lake, again, they have a small lake with very little dilution and potential for algal blooms there which they are trying to prevent by having a nitrate limit. We don't feel that is as critical at this site, so that's why we suggest that it is included as a

monitoring-only parameter.

Q ANNE WILSON: Anne Wilson, Environment Canada. I would like to just make a point of clarification. On the Snap Lake license, it was a toxicity issue, not an enrichment or eutrophication issue. What we did do to make recommendation on that license limit was to look at the most sensitive native species. We did not use the tree frog that was in the CCME guidelines as a criteria, and came up with a number that would be protective from chronic toxicity and acute toxicity within Snap Lake as the nitrate will build up over time there. So I believe the renewal of the Ekati license will also have nitrate regulated, so I think we are seeing a trend that way.

Anne Wilson, Environment Canada. And I will apologize in advance if this was covered last night. For the release of effluent from the tailings containment area into Stream C3, I understand that the flow levels will be between the 5 and 10-year maximums and that Tahera has undertaken to monitor closely for any erosion which may occur.

The question that is in my mind is what contingency will be in place for immediate response if erosion is observed, because often once it

starts, it will be -- it will snowball a little bit, thermoerosion will lead to further erosion even if the discharge is stopped. Will there be materials onsite and equipment ready to install whatever mitigation is needed?

A PETER McCREATH: Pete McCreath, Clearwater Consultants for Tahera. The plan, Anne, is that the C3 stream would be inspected prior to any releases occurring from it. So it would be a comprehensive walk over and inspection looking for potentially weak areas, erodible areas, if those were discovered.

And I don't know if you have seen the stream itself, but it is somewhat hard to find sometimes. Weak areas would be reinforced with clean gravel, for example, or clean granite as riprap to prevent erosion.

The peak flows that you referred to would be for a contingency time of release. If there was the need to store water for a couple of years within the PKCA and then release two years' worth of water in a single season, then in that case, the average monthly releases over the peak month would approximate something like the five to ten-year return period flow in a natural stream, an event which has obviously occurred a number of times in

the natural channels, so it is not an extremely rare occurrence.

During discharges, there would also be monitoring going on to make sure that there was not ongoing erosion, and if there was, there would be the remedial measures that would be put in place would be to put in erosion-protection material as required.

ANNE WILSON: Thank you, that's all my questions.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any questions from DFO to be addressed to the applicant?

DFO QUESTIONS THE LICENSEE:

Q DERRIK MOGGY: Derrik Moggy with Fisheries and Oceans. A couple of questions I had, with respect to the C1 diversion channel, I was wondering if you could elaborate a little bit more on what the changes were that you were referring to in your presentation?

A RICK PATTENDEN: Rick Pattenden. The original design of the diversion channel called for no fish-friendly features, essentially a conduit to pass water. That has since been changed. The new features are the fish-friendly section, Reach C3. And within Reach C3, we have a defined channel that

will have the ability to contain standing water during low flow, which fish can use. In addition, there will be ripple pool sequences built in to that fish-friendly channel. These are the new features since the original design.

The specific redesign aspects are detailed designs of the pool ripple complexes which have been presented to DFO. And an additional redesign or adjustment would be a narrowing of the dissipation pond number 2 to address a potential issue of permafrost. That redesign has not been submitted to DFO for review, but Cam Scott may want to comment on his confidence in being able to provide that design to DFO.

CAM SCOTT: Cam Scott, SRK. Yeah, what you see now -- what you have seen now, Derrik, very much reflects what we can say at this time, and a lot of the details will be developed as we spend time in the field over the next construction season and moving into the actual construction of the diversion itself.

Q DERRIK MOGGY: Okay. Thank you. The other question I had was with respect to the fish salvage program which you used a protocol that has been developed by DFO to more or less be designed specifically for Long Lake. Has there been any

further discussion, I guess, with some of the local communities on the implementation of that fish salvage program and possibly the end use of the fish?

A GREG MISSAL: Greg Missal with Tahera. We haven't formally done that yet, Derrik, but the intent is to, through the KIA initially, I guess, ask them their opinion on which group might be the most appropriate to be involved in a project like that. I suspect that it is probably one of the HTOs or HTAs in one of the communities, and of course we would seek KIA's advice on that, and that would be the route that we follow on that program for getting the local input on the project.

DERRIK MOGGY: Thank you. No further questions.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are there any questions from NTI to be addressed to the applicant? Thank you. Are there any questions from KIA to be addressed to the applicant?

MR. DONIHEE: No sir.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are there any questions from the Hamlet of Kugluktuk to be addressed to the applicant? Are there any questions from the Nunavut Water Board to be addressed to the applicant?

WATER BOARD STAFF QUESTIONS THE LICENSEE:

Q DIONNE FILIATRAULT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Dionne Filiatrault. The Court Reporter knows my name, and most people know my name.

Just based on the actual presentation that you gave, I will start there, it is the most recent information that summarizes your overall submission. Could you clarify the predevelopment baseline work that may not be accounted for in the application?

What I'm looking for is there was a lot of additional baseline work that was required, and I'm looking more towards water quality or impacts to water that may have been requested following the NIRB project certificate, a commitment that would have been made by Tahera and the work would have been done, say, following the submission of this application in August.

Has any work been done this summer that is not represented in here or that has been taking place up to now?

A BRUCE OTT: The work that was -- sorry, Bruce Ott, AMEC. Dionne, to answer your question, the work that was done this summer which I alluded to was the aquatic effects monitoring

program, the detailed summary monitoring which also included a collection of -- another collection of sediment which was requested by Environment Canada.

The one thing that I can think of that's outstanding with respect to the request from Environment Canada and commitments by Tahera is late winter oxygen levels. We applied for a permit under NRI to do the work up there. Unfortunately, it -- in October last year, unfortunately it wasn't issued until June, and by then it wasn't really representative conditions at that time.

Q DIONNE FILIATRAULT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm aware of the one outstanding issue of dissolved oxygen. Has discussion taken place with Environment Canada as to the frequency and proposed submission or reporting of that information either back to Environment Canada, or do you plan to provide that information to the Board? And if so, when?

A BRUCE OTT: Bruce Ott, AMEC. We had one note about a month or so ago from Environment Canada with respect to when the aquatic effects monitoring program might be available, specifically the sediments. What we left with Environment Canada was that the sediment report probably could be supplied in advance of all of the

aquatic effects monitoring program, but since it was really an integral part of it, we would prefer to submit everything as an integral report. I personally have had no further correspondence with Environment Canada with respect to that particular issue.

A RICK PATTENDEN: Rick Pattenden. The outstanding components of the monitoring program for 2005 are in the process of being analyzed and presented. We didn't envision completion until sometime in January, so that report wouldn't be available to the Board at this time.

Q DIONNE FILIATRAULT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is in relation to the PKCA, when you were talking about the divider dike. There seems to be some confusion within the documentation as to when that divider dike construction, when it is proposed to start, and I just want to get the final if it is available, when you foresee the earliest that this would be constructed?

A CAM SCOTT: Cam Scott, SRK. Yeah, Dionne, the details as outlined in that memorandum that was issued in, I believe, mid-November is the current thinking. It fits more tightly with the schedule and the construction plans for Tahera, and specifically the first stage, the waste rock

component to elevation 517, which is about two or three metres above the lake level, would occur this coming summer, the 2005, subject to permit, of course.

The other elements in terms of the filters and the transition zones on the upstream face would be installed in conjunction with later on and, again, subject to further testing and information, but prior to the deposition of pump fine PK within the cell.

Q DIONNE FILIATRAULT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Along that same line, I guess I am just trying to understand how the actual construction takes place. If there is -- is there water on the upstream face of that divider dike when those variation transitional layers are put into place that Don referred to in his presentation?

A CAM SCOTT: Cam Scott, SRK Consulting. The initial placement of the waste rock would occur in the wet during the summer. My understanding, and correct me if I am wrong here, is that the actual dewatering of Long Lake to some practical limit would occur over the late summer and fall, in which case essentially the current location of the divider -- the location of the divider dike is in approximately one or two metres

of water.

So, in other words, shortly after the -- or some period of time after the dewatering starts, there will be effectively a dry zone on the upstream face and on the downstream face, for that matter, either side of the dike, so that the subsequent placement of the actual transition and filter zones would occur in the dry.

Q DIONNE FILIATRAULT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the presentation that Don Hayley gave, he talked about fill times, he evaluated the long-term temperature effects and related it, I believe, to typical values that were determined at Ekati in '95. I'm just wondering if the water in the PKCA is to be drawn down for construction, how long is the fill time expected on the upstream face of the west dam for this particular project?

A CAM SCOTT: Cam Scott, SRK Consulting. I think in practical terms, Dionne, the water level will rise fairly slowly just because most of the water coming in will be from construction, and a lot of the sources that have been assumed for modeling won't be contributing water, such as from the various ponds, and so on, associated with waste-rock piles.

For modelling purposes, essentially what has

been assumed is that the water level is quite high very early on, which is essentially what one would assume under normal circumstances for design modelling.

Q DIONNE FILIATRAULT: Hi, it is Dionne. I have been told. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There was some reference in the documentation that when you draw down the water on the upstream face of the west dam, there is also going to be a low spot where there is another dike that is referenced, and I am just wondering if you could speak a little bit about this internal dike that is going to be generated almost between the divider dike and the west dam. I'm not really clear on what that is all about.

A CAM SCOTT: Cam Scott, SRK Consulting. Current plans don't indicate that we would construct something, another structure, between the divider lake and the west dam. There is some reference in the text that depending on water quality and settlement of suspended solids, there is something that could be constructed, again, to facilitate the process of getting rid of the solids -- suspended solids in the water. And, again, that just touches on the slide that Mr. Hayley had last night which basically showed the

difference between the water on either side of the divider dike at Ekati.

So, in other words, if you are not getting full satisfaction from the initial divider dike, there is that latitude to put something in later. It is not something that is committed to at this statement, it is just a statement of what could occur.

Q DIONNE FILIATRAULT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a verification, in the modelling that was done for the dilution, and this refers to the presentation that Kelly Sexsmith gave, was the control lake to the southwest of -- or south of Lake C3 considered as far as an effect on the overall dilution modelling that was done?

A KELLY SEXSMITH: I believe -- it is Kelly Sexsmith. The Jericho River flows through that control lake into Lake C3, is that correct, Bruce?

BRUCE OTT: Yes.

A KELLY SEXSMITH: So there is a constant gradient of flow into Lake C3 from that direction. So in that respect, the influence of the control lake on Lake C3 is included just as a simple flow.

There is no time that the flow could reverse its correction, so that was not considered.

Q DIONNE FILIATRAULT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This refers to the monitoring of the site and the presentation by Bruce. It seems that in the overall water quality monitoring or even sediment monitoring for the site, that there has been no consideration, other than toward Ash Lake, Lynne Lake and in relation to the winter road, there has been no consideration of monitoring south or southwest of Long Lake, and I'm just wondering what your thoughts are on that and why there has been no consideration from water monitoring south and southwest?

A BRUCE OTT: Bruce Ott, AMEC. Lynne Lake is proposed. As we have indicated, there is no -- there will be no direct discharge to that water system. In fact, and, Mr. Scott may be able to discuss this a bit further, the waste rock and the waste handling facilities won't approach that area of the divide for some time after mining begins. Thus, the only possible effects on that system would be from airborne -- say from blasting, if nitrate or ammonia were carried over into that -- over into that system. We feel that the one monitoring station in Lynne Lake will -- would adequately predict any effects that the mine might have on that lake system.

Q DIONNE FILIATRAULT: That addresses more the southeast area of the project. I'm worried about the southwest area of the project, Mr. Chairman, in relation to any potential airborne particulate that is being generated through the deposit of fine PK in the PKCA, and it being deposited south of the project depending on predominate winds or whatnot, so I am just wondering if that was thoroughly thought out.

A BRUCE OTT: Bruce Ott, AMEC. I'm not quite sure, if we are talking Long Lake and we are talking southwest, which lakes that you might be talking about? There is one that I know that is almost due west, might be a little southwest of Long Lake, but not -- I'm not aware of any other water bodies in that area, so I must not understand what you are asking.

Q DIONNE FILIATRAULT: That's fine, Mr. Chairman, I will go to my next question.

In relation to the presentation that was provided by Court Smith in reference to the reclamation and cost estimate assumptions and site assumptions, they indicated that the surface facilities such as the camp office complex, mine shop are Nunavut owned and operated, and this brings into my mind an administrative issue or

potential administrative issue is that is the Nunavut Water Board required to licence in any other way these facilities? They obviously are not owned and operated by Tahera. Nuna has indicated that they will be owned and operated by Nuna.

You know, at this point we would need a detail of what facilities exactly that includes and exact water and waste requirements and/or locations to water and waste. And if at this point Tahera doesn't have that information, when will they have it to be able to provide it to the Board?

GREG MISSAL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Court Smith to respond to that question.

A COURT SMITH: Mr. Chair, Court Smith. During the final reclamation, it is necessary to bring in a temporary camp to be able to demobilize the final aspects. Is that what you are referring to?

Q DIONNE FILIATRAULT: No, it referred to -- and I can actually probably give you the slide reference in your presentation, if I can actually find it now. Here it is. Nuna logistics, it is probably about your, I don't know, 17th slide where you refer to site assumptions, and I'm just looking for clarification on what those facilities are and