

September 25th, 2005

Ms. Dionne Filiatrault
Manager Technical Services
NWB & NIRB
PO Box 119
Gjoa Haven, NU X0B 1J0



5 Cherry Blossom Rd.
Cambridge
Ontario, Canada
N3H 4R7
Telephone
(519) 650-9833
Fax
(519) 650-7424

RE: Review of Aquatic Effects Monitoring Program for the Jericho Diamond Project

Dear Ms. Filiatrault

As per your request, we have reviewed the Aquatic Effects Monitoring Program (March 2005) prepared for the proposed Jericho Diamond Mine. Our comments are provided in the following review.

Overall, the Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan was found to be logical in its presentation, well thought out and reasonably complete from the perspective of providing the information and data necessary to support the conduct of an Ecological Risk Assessment. The comments provided below are generally minor in nature and certainly do not expose any major flaws in the approach to the monitoring program as presented.

Within the discussion of the overall scope of the Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan (Section 2.3) concepts such as “change”, “statistical certainty”, “ecological relevance”, “long-term irreversible change”, and “biologically significant effect” are used. It is felt important for the approach to clearly focus on those changes and effects that have ecological significance from the perspective of being deleterious and not just statistically significant. The term ecological relevance may imply a negative or adverse change but this needs to be made very clear since not all changes of ecological relevance are necessarily undesirable. This is briefly touched upon in the last sentence of the 2nd last paragraph of page 6 where it is acknowledged that some changes of biological relevance are acceptable and others are not. However, it would be of significant value if the criteria for what constitutes a deleterious effect were clearly defined so that meaningful endpoints can be applied to any of the observed changes.

The data to be collected as part of the Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan is felt to be extensive but it does not include any toxicity testing. If the nature of the material potentially discharged from the mine-site is not felt to be conducive to this type of analysis then a statement to this effect (with the appropriate supporting arguments) should be included. However, if this is not the case, the conduct of routine chronic toxicity studies (as outlined in Section 7 of the Metal Mining Guidance Document for Aquatic Environmental Effects Monitoring) should be included as part of the monitoring program. In Section 2.3, a reference is made regarding the addition of toxicity testing in the event that significant ecological impacts are noted. A more proactive and precautionary

approach is warranted with toxicity testing being part of the initial investigations and not limited to when there is already a potential concern. In addition to giving advanced notice of a potential problem, they would also provide important baseline data.

This concludes our comments of the document entitled, *Jericho Diamond Mine Project: Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan (March 2005)*. If there are any questions or concerns regarding the comments or any other elements of the Aquatic Effects Monitoring Program, please feel free to contact Dr. Ulysses Klee at (519) 650-9833 (x246).

Sincerely,

Ulysses Klee, Ph.D.
Senior Ecotoxicologist/Risk Assessment Specialist
Project Manager
Dillon Consulting Limited





5 Cherry Blossom Rd.
Cambridge
Ontario, Canada
N3H 4R7
Telephone
(519) 650-9833
Fax
(519) 650-7424