



P.O. Box 119
GJOA HAVEN, NU X0B 1J0
TEL: (867) 360-6338
FAX: (867) 360-6369

NUNAVUT WATER BOARD
NUNAVUT IMALIRIYIN KATIMAYINGI

October 16th, 2006

File: 2AM-JER0410/D10+H3
By Fax: 1-416-777-1898

Greg Missal
Vice-President Nunavut Affairs
Tahera Diamond Corporation
130 Adelaide Street West, Suite 1900
Toronto, Ontario M5H 3P5

Subject: NWB review of submitted TDC responses to Waste Rock Management Plan Part 2 in relation to Schedule D, Item 10 and a review of Intervener comments in relation to Part H, Item 3 and Part D, Item 10 of Water Licence 2AM-JER0410

Dear Mr. Missal:

Further to my October 11th, 2006 email the Nunavut Water Board (NWB) requests further clarity on issues related to the Jericho Diamond Mine Waste Rock Management Plan Part 2 (**Part D, Item 10** and **Part H, Item 3 (Intervention comments)**). The following documents were consulted in reviewing the Waste Rock Management Plan Part 2 (WRMP):

- i. **Waste Rock Management Plan Part 2 –Tahera Diamond Corporation - Jericho Project Waste Rock Management Plan Part 2: Kimberlite Ore, Coarse Processed Kimberlite and Recovery Circuit Rejects 1100060.004** (received: January 27, 2006)
- ii. **NWB response to Waste Rock Management Plan Part 2 report – Tahera Diamond Corporation – Jericho Diamond Mine – NWB response letter to Waste Rock Management Plan, Part 2 report** (dated: October 11, 2006)
- iii. **Environment Canada Intervention Statement – NWB1JER0410 - Tahera Diamond Corporation, Jericho Diamond Mine – Waste Rock Management Plan, Part 2** (received: March 3, 2006)

After a review of the above listed correspondence it has been determined that additional information and clarity is needed. The NWB requests additional information regarding the following listed items. Where appropriate, the NWB has arranged the comments according to items a) to h) specified in **Schedule D, Item 10** of the water licence **2AM-JER0410** (formerly NWB1JER0410). Intervener comments were also considered in NWB remarks related to **Part D, Item 10** and **Part H, Item 3**.

1. Pursuant to **Schedule D.10(f)** of the water licence **2AM-JER0410** (formerly NWB1JER0410), the WRMP shall “*ensure maintenance of a 200 m buffer between the toe waste rock dump site 1 and Carat Lake*”. Has this provision been achieved? The Board requests additional detail or direction to the appropriate reference document and section where this provision has been satisfied.

2. Pursuant to **Schedule D.10(h)** of the water licence **2AM-JER0410** (formerly NWB1JER0410), the WRMP shall include detailed design within the report on “*monitoring to be done during construction*”. TDC stated that volumes and masses of waste rock will be reported. What are the details and methods of analysis for water quality and quantity drained/collected from the stockpile area, stockpile dimensions, density, and any other parameters that will be monitored during construction? How will this information be provided to the Board?
3. Further to bullet point #7 in **Document (ii)**; what efforts are in place to separate contact of the coarse processed kimberlite (PK) from the underlying tundra soils? The granite waste rock will provide some separation of these materials; however, is it sufficiently thick to ensure isolation?
4. Further to bullet point #8 in **Document (ii)**; has there been sufficient flow available to obtain a sample for water quality analysis and annual seepage surveys that are proposed for July or August? In the event of limited flows during this time, does TDC plan to complete sampling during an earlier point in the year or following rain events? The NWB also requests that TDC formally responds to EC Intervener comments “*While the water license provides very general guidance on the seepage surveys, EC recommends that the proposed seepage monitoring plans be drafted and circulated for review. Environment Canada would like to flag to the NWB the potential for pH depression associated with residual iron that may be contained in coarse PK from the dense media separation*” and indicate what measures will be installed by TDC in response.
5. Further to bullet point #14 in **Document (ii)**; What will be the frequency of testing and how long will testing be carried out for from the recovery circuit rejects pile? What are the potential geochemical interactions that could occur when recovery rejects are combined with coarse PK and Waste Rock Dump #2?

In summary the Board requests a formal response to each of the above stated provisions. Sufficient detail and an avoidance of ambiguity should be followed in submitting response materials to the listed provisions. If you require assistance whatsoever please feel free to contact Dr. Jamie Van Gulck, P.Eng. at (519) 577-4129 or vangulck@vgqconsulting.com.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:

Joe Murdock
Director Technical Services

cc. Ramli Halim (Hatch-Acres)
Jamie Van Gulck (VGQ)
Lee Barbour (U of S)
Carl McLean (INAC)
Jim Rogers (INAC)
Peter Kusugak (INAC)
Stephen Bathory (INAC)
Geoff Clark (KIA)
Colette Spagnuolo (EC)
Tania Gordanier (DFO)
Mike Atkinson (GN-DOE)

Josh Gladstone (NIRB)
Kevin Buck (NIRB)
Cheryl Wray (TDC)
Bruce Ott (AMEC)