



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

ᓄᓇᓂᓪ ᐃᓕᓕᓂᓪ ᑲᑎᓕᓂᓪ
NUNAVUT WATER BOARD
NUNAVUT IMALIRIYIN KATIMAYINGI

File: NWB2DBY

June 16, 2005

By Email

Dennis Doulos
Indicator Minerals Inc.
1400-625 Howe Street
Vancouver, BC
V6C 2T6

Subject: Water Licence NWB2DBY Application

Dear Mr. Doulos:

After review of NWB2DBY, Darby Project Water Application, it has been determined that the accompanying supplemental questionnaire is incomplete. Please find below a list of comments in regard to the submitted contents of the supplemental application.

- a) Question #5 – The documentation submitted makes no indication to activities after 2006 yet the duration of the project will last until late 2009. The reviewer requests scheduling for the entire project duration.
- b) Question #7 – Reference is made to the attached Operational Summary in response to the question. The reviewer did not find an appropriate answer to the question within the Operational Summary appendix. Reference was made to the number of sleep tents planned on site but no actual reference to the number of crew and the crew scheduling. Furthermore it appears as if there is a transient nature to the project (“2005 field season will be dependent on drill and drill crew availability”) thus a fluctuation in personnel. This needs to be further detailed.
- c) Question #17 – A N/A answer is provided. Within the Operational Summary it is stated that “The object of the exploration is to discover economic diamondiferous kimberlite deposits”. The reviewer would suggest a more appropriate answer (i.e. “Diamond”) as the type of deposit the exploration team is seeking.
- d) Question #27 – The estimated demand is ambiguous. The allotted units are in L/capita • day whereas the personal numbers and fluctuation are not provided to honour a defined amount of water. The same may be said with the Drilling Units specified demand. How many drills will be in operation and how long will the drills be operational? The reviewer suggests that the proponent provides a conservative estimate to account for operation uncertainties, personal fluctuations and maximum personal expected on site at a given time.
- e) Question #35 – In Question #32 there is mention of a latrine sump to treat camp sewage and a sump to treat camp greywater yet in Question #35 details are not included outlining the specifications of these sumps. The reviewer requires completeness of this detail.

- f) The reviewer would like to suggest that the proponent appropriately references the page number and location of the answer on the page (i.e. the paragraph number on the page) to Questions #7, #9, #10, #13, #14, #19, #20, #21, #29, #30, #32, #33, #34, #36. This will expedite the review process and provide the proponent with a set of measures to ensure that the questionnaire requirements are met.

If you have any questions with the above comments please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

Joe Murdock, B.Sc., M.Sc. Cand., MIT.
Technical Advisor