

# WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



Minutes – February 7-8, 2023

Yellowknife Boardroom and by teleconference / Zoom

## Present:

Charlie Catholique, *Chair*

Jack Kaniak, *Vice-Chair*

Violet Camsell-Blondin, *Secretary-Treasurer*

Marc Whitford, *Director*

Gord Macdonald, *Director* (by phone)

Lutselk'e Dene First Nation

Kitikmeot Inuit Association

Tlicho Government

North Slave Metis Alliance

Diavik Diamond Mines

## Absent:

Ryan Miller, *Director*

Kelly Fischer, *Director*

Yellowknives Dene First Nation

GNWT

## Staff:

John McCullum, *Executive Director*

(minutes)

Mohannad Elsalhy, *Environmental Specialist*

(minutes)

Environmental Monitoring Advisory Board

Environmental Monitoring Advisory Board

## Guests:

Jeffrey Cederwall, GNWT-ENR (Day 1&2 – in person)

Kathy Unger, GNWT-ENR (Day 1 – in person)

Imran Maqsood, GNWT-ENR (Day 1 – by phone)

Brian Kopach, MSES (Day 1 – by phone)

Bill Slater, Slater Environmental (Day 1 – by phone)

Megan Cooley, North-South Consultants (Day 1 – by phone)

Jennifer Kirk, Arcadis (Day 1 – by phone)

Barbara Hard, Arcadis (Day 1 – by phone)

Bill Pain, GNWT-ENR (Day 1 – by phone)

Bryana Matthews, GNWT-ENR (Day 1 – by phone)

Lorraine Seale, GNWT (Day 2 – in person)

Sean Sinclair, Diavik (Day 2 – by phone)

**Tuesday February 7, 2023**

**Meeting started at 9:05 am at EMAB Boardroom and by teleconference**

Chair begins meeting with moment of silence.

### **Item 1: Approval of Agenda**

Chair reviews agenda.

# WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



Item 15: TK Fish Camp Workshop cancelled.  
Item 16: WMMP Addendum motion cancelled.  
Gord suggests adding additional item (governance question) for tomorrow.

**Motion:** to approve agenda for February 7-8, 2023 meeting as amended

**Moved:** Marc Whitford

**Seconded:** Violet Camsell-Blondin

Motion carried

## Item 2: Conflict of Interest

No conflicts declared

## Item 3: Minutes of Previous Meeting

Board reviewed minutes of previous meeting.

Delete last name included in item 3. Refer to Interim Land Manager instead of naming a person.

**Motion:** to approve November 29-30, 2022 meeting minutes as amended:

**Moved:** Marc Whitford

**Seconded:** Violet Camsell-Blondin

Motion carried.

None against, no abstentions.

Review of Action Items

- Len McCale is Nuna contact for closure at Snap Lake. Marc will provide contact information.

No outstanding recommendations

## Item 4: Finance

ED presents item in kit.

### Two-year budget status

- Diavik has provided a draft letter making additional commitments for the 2023-25 budget. Executive is recommending the Board approve the amended two-year budget with commitments from Diavik for Additional Funding.
- Change “them” in last line of Diavik letter to “EMAB” to clarify
- Add a place for EMAB to sign to agree to the Diavik letter conditions
- Discussion on budget for community updates; clarify what costs are covered for each Party. May need to be updated.

**Motion:** to approve the amended 2023-2025 budget as presented:



**Moved:** Marc Whitford

**Seconded:** Jack Kaniak

Motion carried.

None against, no abstentions

**Motion:** to accept and approve Diavik's draft letter dated February 6'23 with proposed amendment for conditions of agreement on EMAB Recommended 2023-2025 Workplan and Budget

**Moved:** Marc Whitford

**Seconded:** Jack Kaniak

Motion carried.

None against, no abstentions

Gord will provide a final version of the letter with revision and a place for EMAB to sign off.

### **Revised current year budget**

ED reviews the changes to the current year budget to include the recent \$58K payment by Diavik.

**Motion:** to approve the revised 2022-23 budget as presented

**Moved:** Marc Whitford

**Seconded:** Violet Camsell-Blondin

Motion carried.

None against, no abstentions

The rest of item 4 and item 5 are postponed to tomorrow.

### **Break**

### **Item 6: Update on Diavik Meeting of EA Parties, Jan 20'23**

Jeffrey Cederwall from GNWT joined the meeting.

ED presents item.

Discussion:

- EMAB members who attended the Jan 20 meeting of the Parties gave their views
- Nothing was agreed to – no voting was done
- Hard for Diavik to develop TK Monitoring. EMAB, Diavik, first nations and elders have to work together to develop the TK Monitoring Plan.
  - Holding Community meetings to develop the Plan is a good idea.
  - Diavik should provide enough funding for TK monitoring.
- Need to talk about EMAB role during and after closure. Would like to see EMAB continue.
- EOI process is dead
- Diavik hoping communities will get together to work on TK Monitoring. Proposed a meeting on February 22. So far only TG and NSMA have confirmed for that date.
- Further discussion needed on future of EMAB

## WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



- EMAB should not take on TK monitoring; stay in watchdog role.
- Feb 22 meeting should discuss the logistics of the TK Monitoring Working Group (TK WG; unanimous support is needed).
- It is better to replace the EOI process with the TK WG .
- Tk Monitoring Plan will be developed via discussions, involving parties and indigenous communities.
- All Parties agreed to discuss the future of the Environmental Agreement through an Environmental Agreement Working Group (EA WG).
- Any changes to the EA require unanimous agreement.
- EMAB could meet before the EA WG to provide recommendations on its role. EMAB could consider engaging with the communities on this issue.
- All parties sent two reps to the Jan 20 meeting except KIA. EMAB could send a letter encouraging KIA to send two reps in future.
- Parties are welcome to add more than one contact person for the EA working group.

Q: When will the first meeting of the EA working group be conducted?

A: Nothing is set yet. TK has more urgency than EA.

- Right now we are talking about the TK WG
- Feb 22 may not work; conflict with Indigenous Consultation workshop

Q: Will EMAB be invited to the Feb. 22 Meeting as an observer?

A: That will be a decision by the group participating in the meeting.

- EMAB could recommend they have an observer
- Important to keep EMAB up to speed on TK Monitoring. Send an EMAB staff member as observer.

**Action Item: add an item to the Agenda of the next Board Meeting to discuss EMAB role in the future (one day meeting).**

**Motion:** to send a formal letter to each of the contacts for the TK WG recommending that an EMAB Staff Member attend the TK Working Group as an observer.

**Moved:** Marc Whitford

**Seconded:** Jack Kaniak

Gord against, others in favor

Motion carried.

**Motion:** to send a formal letter to each of the contacts for the EA WG recommending that an EMAB Staff Member attend the EA Working Group as an observer.

**Moved:** Jack Kaniak

**Seconded:** Marc Whitford

Motion carried.

None against, no abstentions

**Action Item: to send two formal letters to the contacts for the Working Groups recommending that an EMAB Staff Member attend the TK and EA Working Groups as an observer.**

# WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



Discussion (cont.)

- Does EMAB want to recommend the Working Groups be independently facilitated?
- May not be needed, especially if EMAB observes

Item tabled to tomorrow.

## **Item 7: EOI Update**

Tabled to tomorrow.

## **LUNCH**

## **Item 8: GNWT Air Quality Guideline Update**

Imran Maqsood from ENR joins the meeting.

ES presents item

- Last update from ENR: The Final Air Quality Monitoring Guideline will be issued by ENR in February 2023.
- The “What We Heard” document supposed to be finalized in January 2023, but EMAB did not see it yet.

Imran says that ENR is developing a high-level response to EMAB letter dated January 30’23.

- ENR will explain the reasons for the continued delay on finalizing the Guideline.
- ENR will also provide the new timelines of the Guideline and the review of the EAQMMP.

Q: is GNWT still on track for timeline presented at November meeting?

A: yes

## **Item 9: Water Licence Amendment for Natural Drainages**

## **Item 10: Update on FCRP Review**

Brian Kopach from MSES, Bill Slater from Slater Environmental, Megan Cooley from North-South Consultants, Jennifer Kirk and Barbara Hard from Arcadis join the meeting.

ED presents item

- EMAB submitted 118 comments on the WL Amendment for Natural Drainage.
- WLWB will hold the technical session March 6-10.
- WLWB will hold the hearings at the end of May.

Diavik rep noted they received comments from all Parties.

- Most comments are on Surface Water Action Level Framework, monitoring frequency, technical questions and some clarifications.

## **Bill Slater from Slater Environmental presents review**

- Presentation covers both WL Amendment and FCRP

## WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



- Decommissioning the ponds is an uncommon approach for progressive reclamation before closure earthworks are finished. Collection ponds would capture sediment in runoff caused by earthworks.
- There may be value in keeping some ponds.
- More criteria should be developed for each pond. Currently only acute toxicity and pH. No numerical standards for metals or other parameters. Diavik could create criteria for individual ponds but doesn't plan to do this.
- There should be standards for all ponds; at a minimum there should be a standard for TSS. Diavik says they accept this.
- Effort will be required to re-establish a pond after it is decommissioned. Decision to decommission must require the discharge is clean.
- Diavik's Surface Water Action Level Framework proposes a risk assessment as the first step if water quality exceeds closure criteria. The first step should be to manage the discharge.
- Closure criteria for wildlife drinking water seem OK – defers to other consultants.
- Concern about use of recreational standards for humans drinking water. People may drink water in mixing zones; recreational standards are not intended for drinking water.
- Monitoring discharge should go beyond the five years Diavik proposed. Issue is effect of flood events which may not happen frequently. They should be design criteria for erosion of dams.
- Concerns about acid generating rock (PAG) over time; effect will not be seen until neutralizing ability of surrounding rock is used up.
- Monitoring program is required for monitoring seepage from areas where PAG rock was used.
- How much neutralizing material is in this rock? How much acid generating? What is the lag?

### Discussion

Q: concern about acid-generation from NCRP?

A: that is covered in NCRP closure plan, but a small amount of PAG rock was used in construction. This is probably OK, but need to monitor for a long time to be sure. It can take a long time before the runoff goes acid.

### **Megan Cooley from North-South Consultants presents their review** (slides in kit)

- Presentation covers both WL Amendment and FCRP
- Most comments on runoff monitoring, sampling frequency and Surface Water Action Level Framework (SWALF).
- EMAB can provide more comments during the technical sessions and public hearing.
- Sampling – Diavik proposes to discontinue monitoring if they are unable to take a sample for two years. Any decision to discontinue monitoring should consider the conditions, not just a set length of time.
- Include chlorophyll *a* in monitoring to cover nutrients.
- SWALF
  - Not enough detail in sampling schedule.
  - Take time lags into consideration; shipping, analysis time etc will slow down getting the results; runoff can change over time.
  - Nutrients – sampling only addresses toxicity. Proposed 10 times limit is very high for nutrients.
  - Lack of trigger in mixing zone.



- No action level framework for nutrients.
- AEMP
  - No response plan; just SNP Response Framework which only applies to pond runoff, not mixing zones.
  - Diavik should provide a clear description of AEMP action levels; what monitoring results would trigger actions.
  - Fish
    - Sampling areas should include an area expected to have the highest levels of contaminants.
    - Fish health analysis should include comparison to reference conditions.
  - Recommended 2 years of monitoring before breaching.

#### Discussion

- Most ponds won't be breached until 2027, so lots of time to collect baseline information.

Q: How long will the water be in the pits before breaching?

A: It depends on the water quality.

#### Jennifer Kirk from Arcadis presents their review (slides in kit)

- Presentation covers both WL Amendment and FCRP
- Closure Objectives comments/concerns
  - Use of Recreational Guidelines for Drinking Water.
  - Removal of AEMP Benchmarks for aquatic health.
  - Criteria for sediment are only for hydrocarbons; there are risks for other parameters eg. arsenic and uranium.
- SWALF
  - Exceedance triggers risk assessment; should also trigger mitigation action since risk assessment can take a long time.
  - Lots of clarification required on how aquatic life will be protected.
  - There should be no chronic toxicity at the end of the mixing zone.
    - Use of IC50 at end of mixing zone means potential to impact half of organisms.
- Comments on Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment (HHERA) and relevant appendices.
  - Approaches seem mostly acceptable with clarifications of assumptions.
  - Aquatic Risk Assessment – use of CCME short-term benchmarks is not appropriate.
  - No cumulative effects assessment.
  - Approach to Wildlife health raises some questions.
  - Need to ensure reference locations have not been affected by mining.
- Summary of Concerns:
  - Clarifications.
  - SWALF and closure criteria.
  - Protection of water quality not addressed.
  - Consider cumulative effects.

# WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



- Important to review reference conditions.

## Discussion:

- Recommendation to include Arsenic and uranium in the closure criteria.
- LdG water should meet drinking water standards.

Q: Which guidelines for drinking water was Diavik using before the FCRP?

A: Previously Health Canada Drinking Water Guidelines.

- Noted that Lac de Gras is the drinking water source for Kugluktuk.
- Dust may be affecting LdG.
- Make sure caribou aren't eating from contaminated soil.

**Brian Kopach from MSES presents their review** of the wildlife components in the FCRP

- Mostly looking for additional detail on criteria and triggers for mitigation
- Test for decrease in size of ZOI

## Discussion:

- Some animals have died at the mines. What is the cause?
- Small animals slowly disappearing.
- These animals should be monitored in post closure.

## Item 11: Diavik Revised WMMP

Kathy Unger from GNWT-ENR joins the meeting  
ES introduces item

Intent was to review Diavik response to GNWT Conditions on approval of WMMP. Diavik came prepared to discuss comments on the 2021 WMR Addendum.

## Discussion:

- Concern about stopping behavioral scans and just using collar data. Question about possibility of shorter GPS collar fix rates for caribou nearer the mine complex.
- Last WMR report concluded there was insufficient data to do a caribou behavior analysis.
- Diavik should continue Caribou behavioral scan monitoring and compare to collar data results.
- Some research uses collar data to assess movement behavior. ENR will review EMAB Jan 11'23 letter and respond, including research on use of collar data.
  - Noted that there is limited behavior scan data.

Diavik ZOI Analysis submission to ENR (from November'22)

- GNWT is developing a way to distribute documents for review.
- Trying to do WMMP reviews through WLWB Online Review System (ORS).
  - Can't review related documents, such as ZOI Methods, through ORS.
  - Lack of staff to distribute documents.



# WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



- ENR will try to make the ZOI methods paper ready for review ASAP.

**Action Item – send email requesting Diavik provide Nov 10 ZOI Paper; copy to ENR.**

Discussion:

- Diavik was planning to do the ZOI analysis on a combined dataset with Ekati.
- Ekati is not willing to share data at this time, so Diavik will need to change its approach.

Q: will Ekati's decision delay the Diavik process?

A: yes – the analysis won't be in the 2022 WMMP report.

Q: Does ENR agree with discontinuing the behavioral group scans of Caribou?

A: ENR will speak to this in their response to EMAB's Jan 11 letter.

- Need to consider cumulative effects of Diavik and Ekati on environment at LdG.
- Diavik developed a model for cumulative aquatic effects at LdG.
- ENR should lead an overall cumulative effects assessment – maybe CIMP.

**Action Item: look into cumulative effects assessment at LdG: water, wildlife, fish etc.**

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 pm

## Wednesday February 8, 2023

**Chair opens meeting at 9 am (EMAB Boardroom and by teleconference)**

Chair reviews the agenda. Several items tabled from yesterday to today:

- Item 4 – letter regarding Contributions Repayable.
- Item 5 – workplan.
- Item 6 – actions coming out of Jan 20 meeting of Parties.
- Item 7 – EOI comments.

**Item 12 – Update on GNWT Long-Term Liability Policy/Approach**

Lorraine Seale updated the Board on progress addressing long-term liability at Diavik

- Not much has changed since last update in June 2021.
- LWB Closure Cost Guidelines is a major component.
- Pubic Lands Act regulations will address land leases.
  - These are still in the early stages of development – confidential draft.
  - Lorraine will touch base with Sally Card to advise of EMAB's interest in participating in review of regulations.
- GNWT will review the security deposit after WLWB makes a decision on the FCRP.
- Dept. of Lands will merge with ENR on April 1 – responsibilities will remain the same

Q: what about long-term liability after relinquishment?

A: PLA regulations will address surrendering of land leases. The Closure Guidelines may be updated.

# WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



Q: what about approaches like in Saskatchewan where all mines pay into a fund?

A: the fund only applies after gov't has agreed that a mine site is safe and secure.

- There is a letter on file with the LWB; gov't taking a project back after active closure would come with conditions.

Q: how does the Environmental Agreement (EA) related to long-term liability? What protection is in place for the long-term?

A: EA plays an important role. Part of purpose of EA was to provide oversight during closure and post-closure. Good to hear a working group is being set up to review the EA.

Q: who else is working on developing closure guidelines?

A: LWB is inviting various Indigenous governments; goes beyond membership of the Intergovernmental Council (IGC). Any legislation proposed by the Minister has to be reviewed by the IGC and be passed by the Legislative Assembly.

Q: Does Lands participate in issues related to overlapping jurisdictions

A: sometimes – depends on the issue

- Concern that projects in Nunavut can affect caribou in NWT. Nunavut has stated TG has not standing to comment in Nunavut

**Action Item: send Lorraine's contact information to Board.**

Q: are there protocols for restoration after a small project winds up?

A: these are largely handled by the LWB's. Conditions set for clean-up. Security is required. Inspector checks site and makes a recommendation to the LWB. Similar process with water licences.

Q: what about compensation for effects on water use

A: part of LWB process. GNWT makes recommendations.

- Noted that maps that come with LUP applications are not very helpful
- Lorraine noted the Regional Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Slave Geological Province that was requested by TG. There will be opportunities for public input on Feb 16. Contact Rebecca Chouinard at CIRNAC.
- Noted there is potential for cumulative effect on Lac de Gras from Diavik and Ekati.

**Item 13 – Update on WLWB/GNWT legal issues regarding EQC's and decisions**

- ED presented item. Noted that this disagreement may affect the decision on the Water Licence Amendment for Natural Drainages
- Doesn't seem to be much progress on agreement between Diavik and GNWT on this issue.
- Could be resolved by reference to the courts. This could take a long time and outcome may not be satisfactory. This could delay mine closure or have other effects.

**Item 4 – Finance (cont.)**

ED presents budget forecast for remainder of 2022-23

- EMAB should try to spend any surplus or request to roll it over.

**Action Item: send a current Income Statement to Board at beginning of March**

**BREAK**

# WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



## Item 4 – Finance (cont.)

ED presents draft letter regarding contributions repayable

**Motion:** to approve letter to Diavik regarding contributions repayable

**Moved:** Marc Whitford

**Seconded:** Violet Camsell-Blondin

Motion carried

None against

No abstentions

**Action Item:** send a copy of EMAB’s Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest Policy to the Board

## Item 5 – Workplan, Budget and Board Calendar for 2023-24

ED presents draft workplan and budget

**Motion:** to approve the budget for 2023-24 as presented.

**Moved:** Charlie Catholique

**Seconded:** Marc Whitford

Motion carried

None against, no abstentions

ED presents draft Board calendar

- Noted possible conflict of dates for June 12-14. Will confirm.
- Noted some issues working with Dropbox. Possible Board training opportunity?

**Motion:** to approve the draft Board calendar for 2023-24 as presented

**Moved:** Violet Camsell-Blondin

**Seconded:** Marc Whitford

Carried

None against, no abstentions.

Noted: Western Indigenous Consultation and Engagement Conference – Feb 22

- EMAB should make a presentation at PDAC

## Item 14 – TK Panel

ED presents item from kit

- i) Fish Camp – received letter from Diavik on November 30. They cancelled the 2021 fish camp video; couldn’t reach agreement. No response to EMAB recommendation to receive raw footage.

**Action Item:** ED to draft a letter for Board review expressing EMAB concerns about Diavik’s decision; not in the spirit of the EA.

# WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



## Follow-up fish sampling

ED presents item

Discussion:

- At August 2022 session Diavik used fine fish nets. Too small to catch any large fish.
- Caught fish by angling.
- Fish were in same condition as at 2021 Fish Camp
- Fish sampling and reporting are now being done by Diavik. this is no longer a TK effort; it is being run by western scientists with community observer
- Golder will prepare a technical memo, to be ready by end of May.
- Diavik should share this Memo with EMAB. Follow up may be required.

**Action Item: include EMAB comments on the follow-up sampling with letter on the fish camp video. Review recommendations from 2021 Fish Camp report and reference relevant parts.**

- Elders know the fish in LdG aren't good to eat anymore, so won't touch them.

ii) Letter on TK Governance

ED presents item from kit. Should the letter be withdrawn?

- suggestion to not continue with the letter as there are two letters to be drafted for TK and EA working groups.

## LUNCH

### Additional Item - Governance

Gord presents email

- Email circulated noting short timelines for some email motions and suggesting Board members don't have time to read all the material, so should be voting on a recommendation from staff.

Discussion

Q: Why would this be different for the Diavik rep than other members?

A: provides the option for Board members.

- Board members all doing their job. Why is Diavik rep asking this question?
- Implies Board members don't understand the material or prepare for votes
- Seems to be telling Board members they need to do their homework. Not happy with this request; seems rude. Consider sending this to Parties.
- If Board members aren't concerned then no issue. No offense was intended.
- Members review material and make informed decisions. Good to have sufficient time for decisions.

### Item 6 – Jan 20 Meeting of Parties (cont.)

i) One-day EMAB meeting on future role of EMAB

## WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



- Can combine with a regular EMAB meeting; possibly extend by a day
- Consider asking Parties for input on agenda
- Some members of EA Working Group (EA WG) are also on EMAB
- Report back to EA WG after meeting; hold next EA WG meeting after EMAB meeting
- No urgency on this discussion;
- Send email invite to all

### Item 14 – TK Panel (cont.)

#### ii) Letter on TK Panel Governance

- TK Panel is being addressed by Parties through TK Working Group (TK WG) set up on Jan 20
- TK WG will determine EMAB's role related to TK Panel; EMAB should discuss during one-day meeting on future of EMAB
- Disagreement with last bullet in letter that says Diavik is administering the Panel on behalf of EMAB. Diavik's view is that the TK Panel was not EMAB's Panel
- EMAB could set up its own TK Panel and submit a proposal to Diavik for funds.
- ED explains how the TK Panel was set up by EMAB, then taken over by Diavik. Diavik was supposed to convene Panel for one meeting, then EMAB planned to discuss what would happen next. Instead Diavik told the Panel EMAB had agreed Diavik could take over the Panel and EMAB never had the discussion.

Q: do Panel members understand they are working directly for Diavik?

A: probably

- This should be discussed by TK WG
- Diavik decided Panel is on pause; first, need to decide the purpose for setting up another TK Panel
- TK Panel members should decide
- TK WG should meet before EMAB gives it direction
- Diavik has its own TK Panel
- TK Panel was formed by EMAB. EMAB never agreed Diavik could take over the TK Panel

Q: who chooses the representatives for the TK Panel

A: Parties choose

- There should have been an agreement before Diavik took over the TK Panel
- Why does this matter?
- Diavik changed the facilitator on its own; not happy with that decision
- Is EMAB saying Diavik can't have a TK Panel?
- Diavik can set up a Panel, but not under the EA
- Still need to decide what a Panel would do before setting it up.
- It should focus on closure
- TK WG should decide. If they think a Panel is needed then it should be set up.
- Panel has already done lots of work on closure; that should be reviewed
- The Panel can't do the monitoring
- Suggested to re-draft the letter taking into account current situation with TK WG and send to Board for approval

# WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT



- Also include some history of the Panel formation and takeover by Diavik

Q: does Panel represent communities?

A: no, they represent themselves.

**Action Item: ED to re-draft letter on TK Panel Governance for current situation and send to Board for review and approval.**

- iii) Does EMAB want to take back TK Panel
- TK Panel is on hold. TK WG should discuss the need for a Panel.
- iv) Posting TK Panel reports on EMAB website

**Action Item: Post current TK Panel reports with disclaimer that they did not follow the same verification process as previous reports, and that the final version of the reports was not verified by the Panel.**

## BREAK

### Item 17 - Board Member Update and Community Concerns (Roundtable)

Marc – NSMA is in a time of transition

Jack – KIA elected a new President – Robert Greenley

- Interim Executive Director is Fred Pedersen
- Interim Land Manager
- New people coming on stream; trying to meet them all

Charlie – new WLEC Manager – Tastsy Catholique

- Hiring new SAO
- Community update: initially, last three weeks of March.

Violet – TG is doing a workplan. Calendar is filling up.

- Planning on visiting all communities by road before April
  - May be an opportunity for EMAB to do community updates
- Regional mine remediation meeting 1<sup>st</sup> week of April
- Several remediation projects: Rayrock, and some smaller mines in the Hottah Lake area

Meeting adjourned

Closing Prayer – Charlie Catholique

**Next meeting, April 18-19, 2023**