

July EMAB Board Meeting
July 21, 2001 – Day One
EMAB Board Room, Yellowknife

Present

Bob Turner, Chair, North Slave Métis Alliance
Floyd Adlem, Vice-Chair, Government of Canada
Doug Crossley, Kitikmeot Inuit Association
John Morrison, Government of Nunavut
Florence Catholique, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation
Johnny Weyallon, Dogrib Treaty 11 Council
Doug Doan, Secretary-Treasurer, Government of the NWT
Erik Madsen, Diavik Diamond Mines Inc. (afternoon only)
John McCullum, Executive Director

Absent

Lawrence Goulet, Yellowknives Dene First Nation
Erik Madsen, Diavik Diamond Mines Inc. (morning only)

Guests

Julian Kanigan, Resource Management Officer, DIAND
Gord MacDonald, Diavik Diamond Mines Inc.
Julie Dahl, Department of Fisheries and Oceans
Elaine Blais, Department of Fisheries and Oceans
Carole Mills, Independent Environmental Monitoring Agency

Minute Taker

Erica Janes, GeoNorth Limited

Welcome from the Chair – 9:11 am.

Florence Catholique gave the opening prayer.

Approval of Agenda

John McCullum stated that several items were added to the meeting binder, including new correspondence, capacity fund updates, revised minutes from June, and financial statements. These items were distributed before the meeting began. It was requested that the binders be made more useful at future meetings, with a table of contents or guide, as many members had trouble finding particular items.

Motion #01-03-07-21

Accept agenda as presented.

Moved: Doug Doan

Seconded: Doug Crossley

Carried: Unanimously

Approval of June 10th and 11th Minutes

It was requested that the description of the public meeting on the evening of June 11th include that the Board reviewed the Outstanding Action Items at this time. Changes made have been added to the end notes of the minutes.

Motion #02-03-07-21

Accept June 10th and 11th minutes as amended.

Moved: Floyd Adlem

Seconded: John Morrison

Carried: Unanimously

Selection of Water Quality Contractor/ Water Quality Workshop

John McCullum led the Board through a review of the Terms of Reference for the hiring of a water quality expert, stating that the expert will be required to examine Diavik's water license amendment and give comments to the Board, help with community and Board understanding of issues, participate in the water quality workshop planned for later in the summer, and provide the Board with assistance through a standing offer until March 31, 2004. The total value of the work will be \$7500, with an hourly rate paid after that amount is exceeded. EMAB received two proposals in response to the RFP, which are both included and summarized in the meeting binder.

John informed the Board that one proposal had been received from Komex International, the other from Joe Acorn, a local independent contractor. He stated that neither proposal provided a fixed price, and that Komex's daily rates were double that of the independent contractor. Both proposals contained similar methodology. John expressed his disappointment that neither proposal adequately addressed fish-ammonia concerns by including a fisheries biologist and/or toxicologist on their team; both had an environmental engineering perspective. He informed the Board that he had contacted Komex and determined that they had access to a fisheries biologist and a toxicologist, but it was pointed out that to be fair, John should also contact Joe Acorn to determine if he had access to similar resource people. John stated that he was also leaning toward Komex because Joe Acorn will be unavailable August 3 – 16, which is inconvenient timing because comments are due by August 8th.

It was then suggested that a fisheries biologist or toxicologist could be hired on a separate contract for the water license amendment, separate from the water quality workshop. Consultants suggested for this work included Peter McCart and John Sprague. This would increase the cost to the Board, and would require a motion. The Board discussed the impact on submitting comments to the MVLWB on time if tenders are invited at this point. It was suggested that preliminary comments could be submitted indicating the Board's concern and that they were contracting expert review. There was some concern about protocol, with regards to hiring contractors outside of the issued RFP, but it was decided that if the Board and ED are not satisfied with the quality of proposals submitted, other contractors may be retained separately to assist with the original contract.

The Board decided to postpone a decision on a contractor until the following day, pending John McCullum's conversation with Joe Acorn about Joe's access to a fisheries biologist/toxicologist.

Julian Kanigan joined the group at 9:25 am.

Gord MacDonald joined the group at 9:35 am.

John McCullum then raised the issue of developing the agenda for the planned water quality workshop in Kugluktuk. He stated that he had received comments on his draft indicating that participants will need to learn the basics about water quality before anything else. However, he wasn't sure what to include on the agenda, nor how much time to budget for this. John asked for feedback from the Board on structuring the workshop agenda and facilitation, so that planning can move forward.

It was pointed out that water quality and sampling are complex issues and processes, and that participants need to understand that facts. However, it was agreed that participants need only learn the basics, such as information about guidelines, sampling, effluent discharges, allowable limits, and inspectors. Then, participants can move on to addressing Diavik-specific water quality issues. John McCullum expressed concern about needing an expert to assist in developing the workshop agenda.

There was some concern about hiring a facilitator before the agenda is set, but it was decided to simply request the facilitator's daily rate, and articulate the general requirements.

Gord MacDonald suggested that the material could be covered in no fewer than three day-long sessions. The first would include a one-day general overview of water quality issues and sampling. Gord agreed that Diavik and the inspectors could assist with providing the basics on the first day. The second day would address Diavik-specific issues, and the third day would be used for reviewing the results from the Diavik site, allowing participants to apply what they learned on day one.

There was some discussion about sampling methodologies, and the fact that different techniques yield different results. It was explained that drinking water sampling and testing is addressed as a health issue, rather than environmental, and has more rigorous standards. It was pointed out that communities across Canada are doing their own sampling because they are not satisfied with the testing methodology or results. This can be difficult because of stringent sampling requirements.

The discussion returned to the workshop agenda. The Board agreed with Gord's suggestions to include the following topics on the agenda for the overview day:

- the objectives of sampling;
- the differences between drinking water and environmental testing;
- designing sampling programs;
- the chain of field to lab to results and related considerations;
- how to interpret test results;
- common standards; and
- regulatory requirements/aspects governing water quality.

It was agreed that a three day workshop would be adequate, but that some drinking water issues would have to be covered, given that Kugluktuk's drinking water comes from Lac de Gras. It was also agreed that the facilitator retained for the workshop does not have to be an expert on water quality issues; the facilitator simply needs to be skilled in keeping people on track. The water quality expert and the facilitator would be expected to assist in refining the workshop agenda, but in the meantime, John McCullum will update the draft agenda.

There was some general discussion on the roles of various contractors at the workshop, and it was clarified that the water quality expert, workshop facilitator, and community coordinator would all be separate roles. It was agreed that 5-10 days' work would be estimated for the facilitator, for preparation time, workshop attendance and report write-up. The facilitator is intended to orchestrate the workshop, and will be assisted by EMAB staff in organizing logistics. This information will be

included in the contract Terms of Reference. Doug Crossley informed the Board that he has been working on finding a community coordinator. The value of the water quality expert and facilitator, as well as workshop participants, having different perspectives on sampling issues was raised.

Action Item: John McCullum will update the draft agenda for the proposed Kugluktuk water quality workshop.

The Board revisited their reasons for having the workshop, which are to enhance the parties' understanding of Diavik's water quality program (as has been done with wildlife and fish issues) so that the Board can make informed decisions about water quality. It was suggested that the workshop be delayed until September to allow more time for organization.

There was a discussion about the workshop budget. John McCullum informed the Board that the latest estimation for the workshop cost was \$60,000, based on 30 participants and not including the cost of the facilitator. This is twice the original budget.

Break – 10:30 am

Reconvene – 10:53 am (Bob Turner did not return)

Accommodation and seating limits on commercial flights are both possible limiting factors on the number of participants. The Coppermine Inn has room for 22, and there is a local B&B. Commercial flights from Yellowknife to Kugluktuk are normally configured for 14 passengers.

The budget discussion continued with mention that the total cost is estimated at \$75,000, including the facilitator. John McCullum stated that travel to and from Kugluktuk makes up \$25,000 of the total cost, but if non-local participants are limited to one chartered twin otter, the budget can be reduced to \$55,000. This would mean limiting each Aboriginal Party to two participants, but additional people may be able to come on a scheduled flight. While this is still over budget, John pointed out that EMAB's capacity funding spending is low this year. It was pointed out that the Board won't have to pay for Federal employees' expenses, but that the total cost for the workshop will still probably reach \$70,000 with all expenses.

Motion #03-03-07-21

Extend water quality workshop budget to a maximum of \$75,000, exclusive of technical expertise and the workshop facilitator, but including a community coordinator from Kugluktuk.

Moved: Florence Catholique

Seconded: Doug Doan

Carried: Unanimously

The Board discussed possible workshop dates in September given hotel availability in Kugluktuk and then need to organize it well, given the expense. Also, August is not a good time for many of the Aboriginal Parties, as there are many activities on the land happening at this time, as well as a number of AGMs.

Action Item: John McCullum will move the Kugluktuk water quality workshop to September, details to be planned with the assistance of the retained facilitator.

It was then suggested that the EMAB AGM could be held in Kugluktuk, in conjunction with the water quality workshop, provided that all Board members are in attendance, but no decision was made on this matter.

Carole Mills joined the group at 11:12 am.

Presentation on Ammonia at Diavik

Gord MacDonald of Diavik gave the Board an update on the ammonia situation at the Diavik site. He reviewed the Diavik Technical Committee's presentation that members had attended the previous month, and informed the Board that the license amendment application has been filed with the MVLWB, and that it has been sent out for comments by August 8th. Diavik has continued with daily monitoring of ammonia levels in the North Inlet, and weekly results are sent to Julian, DIAND Inspector. Diavik is continuing with audits of explosives handling in the pit, and a specialist has been contacted to review water treatment technologies, and is now finalizing report. The known options for decreasing ammonia concentrations on site have been examined and determined to be not technically feasible. The following treatment options were examined:

- Air-stripping (vaporizing the ammonia into the air): requires water temperatures above 10°C, so would only work for a tiny portion of the year on site. Storage would be required for ammonia-laden water for the remainder of the year.
- Break-point chlorination (chemical ammonia removal): involves chlorinating water, which produces a potentially toxic chlorine discharge. Environment Canada would probably not permit this.
- Ion exchange (filtering out ammonia): this was reviewed in the EA, but the end product is concentrated brine, which Diavik doesn't have a place to dispose of.

As there is no proven technology for the site, Gord informed the Board that Diavik is not holding out for a treatment solution. It was brought up that BHP is doing something like air-stripping, but clarified that they are using atomization to lose ammonia. However, this isn't a proven technology and requires a large land area, and Diavik has much higher volumes of water to deal with, making this technology unfeasible. Gord said that he would check into making the report available to EMAB and to the public.

A question was asked about whether different sumps have different concentrations of ammonia. This is the case, so the next question was whether the higher concentrations could be pumped to the PKC. At this point Diavik doesn't know whether the PKC will be able to handle more minewater, so they can't commit to this.

A question was asked about the original predictions for minewater and ammonia levels and Gord indicated that predictions of minewater concentrations are very inexact. He thinks DDMI has higher minewater seepage than predicted, so there is more contact between minewater and blast rock.

A question was asked about whether it would be less of a shock to fish, fry and eggs if the water in the North Inlet continued to be diluted using Lac de Gras water before sending it back to Lac de Gras. Gord indicated this would be the case if the discharge was toxic, which is not the case.

Gord stated that ammonia levels in the North Inlet continue to drop, after a large spike. The previous day, ammonia levels were at 10 mg/L, and are expected to drop to 5-6mg/L soon. This is a level that is acceptable; a toxicity sample from the previous weekend verified this threshold. The only sample

they've had that was toxic was at 32 mg/L. Diavik is still working on the best water collection location with regards to locating the new sumps as the pit develops. Gord said that the goal is to keep the sumps as close to the water as possible, so that water running over rocks (and picking up ammonia) is minimized. Also, sump water from the pit is transported via pipeline, so less ammonia is picked up. This is still a learning process for Diavik, and meters are being used in the sumps to monitor the ammonia levels.

Gord reviewed the difference in toxicity between ionized and un-ionized ammonia: it is the un-ionized ammonia that is toxic to fish. The low temperature and pH of water in the North means that the proportion of un-ionized ammonia is lower than it is further south. The water license amendment that Diavik has submitted to MVLWB requests regulation by un-ionized ammonia instead of ionized, which isn't toxic. However, both will continue to be monitored. There was some general discussion about dilution of ammonia and toxicity levels, and Gord said that Diavik is working on determining exact fish toxicity level for ammonia.

Bob Turner rejoined the group at 11:30 am.

The Board discussed the issue of non-compliance, and the options open to interveners through MVLWB on license amendments. It was suggested that the Board should write a letter to MVLWB stating that they are planning to hire a technical expert to comment on the license amendment application, and will submit a response, in case the response itself cannot be made in time. This will register EMAB's concern with MVLWB, which will only hold a hearing if interest is expressed. The Board discussed the need to work cooperatively with Diavik and all regulators to thoroughly and progressively implement all options available. It was pointed out that EMAB has an advisory role, and therefore, MVLWB only has to consider EMAB's advice, they aren't obligated to take it.

*Break for lunch – 12 noon
Resume – 1:30 pm*

Julie Dahl and Elaine Blais arrived for 1:30 pm.

No Net Loss Habitat Compensation

John McCullum started the discussion by outlining topics for discussion: clarification about proposal considerations, timing questions for proposal development, and the issue of the East Island lakes. He pointed out that all of these issues are included in correspondence with DFO included in the meeting binder. Florence stated that Lutsel K'e's position remains that the pristine East Island lakes remain undisturbed. Florence asked if there haven't been any previous studies done on this kind of lake before, and Julie Dahl responded that other studies have been done, but not on similar small northern lakes that have been manipulated to enhance their productivity. There has been enhancement of streams and areas near lakes, such as at Stagg River near Rae. There was some discussion about the reasoning behind manipulating the productivity of pristine lakes. DFO wishes to open up access from Lac de Gras to the East Island lakes that haven't been disturbed, thereby increasing connectivity and fish habitat available. DFO understands the aversion to manipulating lakes with fish present, but if habitat is made accessible where there currently are no fish, they don't see why there would be objections. One of DFO's reasons for wanting to keep a lake on the island is to try and address the "like-for-like" principle in their Habitat Management Policy of the Hierarchy of Preferences. This was established to help decide what kinds of activity to initiate first: like-for-like compensation, which involves no net loss in productivity. By enhancing an East Island lake, lost habitat is compensated for,

and mainland lakes would be left alone. If habitat compensation works don't create as many habitat units as originally estimated, then the residual can be moved off site. DFO stated that 4.6 habitat units were destroyed on East Island; mainland lakes m1, m2 and m3 make up 3.7 habitat units, and it is hoped that East Island lakes will make up an additional 3.3.

Erik Madsen arrived at 1:48 pm.

Different options for creating over-wintering habitat were discussed, including excavating lake bottoms, removing access barriers, and improving flow, which might also reduce water volume. It was pointed out that the environmental impact of the mine on the island lakes is still unknown; lakes that are pristine today may be adversely affected in the future. DFO agreed that both off-site and on-site enhancement works are experimental. There was further discussion about peoples' willingness to fish in lakes previously impacted by mining and other industrial activities. Diavik stated their lack of willingness to participate in enhancing previously contaminated sites; DFO concurred.

DFO stated that they had approached EMAB in December to identify specific small-scale habitat enhancement projects, hoping to hear of areas where, for example, access to streams was blocked by roads, or collapsed culverts. In December, parties talked about wanting to clean up abandoned mine sites and shorelines, but DFO could not work with these large-scale suggestions. DFO is still waiting for specific ideas for habitat enhancement projects. It was then suggested that DFO and Diavik visit the communities to make sure their project idea requirements are clearly understood, and to provide examples of what kinds of projects they are interested in supporting. Guidelines for the meetings should be provided beforehand so that people stay on track. Then, it would be easier for communities to give them further ideas for habitat enhancement projects that can demonstrably enhance a given situation. There was some discussion about the utility of this plan, but DFO stated they have some money that they would like to spend on working with communities to identify issues and concerns. Community meetings can be done for habitat enhancement project ideas and off-site/on-site simultaneously. This way, the habitat compensation database can be developed. This will provide proponents with a list of community-endorsed projects to choose from, and expedite the process of habitat compensation significantly. Therefore, DFO should be doing the consultations, but Diavik could participate to a limited degree to stimulate discussion.

The management issue of over-fishing in the Yellowknife area, which is continually growing, was raised. It was stated that EMAB is looking for assurance of DFO's support to develop various Aboriginal priorities, such as the issue of over-fishing, which was described in detail. DFO stated they felt the December meeting was a clear indication of their commitment to habitat compensation works, and that over-fishing is a management issue that cannot be dealt with in a habitat compensation program. It was then pointed out that the letter from DFO to EMAB dated June 19 and included in the meeting binder did, in fact, give the assurance that EMAB had been requesting that DFO agrees with EMAB's recommendations to look at habitat work in the surrounding area.

There was further discussion about the definition of the word "pristine", and whether or not EMAB would support half of the compensation works to be done on pristine island lakes. It was restated that the Board was not in agreement on this issue. Discussion then turned to the philosophy behind like-for-like compensation, which basically states that what is destroyed in one area is brought back elsewhere. DFO explained the reasoning between having both on-site and off-site compensation, in terms of every affected lake having a zone of direct and indirect impact; if compensation is always taken off-site, a much larger area is in fact impacted. The idea behind on-site compensation is to fool the fish into thinking that nothing has changed; fish may have to go slightly somewhere else, but overall population integrity still maintained.

EMAB members maintained the position that all lost habitat cannot be compensated for on-site. This is why parties are interested in off-site compensation, and concerned about negative and cumulative effects on fisheries resources instead of the specific, smaller-scale projects that DFO has in mind. Lutsel K'e maintained their position that they do not support work proposed for the East Island lakes, but stated that if Diavik and DFO together went to the community and clearly explained their reasoning for wanting to do so, there maybe is a chance of the community changing its mind because it wants to support the Diavik project. It was generally agreed that if compensation issues were discussed with actual land users, there would be a much greater chance of communities understanding and supporting the types of projects that DFO is interested in. These types of discussions would also provide the opportunity to start compiling the habitat compensation database for project proponents' use. The database is not intended to be a highly detailed list of projects; thus the proponent would have to work with the community to develop an enhancement plan. However, it expedites the process of habitat compensation if the proponent and DFO know that the community supports particular projects from the outset.

The discussion then returned to community priorities, where the parties and DFO debated the issue of scope: DFO is interested in small-scale projects, while the parties are interested in addressing more general, large-scale issues. It was agreed that Diavik and DFO will not support projects that involve resource management concerns, nor projects having to do with contaminated sites. EMAB has other opportunities to raise fisheries management issues. DFO indicated that fisheries management issues are at the forefront of their current priorities, but they are facing funding issues that haven't allowed certain activities to be carried out. It is possible that funding from the habitat compensation fund may be used for management issues, but EMAB pointed out the importance of making it very clear that management issues are not dealt with under the habitat compensation fund.

One Board member stated that he never considered the East Island lakes to be pristine, so didn't expect there would be an issue with using one for an enhancement experiment. He feels there is a need to know if habitat enhancement works.

DFO agreed that community consultations should be held to develop the habitat compensation database, as well as to clarify the purpose and goals of the type of compensation projects they're interested in supporting, including the reasons for wanting to do work on one of the East Island Lakes. This will be done along with Diavik personnel, and as soon as possible, as all agreed that this issue has been dragging on for quite some time. Gord and Julie agreed to meet on this and Gord suggested trying to complete consultations before Christmas.

Action Item: Gord MacDonald and Julie Dahl will meet concerning community consultations on the No Net Loss habitat works, with the goal to complete consultations before Christmas.

Gord MacDonald, Julian Kanigan, Julie Dahl and Elaine Blais parted the group at 3:10 pm.

*Break – 3:10 pm
Resume – 3:30 pm*

Expert Review of Priority Reports

The Board discussed the amount of reporting received on the wildlife and aquatic effects management plans at the mine site. Some concern was expressed that monitoring programs are running, but EMAB is only informed about them in Diavik's annual reports. It was suggested that EMAB write a letter to RWED, requesting that the inspector report to EMAB on a quarterly basis on the wildlife effects monitoring program. It was pointed out that RWED wildlife inspections are not related to the WEMP. Additionally, the suggestion was made to invite Diavik personnel to an EMAB meeting to present that report. Diavik was amenable to this idea.

The Board discussed whether or not there is a need to hire experts for ongoing review of reports on the AEMP and the WEMP, on behalf of EMAB. It was pointed out that it would be economical to use, as much as possible, the expertise of Diavik personnel and Federal and Territorial inspectors and wildlife people, who are already paid to do this type of activity. The appropriate experts would be invited to attend the presentations of the WEMP and AEMP and provide comments and information. If these people cannot answer EMAB's questions, then experts can be hired to do so in any given year. It was generally agreed to work with those available, and then retain other experts as needed. It was suggested EMAB have standing offer agreements with an expert on each of wildlife, water, and fisheries, and each standing offer would be reviewed annually. The Board agreed to bring in Diavik staff to discuss the AEMP and the WEMP at the next Board meeting.

Action Item: John McCullum will arrange for Diavik staff to discuss the AEMP and the WEMP, the next time the Board meets.

Action Item: John McCullum will initiate the process of developing standing offer arrangements for wildlife and fish experts, to be reviewed on an annual basis.

Traditional Knowledge Panel

The Board was presented with the revised Terms of Reference for the TK Panel, for discussion and approval. It was pointed out that the ToR for the TK Panel were quite broad and encompassing in scope, but later clarified in the context of EMAB. Some discussion on the scope of the TK Panel followed, including whether or not the TK Panel should be available to other groups besides EMAB. The intention is that the TK Panel convenes only with EMAB's direction; if this is the case, the Board agreed that it must be reflected in the name. There was agreement that the name should be the "EMAB TK Panel", to avoid any confusion about who directs its activities. However, there was some concern that EMAB would be billed if the TK Panel were called upon to provide information to another party. There was further discussion on whether the TK Panel should be solely EMAB's, or be a regional body. If it were EMAB's, individual panel members could possibly be contacted to provide their expertise to other organizations. However, this could present problems in that they should be accessible as resources, but will not have the funding to support themselves. The issue of linking panel members with the parties was also discussed, as well as the option for the TK Panel to act as a bridge between Regulatory Authorities and EMAB. It was generally agreed that it was outside EMAB's mandate to organize the TK Panel to be regionally-focused, but that government and industry should be involved in a regional panel when one is established. It was agreed that EMAB would write a letter to DIAND, and copy it to GNWT-RWED, Diavik and BHP, and the Aboriginal parties. The letter would explain the establishment of an EMAB TK Panel and recommend that a regional TK panel is established with DIAND's assistance. At this point, EMAB would put their support behind the regional panel, although there was some discussion about whether this kind of body is included in EMAB's mandate. The members agreed that this would occur far in the future. It was agreed that

EMAB would be sensitive to IEMA's desire to use the TK Panel, and that IEMA would be free to use the same model to establish a TK panel of their own.

Action Item: in the TK Panel Terms of Reference, John McCullum will remove the paragraph concerning other organizations' use of the panel, and consistently refer to the panel as the "EMAB TK Panel".

Motion #04-03-07-21

Accept the Terms of Reference for the TK Panel as written, with deletion of second paragraph under "Provision of Advice", and consistent reference to the panel as the "EMAB TK Panel".

Moved: Floyd Adlem

Seconded: Doug Doan

Carried: Unanimously

John McCullum then pointed out that EMAB was also supposed to review the recommendations from the March TK Monitoring Workshop, and decide what action to take on them. The Board discussed the fact that having a regional TK panel to provide advice to industry and regulators to improve resource management has been an issue for many Aboriginal groups for some time. A regional panel makes fiscal and good sense, because nobody wants an advisory group for each mine. A regional panel will work well with cumulative effects initiatives over the long term, and it was agreed that the Board has taken a first step towards this body by setting up a TK panel under EMAB. There was some discussion about finding and using models of other regional environmental panels in Canada in the eventual establishment of a regional TK panel in the NWT.

It was agreed that the letter sent to DIAND, GNWT-RWED, Diavik and BHP and copied to the Aboriginal parties should include reference to the March workshop, and explain why EMAB is setting up their own TK Panel. Although members were concerned that the focus at the workshop expanded beyond what was originally intended, it was agreed that EMAB should support its recommendations for a regional TK panel in the letter, in order to help promote the integration of TK into various projects.

Action Item: EMAB will write a letter to Bob Overvold and copy it to the Aboriginal parties, GNWT-RWED, Diavik and BHP, concerning EMAB's actions to establish their own TK Panel, as well as expressing support for a future regional TK panel.

Meeting adjourned at 5:01 pm.

***July EMAB Board Meeting
July 22, 2001 – Day Two
EMAB Board Room, Yellowknife***

Present

Bob Turner, Chair, North Slave Métis Alliance
Floyd Adlem, Vice-Chair, Government of Canada
Doug Crossley, Kitikmeot Inuit Association
John Morrison, Government of Nunavut
Florence Catholique, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation
Johnny Weyallon, Dogrib Treaty 11 Council
Doug Doan, Secretary-Treasurer, Government of the NWT
Erik Madsen, Diavik Diamond Mines Inc.
John McCullum, Executive Director

Absent

Lawrence Goulet, Yellowknives Dene First Nation

Guests

Julian Kanigan, Resource Management Officer, DIAND
Rosella Stoesz, Annual Report Contractor

Minute Taker

Erica Janes, GeoNorth Limited

Welcome from the Chair – 9:18 am.

Water Quality Expert Update

John McCullum informed the Board that Joe Acorn had taken another contract, and was therefore retracting his proposal to act as EMAB's water quality expert. The options would then be to retain Komex, which didn't allow for a fisheries biologist or toxicologist in the budget, or re-run the RFP. The Board discussed the fact that comments on Diavik's water license amendment must be submitted in about two weeks; therefore, timelines are an issue. The idea of re-running the RFP was eliminated on these grounds. It was then brought up again that the Board could submit an initial letter mentioning their concern, and notify MVLWB that comments from retained professional experts would be forthcoming. This would allow a more informed Board decision on the issue, and make sure that EMAB's concern is registered in the hopes that a public hearing will be held. Komex seems to think there would be enough time to do a review of the material and submit comments to MVLWB on time. However, it was suggested that the Board may want a second opinion.

Action Item: John McCullum will contact Peter McCart, John Sprague, Dave Osmond, and Stantec, to determine their availability to act as consultants on Diavik's water license amendment application on behalf of EMAB.

The contractor(s) hired for a second opinion would be retained on a separate contract only to review and comment on the water license amendment application, for 3-4 days of work. The Komex contract would also include providing a plain language interpretation of the issues and application, as well as participating in the planned water quality workshop in Kugluktuk.

The Board discussed the need to send a letter to MVLWB in the next couple of days, to notify them of EMAB's intention to retain a water quality expert to comment on Diavik's license amendment application. The letter will commit EMAB to having comments to MVLWB by mid-August or so.

Motion #01-03-07-22

Accept Komex's proposal as per EMAB's Terms of Reference.

Moved: Bob Turner

Seconded: Doug Doan

There was some additional discussion about retaining Peter McCart and how to deal with the contracting process.

Carried: Unanimously

Action Item: John McCullum will contact two other contractors to assist the Board with water quality advice, possibly Peter McCart and Stantec.

Executive Committee Reports: Capacity Fund Update

John McCullum informed the Board that he had communicated with Dogrib Treaty 11 Council, and confirmed they had no capacity fund activity for 2002-03, and had not yet submitted a proposal this year. The KIA has submitted an ambitious but good proposal to do water quality monitoring. Lutsel K'e has also submitted a proposal, which was included in the meeting binder, and they have received partial funding. However, John mentioned that this is a complex issue that would require further discussion. The NSMA has drafted a proposal, but John was unsure of its status. The Yellowknives Dene proposal also has unknown status.

The Board discussed Lutsel K'e's proposal. The community has already begun working on the project, but it was determined that a mistake was made with regards to payment in 2002-03. The Board considered whether to claw back the over-payment, or allow Lutsel K'e to keep the money, which was already accounted for, and whether to approve this year's proposal from Lutsel K'e, which John McCullum recommended. There was a discussion about how the capacity funds are allocated to each party. It was clarified that each party was given \$30,000 in the first year of fund operation, and then every year after that, parties are eligible for as much as they spent the previous year. Funds cannot be banked.

Johnny Weyallon joined the group at 9:55 am.

It was mentioned that because the capacity funds haven't been fully disbursed, there are extra funds available. In order to allow Lutsel K'e to keep the over-payment, the Board would have to agree to not apply the rule in this case.

Motion #02-03-07-22

Accept capacity fund deferral request from Lutsel K'e. This is a one-time only exception to EMAB policy.

Moved: John Morrison

Seconded: Doug Crossley

There was additional discussion to refine the motion, and make very clear that this is a one-time exception, and that EMAB intends to follow its capacity fund policy in the future.

Carried: Unanimously

Motion #03-03-07-22

Accept Lutsel K'e's proposal for capacity funding for 2003-2004.

Moved: Doug Doan

Seconded: Floyd Adlem

Carried: Unanimously

*Break – 10:03 am
Resume – 10:29 am*

Operations Manual: Capacity Funding Appendices

The Board was asked to review the Appendices included in the meeting binder. The importance of accountability was brought up, and it was suggested that all parties should have to provide EMAB with brief financial reports on capacity fund activities. This accountability is especially important to Diavik. There was some discussion about how unused funds should be used, and it was agreed that all Aboriginal parties would be better able to use their allocated \$30,000 per year if they were assisted by EMAB. EMAB's plan to hire a communications analyst will help accomplish financial reporting, as this individual will be available to assist the parties with planning, reporting, and associated activities. In the meantime, John McCullum is available to communicate with and assist the Aboriginal parties recognizing that there may be other commitments. The Board discussed Outcrop's report, in that it suggested that communications is a big issue for EMAB, and that the Board's public presence should be increased. Clearly, a staff member needs to be hired, and there was discussion about the nature of the position. It was pointed out that the communications analyst position has a field officer component, in terms of going out to the communities to assist with project design, implementation and reporting. And, because of the duties required, this should be a full time position for a highly motivated individual. There is money in the budget for a modest, full-time salary for this position, but due to EMAB's current under-spending, it's possible that more money could be made available, especially considering the importance of the position.

Action Item: the Executive Committee will begin working on the job description for an EMAB Communications Analyst.

EMAB's accountability was discussed further, in terms of the Board's fiduciary responsibility, members' responsibility to their parties, as well as public perception. If Aboriginal parties are required to report on their capacity fund activities, the Board is also provided with an opportunity to showcase the community activities it funds, and demonstrate their successes. Aboriginal parties' accountability for capacity funds was also discussed, with reference to the fact that EMAB shouldn't hold Board

members responsible for their party's actions. This led to a discussion about the tie between Board members and community contacts for capacity funding. As each Aboriginal party is structured and functions differently, it was agreed that a letter should be written to the parties to let them know how EMAB wishes to proceed with regard to capacity funding. Having a single contact person for capacity funding in the community would assist with continuity, in terms of reporting and accountability, as well as community capacity itself. The original intent of the capacity funding was discussed: to increase the capacity of the EMAB member in providing the Diavik message to communities, or to develop community capacity in general? The Board referred back to the original adoption of the WKSS funding model, which funded communities on a quarterly basis, and required a report each quarter. It was agreed that funding should be flexible enough to allow for each party to deal with their capacity funding how they see fit, and the Board referred to EMAB policy, as included in the meeting binder. This policy states that the member and the party will work together to decide how to spend the funding; this ties the member to the community, in that the party receives the money, but the member is responsible. The EMAB communications person can work with members to spend and report the funding, according to communications strategy, if required. However, there was some uncertainty about differences between EMAB policy and the wording in the funding agreement, with regards to parties' roles. The Board agreed to clarify this with a motion.

The Board further discussed the wording of the agreement (Appendix B), in terms of its implications for providing funds to communities. A number of changes to Appendix B were agreed upon, including:

- instead of "projects and initiatives" the Appendix should read "capacity building initiatives" in general;
- clarification of the fiscal year from April 1 to March 31;
- removal of "community" in reference to the capacity building fund;
- reference to EMAB Operations Manual s. 2.5, in regards to EMAB capacity fund policy;
- #2: "Liaison for the plan shall be the EMAB member (insert name)...";
- #5: Changing "audited statement" to "signed statement of expenditures" (this to also be changed in the EMAB Operations Manual so that the wording is consistent); and
- #5: include a reminder to provide photographs (not a rule)

Floyd committed to making the changes during lunch break, and presented Board members with a revised Appendix B following the lunch break.

Board members then discussed Appendix C, and the changes to be made to it. These included making the wording consistent with Appendix B with regards to capacity building (without reference to community), and capacity building initiatives (no projects).

It was suggested that EMAB write to the Aboriginal parties, enclose the revised Appendices on capacity funding, and advise them that assistance is available from EMAB to develop capacity fund plans, if required.

Operations Manual: contract approval amounts

Motion #04-03-07-22

Approve changes to section 2.3.3 of the Operations Manual (change amount from \$5000 to \$10,000, and the number of quotes from 2 to 3.

Moved: Florence Catholique

Seconded: Floyd Adlem

The Board briefly discussed the reasoning behind increasing the value of contracts required to go to tender, agreeing that the motioned changes will allow more flexibility to make decisions outside of board meetings.

Carried: Unanimously

Financial Reports

Doug Doan informed the Board that the statements in the binder were from May 31, and those distributed at the meeting were current to June 30. He reviewed the Balance Sheet, and explained that he and John McCullum had met with EMAB's auditor, who clarified several items for them. The auditor was reportedly pleased with the state of affairs at EMAB, and had only minor changes to suggest. The auditor's report will be forthcoming.

Doug reminded the Board that last year, EMAB conducted one formal budget review. EMAB is currently under-spending, but there are plans for expenditures. John McCullum, Doug Doan and Floyd have agreed that after capacity funding, hiring for a communications position, and conducting the water quality workshop in Kugluktuk, it will be appropriate to do another formal budget review. Doug requested comments and suggestions from the Board on formatting and clarity of the financial statements. The Board was happy with what he presented, and made no suggestions.

Break for lunch at 12 noon

Resume – 1:39 pm

Rosella Stoesz and Julian Kanigan joined the group following the lunch break.

Annual Report

Rosella reviewed the plan for this year's annual report with the Board. She stated that she was looking for feedback from the Board on a cover image, and presented them with an original print believed to have been purchased for use on an EMAB annual report cover. The Board discussed the fact that the original print would cost an additional \$825 to use on the cover, because of royalties to be paid to the artist. However, it was noted that Diavik has many images that could be made available to EMAB for the cover image at no cost. A photo collage option was presented, but the Board was in favour of using a Diavik caribou photo, as caribou are very important to the Aboriginal parties, and it would be easy and free to obtain a photo. The Board also agreed to have the original print frame and displayed in the EMAB office.

Action Item: Erik Madsen will contact Tom Hoefler at Diavik to obtain the caribou photo that Florence picked out for the annual report cover.

Rosella reviewed several items that had been changed in this year's report, compared to last year's. She also requested clarification on a number of items. These included the following:

- The Fish Palatability Study presentation done at the Geoscience Forum in November should be included in the list of Board activities, along with images (John McCullum has the PowerPoint presentation at the EMAB office);
- A list of several questions on the Fish Palatability Study;
- The member contact list has been moved to the front cover, and photos will not be included, only the list of Board names/contacts;
- The Terriplan workshop on regional monitoring should just be referred to in terms of EMAB attending and supporting the concept. The recommendations should not be listed;
- Describe members' courses taken as part of capacity building as general computer knowledge (including email and PowerPoint), as well as a course in conflict resolution through the DIAND Justice Department. The heading should be changed to "training";
- With reference to the letters sent out on water license amendment, the sentence should read that no changes were made to AEMP since it is already designed to monitor effects of phosphorous;
- Rosella agreed to contact the Tibbitt to Contwoyto Committee for photos of the winter road to include;
- Page 8: "community representatives and elders" attended the TK Monitoring Workshop;
- Photos from the TK Monitoring Workshop may be available from Sean Kollee of IEMA, for inclusion in the report;
- Page 9: there is space for a quote from the Chair on EMAB's perspective on the recommendations from TK Monitoring Workshop;
- Page 11: the quotation from Dargo's report was removed;
- Page 12: reference to the lack of reporting on activities removed;
- Photos for the Fish Palatability Study may be available from Adrienne Forest (Diavik);
- Page 14: Erik will provide Rosella with a re-worded purpose of the Rabbit Lake trip;
- Page 23: there is new information concerning a letter sent to John McCullum. Corrections have been made and given to Rosella so that she can update this section;
- Page 27: under TK, should read "the Board decided to establish an EMAB TK Panel";
- In terms of rotating meetings, report should refer to "parties' communities", not "affected communities";
- Inclusion of a statement about the Fish Palatability Study being an excellent example of using TK and science together;

This item was followed up with some discussion on the state of the baseline data from the Fish Palatability Study. The report was delayed due to problems with DFO's "sniffer", but the rest of the report is completed. It was agreed that EMAB should follow up with DFO on the electronic sniffer data, as Diavik has already done. The samples may be too old to sniff.

Action Item: John McCullum will contact Gord MacDonald of Diavik and then write a letter to DFO to follow up on the electronic sniffer issue.

There was some brief discussion about who EMAB has agreed to hire for translating the annual report. It was confirmed that Bertha Catholique will handle Chipewyan translations, Margaret Mackenzie will do the Dogrib, and Gwen Ohokak will translate for the KIA.

Doug Crossley mentioned that he had sent corrections concerning the intent of the Kugluktuk program to Rosella already, which were noted. Rosella requested records of a public meeting held in Lutsel K'e, under the Community Consultation section, and it was noted that minutes were taken by an EMAB staff member but never seen. It was decided to state that the meeting was held, was well attended, and the Chair gave a brief presentation on EMAB's role, held discussions and answered questions. A Board development workshop was held at the same session, where a mission statement was developed and agreed to without a formal motion. It was agreed that this mission statement should be dealt with more formally at a later date, and referred to as a draft for the time being.

It was mentioned that the EMAB review of the WEMP had no motion (page 22). Members remembered that EMAB decided that approving plans is not within their mandate, but that they officially commented on the plan. There was brief discussion about the need to examine the EA and determine how EMAB is intended to deal with the development of monitoring plans and programs, in terms of ensuring that TK and other Aboriginal components are present.

The Board agreed that they would like to see the new satellite photo from July 18, 2003 of the Diavik site on the back cover of the annual report. EMAB will also recommend to Diavik that copies of the poster are provided to all of the parties.

Action Item: John McCullum will recommend to Tom Hoefer at Diavik that copies of the poster are provided to all of the Parties, as well as to the Board.

Rosella informed the Board that there is still time for additional changes to be added this week, but requested that any suggestions be sent to her by Thursday. At that point, she will develop the one-page executive summary for the translators, which will be reviewed by the Executive Committee.

Rosella parted the group at 2:56 pm.

Inspection Report

Julian briefly reviewed his latest inspection report, which was included in the meeting binder, and told the Board that he would answer any questions they had. Items covered in his report included:

- Zinc sampling: since the high levels in April, zinc levels have been well below compliance levels, as shown in the July 2nd and 8th test results. Split and triplicate sampling, intended to increase the test reliability, will start up soon, and Julian will keep EMAB updated on the results.
- Water seepage has been patched in Pond 10, which leaked again this year. Diavik responded quickly to the leak by digging sumps and pumping water back into the pond. The chemical composition of the water shows it is runoff from the site, and parameters are within limits at Station 18.
- Julian received a letter on July 16 detailing Diavik's plan for dust control at the crusher. They will spray the blast rock and conveyor belt with water from Lac de Gras, like the previous year, and Julian will inspect this system the next time he is on site. He has no major concerns about this system.
- Remaining ammonium nitrate bags have been removed to storage; Julian is no longer concerned about them.
- Some small spills have been scraped up.
- A barrel has been placed at the A154 fuelling station to catch drips.

- Julian is satisfied with the new formatting for inspection reports on dams and dikes.
- There are multiple sumps in the A154 pit. There is already a difference in the water quality between sumps. A third sump is being developed presently.
- Julian has been receiving data weekly on the ammonia levels, and they continue to drop, as Gord mentioned earlier in the meeting.
- The geotechnical engineer was on site while Julian was doing his inspection, and his report will be released in a month or two. The engineer told Julian that he was happy with the beach formation at the PKC: it's stable and not retaining water. The engineer will be on site to supervise the raising of the PKC dams.
- Julian looked at ponds 11, 12 and 10; there was lots of water movement in June. Given water quality results, the water from the ponds was good enough to be pumped into Lac de Gras.
- The waste area is now being used on a more permanent basis.
- The liner in the bulk fuel storage area is working fine, although small amounts of fuel were found to be leaking from the valves when fuel is delivered. A few spills were scraped up in this general area.
- As there is no snow on site currently, Julian looked at various spill areas and cleaned up areas. There are five more spill areas requiring attention.

Julian informed the Board that another report would be released in 2-3 weeks, following his next inspection. He defined a "small drip" as a small area where fuel must be scraped up in response to a question from the Board.

Julian parted the group at 3:12 pm.

*Break – 3:12 pm
Resume – 3:30 pm*

It was agreed that because a number of members had to leave, only priority agenda items would be addressed. The remaining items would be added to the agenda for the next Board meeting.

Correspondence: Diavik fencing issue

The Board reviewed and discussed the draft letter to Diavik regarding fencing on site, included in the meeting binder. It was explained that during the comprehensive study, Diavik made some commitments made to implement recommendations with regards to fencing on site. However, according to Murray Swyripa's letter, Diavik is not intending to implement these recommendations. It was generally agreed that if Diavik made the commitments, they should act upon them, especially considering the recommendations were made at an elders' workshop.

Motion #05-03-07-22

Make recommendation to Diavik and Responsible Authorities to immediately implement fencing requirements detailed in the Diavik Diamonds Project Comprehensive Study Report Section 9.4.1 clause i).

Moved: Florence Catholique

Seconded: Johnny Weyallon

Carried: With one abstention

Correspondence: Aquatic Effects Monitoring Program (AEMP)

John McCullum reviewed the issue: EMAB sent a letter last July supporting MVLWB doing an independent review of the program, because of its unconventional nature. A review has not been undertaken. Regulators are still uncomfortable with the program, and John proposed that EMAB send a follow-up letter to MVLWB recommending that they contract someone to do an independent review of the program.

Motion #06-03-07-22

Send a letter of recommendation concerning a review of the AEMP to MVLWB.

Moved: Florence Catholique

Seconded: Doug Crossley

There was further discussion about EMAB's position with regard to being able to make recommendations to MVLWB, and their obligation to follow EMAB's recommendations. It was stated that EMAB has never obtained a legal opinion on this matter, and that at one point, EMAB was planning a workshop on this topic with MVLWB. John McCullum informed the Board that he had spoken with Bob Wooley at MVLWB, who told him that EMAB's previous letter had fallen through the cracks. Bob encouraged John to re-send the letter to remind MVLWB of EMAB's recommendation, and to let them know that EMAB did not receive an earlier response. After some discussion, it was agreed that EMAB should not test legalities over this issue, but take a cooperative approach to resolving it.

Carried: Unanimously

Action Item: John McCullum will meet with Bob Wooley from MVLWB in regards to the above-mentioned issues with MVLWB.

Erik Madsen left the meeting at 3:45 pm.

John Morrison left the meeting at 4:03 pm.

Committee Budgets

The Board discussed the issue of honoraria, as the Executive Director has no authority to spend money in committee budgets, and this required clarification. It was agreed that when committees are set up, the budget is established. The committee chair should have to work within the budget and if that isn't possible, the chair should have to approach the Board for additional funds. The chair is responsible for authorizing committee expenses. It was also agreed that the Executive Director should coordinate committees, and be able to make recommendations on their budgets and time allocations for various tasks. Contractors hired to do work for a specific committee should also have input into the activities of the committee.

Action Item: John McCullum will add a paragraph to the Honoraria section of the Operations Manual to clarify committee budgets, as above.

Fish Palatability Study Update

As Erik Madsen was not present to update the status of the upcoming Fish Palatability Study, Floyd Adlem stepped in to update the Board. The Study is planned for August 12 – 15, with community members arriving by charter to the Diavik TK Camp on August 12. All community representatives have been identified for participation in the study; each community has a coordinator, plus 3-4 additional representatives. Two representatives from the Yellowknives Dene will be acting as cook and cook's helper. The food list has been prepared, and food will be ordered. Matt Kennedy from Jacques Whitford has been confirmed to participate, and scientific permits have been applied for through DFO out of Hay River. Participants' per diems have been taken care of. All participants will fly out of camp to Yellowknife on August 15 at 11:00 am; KIA representatives will stay overnight in a hotel, and return home the following day.

Brenda Bailey is the contact for the Study, and can be reached at 766-5408, if members have any questions.

Next Meeting

Board members agreed that the next meeting should be a teleconference, to be held sometime during the week before the water quality workshop in Kugluktuk, tentatively Thursday, August 28th.

Water Quality Workshop

The Board revisited the planned water quality workshop to decide upon tentative dates. It was agreed that the second week in September would be best, but the first week may also be a possibility. Given hotel availability, the week of September 8 – 12 will be the target. Doug Crossley reminded the Board that the Kugluktuk Council is supportive of the workshop, and will help to accommodate and promote it.

Operations Manual: Capacity Funding Appendices

This item was revisited so that the Board could make a motion on it.

Motion #07-03-07-22

Accept the Capacity Fund section from the Operations Manual as amended, including Appendices B and C.

Moved: Floyd Adlem

Seconded: Doug Doan

Carried: Unanimously

Outstanding Action Items

The Outstanding Action Items list was not reviewed during the July Board meeting. The most current list therefore remains the May 7th and 8th Outstanding Action Items list.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 pm.

End Notes: Corrections made to Unrevised Minutes

1. Page 2, Selection of Water Quality Contractor/Water Quality Workshop: John Sprague's name was corrected.
2. Page 3, Selection of Water Quality Contractor/Water Quality Workshop: "*It was suggested that preliminary comments could be submitted indicating the Board's concern and that they were contracting expert review.*" was added.
3. Page 4, Selection of Water Quality Contractor/Water Quality Workshop: "*Accommodation and seating limits on commercial flights are both possible limiting factors on the number of participants. The Coppermine Inn has room for 22, and there is a local B&B. Commercial flights from Yellowknife to Kugluktuk are normally configured for 14 passengers.*" was added directly after the Break.
4. Page 5, Presentation on Ammonia at Diavik: "Break-point chlorination (chemical ammonia removal): involves chlorinating water, which produces a *potentially toxic* chlorine discharge. Environment Canada would *probably* not permit this." (corrections in italics)
5. Page 5, Presentation on Ammonia at Diavik: "However, this isn't a proven technology *and requires a large land area*, and Diavik has much higher volumes of water to deal with, making this technology unfeasible." (corrections in italics)
6. Page 5, 6: Presentation on Ammonia at Diavik: several questions posed during the discussion were added:
 - "*A question was asked about whether different sumps have different concentrations of ammonia. This is the case, so the next question was whether the higher concentrations could be pumped to the PKC. At this point Diavik doesn't know whether the PKC will be able to handle more minewater, so they can't commit to this.*"
 - "*A question was asked about the original predictions for minewater and ammonia levels and Gord indicated that predictions of minewater concentrations are very inexact. He thinks DDMI has higher minewater seepage than predicted, so there is more contact between minewater and blast rock.*"
 - "*A question was asked about whether it would be less of a shock to fish, fry and eggs if the water in the North Inlet continued to be diluted using Lac de Gras water before sending it back to Lac de Gras. Gord indicated this would be the case if the discharge was toxic, which is not the case.*"
7. Page 6, Presentation on Ammonia at Diavik: "*The only sample they've had that was toxic was at 32 mg/L.*" was added to the discussion.
8. Page 7, No Net Loss Habitat Compensation: "*There has been enhancement of streams and areas near lakes, such as at Stagg River near Rae.*" was added.
9. Page 8, No Net Loss Habitat Compensation: "It was then pointed out that the letter from DFO to EMAB dated June 19 and included in the meeting binder did, in fact, *give the assurance that EMAB had been requesting that DFO agrees with EMAB's recommendations to look at habitat work in the surrounding area.*" (corrections in italics)
10. Page 8, No Net Loss Habitat Compensation: "*One Board member stated that he never considered the East Island lakes to be pristine, so didn't expect there would be an issue with using one for an enhancement experiment. He feels there is a need to know if habitat enhancement works.*" was added.
11. Page 8, No Net Loss Habitat Compensation: "DFO agreed that community consultations should be held to develop the habitat compensation database, as well as to clarify the purpose and goals of the type of compensation projects they're interested in supporting, *including the reasons for wanting to do work on one of the East Island Lakes.*" (corrections in italics)

12. Page 9, Expert Review of Priority Reports: “*It was pointed out that RWED wildlife inspections are not related to the WEMP.*” was added.
13. Page 9, Expert Review of Priority Reports: “*The appropriate experts would be invited to attend the presentations of the WEMP and AEMP and provide comments and information.*” was added.
14. Page 9, Traditional Knowledge Panel: “It was generally agreed that it was *outside EMAB’s mandate* to organize the TK Panel to be regionally-focused, but that government and industry should be involved in a regional panel when one is established.” (corrections in italics)
15. Page 9, Traditional Knowledge Panel: “It was agreed that EMAB would write a letter to DIAND, *and copy it to GNWT-RWED, Diavik and BHP, and the Aboriginal parties.*” (corrections in italics)
16. Page 12, Water Quality Expert Update: Dave Osmond added to Action Item.
17. Page 13, Water Quality Expert Update: “The *Komex* contract would also include providing a plain language interpretation of the issues and application, as well as participating in the planned water quality workshop in Kugluktuk.” (corrections in italics)
18. Page 13, Executive Committee Reports: Capacity Fund Update: “John McCullum informed the Board that he had communicated with Dogrib Treaty 11 Council, and confirmed they had no capacity fund activity *for 2002-03*, and had not *yet* submitted a proposal this year.” (corrections in italics)
19. Page 14, Operations Manual: Capacity Funding Appendices: “In the meantime, John McCullum is available to communicate with and assist the Aboriginal parties *recognizing that there may be other commitments.*” (corrections in italics)
20. Page 14, Operations Manual: Dargo’s Report changed to *Outcrop’s* Report.
21. Page 16, Annual Report: “The member contact list has been moved to the front cover, and *photos will not be included, only the list of Board names/contacts.*” (corrections in italics)
22. Page 16, Annual Report: “With reference to the letters sent out on water license amendment, the sentence should read that no changes were made to AEMP *since it is already designed to monitor effects of phosphorous.*” (corrections in italics)
23. Page 16, Annual Report: Adrienne Forest’s name corrected.
24. Page 16, Annual Report: “*The report was delayed due to problems with DFO’s “sniffer”, but the rest of the report is completed; The samples may be too old to sniff.*” was added.
25. Page 18: AEMP: “John McCullum reviewed the issue: EMAB *sent a letter last July* supporting MVLWB *doing an independent* review of the program, because of its unconventional nature, *. A review has not been undertaken.*” (corrections in italics)
26. Page 18: AEMP: Motion #06-03-07-22 changed to read: “*Send a letter of recommendation concerning a review of the AEMP to MVLWB.*”
27. Page 20, Water Quality Workshop: “Doug Crossley reminded the Board that the *Kugluktuk Council* is supportive of the workshop, and will help to accommodate *and promote* it.” (corrections in italics)