

**APPROVED – MOTION # 2-02-09-13**

**EMAB Board Meeting**  
**Tuesday, June 26<sup>th</sup>, 2002**  
**EMAB Office, Yellowknife, NT**

**Present:**

Robert Turner, Chair, North Slave Metis Alliance  
Floyd Adlem, Vice-chair, Government of Canada  
Angus Martin, Yellowknives Dene First Nation (alternate)  
Erik Madsen, Diavik Diamond Mines Inc.  
Florence Catholique, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation  
Johnny Weyallon, Dogrib Treaty 11 Council  
Allen Niptanatiak, Kitikmeot Inuit Association (observer)

**Staff:**

Kirstie Simpson, Executive Director, EMAB

**Absent:**

Doug Doan, Secretary-Treasurer, Government of the Northwest Territories  
Paul Partridge, Government of Nunavut  
Alex (Sandy) Buchan, Kitikmeot Inuit Association  
Lawrence Goulet, Yellowknives Dene First Nation

---

Meeting called to order 1:30 (morning was spent at Fish Palatability meeting).

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Discussion / Recommendation</b>	<b>Action</b>
Rotation of meetings between communities	<p>It was brought to the board's attention that they had not formally agreed to rotate board meetings between communities.</p> <p><b>Motion #1-02-06-26</b></p> <p>EMAB will make best efforts to rotate board meetings annually in locations to be determined by each of the aboriginal parties in turn. The rotation will be in the following order: Lutsel K'e, NSMA, YKDFN, KIA, and Dogrib Treaty 11.</p> <p><i>Moved:</i> Florence Catholique <i>Seconded:</i> Angus Martin <i>Carried:</i> Abstention 1, carried</p>	<p>E.D to evaluate budget for cost implication arising out of community meetings.</p>
Review of Regulatory	<p>There was considerable discussion over the</p>	

Flow chart	<p>mandate of the board as it relates to the regulatory review process. The issue of putting in place the T.K and S.K panels was raised and these panels could then be accessed for advice. A question was raised as to whether the DTC should be the review agency. Is there a conflict if EMAB participates in setting the regulatory requirements, and the specific conditions of license and still monitors the regulatory process independently? EMAB does not want to be in between the regulator and the company but how does EMAB know that the decisions were good or bad if we don't observe the process. One approach is to be fully informed of what things mean, and then monitor the regulatory process to see if it is working properly. This way EMAB would have a hand in making sure the regulatory process is doing their job.</p> <p>The board agreed to set aside discussion of the regulatory flow chart as part of the board development workshop.</p>	<p>Confirm relationship of EMAB with regulatory authorities so the board does not get in between the regulator and the company.</p> <p>Board to review regulatory flow chart developed by Executive Director.</p> <p>Should EMAB be reviewing the technical submission from DDMI and regulators? Or is EMAB getting too involved with the regulatory function and should step back and observe the regulatory function.</p>
Review of Fisheries Technical Submissions June 19 draft	The E.D provided a review of various technical submissions from DFO and DDMI for approval. There was some discussion as to whether EMAB should be providing comments on technical reports or observing how these are dealt with by the regulators.	<p>EMAB will provide comments on the Fish reports as prepared by the Executive Director and Pete McCart but will re-consider the approach for the future.</p> <p>Comments on the Technical Review to be submitted to E.D by end of week (June 28) and then final letter sent out to DFO.</p>
Review of AEMP	The discussion of the 2002 technical report indicated that there were errors in it and DDMI would be revising it and re-submitting it to the MVLWB in October. Again, there was discussion that EMAB is getting too involved in the technical reviews and needs to back off. Whether or not the review to date by	E.D to draft brief letter to MVLWB re: AEMP saying that we agree that the 2001 AEMP should be re-released after errors are corrected

	<p>the regulatory body was adequate was raised as well as the MVLWB's comment that long term monitoring plans may belong more with EMAB than the regulatory body. EMAB decided to send a letter to the MVLWB addressing general concerns with the AEMP and to support an independent review of it.</p> <p>3:30 meeting adjourned. Next meeting to be held at Old Ft Rae, August 13 to 15, 2002.</p>	<p>and that an independent review of the AEMP should be carried out by MVLWB.</p>
--	---	---