

Environmental Monitoring Advisory Board

Minutes – June 4-6, 2018

Diavik mine site and EMAB Boardroom, Yellowknife, NT

Present:

Arnold Enge, *Acting Chair*

Doris Enzoë, *Alternate*

Laurie McGregor, *Alternate*

Gord Macdonald, *Director*

Michael Birlea, *Alternate (Day 1)*

Sean Richardson, *Director (Day 2 & 3)*

North Slave Metis Alliance

Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation

Government of the Northwest Territories

Diavik Diamond Mines

Tlicho Government

Tlicho Government

Absent:

Jack Kaniak, *Director*

Napoleon Mackenzie, *Chair*

Kitikmeot Inuit Association

Yellowknives Dene First Nation

Staff:

John McCullum, *Executive Director*

(minutes)

Allison Rodvang, *Environmental Specialist*

(minutes)

Environmental Monitoring Advisory Board

Environmental Monitoring Advisory Board

Guests:

Sean Sinclair, Diavik (Day 3, by phone)

Jamie Steele, Lands Inspector (Day 2)

Kelly Fischer, ENR Air Quality (Day 2)

Dan Coulton, Golder (Day 3, by phone)

Abbie Stewart, MSES (Day 3, by phone)

Petr Komers, MSES (Day 3, by phone)

Randy Knapp, Knapp Consulting (Day 3, by phone)

Karin Clark, ENR-Wildlife (Day 3)

Andrea Patenaude, ENR-Wildlife (Day 3)

Monday, June 4, 2018 – Site Visit

Sean Sinclair, Diavik, toured Board and Staff around the mine-site. Looked at the Communications Building TSP sampler, A21 open-pit construction, A415/A154, wind farm, till placement and slope on WRSA, PKC ponding, water treatment plant, sewage treatment plant, and the waste transfer area.

3:00pm – Board and Staff started meeting

Motion: *To appoint Arnold Enge as Chair for the June 4-6, 2018 meeting*

Moved: Gord Macdonald

Seconded: Laurie McGregor

Motion carried.

Motion: *To approve the proposed agenda as presented*

Moved: Laurie McGregor

Seconded: Doris Enzo

Motion carried.

Agreed to postpone review of minutes with expectation that more members who had been present for the February meeting would be available on June 5.

4. Action Item Review

- Should include a column in the action item table for when we expect to receive responses to EMAB letters
- Include an item on long-term liability policy as a way of ensuring this remains on EMAB's radar.
- Need to get the letter on DFO/ECCC review of Diavik documents prepared and sent to Board for review
- Q: Did EMAB formally recommend that GNWT review Diavik's 2016 EAQMP Report? **A: will have to follow-up on this.**
- EMAB should mention the WLWB letter to DFO in EMAB's letter to DFO/ECCC on updated Fisheries Act
- To arrange a meeting with TG, it may be easier to speak with Grace Mackenzie than Laura Duncan
- **Provide conflict of interest forms to Laurie, Michael and Sean for signature**

Action Item: Put Diavik's 2015 Fish Camp video on EMAB's website

Action Item: Incoming/outgoing correspondence should be on website

Noted that EMAB has received the draft of Diavik's EAAR with comments due by June 29.

Action Item: ES will prepare comments on EAAR and send to Board for review by email, with conference call if required.

Action Item: put draft EAAR in Dropbox.

Meeting adjourned at check-in time for return flight to Yellowknife.

Tuesday, June 5, 2018

Meeting Reconvened at 9:00am in Yellowknife

1. Call to Order

Chair opened meeting at 9:15 am.

4. Minutes of Previous Meetings

Motion: *To approve the Minutes of February 27-28, 2018*

Moved: Sean Richardson

Seconded: Gord Macdonald

Motion carried.

Chair asked the ED to note any important email motions.

5. Financial Report – May 2018

ED updated Board on Variance Report 2017 – March 2018

Q: Line that says \$0 for workshops?

A: This line would be for EMAB to host a workshop. The only workshop discussed during the workplan was an assessment by the TK Panel, and this has a separate budget line. WLWB workshops usually come up on relatively short notice and would not be included in this line item.

Comment: Source from local artists for promotional items.

Comment: Paying a lot for rent. Month to month is good but also doesn't give EMAB much stability. Noted that local rents have been reviewed and EMAB's location is one of the cheapest in Yellowknife. Request that there be a discussion on looking into space that does not include a boardroom at a future date.

ED presented item from kit on Standing Offer Renewals

- Board agreed to approve the standing offer for Arcadis limited to air quality review.

Motion: *To approve standing offers with North-South, MSES, Randy Knapp, Arcadis (air quality) and Bill Slater for this year.*

Moved: Gord Macdonald

Seconded: Sean Richardson

Motion carried.

Motion: *Move to change the Personal Automobile Rate in Appendix B of the EMAB Operations Manual to "current Federal Treasury Board rate" to be consistent with per diem rate policy.*

Moved: Laurie McGregor

Seconded: Doris Enzo

Motion carried.

ED presented item on EMAB support for board member internet costs

- Board agreed that there should be a policy in place for EMAB to buy computers for board members, software and subsidization of internet costs prior to any actions taken to actually doing this.

Action Item: ED to draft policy to address EMAB providing computers for board members, as well as covering software and subsidization of internet costs.

Item 9 – ENR Legislation Update (moved from afternoon)

Staff presented item from kit.

Noted that the air regulations related to WLWB permitting are on hold while GNWT determines the best mechanism for implementation. It looks like the MVRMA will have to be amended to allow inclusion of air quality in water licencing and land use permitting. The original changes to the EPA are proceeding: contaminant limits, air zones, incinerators are going ahead under the EPA and should be out and in place by end of fiscal year. Will include emission limits on incinerators.

6. Inspector's Report

Jamie Steele joined EMAB's meeting for his inspection report.

Highlights of his inspections/Discussion:

- Last two inspections focused on freshet, ponded water against PKC, and ongoing waste rock classification. He checked all perimeter sumps on the PKC – these were still frozen during last trip.
- Does not have any concerns with waste management on site
- WLWB's recent decision to allow ponded water against a dam has been difficult to enforce. Pond rises and falls and it is difficult to know whether the same water has been in contact with the dam for 14 days. The ponds are quite shallow (roughly 2-3 feet) so he is not concerned at this point.
- Engineer of Record doesn't feel that the ponds against the dam are a structural concern
- A21 dewatering is complete
- Areas examined in follow-up to waste rock misclassification that were thought to have Type III came back as Type I. Based on these results, Diavik is in compliance with WRMP. The will prepare a report. He is satisfied the non-compliance has been addressed satisfactorily.

Q: where does the ponded water go in the PKC?

A: some water reports to the middle pond and the rest would be released as seepage to the sumps or collection ponds.

- Diavik is going to start having a conversation about what can stay underground
- Next inspection will focus on making sure the mine site is clean – "spring cleaning"

Q: question about use of water to keep dust down on roads. Should it be clean from lake or process water?

A: one board member said the water should be clean.

7. WLWB Discussion – Item cancelled due to unavailability of WLWB staff

Discussion on instrumentation of WRSA

Gord Macdonald used the spare time to explain the process Diavik will be going through to meet the WLWB's Reasons for Decision regarding instrumentation of the WRSA.

Discussion:

- Till must be sampled and meet moisture content and particle size requirements.
- WLWB Decision requires Diavik to sample every 50m² and include five clusters of instruments in critical areas (thermistors to measure temperature and TDR probe to measure moisture content). They will use the sample results to identify worst-case situations as proposed locations.
- Installation must be done within 6 months of completion of placement of cover
- Board assumed instrumentation would not occur until progressive reclamation on the WRSA was complete, however Diavik would like to install as they go.
- This work cannot be done in winter as it requires drilling through the pile. Work must be done before October.
- Given the time sensitivity, WLWB suggested Diavik bring EMAB and GNWT up to speed on the issue and propose a 45-day review instead of 90-day review.

- Diavik will aim to make their submission by August to ensure a decision by mid-September.
- Instrumentation will be placed where Diavik thinks the worst-case scenario would be.
- WLWB directed the sampling plan to be included in a revised closure plan. Diavik proposes to submit an appendix for the sampling results and proposed locations instead of the whole WRSA Final Closure Plan report.
- Board felt this proposal was reasonable provided it is a one-time occurrence. EMAB should be able to turn their response around in about two weeks.

Lunch 12 pm – 1 pm

8. Air Quality Discussion

Kelly Fischer joined meeting.

ES presented item from kit. Noted that the original requirement for TSP monitoring was to verify EA predictions.

Concerns include:

- Golder dispersion model never reviewed by EMAB or GNWT
 - Dispersion model assumes A21 does not proceed
- Program does not follow original proposal from Golder; 2 units instead of 3 proposed, and in different locations
- Equipment has had a lot of problems and been out of service for long periods
- Data has multiple problems so may not be valid
- No data collected during open pit mining

Discussion:

- GNWT position – Diavik committed to verify model predictions. Diavik feels they have done that, but data collection rate does not support this. Premature to say they have verified prediction.
- Diavik noted the EAQMP program assessment will be submitted this month

Q: does re-design incorporate comments from reviewers?

A: Yes.

Q: ENR is willing to help Diavik with their EAQMP?

A: if Diavik wanted advice on using something else that has known track record in the north GNWT could provide advice. Can't necessarily provide training.

Q: Are the GNWT systems fully automated?

A: No, John Mackay spends 4-5 days at each station 3-4 times per year. GNWT has someone available to provide assistance at each site all year. GNWT has back-up monitors they can swap out, which is standard practice for air quality monitors. The monitors require ongoing maintenance and supervision. John spends a lot of time calibrating equipment. They have an 85% data capture rate.

- GNWT and EMAB need to review the model to see when it predicted high TSP, which might indicate when Diavik should put a priority on monitoring for TSP eg. summer
- EMAB principle is to make decisions based on science.
- Diavik could purchase another unit to allow them to swap one out for service

Q: Can dust canisters give this information?

A: Would need to see dispersion model. Dustfall canisters give number over an entire season and measure deposition. Programs are different.

- Dust includes everything – can't focus on one component. TS monitors provide hourly/daily information
- Noted that GNWT will be putting air regulations in place so it is in all parties best interests to have a well-designed, well set-up program in place
- ENR will review the revised EAQMP.

Action Item: Send letter to Diavik requesting that they continue to run the TSP monitors until EMAB has reviewed and provided comments on the program re-design.

Motion: EMAB staff draft letter to Diavik requesting they continue monitoring TSP monitors until the new program is finalized.

Moved: Doris Enzo

Seconded: Laurie McGregor

Motion carried.

ENR noted that the Air Quality Framework is on hold for now but the other parts of the proposed regulations are going ahead and will be in place by the end of the year.

Aileen Stevens is new contact for ENR.

Break 2:30-2:45

9. TK Panel meeting update and TK Recommendations follow-up

ED presented item from kit.

Discussion:

- EMAB had an undertaking to ask the Panel if they would be interested in doing an assessment of how Diavik has responded to their recommendations.
- EMAB should ask its consultants if they have seen other developments incorporate TK into management/monitoring plans.
- The Jay project EA requires Ekati to report on how they use TK. The annual report is due to MVEIRB July 1 EMAB should consider reviewing this report for ideas.
- Next TK panel meeting will likely be in the fall 2019 to see the North Inlet in ice-free conditions.

Q: Reason why storing PK underground wasn't in original closure plan?

A: This was not seen as a possibility at that time.

- Seems like TK Panel is functioning well.
- Diavik put TK recommendations in their Water Licence amendment application for the PK underground proposal
- Youth are good at asking questions that encourages the elders to speak up more.
- Panel has many topics that they want to cover so EMAB's proposal for a review of all recommendations is probably low on list.

Action Item: Board to address additional follow-up to TK Recommendations

10. IEMA Update

Marc Casas updated board on IEMA activities.

Discussion:

- Noted change to directors: Ron Allen replaced Doug Doan, Jesse Jasper filled vacancy and Bill Slater replaced Arnold Enge
- Updated website – added video to website for community members who don't get opportunity to go to site. Translated into three different languages
- Expecting updates to their EA to be finalized by summer 2018
- Jay was approved and recently put on hold, Misery Underground has not been approved yet; expecting RfD from WLWB next month; Sable has started
- Beartooth was first to receive PK – approx. 60% full. Will have a 30 m. water cap.
- Looking to use Panda Pit for PK deposition
- Looking to change potassium EQC; Misery ore body was causing increase in potassium, previously had water quality objective raised and asked to raise EQC. Board still hasn't made decision on this
- Composting has reduced waste a lot – takes place in an enclosed vessel.
- Security – seems like GNWT and LWBs are determining holdbacks for performance of closed components somewhat arbitrarily (15% holdback for Panda Diversion). Sent a letter to regulators to improve and define a process for holdback and relinquishment. Response was that they are working on it. Know that EMAB has similar concerns
- Reliability of some data – last ICRP was in 2011, updated report is due July 6, which includes reclamation research. Without Jay, closure will happen in 2021. IEMA is concerned with thermal modelling predictions and water balance in waste rock piles; Fox pile is not frozen in many places while Panda, Koala and Beartooth are largely frozen. No data on how much water is held in the waste rock piles.
- Held a workshop on waste rock
- Noted it is very hard to do a water balance on a full pile
- IEMA disappointed in DFO involvement in regulatory process

June 6, 2018

Meeting reconvened at 9:10 am

11. Update of SGP Wildlife Workshop and follow-up discussion with Diavik and Ekati

Dan Coulton (Golder) and Sean Sinclair on phone

ES presented item from kit.

Discussion:

- Noted that workshop was not structured to coordinate efforts between the mines and ENR → keep this as a broader recommendation to the GNWT: workshop should be more directive rather than providing information to the people, because there really is no other forum
- Workshops should be done more frequently

Karin Clark and Andrea Patenaude joined meeting

- GNWT noted that conversations about wolverine and grizzly occur in other forums.

Q: when were these other meetings?

A: Was a workshop last fall when the mines talked about grizzly monitoring; EMAB was not made aware of this

- No recent meeting about the wolverine

Q: Does GNWT see themselves having a role in standardizing caribou behavioural monitoring protocols?

A: Yes

Action Item: recommend GNWT hold workshops to coordinate mines' wildlife monitoring activities and include EMAB.

12. 2017 WMP Review

Petr Komers and Abbie Stewart joined the meeting by phone.

Sean Sinclair presented Diavik's 2017 WMP Report

Discussion:

- Observed 32 caribou groups close to the mine. Power analysis showed that 110 scans (55 near mine; 55 far from mine) would be needed to detect a 15% change in feeding intensity.
- Northern caribou migration is in line with predictions; southern migration is questionable
- Grizzly - set up six sampling sessions in 2017 and left for ten days. Identified 136 grizzly bears (55 males, 81 females). 74 grizzlies identified in previous surveys in 2012 and 2013. This is early data, but it seems like population is stable.
- Sightings of bears onsite – three-quarters were one bear that is resident (68 out of 90)
- 44 wolverine sighted
- 2 peregrine falcon nests
- 475 tonnes of waste incinerated; 375K litres of waste oil burned.
- Windfarm provides about 10% of energy
- Responses to EMAB comments on 2016 WMP and CAR are in Appendix J of report

Letter from EMAB - April 10, 2018 – preview of Diavik responses included in presentation. These resulted in a lot of discussion

- Letter requested Diavik establish a ToR for the WEMP, and asked questions on current program
- Comment on point (f) – changes to program design is not the same as adaptive management in response to program results i.e. adaptively managing a ZOI that is bigger than expected

Q: Are mitigation measures listed as well as changes to programs?

A: Some mitigative actions have been related to waste management.

- As far as EMAB is aware there have been no mitigative actions to reduce ZOI
- Diavik stated a formal response to EMAB's letter will be coming soon
- Discussion on what type of ZOI monitoring that should be done. Diavik felt the workshop didn't seem to think aerial surveys would be the best way to monitor ZOI as the ZOI varies

and the surveys disturb caribou. Folks more interested in mitigating the potential impacts of the ZOI.

- Last accepted ZOI analysis occurred in 2012. Something needs to be pursued at this point. There is no evidence that the ZOI has been minimized over time. Analysis of GPS collar data might explain variation in the data and show a potential cause. Then we could work towards mitigation. Data quality from aerial surveys is better.
- GNWT is going to send Boulanger's new analysis out with workshop report.
- If another analysis of ZOI is done it should include demographic information

Q: Who is part of the ZOI TTG?

A: Karin Clark, Andrea Patenaude and Jan Adamczewski for ENR, Golder (didn't capture who), Harry O'Keefe (Ekati) and Sarah Mclean (De Beers), Kim Poole, John Boulanger and EMAB.

Q: Anyone from communities on the TTG?

A: No, information on the technical details would be discussed in the smaller groups and the implications of technical details be discussed in the larger, more relevant forum.

- Mines met with ENR in June 2016 to discuss the caribou behavior monitoring protocol. Caribou movement patterns are different since mines. Movement patterns are changing yearly.
- Diavik is hesitant to change behavioural monitoring methods as concerned they'd lose data continuity.
- Methods between GNWT and the mines really aren't that different. Categories of behaviour are the same, if there were to be a change made it wouldn't mean that all the data needs to be thrown out.
- Changes in caribou behaviour is also part of the ZOI. They are lower level of investment than aerial surveys. Need more observations near and far from the site to get sample size that we need.
- GNWT secured funding from WWF and collaborating with UNBC to do a project on caribou behaviour based out of Gahcho Kue which will include analyzing stress hormones in fecal pellets and doing collar data analysis. Diavik can talk to ENR about getting involved. Student could potentially use Diavik behavioural data as well.
- GNWT not saying behavioural ZOI and distribution ZOI are the same
- If people aren't willing to change their methods, then problem almost seems unsolvable.
- EMAB has been hearing completely different things regarding the behavioural data collected by Diavik and Ekati in terms of its compatibility
- Ekati still does behavioural scans, but they do more focal scans which are not compatible, meaning there are very limited compatible data
- Need to have an agreement on which method mines/government are going to focus on. GNWT has come up with three different methods that are nested in what the mines already do. Will require being efficient with the time that goes into training.
- Population of grizzly seems stable; will wait for report before assessing future
- Wolverine hair snagging surveys – program was created to study population when it was an at-risk species, but it no longer is.
- GNWT is interested in the wolverine population as it has seen a decline. ENR isn't prepared to say that program is over. Diavik's interpretation is that changes in the population do not seem to be a mine effect. May be useful to have a discussion to consider less frequent monitoring
- Information on dust and vegetation monitoring to inform aspects of a caribou ZOI – if the mid field sites exceed the trigger they would switch back to three-year cycle.

Q: where did trigger come from?

A: Reference sites will be used for trigger in response to EMAB's previous comments

Diavik has analyzed behavior data to 2017 by combining it with the pre-2012 dataset to get enough power.

Q: Does feeding category include feeding and searching?

A: Head down includes feeding and searching.

- ENR is proposing another category for feeding intensity
- Diavik looked at caribou distribution using EMAB/MSES suggestions
- Diavik noted they do observations on all caribou at site regardless of herd
- Noted that caribou now arrive later at Diavik. Calves are older so more resilient.
- ENR is not backing away from the 14 km ZOI; it does vary by year but not by much
- Should we think about adaptive management in terms of the 14km ZOI? Range quality might be influencing this

Rest of item postponed until after lunch

13. Diavik security holdback estimates for WRSA-NCRP

Randy Knapp joined the meeting by phone.

Gord presented Diavik's estimate of security holdbacks for the WRSA

Discussion:

- Security is calculated through RECLAIM
- Security is held in two pieces for the WRSA; WRSA performance and Monitoring/Maintenance
- Diavik is interested in completing progressive reclamation to reduce the amount of security related to performance.

Q: Do you get it all back or is there a hold back?

A: Diavik didn't want an arbitrary hold back. Method should include science. GNWT and LWBs have not provided a process for this.

- Clear that there will be a hold back against performance. Question is how to calculate a hold back.
- The WLWB asked Diavik to provide estimate of security holdback for:
 - moisture content (which is shorter term),
 - against uncertainty with climate change and variation in thaw depth, and
 - long-term monitoring and maintenance. Diavik provided a proposal for the first two.
- Diavik came up with methodology and wanted to distribute it for review for others to comment on.
- Maximum reasonable consequence – small area of thaw back versus whole pile in worst climate scenario. Diavik proposes increasing cover thickness by an additional meter to address both these possibilities:
 - For moisture content increase cover over a small area of side slopes
 - For climate change cover entire side slope
- Diavik is proposing the holdback be based on the likelihood of the event happening. This is subjective

Randy discussed his concerns with the proposal:

- Approach seems rational. Concerns include:
- No basis provided for likelihood estimates
 - The problem either will or will not happen – full cost or none
- Unit rate might not be representative; must include things like bringing equipment to site, setting up a camp, removing equipment from site, and monitoring
- Diavik noted the numbers are from GNWT – can't say it is fully inclusive of mobilization such as putting in an ice-road in two successive years (equipment comes in one year and goes out the next).
- RECLAIM includes mobilization costs; Diavik is not asking for those reductions as part of hold back. Question is whether these estimates fully include potential mobilization costs. If they do then there shouldn't be a problem with the rates.
- Diavik has not done projections after 100 years, which was part of WLWB Directive. Diavik technically hasn't answered this, although it is not clear how they would.
 - Diavik assumes this would refer to establishing a trend line
- Error noted where unit should be square meters not cubic meters

Q: What is the basis for the Likelihood table?

A: Table comes from risk processes used within company. Numbers are conservative.

- Randy would have liked to see Diavik incorporate all the failure modes (not just moisture and climate change) and come up with likelihood
- Not sure how to improve likelihood estimates
- It would be helpful to have some engineering discussion in the proposal
- Comment deadline is June 29

Action Item: EMAB will draft comments (including Diavik responses to questions) and send to Randy and Gord to respond to, then to Board for approval prior to comment deadline.

Lunch 12 pm – 1 pm

13 con't

MSES presented the results of the 2017 WMP Report review:

- Includes report, conference call with Golder, SGP Workshop, Appendix J responses, EMAB correspondence and recent wolverine DNA report.
- Indirect habitat loss may be a potential consideration for ZOI, but no prediction related to this
 - Golder states the ZOI would implicitly capture this
- Boulanger has also brought up range quality in his analysis of ZOI

Q: Is Diavik going to be using reference sites as trigger to resume Vegetation and Lichen Surveys?

A: Yes

ZOI

- The recent ZOI work by Boulanger using collar data could be applied to the ZOI
- Need to investigate effect of resuming open pit mining at A21.
- TK might help to identify causes of ZOI

Behaviour

- Ekati and Diavik should cooperate on behavior protocols
- Will update report following June 14 conference call

TK

Q: From own experience, have you been involved in projects that have successfully incorporated TK that you could share to help Diavik?

A: Past two or three years combining TK and western science on a project in Wood Buffalo National Park. Involves First Nations in northern Alberta. MSES will send link.

Q: Who called the June 14 meeting?

A: EMAB

- MSES have questions about statistical independence of collar data that weren't addressed in past report.
- Investigate reasons for change in southern migration
- MSES suggested TK could help Diavik determine why some predictions i.e. distribution are not being followed and could help with adaptive management solutions.

Q: Could EMAB present options for what responses they could take?

A: Mines should consolidate information from all projects which could help narrow down what might be applicable for Diavik mine specifically. An adaptive management workshop may be an avenue where this could happen

- The Boots on the Ground program described a situation where caribou were unable to migrate past a pinch point due to wolves herding them and landscape barriers. Something similar could be done specific to the Diavik and Ekati mines to find out what is shifting the migration. Perhaps there is something else on the landscape that needs to be observed. There could be ways to reduce noise and activities.

Q: Does Diavik have any protocols for blasting?

A: No policy on how far caribou must be for blasting. Management is done when caribou are on site.

- Noted that Sabina has proposed to stop blasting when caribou are within 5 km.

Q: Temporal link for dust and caribou movement/caribou behaviour?

A: Can't comment but could provide formal response (Diavik).

Grizzly seem OK. They are listed as a species of special concern

Wolverine also OK

- MSES is supportive of the combination of track and hair surveys for wolverine
- Wolverine population in NT is no longer at risk but is declining. This is due to a re-designation of the population
- Possible effect of caribou range contraction.

Waste Management

Fox and wolverine were highest in WTA – higher than 2016. Attraction to A21 has decreased. Keep track of numbers and compare going forward.

Q: Does Diavik document the adaptive management actions in the report (putting up a fence, educating employees)?

A: No, this could be another EMAB recommendation

Q: Is the new behavioural data going to be in the WMP report?

A: Diavik will be providing new data with response to EMAB's April 10, 2018 letter.

- MSES will wait to finalize report until the June 14 call

Action Item: Have MSES send EMAB information on TK studies they have worked on.

Action Item: EMAB recommend Diavik include a description of all adaptive management activities in the WMP reports that are taken to reduce effects to wildlife.

Action Item: EMAB to consider recommending / hosting a workshop on possible adaptive management measures for wildlife – ZOI, behavior, distribution

Action Item: EMAB to follow up MSES review of WEMP Report with recommendations to Diavik and GNWT

14. Board Member Round Table and Community Concerns

Sean Richardson – Tlicho Government

- Spoke with management staff and community government – open to having EMAB and other monitoring boards come to the communities to provide updates
- Will send out invitations to all boards

Doris Enzoe – Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation

- No updates from community

Arnold Enge – North Slave Metis Alliance

- No community concerns about Diavik

Laurie McGregor – GNWT

- GNWT will review Diavik's Water Licence amendment application

Q: Should EMAB be sending a letter regarding GNWT providing comments on the wildlife closure criteria in Diavik's ICRP?

A: Wouldn't hurt to have EMAB send a letter on this.

Action Item: EMAB send letter to GNWT requesting that they provide comments on the closure criteria related to wildlife in Diavik's ICRP.

15. Next Meeting

Next meeting was tentatively set for August 14-15, 2018.

Chair adjourned the meeting at 2:10 pm.