

Hello Patrick.

The concern I have is that not all statements identify who made them and there are assumptions being made that DIAND is responsible or has some liability in some sort of way. Put yourself in the place of someone reading the comments on the public registry who was not at the meeting, like myself or our District Inspectors. Are you going to identify who/what organization asked the questions, made the comments, responses, observations etc.? Don't you think some of them are rather vague and ambiguous? Some statements don't seem to consider that there was different legislation (TLURs) in the past which has been replaced (with the MVLURs). We are kind of apprehensive about how people might react to the statements.

In order to provide a reference for soliciting comments from other DIAND staff I identified your groups of Comments, Questions, etc, by numbering them from 1 to 59. Only Item #s 8, 12, 15 & 16, which relate to our District Office (Inspectors) are a concern to us.

8. Comment – I don't want to see things that were missed in past EAs to be dragged into the present one. A lot of things that happened at the site occur over 20 years ago. I don't know what liability the company has and what liability DIAND has.

DIAND does not have any liability because any activity occurring at this site, past or present, is the Companies responsibility according to existing land use permits and lease documents and the company is still very much solvent and active.

12. Comment – Monitoring of roads and their physical stability is a concern so that sedimentation is not a problem. Erosion problems were clearly visible in the video. How is CZN going to ensure that the roads don't become a problem in the future? Those are the kind of details we need to know.

*Response (CZN) – DIAND looks at the roads, have they shared their information about them?
Response – CZN is responsible for the roads, not DIAND. Assurance is needed that if CZN leaves, the roads will be looked after.*

The roads constructed, past or future, are regulated and monitored as per the conditions in land use permits and lease covenants according to the processes currently in place, that is the assurance that is required. It should be realized that the environmental standard 20 years ago was different from today. Any new L U P for drilling and access roads should have conditions that the Company/Permitee must adhere to.

Our District Inspectors feel the statement, "Erosion problems were clearly visible in the video." is a rather inflammatory statement which could reflect badly on them, since the video isn't readily available. Is the video going to be viewable on the registry? On Line? and to "who" are the problems clearly visible. Also statements could be taken out of context. Again who made the Comment? Did you consider that the statements might be interpreted as being slanderous to those

who enforce the regulations?

15. Comment – I'm not sure that all road disturbances are attributed to the company; some might be the responsibility of DIAND.

As far as our Inspectors know, other than inspecting roads under land use permit conditions or lease covenants, DIAND has no other responsibility for road disturbances at the CZN site.

16. Comment (CZN) – DIAND is the ultimate steward of the land, we have a surface lease agreement with them for the facilities.

Yes, which is for Minesite Maintenance only. The Company still needs a Land Use Permit for any activity under Sec. 4 or 5 of the MVLURs..

If the notes are only general information and not to be considered a verbatim transcript of what was said why would you make them available to the general public?

Ken Leishman
DIAND Land Administration