



Environmental Management System Working Group Meeting – 25 April 2012

27 June 2012



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

EA No. 0809-001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. MARCH 5 2012 MEETING SUMMARY	2
3. EMS FRAMEWORK AND APPROACH TO EMS/EMP DEVELOPMENT	2
4. EHSC POLICY	5
5. EMS WG TERMS OF REFERENCE	5
6. DESIGN STAGES/REFINEMENTS VS. RECLAMATION RESEARCH PLANS AND JUNE INFO SESSION	6
7. LIFE-OF-PROJECT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	7
8. ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLANS (EMPs)	7
9. FORMAL CLOSING REMARKS	9
10. GENERAL DISCUSSION – DRAFT EMP OUTLINE / EMS MATRICES.....	9
APPENDIX A – ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM UPDATE – POWERPOINT PRESENTATION	14
APPENDIX B – DRAFT GMRP ENVIRONMENT, HEALTH, SAFETY AND COMMUNITY POLICY.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
APPENDIX C – DRAFT GMRP EHSC POLICY COMMENTS TRACKING TABLE	15
APPENDIX D – DRAFT EMS WORKING GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	21



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 25 April 2012

June 27, 2012

1. INTRODUCTION

The Giant Mine Remediation Project (GMRP) Team organized a meeting of the Environmental Management System (EMS) Working Group of the Parties (WG). The meeting was held in the Basement Boardroom of the Scotia Building in Yellowknife, 25 April 2012 from 9:00 to 12:30 (extended time 1:30 - 3:30 pm).

The PowerPoint presentation used by the Project Team is provided in Appendix A. Meeting participants included members of the GMRP, as well as representatives from the interested parties and regulatory boards:

Giant Mine Remediation Project Team	Team Member
Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	Octavio Melo
Government of the Northwest Territories – Environment and Natural Resources (GNWT-ENR)	Erika Nyssonen
Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC)	Lisa Dyer
	Norm Quail
	Linda Pickett
	Chris Doupe
GMRP Interested Party	Representative
Environment Canada (EC)	Amy Sparks
Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO)	Morag McPherson
Alternatives North (AN)	Kevin O'Reilly (regrets)
Yellowknives Dene First Nation (YKDFN)	Todd Slack
City of Yellowknife (City)	Dennis Kefalas (regrets)
Observer	Representative
Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board (MVEIRB)	Alan Ehrlich
Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board (MVLWB)	Kathleen Graham

*Notes were taken by Krista Amey, DPRA.

Lisa Dyer (PWGSC) provided an overview of the meeting's agenda and initiated roundtable introductions. Lisa then presented the purpose and objectives of the meeting.

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

This meeting was a follow-up to the 5 March 2012 EMS Update with the Parties, with the purpose of providing another informal update on the recent and current activities of the GMRP Team on the EMS and seek further feedback from interested parties to inform both content and process for the continuing development of the EMS.



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 25 April 2012

June 27, 2012

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this meeting:

- To provide an update to WG Members on progress since last meeting and the continuing development of the EMS
- To communicate the overall approach for development and implementation of the EMS
- To seek feedback on the approach and suggestions for appropriate times and means for engagement with interested parties

This report provides a summary of this meeting and will be uploaded to the Review Board registry along with the associated materials.

2. MARCH 5 2012 MEETING SUMMARY

Lisa and Octavio Melo (AANDC) gave a quick update on the status of the March 5 Meeting Summary and the EHSC Policy. Comments and edits from the Parties have been incorporated into the summary report and the revised document has been re-circulated. The comments and edits from the Parties on the Environmental, Health, Safety and Community (EHSC) Policy have been consolidated in a table and some preliminary thought has been given on how the GMRP Team will incorporate them into a revised policy document.

During the March 5 meeting, there was a request that the Gap Analysis be distributed. This has been completed. Morag McPherson (DFO) said that she had a couple of questions but that perhaps a discussion on the Gap Analysis could occur at a later date, allowing other Parties to review it, too.

Erika Nyssonen (GNWT-ENR) said that there have been a number of draft documents distributed for review and that perhaps at the end of today's session, the group can set a deadline for reviewers' comments to be submitted.

3. EMS FRAMEWORK AND APPROACH TO EMS/EMP DEVELOPMENT

Octavio provided a synopsis of the conceptual framework of the EMS, which included an overview of the bodies involved and the project engagement activities. He then laid out the process moving from the EMS through the Environmental Management Plans (EMPs) and on to the Environmental Management Programs which will be developed by the contractors. Octavio identified the conceptual steps stemming from the EMPs, involving the Design, Construction, Operations/Care & Maintenance, and Management and Governance. Octavio reviewed the proposed short-term priorities of the EMS WG.



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 25 April 2012

June 27, 2012

Todd Slack (YKDFN) suggested that the term *Environmental Management Program* be changed as its acronym is the same as *Environmental Management Plan*, which potentially leads to confusion.

Morag asked if it is standard practice to incorporate Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) other than Environmental (i.e. Occupational Health and Safety (OH&S) or Community) in an EMS Framework.

Octavio responded that the more progressive frameworks do, depending on the situation (e.g. Nexsen Corporation). GMRP started with Environment as the main focus at first, but it became apparent that it was most logical to integrate environment, health and safety and community into a single management approach.

ACTION

- a. **EMS Team to clarify EMP terminology.**
- b. **EMS Team to rename *Environmental Management Program* such that it does not have the same acronym as *Environmental Management Plan*.**

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE INTERESTED PARTIES

Alan Ehrlich (MVEIRB) requested clarification on the roles of EC and DFO as Interested Parties and as advisors to the EA.

Morag explained that EC and DFO do not work on behalf of the proponent but provide expertise to assist the GMRP in the design of the program. They provide peer review of all relevant documents, ensuring compliance to the pertinent federal acts (e.g., *Fisheries Act*) and regulatory requirements.

Alan stressed the importance of clarity on the roles and responsibilities of the Interested Parties moving forward.

Lisa provided an example where, as one of her projects is the Baker Creek Diversion, she goes to DFO for advice and as concerns are raised regarding management. Part of the intent of EMS meetings like this one, is to provide openness and transparency. Parties are given the opportunity to comment and to understand the perspectives of other Parties. EC and DFO provide advice to GMRP, as do the other Parties, but also ensure that regulatory requirements are being met.

Octavio further clarified that the information provided by all Interested Parties is considered in development of the EMPs. The EMPs, in turn, will be reviewed by the Parties to further ensure they contain all necessary information.

SIDEBAR DISCUSSION

- EC and DFO to have a discussion with MVEIRB at some point to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the Interested Parties.



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 25 April 2012

June 27, 2012

Todd Slack (YKDFN) stated his confusion regarding the preparation of the Developer Assessment Report (DAR) and the inclusion of contribution from the Parties.

Morag said that DFO had provided comments on the DAR but email circulation of documents/comments is not always the best mode of communication. Lisa said that because communication among several groups is difficult through email and phone calls, this is why the GMRP is trying to meet like we are today – to facilitate open dialogue.

WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE

Todd requested clarification on the term Work Breakdown Structure (WBS).

Octavio explained that WBS is an engineering term used when a project is theoretically deconstructed into manageable and intuitive sub-projects. For example, the GMRP is broken down by mine component, and then further broken down by finer elements and so on; consequently useful in analyzing the regulatory requirements by mine component or element and then ensuring that these are met. See Section 10.

Lisa further clarified that a WBS is a way of organizing the projects into meaningful packages for delivery.

EMS WORKING GROUP PRIORITIES

Octavio had identified the development of an EMP for the Roaster demolition as one of the proposed priorities of the WG. Todd asked about the status of the Roaster demolition from the regulatory point-of-view, stating that it needs clarification.

Octavio said that the Roaster is part of the EA but there is a related but separate process being considered to proceed with permitting because of the unacceptable nature of the risks to health and safety and the environment. Octavio further said that, in terms of contracting, the GMRP will proceed using the Design/Build approach (i.e. one contractor will do both the design and planning of the work as well as the actual demolition).

Morag had a question regarding priorities. She said that there were a couple of recommendations that had come out of the Gap Analysis. She suggested that at some point the GMRP should produce a list of priorities.

Chris Doupe (PWGSC), Erika and Octavio all agreed; further stating that there is a very draft list that has been developed but that input from Interested Parties would be helpful.

ACTION

- c. EMS Team to circulate draft list of priority activities for input from the Parties.**



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 25 April 2012

June 27, 2012

4. EHSC POLICY

Octavio reiterated that all of the comments received from the Parties have been helpful and have been compiled into a table (see Appendix B). The GMRP Team has reviewed all of the comments and has drafted some preliminary responses, on which further input is sought from the Parties. The table has been circulated for comment on whether GMRP's response and direction is supported.

Octavio asked the group how it would be best to tackle the Policy and its associated comments and draft responses. He further noted that the Policy will be signed by the Assistant Deputy Minister of AANDC.

Todd suggested that it would probably be best to leave it for a later date.

Lisa agreed that that would be fair. The Parties need the opportunity to digest the comments and recommended responses.

ACTION

- d. Address comments and responses on the Policy at the next EMS Working Group of the Parties Meeting in May.**

5. EMS WG TERMS OF REFERENCE

Octavio, through a number of slides, provided an overview of the draft Terms of Reference for the EMS Working Group. This overview included the WG's mandate, its members and their responsibilities, meetings and funding. Octavio identified that there will be another WG meeting in May, a public meeting in June on the EMS and then this will be followed by another meeting of the WG in the summer. The Public Hearings will be in September.

REMEDIATION OBJECTIVES

Following Octavio's presentation, there was a discussion centred on the GMRP objectives. Todd stated that part of the issue is that the objectives for some of the mine components are fuzzy and confusing. Lisa agreed that there needs to be an understanding of what is driving the EMS matrices. The Parties need to see the GMRP's objectives and then, once they have seen the objectives, the Parties can look at the matrices with more of a contextual understanding.

Morag stated that there is lots of scattered information in the DAR. It would be helpful if the GMRP Team could summarize the current status of the project and provide this to the Parties. Amy Sparks (EC) agreed saying that it is a struggle to understand the current thinking and status because the Parties don't have all of the information because things are ongoing. Amy asked why the EMPs won't be completed and available prior to the Public Hearings. Erika indicated that we are now trying to play



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 25 April 2012

June 27, 2012

catch-up because of the process that has been taken to date. Amy stated that she is confident that all of the concerns raised by the Parties will be considered.

At the end of the discussion, it was decided that the GMRP would produce a document identifying each of the mine components and the high-level objectives for each. Then once this context is provided we can continue to move forward by bringing in the complexity.

ACTION

- e. GMRP to provide a brief overview of current project status in future presentations to the EMS Working Group of the Parties**
- f. GMRP Team to produce a document identifying each of the mine components and the associated high-level objectives.**

Morag asked if the commitments and the DAR are being updated as the project moves along. Keeping the critical documents updated and the Parties informed, such that we're not all working on different levels, will help in the Parties' evaluations.

Lisa asked if there were any other issues or concerns regarding the Terms of Reference.

Todd indicated that he has written comments at his office. Erika asked that if the Parties have any ideas to please forward them along.

Octavio said that there is a three-page document on the Terms of Reference and that any suggestions from the Parties regarding what the GMRP should work on until the end of the fiscal year are welcomed.

Todd said that he read Kevin O'Reilly's (AN) comments on the Terms of Reference, who had stated that a list of acronyms and definitions would be helpful but generally the Terms of Reference seemed alright. It was noted by Erika that a definitions list has been circulated for review and comment.

Todd feels that it would be good to go into the June meeting without a workplan and perhaps it can be developed afterwards. Norm Quail (PWGSC) said that we know that we have a lot to accomplish and that there is a strong need to identify issues that need to be clarified before the Public Hearings.

6. DESIGN STAGES/REFINEMENTS VS. RECLAMATION RESEARCH PLANS AND JUNE INFO SESSION

Octavio presented the GMRP's Cost Uncertainty Curve and the predicted Timeline through to the end of Remediation into Perpetual Care. He drew attention to the fact that uncertainties will be resolved as designs evolve and pointed out that the design refinement process and the closure research plans are parallel processes which intercept and interact. He then stated that the GMRP has tentative plans to



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 25 April 2012

June 27, 2012

hold a Public Open House in mid-June with the objective to inform the public on the status of the design and EMP development, and to seek public input.

7. LIFE-OF-PROJECT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Chris provided an overview of the “Life of Project” Management Plan. This synopsis provided high-level and specific objectives, the mechanics of collecting baseline conditions, the design parameters of the program, aspects to be monitored, inspections, audits and adaptive management. Chris also summarized the program design status, delivery and potential for online public access.

ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

Todd brought up that monitoring and management ought to be kept separate since monitoring informs management. Chris agreed and stated that both are part of the program.

Alan said that it is important to understand and identify that there are some cases in which adaptive management is not applicable. He pointed out that bullet #4 on slide #26 (Challenge Function) is a broad and sweeping statement and it needs to be clarified. When is adaptive management appropriate and when is it not appropriate.

Erika asked for an example of when adaptive management is not appropriate. Lisa stated that performance evaluation is part of the program and that we will always consider ways to improve/modify, if needed.

ACTION

- g. GMRP Team to clearly identify in the plan when adaptive management is applicable and when it is not applicable.**

TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS

Todd emphasized the importance of clear definitions and terminologies (i.e., objectives, baseline, framework, etc.).

8. ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLANS (EMPs)

Norm gave an overview of the Environmental Management Plans (EMPs). This included the purpose of the EMPs; EMP integration into the EMS; development, approval and amendments of EMPs; contracting and responsibilities; definitions and conformance to requirements; response to abnormal and emergency conditions; training and communication; monitoring and metrics; and Sampling and Analysis Plans (SAPs).



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 25 April 2012

June 27, 2012

Todd sought clarification on the matrices versus the 1- to 5-page EMP document.

Chris and Octavio explained that the matrices are the analyses and the EMP is the plan that is yielded from the analysis.

ACTION

- h. Norm will populate an EMP with Building information to help demonstrate how the matrices will link to the development of an Environmental Management Plan.**

INSPECTOR/CONTRACTOR FEEDBACK LOOP

A discussion took place on how “Measures of Success” came up during the Technical Sessions. That is, how will the GMRP provide direction/controls to the contractor regarding regulatory requirements and how will this inform the Regulators. There needs to be a two-directional flow of information. Morag suggested that criteria get listed; for example, conditions of the Water Licence.

CONSTRUCTION MANAGER

Lisa asked if the roles and responsibilities of the Construction Manager were clear to the group. Norm stated that the Construction Manager would be analogous to the General Contractor on a construction site, who oversees the overall project and sub-contracts out components of the work, such as plumbing, electrical, etc.

Morag enquired regarding the timing. Will the EMPs be finalized before contracting is in place? Running the two in parallel may cause difficulties. It would be important to include some language in the contract regarding the potential for change orders.

Norm said that some of the EMPs will be in place prior to the construction management. In order for any remedial activities to occur EMPs will be required and approved.

Octavio provided further details of how the Construction Manager approach generally operates. He said that it will have to be made clear that the Construction Manager will not be allowed to undertake the bulk of the work. During the selection process, the GMRP will review track records of bidders. The Construction Manager will have to understand that they will only be allowed to do approximately 20% of the work with their own work forces. Construction packages will be produced and provided to the Construction Manager, who in turn lines up the required trades people and sub-contractors to complete the job.

QUALITY ASSURANCE / QUALITY CONTROL

Morag asked what quality control mechanisms are in place. Lisa further asked how approval of the plan will take place. If it is flawed – how is the checking function applied?

Norm stated that the overall accountability lies with the GMRP Environmental Manager, who will ensure that things are happening as they should be. Octavio added that the GMRP will have to determine how



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 25 April 2012

June 27, 2012

to review and approve contractor submittals. He said that it needs to be made clear that work cannot start until there is approval and what the penalties would be, if it does.

Morag stated that it will be important to show the GMRP's commitment by demonstrating through the EMPs how the Construction Manager will meet the requirements. The check function must be clearly communicated.

FUNDING

A brief dialogue centered on funding occurred. Alan asked if funding is part of today's discussion. Octavio stated that currently funding is coming to the GMRP through the Treasury Board in 5-year increments. The possibility of other ways of securing funding would need to be explored in the future.

METRICS

A quick discussion took place on establishment of the metrics. It was clarified that the regulatory bodies have mandated metrics and these will be provided in the EMPs.

9. FORMAL CLOSING REMARKS

The formal meeting with the Parties ended at 12:30. Lisa asked if people were available to return following a one-hour break for lunch, to discuss the matrices and the draft EMP outline in more detail. However, due to prior commitments, Octavio, Morag, Alan and Kathleen were unable to return. Consequently, the GMRP Team along with Todd and Amy reconvened from 1:30 to 3:30.

Before breaking for lunch, Lisa thanked everyone who attended the meeting, stating that once again a lot of very good information came out of the gathering and that further feedback regarding the documents that have been (and will be) circulated would be very beneficial. Erika will send out a suggested date and time for the next meeting of the EMS Working Group in the next week or so along with revised documents for review by the Parties. Lisa ended the morning by re-stating the importance of these meetings, in that they provide a forum that facilitates open dialogue and continued sharing of information. Such information-sharing ultimately leads to the improvement of content and process for the further development and success of the EMS.

10. GENERAL DISCUSSION – DRAFT EMP OUTLINE / EMS MATRICES

The smaller group resumed at 1:30 for a general discussion centered on the draft EMP outline and the sample EMS matrix.



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 25 April 2012

June 27, 2012

PARTY PARTICIPATION

Amy started the discussion by re-stating her struggle with how high-level the EMS is at this point, but further saying that perhaps going through the specifics will help. She just wants to be assured that the EMPs will get updated as new regulations come out.

Linda Pickett (PWGSC) clarified that part of ISO 14001 is that the EMPs are continually re-evaluated and updated as new information and new regulations come in. Norm further stated that there will be dedicated and registered staff who will keep up with the regulations and the updating of the EMPs. Amy further stated that the feedback loop and applicable action would be good to see. Norm said that bringing the EMPs down to an understandable level is important, plus the need to clearly define terms.

Amy suggested, in terms of priority EMPs, that it would be good to get the Long-Term Monitoring Plan done first. Erika agreed that the Long-Term Monitoring Plan is needed now.

Lisa asked Amy how she sees EC's involvement moving forward. Amy said that she is the main contact person with the direction from her managers that Giant Mine is her priority. She sees having to call on other EC people for their expertise. Amy said that she would like to be involved in the re-vegetation and the vegetation of the tailings cover, etc., as well as some other smaller issues.

Lisa asked Todd what are the needs of the YKDFN moving forward. Todd said that the Yellowknives want the plans to be Best Practices, ensuring that there is a high bar set. In terms of participating, he doesn't know, but he definitely sees involvement in helping to set up the overarching terms and definitions.

JUNE DESIGN SESSIONS

Erika said that the language for the Public Forums will be scaled down. She further stated that the GMRP is looking for suggestions regarding the need for two sets of sessions: one for the Parties and one for the Public.

Lisa asked Todd for input on how to bring participation in the YKDFN. Todd said that earlier in June would be better because people will be out on the land later in June and throughout the summer. There is a YKDFN Assembly in June, too. Lisa further asked what the GMRP can do to get information out effectively, suggesting a general information session, perhaps with stations by mine component. Todd asked if he could take away these questions for input from the Yellowknives community. He said that simplicity will be key to all of this – at this point the Parties do not have a clear sense of the Project. Todd further stated that he wants to see the mine components and their objectives presented in terms of the Giant Mine vision.

WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE

Todd sought further clarification on the Work Breakdown Structures, specifically what they are and who the Project Managers are for each. Following the response, Todd inquired as to the overarching roles and responsibilities of AANDC and PWGSC. Lisa said that AANDC is the owner of the site and is



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 25 April 2012

June 27, 2012

responsible for the overall delivery of the project. AANDC sets the overarching goals and secures much of the funding through the Treasury Board. PWGSC is like the general contractor and is responsible for the finer delivery of the project in terms of contracting and procurement. PWGSC oversees Care and Maintenance, manages the design, and contracts the technical design. There is a service agreement between AANDC and PWGSC, which allows PWGSC to carry out the project.

Work Breakdown Structure (WBS)

1. Baker Creek
2. Surface Water Management
3. Water Treatment Plant
4. Contaminated Soils
5. Care & Maintenance
6. Building Demo
7. Tailings
8. Freeze Optimization Study (FOS)
9. Highway Realignment
10. Waste Management
11. Mine Openings
12. Open Pits
13. Underground
14. Borrow Sources

Mine Component

1. Waste Management
2. Freeze and Underground Works
3. Tailings and FS Tailings
4. Open Pits
5. Baker Creek
6. New WTP
7. Soils
8. Buildings

EMPs AND MATRICES

Todd asked how many EMPs there will be in the end – 14 (to match the number of WBSs); or 8 (to match the number of Mine Components)? Chris answered that the final number of EMPs that will come out of all of this is not known at this point (a minimum of 8, plus the Life of Project EMP). Norm said that as the EMPs get developed, we may realize we need others for site-wide issues (e.g., air quality monitoring). There is a need to define the parameters up front rather than being prescriptive.

Norm provided an overview of the process of developing the matrices and how these will lead to the identification and development of the EMPs.

Amy asked for clarification on whether the matrix is draft or complete. Norm responded by saying that it is draft and that they want to distribute it to people ahead of time for review – asking “does it capture everything?” Then once the gaps are identified, they’ll go to the designers.

Lisa said that what seems to be missing is how the matrix ties into the WBSs. Norm said that the matrices tie into the DAR and that what we can’t see here today is that on the spreadsheet, each of these matrices is identified by the tab at the bottom saying for example, “Waste/Building/Soils”. The matrices are working tools. There are a lot of difficulties with trying to operate in so many different languages (DAR, contractors, ISO 14001, etc.) and trying to bring it all together.



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 25 April 2012

June 27, 2012

INSPECTOR/CONTRACTOR FEEDBACK LOOP

Erika re-stated that contractor/inspector bit from earlier is key. Linda said that typically a checklist is produced to support an EMP.

Todd said that how the audit is achieved is not important; what is important are the clear components, objectives, remediation criteria and performance criteria (= checklists). For example, Erosion/Stability (Sub-Parameter) → Objectives → Criteria → Translate “minimize” into measurable numbers so inspectors have something to cross-check.

Lisa asked if pulling out the mine components, objectives and criteria and putting in a PowerPoint presentation for the next meeting so that there is comfort among the group members, knowing that everybody is on the same page. Norm suggested parking the draft EMP for the time being and either change the nomenclature or populate it with an example.

ACTION

- i. **GMPT separate the waste/building/soils matrix into individual matrices. Next meeting to focus on the buildings matrix to review objectives, remediation activities, and closure criteria.**

Lisa also said we need to ask what are the interests and concerns of the Parties – the Parties don’t care “how”, just want to see that objectives are being addressed and how they are being measured.

Amy and Todd agreed that their concern is that the GMRP is meeting remediation (closure) criteria and performance (action) criteria.

Lisa asked that the group now focus on the Next Steps as we are running out of time today.

Todd said he’d like to see:

1. insertion of a new column for closure criteria
2. break out into components to understand (walk through an example - Buildings)

It was decided by the end of the afternoon’s discussion that there would be another meeting of the EMS Team and the Parties during the week of May 14th. During this meeting the EMS Team will lead the Parties through an example of a Mine Component with its associated objectives, remediation and performance criteria. Lisa suggested that the mid-May be a full day based on availability.

ACTION

- j. **Erika will re-circulate the draft documents for review and feedback within two weeks. These documents include the, definitions and the EMS WG Terms of Reference, Policy Table, and Draft Gap Analysis.**
- k. **Erika will send an email suggesting a date and time during the week of May 14th.**



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 25 April 2012

June 27, 2012

Lisa and Erika thanked Todd and Amy for staying for the discussion, stating that it has been very useful in moving the EMS forward.



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 25 April 2012

June 27, 2012

APPENDIX A – ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM UPDATE – POWERPOINT PRESENTATION



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 25 April 2012

June 27, 2012

APPENDIX B – DRAFT GMRP EHSC POLICY COMMENTS TRACKING TABLE

Policy Section	Comment Number	Comment	Response/ Status	Comment/Discussion
Preamble	1	Todd: Just what is being integrated? Shouldn't the efforts occurring since the submission of the DAR be incorporated? If not, this policy is out of date/based on incorrect information and thus unacceptable. If the Information Requests are stale the day they're submitted, then should the last reference date be from 2 years ago?	See comment	The EMS is dynamic and adaptive and will incorporate all changes to legal and other requirements, policies, and standards as determined by the Project Leadership.
	2	Kevin: Proper references should be provided to these other policies and documents, including an internet link where possible.	Accepted	
Purpose	3	Todd: Objectives is a special word in the closure scheme. Use 'Goals'...it requires the project to provide definitions, as suggested in the tech sessions.	Accepted	Language to be aligned with Guidelines and Closure Goal to be stated.
	4	Todd: Which objectives? The ones from the DAR or the ones to be developed?	See comment	The objectives are those for the Project, and will be included in the Objectives section of the Policy
Scope	5	Todd: The project or the plan. I suspect it's the plan.	See comment	This policy applies to the "Project" as defined in the Project Charter.
Objectives	6	Todd: Don't sound like objectives to me. What about providing for a model remediation that reflects some notion of turning a fiasco into something that could potentially benefit the community? Or is it just to reduce risk?	Under consideration	
	7	Kevin: Consultation should be defined as follows: " Consultation " shall mean, at a minimum: (1) the provision, to the party to be consulted, of notice of a matter to be decided in sufficient form and detail to allow that party to prepare its views on the matter, (2) the provision of a reasonable period of time in which the party to be consulted may prepare its views on the matter, and provision of an opportunity to present such views to the party obliged to consult, and (3) full and fair consideration by the party obliged to consult of any views presented	Under consideration	
	8	Kevin: These objectives very much sound like the lowest common-denominator approach.	See comment	Objectives will be reconsidered given the input from interested parties

Policy Section	Comment Number	Comment	Response/ Status	Comment/Discussion
	9	Todd: Sound more like objectives. How can the objectives for the plan to meet the objectives of the project be so different?	See comment	The objectives are those of the Project, which will be reconsidered as indicated in comment 8
	10	Kevin: This section should contain some form or recognition or acknowledgement that frozen block method is only an interim solution.	See comment 8	
	11	Kevin: The 'industrial' remediation standard for the site has never been accepted by the community and was unilaterally decided by AANDC and GNWT in the Cooperation Agreement, a deal where GNWT limited its liability but had to agree to AANDC decision to only remediate to an industrial standard.	See comment	There may be other versions of how the industrial standard was selected and this Policy will not address that. Objectives will be reconsidered as indicated in comment 8
Guiding Principles	12	<p>Krista: DFO's comments :</p> <p><u>Guiding Principles</u> – As mentioned in the notes, below are some ideas for additional guiding principles found in existing policies that could be incorporated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound environmental stewardship (Federal Contaminated Sites Management Policy – Treasury Board 2002) – related to environmental protection • Timely and reasonable action (Treasury Board 2002) – to protect env, health and safety. • Technical and scientific rigour – commitment to scientifically-valid and/or systematic management frameworks for planning, implementation and monitoring (AANDC Northern Affairs Program Contaminated Sites Management Policy – AANDC 2002a) • Continuous improvement – use of best available knowledge (scientific, traditional and local) for decision-making and continuous improvement of technologies and methods (Mine Site Reclamation Policy for NWT – AANDC 2002b, AANDC EHS policy and AANDC Sustainable Development Strategy) 	Under consideration	
	13	Todd: Where is the past guidance on this from the research and the IRS?	See comment	Unclear what Todd is getting at

Policy Section	Comment Number	Comment	Response/ Status	Comment/Discussion
	14	Kevin: If this principle is to be properly implemented, participant funding will be required given the limited capacity of Alternatives North and perhaps YKDFN. Use 'consultation' as defined in the land claims agreements rather than something as vague as 'engagement'. Consultation can be defined as shown in comment 7.	Under consideration	
	15	Kevin: This will require a significant investment from the Giant Team that has previously not happened.	See comment	The Project Team intends to allocate appropriate resources
	16	Kevin: If this requires resorting to the federal <i>Access to Information Act</i> , then the battle is already lost. The Giant Team should make as much information public as it possibly can, without forcing people to resort to ATI. This should mean spelling out now what sort of data and information will routinely be made public without resorting to ATI requests.	See comment	The Project Team has committed to engaging interested parties in the development of the EMS, including the communications section. The Project Team has further committed to making available a number of environmental reports. Discussions within the EMS WG will help firm up the type of information to be made public on a routine basis
	17	Todd: Provide recognition of what traits make these functions successful.	Under consideration	
	18	Kevin: This is not the classic or even the accepted definition of 'adaptive management'. This section should also contain a commitment to ongoing research and development into a more permanent solution for the underground arsenic.	Under consideration	
Requirements	19	Kevin: This is a little hard to believe when the project did not obtain a land use permit for the FOS and is attempting to exempt the mill conveyor without the agreement or approval of the MVEIRB.	See comment	The Project Team has a different view on whether or not an LUP for the FOS was needed, prior to the S. 98 determination. The Policy is future-looking and future actions by the Project Team will speak for the extent to which this Policy is followed
	20	Todd: Kevin has a good point – good faith approach is in question.	See comment 19	
	21	Kevin: See earlier comments in the text about the value of ISO certification and external verification.	Under consideration	
	22	Todd: I've never understood this approach – why bother if you aren't going to formally adopt it? ... It's an empty and	See response 21	

Policy Section	Comment Number	Comment	Response/ Status	Comment/Discussion
		meaningless statement.		
	23	Todd: Hard to know what these are at this point. The 'what' is very confusing.	See comment	Additional discussion and clarification will come as the EMPs are developed with input from interested parties
	24	Kevin: Does this mean mine components, as opposed to environmental components?	See comment	Yes, this refer to Mine Components
	25	Re. Quarterly reporting: Kevin: To whom and about what?	See comments 16 and 25	The Project has a Performance Measurement System, mandated by AANDC and Treasury Board, for tracking and reporting performance to Sr. Management and Central Agencies quarterly. The environmental section can be made public
	26	Kevin: The purpose of these reports should also include an analysis and review of any trends from baseline conditions, and an evaluation of the AANDC adaptive management approach and systems.	Accepted	
	27	Todd: Reporting to what end?	See comment	The Project considers these reports very important in informing Sr. Management and external interested parties. The reports will document environmental results and recommended changes (e.g. adaptive management) to ensure the site remains safe
	28	Kevin: Note that AANDC already committed to make all such audits public during the Technical Sessions held in October 2011.	Accepted	
	29	Todd: Only link to monitoring is in areas of 'expected uncertainty.'	See comment	The Requirement is meant to mean that the overall monitoring programs will include, among other things, parameters to allow effective response (adaptive management) in cases of uncertainty
	30	Kevin: Will this be publicly reported?	See comment 16	
	31	Todd: What is the system when the project wants to do	See comment	The Project will submit its work plans and

Policy Section	Comment Number	Comment	Response/ Status	Comment/Discussion
		something but funding isn't available? What is the notification scheme for the public?		budget requirements for approval according to federal government processes. Interested parties will be kept informed of approved plans
Accountability	32	Todd: This is the generals and Ray Case?	See comment	At the moment this is the Oversight Committee established under the AANDC-GNWT Cooperation Agreement. The members of this Committee are the AANDC RDG and the GNWT DM of ENR
	33	Kevin: An even more powerful statement would be a requirement for community support or endorsement from YKDFN and the City of Yellowknife would be quite interesting.	See comment	This Policy will be approved by the Project Leader (AANDC ADM of Northern Affairs). Overall accountability for implementation of the policy rests with the Project's Management Board. The Oversight Committee will be asked to endorse the Policy. Having the YKDFN and other interested parties endorse the Policy would also be good and this will be given due consideration by the Project Team
	34	Todd: Links + notes of especially relevant passages.	Accepted	
	35	Todd: Move the endnote to footnote. I can't add a comment to that for some reason.	See comment	Not sure that an action/response from the Project Team is required

APPENDIX C – DRAFT EMS WORKING GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE

Please note that this is the original WG ToR. Comments have been received from two of the Interested Parties. Once the remaining parties have provided input, a second draft will be produced.

GIANT MINE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP WITH THE PARTIES
TERMS OF REFERENCE
APRIL 2012

1.0 BACKGROUND AND MANDATE

As of March 2012, the Giant Mine Remediation Project (the “Project”) is undergoing Environmental Assessment EA 0809-001. During the Technical Sessions in October 2011, the parties to the Environmental Assessment had concerns regarding the phase of design (preliminary design) and the resulting lack of established measureable criteria or monitoring programs. As a result, it was recommended that reclamation research plans be developed. To facilitate the gathering of outstanding information, it was suggested that a working group be established to allow opportunity for interested parties to be informed of current design details and provide meaningful input.

The mandate of the Giant Mine Environmental Management Working Group (the Working Group) is to provide a forum for interested parties to discuss and make recommendations on environmental technical issues regarding remediation of Giant Mine, and provide input into the development of Environmental Management Plans and Monitoring Program. Specifically, the functions of the Working Group are to:

1. Provide a forum to present and discuss information on the overall environmental management system for the site
2. Discuss and allow for input on remediation objectives and subsequent remediation activities, closure criteria and proposed monitoring
3. Allow the Project Team to present on ongoing research and engineering studies via Reclamation Research Plans, for areas where uncertainties in design exist
4. Gain input and advice on further engagement considerations
5. Provide input into the development of Environmental Monitoring Plans, which provide guidelines for the development of environmental monitoring programs

2.0 MEMEBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP

1. **Co-Chairs**: AANDC – Meeting Chair (Octavio Melo) and GNWT – Coordinator (Erika Nyssonen)
2. **Members**: The membership of the Working Group will include the parties to the Environmental Assessment EA 0809-001 and any other interested parties. It shall include one representative and an alternate from member organizations.
Representatives may request permission from the Co-Chairs to have their technical advisors or other support persons attend Working Group meetings. Permission from the Working Group Co-Chairs must be sought at least two weeks prior to the first meeting that the technical advisors or support persons are to attend. This will allow time for other parties to the Working Group to arrange for counterpart technical advisors/support persons to attend Working Group meetings.
Giant Mine Project Team: Members of the Giant Mine Environmental Management Group (EMG), including technical advisors/consultants if required.

Both Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board and Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board staff are invited to attend meetings as observers.

The Project Team will provide secretarial support.

Please see Appendix 1 for a list of organizations and their representatives participating in the Working Group. This list will be updated as required by the Chairs of the Working Group.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PARTIES TO THE WORKING GROUP

3.1 Co-Chairs

1. Shall ensure that all documents generated during the course of the Working Group such as review comments and Project Team responses to comments are distributed to all parties to the Working Group in a timely fashion.
2. Shall ensure that all final documents generated during the course of the Working Group are placed on the public registry.
3. Shall ensure that all deadlines are provided in writing to all parties to the Working Group.
4. Shall notify all parties to the Working Group of any new technical advisors/support persons that may be attending Working Group meetings at least two weeks in advance of the first meeting that they are to attend.
5. Shall ensure that the Working Group meetings are documented, and that the meeting minutes are distributed to all parties to the Working Group and are placed on the public registry.
6. Shall ensure that Working Group meeting discussions remain within the mandate of the Working Group and focused on the agenda set for each meeting.
7. Shall ensure that the list of organizations and their representatives participating in the Working Group is up-to-date (see Appendix 1).
8. Shall distribute an agenda in advance of each meeting.

3.2 Members

1. Shall attempt to maintain the same representatives at each meeting to provide consistency to discussions. The active Working Group representative shall keep alternates informed of all Working Group proceedings. Members will make all reasonable attempts to attend all meetings for their full durations based on the schedules distributed by the Working Group Co-Chairs.
2. Shall adhere to the deadlines set for all steps in the Working Group process.
3. Shall be fully prepared for all meetings.
4. Shall participate in a cooperative manner during Working Group meetings.
5. Shall limit their comments and/or discussions during the meetings to those related to the mandate of the Working Group and to the meeting agenda.
6. Shall address any action items that result from the discussions that take place during Working Group meetings in a timely manner.

3.3 Giant Mine Project Team Environmental Management Group

1. Shall attempt to maintain the same organization representatives at each meeting to provide consistency to discussions.
2. Shall adhere to deadlines set for all steps in the Working Group process.
3. Shall provide any documentation requested by the Chair during Working Group proceedings in a timely fashion.
4. Shall participate in a cooperative manner during Working Group meetings.
5. Shall limit their comments and/or discussions during the meetings to those related to the mandate of the Working Group and to the meeting agenda.
6. Shall address any action items that result from the discussions that take place during Working Group meetings.

4.0 WORKING GROUP FUNCTIONING

4.1 Meetings

Meetings will take place in Yellowknife monthly or as agreed by the Working Group.

Discussions during meetings will deal only with those items on the agenda distributed by the Working Group Co-Chairs prior to each meeting. All Working Group meetings shall be documented and the meeting minutes placed on the public registry.

4.2 Recommendations to the Giant Mine Project Team

The parties to the Working Group will endeavour to develop recommendations to the Project Team by consensus. All opinions and recommendations will be recorded in meeting transcripts and summarized in advisory documents by the secretariat. The advisory documents shall contain a summary of review comments from all parties to the Working Group; a summary of recommendations made by consensus, a summary of minority or dissenting opinions on matters where consensus is not reached, and any other relevant information put forward during the Working Group process. Copies of advisory documents shall be provided to the Project Team and to all parties to the Working Group.

4.3 Funding

1. The Project Team will have a contribution agreement in place with the YKDFN which will allocate funds to participate in this Environmental Management Working Group.
2. Alternatives North will be provided with honorariums to cover preparation for and attendance at meetings.
3. Support for other Aboriginal and NGO members who may join at a later date will be considered by the Project Team.

4.4 Amendment of the Terms of Reference

In consultation with Working Group members, the Project Team may modify the Working Group Terms of Reference or the Work Plan at any time if it is deemed necessary to do so to facilitate the mandate of the Working Group.

4.4 Disbandment of the Working Group

The Project Team reserves the right to disband the Working Group at any time if the mandate of the Working Group is not being adhered to or the responsibilities of the Working Group are not being fulfilled. In addition, the Project Team may sunset the Working Group if and when an Advisory/Oversight Committee is established.

APENDIX 1 – MEMBERSHIP¹

Erika Nyyssonen (Co-Chair)	GNWT
Octavio Melo (Co-chair)	AANDC
Todd Slack	YKDFN
Kevin O'Reilly	Alternatives North
Morag McPherson	DFO
Amy Sparks	Environment Canada
Dennis Kefalas	City of Yellowknife
Adrian Paradis	AANDC
George Lafferty	AANDC
Norm Quail	PWGSC
Chris Doupe	PWGSC
Lisa Dyer	PWGSC
Dave Abernethy	PWGSC
Krista Amey (Secretariat)	DPRA

¹ MVEIRB and MVLWB staff are welcome to participate as observers.