



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

EA No. 0809-001

Environmental Management System Working Group with the Parties

20 June 2012 Meeting Summary

20 July 2012



Aboriginal Affairs and
Northern Development Canada

Affaires autochtones et
Développement du Nord Canada



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

EA No. 0809-001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT	2
3. EMS UPDATE.....	3
4. EMS DEFINITIONS.....	5
5. SAMPLE BUILDINGS MATRIX	10
6. SAMPLE BUILDINGS EMP.....	13
7. STATUS OF APRIL 25 ACTION ITEMS	15
8. NEXT STEPS.....	16
9. CLOSING REMARKS	16



Aboriginal Affairs and
Northern Development Canada

Affaires autochtones et
Développement du Nord Canada



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 20 June 2012

20 July 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, 20 June 2012 from 9:00 to 12:00 (extended time 1:00 - 3:30 pm).

The PowerPoint presentation used by the EMS 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)	Aaron Braumberger
	George Lafferty (morning only)
Government of the Northwest Territories – Environment and Natural Resources (GNWT-ENR)	Erika Nyssonen
Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC)	Lisa Dyer
	Dave Abernethy
	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)	Gordon Hamre
Yellowknives Dene First Nation (YKDFN)	Todd Slack
City of Yellowknife (City)	Wendy Alexander (morning only)
Observer	Representative
Mackenzie Valley Review Board (Review Board)	Alan Ehrlich (portion of morning)

*Notes were taken by Krista Amey, DPRA.



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 20 June 2012

20 July 2012

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 is intended to be both an update on the activities of the Giant Mine Remediation Project Team on the EMS and a follow-up to the previous meeting of April 25 2012. The status of the current work will be presented for discussion and feedback will be sought from Interested Parties to inform both content and process for the further development of the EMS. This will be accomplished by focusing on the Buildings Matrix.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this meeting:

- To provide an update to the Working Group members on progress since the last meeting and the continuing development of the EMS
- To review the Buildings Matrix
- To seek feedback on the approach and suggestions for appropriate time and means for engagement on water quality and frozen block 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. ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

Alan Ehrlich of the Mackenzie Valley Review Board (Review Board), upon the request of the EMS Team, provided a synopsis of adaptive management. As part of his overview, Alan referenced a *Guide for Preparation of Adaptive Management Plans*, which had been prepared for Fisheries and Oceans Canada (March 2008). This guide is provided in Appendix B of this report.

Alan described active and passive adaptive management. Active adaptive management follows a cycle of assessment, design, implementation, monitoring and adjustment; whereas passive adaptive management follows an "if...then..." approach. Alan explained that the Giant Mine project is a mixture of active and passive adaptive management.

Alan followed up on the question posed to him during the April 25 meeting, "when is adaptive management not appropriate?". He answered that adaptive management should not be used when:

- the impact is irreversible (e.g., nuclear meltdown) or unacceptable (e.g., loss of life or extinction of species),
- there is no proof in alternatives (that is, when there is nothing to fall back on), and
- when time frames are very long.



Aboriginal Affairs and
Northern Development Canada

Affaires autochtones et
Développement du Nord Canada



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 20 June 2012

20 July 2012

Alan stated that it is not acceptable to say “we’ll use adaptive management for everything”.

3. EMS UPDATE

Aaron Braumberger (AANDC) provided an update on the progress of the EMS. He said that they are working on an EMS manual and are meeting monthly.

The EMS Team is using the Gap Analysis (led by Stratos) to look at current happenings on site and to translate into new contracts (involves PWGSC (Chris Doupe, Norm Quail and Linda Pickett) and Nuna Logistics). The Gap Analysis is scheduled to be completed by the end of August (with a draft by the end of July). During the second week of July, interviews will be conducted on site. We’ll be looking at how contractors are operating on site and whether or not operations are in accordance with contract documents.

Regarding the Environmental, Health, Safety and Community (EHSC) Policy, Aaron stated that comments from the Parties have been received and reviewed, and the Policy has been modified accordingly. The EHSC Policy will be signed off in the fall by **policy leaders**.

Comment [b1]: ADM Northern

The EMS Manual is expected to be completed by the end of December 2012. The Gap Analysis work feeds into the manual and the Environmental Management Plans (EMPs). At the April 25 meeting, 19 EMPs were identified, with the need for only 8 or 9 matrices, as some of the EMPs do not require matrices. Some aspects of the EMS, that is overarching or administrative pieces, will live in the manual, while other aspects will live in the EMPs. The Buildings matrix and EMPs presented today are preliminary. Some of the EMPs have been identified as priority. The Roaster is the next EMP being developed and should be available in July. The Frozen Block and Water Quality EMPs will follow in August. The goal is to have these completed before the Public Hearings (at least in draft form to this working group). The expectation is to have drafts of all 19 EMPs by the end of the 2012/13 fiscal year. Today’s discussion will be a test run for the EMPs and the matrices, with a desired outcome of targets to work towards. Aaron indicated that we are taking a collaborative approach and are actively working with YKDFN and others. We have outlined the priority EMPs but are currently seeking input on the prioritization.

Amy Sparks (EC) asked to see the list of the 19.

Todd Slack (YKDFN) stated a need to start with the components and this will avoid issues at the Public Hearings.

Norm Quail (PWGSC) provided an example of where certain constituents, for example, soils and sediments, keep coming up within the various projects and components and as such they decided to pull it out and make soils and sediments an EMP. Norm further stated the need to have flexibility.

Comment [KA2]: Re-visit use of this word



Aboriginal Affairs and
Northern Development Canada

Affaires autochtones et
Développement du Nord Canada



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 20 June 2012

20 July 2012

Todd stated adamantly that the Parties want to see the list of EMPs. The Parties have concerns as they hear that the list is changing; decisions must be made. Todd said that the current process is unbearable such that the list is provided to the Parties. The Parties take it away and work on it, but then it changes, leading to a waste of time and resources.

Erika Nyssonen (GNWT) projected the list of EMPs for the Parties to view. Norm asked Aaron if we can say that this is the definitive list. Aaron said that this list may grow but it should not shrink.

Comment [KA3]: I have asked Aaron to provide me with the list of 19 EMPs

Comment [b4]: You should have it now, confirm if you do not..

Lisa Dyer (PWGSC) repeated what the EMS Team is hearing from the Parties:

- People need to know where we are
- People need the list of EMPs
- The Parties need an opportunity for input
- Start with the list, prioritize and maybe adjust the schedule
- The Parties are seeking clarity.

Todd said that he certainly respects the work that is going into the EMS, but further stated that the Parties have been asking for the components, objectives and criteria since the Technical Sessions in October.

ACTION

- a. EMS Team to provide for next meeting:
 - For each Mine Component:
 - Objectives
 - Criteria
 - Closure Goal

Comment [b5]: We need to have a discussion on this with DRC, and Mike.

Gordon Hamre (Alternatives North) asked if there is any reluctance to disclose the list. The Team answered “no”, with Norm adding that the mine component packages are guides and they need to coincide. Using the Buildings as an example, the activity is removing the buildings and safeguarding needs to align with the technical. There is a need for flexibility. Lisa added that people are in the weeds, which is needed. The question is how we take information from the weeds, pull it together to allow Parties to participate. She further added that we want this to be an open and dynamic working group. There is so much work going on. Lisa asked the Parties “What do you need to see?”. Lisa clearly stated that there is not unwillingness on our part – it is about how do we determine what is needed and how do we present it? We want to work more effectively together.

Comment [KA6]: Needs confirmation – doesn’t quite make sense in the context of Gordon question re reluctance

Norm added that these EMPs tie into specifications. We want what is in the EMPs to be what gets implemented on the ground. We are producing the EMPs as operational documents and they have to be produced for implementation.



Aboriginal Affairs and
Northern Development Canada

Affaires autochtones et
Développement du Nord Canada



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 20 June 2012

20 July 2012

ACTION

- b. EMS Team to distribute among the Parties the Adaptive Management paper referenced by Alan Ehrlich.
- c. EMS Team to provide list of matrices and EMPs to the Parties for input on prioritization.

4. EMS DEFINITIONS

Erika led the discussion on definitions. She started by stating that determination of clear definitions comes at the request of Todd during the Technical Sessions. Todd had provided a list, which has now been expanded. Todd added that this is a fundamental issue, that definitions are different among groups and among projects. In order to reduce confusion, there is a need to come up with single definitions that we all use.

Erika continued leading this exercise by projecting the definitions used within various reference documents along with the Giant Mine Remediation Project (GMRP) working definitions. The group reviewed each definition provided for each term and worked together to determine the most applicable definition. References used included:

- Board Closure and Reclamation Guidelines
- Board Adaptive Management Guidelines
- ISO 14001 (ISO)
- BHP Billiton
- Diavik

In the interest of time, Amy suggested that the group focus on a selection of the more pertinent definitions and leave the remainder to the EMS Team to decide applicable definitions.

Erika stated that, during the Technical Sessions, the GMRP Team committed to following the Board's guidelines.

Re Closure Criteria

Todd asked Norm and Chris Doupe (PWGSC) about the different ways that the word "criteria" is being used.

Norm said that the "Closure Criteria" were mostly taken from the Board's Closure and Reclamation Guidelines. "Action Criteria"

Comment [KA7]: Need confirmation – missed what was said about action criteria

Morag McPherson (DFO) said that she was now getting confused about similar-meaning terms being used ("action level", "trigger", "benchmark" and "threshold"), suggesting choosing one and using it consistently.



Aboriginal Affairs and
Northern Development Canada

Affaires autochtones et
Développement du Nord Canada



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 20 June 2012

20 July 2012

Amy suggested using “action level” in the matrix instead of “action criteria” so that there is consistency.

Todd stated that there is a lot of repetition, further suggesting a reduction in the list of definitions, keeping the preferred term.

It was agreed upon by the group to use “Closure Criteria” and remove all other “criteria” from the list.

Todd asked if the term “Aspect” is needed. Norm responded that in order to be consistent with ISO that “Aspect” must be kept and definition will be determined.

Amy felt the Board’s definition for “Closure Criteria” was suitable. Todd agreed but wanted the terms “measurable” and “preferred numerical value” to be added to the definition.

Re Closure Goal

Todd asked for the difference between “Closure Goal” and “Closure Objectives”. Morag said that it seems like the “Closure Objectives” are more specific and that the “Closure Goal” is the overall purpose of remediation. Norm and Morag agreed that they like these definitions but Morag further stated that she wants to make sure that everyone uses and interprets them the same way.

Appendix C presents the definitions table, which includes the definitions from the above reference documents and the draft definitions as determined by the Working Group with the Parties on June 20.

Re Closure Objectives

The group agreed to use the Board’s definition, but to replace “component” with “mine component”.

Re Closure Options

The group agreed to use the Board’s definition, but to replace “component” with “mine component”.

Re Gap Closure Work

Todd said that there is overlap between “Gap Closure Work” and “Reclamation Research Plan”. Norm suggested that the definition for “Reclamation Research Plan” be referenced in the definition for “Gap Closure Work” and vice versa.

Re Long-Term

Todd suggested omitting the term “Long-term” from the list. Chris disagreed, stating that long-term applies to more than active care. “Short-term” is the phase until the “Active Remediation Phase” begins. “Long-term” follows the end of the “Active Remediation Phase” (which will vary by “component”) and will extend into perpetuity (i.e. > 25 years).

Todd stated his discomfort with the notion that time varies depending on the component.



Aboriginal Affairs and
Northern Development Canada

Affaires autochtones et
Développement du Nord Canada



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 20 June 2012

20 July 2012

Re Long-Term Active Care

Todd suggested adding 'e.g. more than 25 years' to the definition.

Re Management

Todd voiced concern about the seemingly different ways in which "Management" and "Management Actions" are being used.

Erika said that she had made up the definition to act as a starting point for discussion.

Lisa said that "Management", "Management Actions" and "Adaptive Management" need to agree with each other.

ACTION

- d. **Re definitions for *Adaptive Management*, *Management* and *Management Action* – cross-reference Adaptive Management paper referenced by Alan Ehrlich.**

Re Mine Component

Todd said he is fine with the definition for "Mine Component"; however he said he does have a problem with how the project is splitting the mine components.

ACTION

- e. **Re definition of *Mine Component* – list out the mine components.**

Re Design

Morag mentioned that in the definition for "Design" that the term "system" is used and questions the use of "system".

ACTION

- f. **Add *System* to list of definitions.**

Re Monitoring

Todd said he likes Diavik's definition of "Monitoring" but would like some of BHP's definition added to it. Suggested wording... "Often monitoring programs are designed to assess if closure criteria are being met.". There was a further suggestion to add "biological and socio-economic" to the definition.

Comment [KA8]: Confirm the following action...



Aboriginal Affairs and
Northern Development Canada

Affaires autochtones et
Développement du Nord Canada



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 20 June 2012

20 July 2012

ACTION

- g. Delete *Monitoring* and go with *ISO Monitoring and Measurement*.

Re Monitoring and Measurement

Linda Pickett (PWGSC) stated the importance of keeping the term “Monitoring and Measurement” when it comes to audit time.

Norm said that there are two different types of “monitoring”; on-ground/on-site monitoring versus monitoring of the system.

Re Monitoring Response Plans

Suggested wording – replace “Aquatic Effects” with “Adaptive Management”.

Norm said that “corrective action” is an auditing term. He said it is important to reflect steps taken in the EMPs wherever we can. It was agreed that there is a need for response plans.

Comment [KA9]: Confirm the following action

Comment [KA10]: Missed the gist of this, please re-work

ACTION

- h. Lisa to check to see if a (or the) *Monitoring Response Plan* is actually needed.

Re Objectives

Amey stated that without specifying what kind of objectives are being discussed and defined, the term by itself is quite meaningless. There was agreement among the group and thus it was decided to delete “Objectives” from the list of definitions.

ACTION

- i. Delete *Objectives* that do not have adjective descriptors.

Re Objectives and Targets (ISO 4.3.2)

Linda indicated that, in terms of maintaining compliance with ISO 14001, it is important to keep the “ISO Objectives”, which change annually.

Todd expressed that it is challenging because there are two different perspectives that are being melded together, that of the Parties who are looking at everything with the Public Hearings in mind, and that of the EMS Team who also have to think in terms of the EMS and ISO.

Norm said that the “ISO Objectives and Targets” should be referenced in the “Closure Objectives”.



Aboriginal Affairs and
Northern Development Canada

Affaires autochtones et
Développement du Nord Canada



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 20 June 2012

20 July 2012

Re Operations

Todd said that, during the Technical Sessions in October 2011, Adrian Paradis used the term “Operations” as a time phase, which is why Todd included the term in the list in order to seek clarification.

ACTION

- j. **Ask Adrian Paradis to define the *Operations* Phase.**

Re Parameter

Norm said that in the Developers Assessment Report (DAR) the terms ‘component’ and ‘sub-component’ were used. So in order to circumvent the multiple uses of “component”, the EMS Team decided to use “Parameter”, to mean ‘environmental component’ and “Sub-parameter” to mean ‘environmental sub-component’.

Lisa asked Norm what is an environmental component. Norm responded by referring the group to the definitions in the DAR.

ACTION

- k. **Replace *Environmental Component* and *Sub-components* definitions with those from the DAR.**

Re Post-closure

Todd stated that it seems as though “Post-closure” is referring to a time frame.

Comment [KA11]: Erika to confirm action item “m”

ACTION

- l. **EMS Team to work out the definitions for *Short-term, Remediation and Long-term phases*.**
- m. **Erika to change Research column in the matrices**

Re Risk

It was agreed to use the ISO definition for “Risk”.

Re Sub-aspect

It was agreed to delete “Sub-aspect” from the list of definitions. It is not an ISO term.



Aboriginal Affairs and
Northern Development Canada

Affaires autochtones et
Développement du Nord Canada



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 20 June 2012

20 July 2012

Re Significance Threshold

It was agreed to delete "Significance Threshold" from the list of definitions because of the earlier decision to not use the term 'threshold'. Further to this, Todd disagreed with the use of 'significance'.

Re SNP (Surveillance Network Program)

Todd suggested adding "not directly tied to closure criteria" to the definition of "SNP".

Re Targeted Monitoring

It was agreed to delete "Targeted Monitoring" from the list of definitions.

Re Targets of Success

It was agreed to delete "Targets of Success" from the list of definitions because they are the same as Closure Criteria.

Re VEC (Valued Ecosystem Component)

It was agreed to keep "VEC" in the list of definitions because it is from the DAR.

At this point the group finished reviewing the definitions. Lisa had stated the importance of completing these definitions as soon as possible in order to move forward consistently.

5. SAMPLE BUILDINGS MATRIX

The group commenced review and discussion of the sample Buildings matrix.

Earlier on in the day during the definitions portion of the agenda, Todd had suggested, and Norm agreed, that the first three columns in the matrix are not useful, and thus could be removed. The matrix doesn't need to link back to the DAR.

ACTION

- n. Omit the first three columns from the matrices.

Re Closure Objective

Todd noted that "Closure Objective" in the matrix did not appear to follow the definition in the list. Amy felt that what was entered under Closure Objective was actually an activity.



Aboriginal Affairs and
Northern Development Canada

Affaires autochtones et
Développement du Nord Canada



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 20 June 2012

20 July 2012

Discussion centered on the term “Objective” and the need was reiterated for the Parties to be provided with the list of mine components and the objectives, criteria and closure goals for each. Lisa asked Todd for his thoughts on what is the intent of the objectives. Todd answered that for the Parties, the objectives and the criteria are the linchpins. Clearly stated objectives and criteria would instill confidence with the Parties and would provide something to assess. In the end, we want to be able to assess the success of the project.

Morag added that the kind of information that is presented in the matrix is indeed the kind of information that everyone is looking for.

Norm restated the difficulties associated with attempting to achieve multiple things simultaneously. The EMPs are what are bound to the contracts.

In the Buildings matrix, the Closure Criteria for Air Quality was discussed. Gordon noted that there was no mention of the contaminants of primary concern (i.e., arsenic). Todd noted that there are multiple criteria under a single objective. He also stated the criteria would be improved by the addition of numerical values (action level).

Amy inquired as to the whereabouts of the “targets”. Linda said that the targets have yet to be developed but they will be in there.

Regarding the sample Buildings EMP, Norm stated that, in essence, the EMP template was populated with sample information for demonstration purposes and that it is not truly draft text.

Lisa said that with respect to air quality, targets have to be developed. The trigger needs to be restated under Action Level. Under closure criteria, arsenic levels are still to be considered. For other contaminants, there will be “if/then” criteria; for example, if the wind is blowing > ## km/hr and soil water decreases to ## ml/kg, then criteria/action levels will be identified.

Closure Criteria for Water Quality was then discussed. Todd argues that “SNP and EEM rate” are not criteria but we need to know what the criteria are. The chemical composition is not part of the objective and so would be talking TSS (Total Suspended Solids), TDS (Total Dissolved Solids) and Turbidity.

Morag said that there would need to be different criteria and a different sampling regime for monitoring. The SNP monitoring is not to be the action levels and the monitoring events are not to be used as the driver.

It was suggested that perhaps there should be a “Work in and around Streams” EMP. Morag said that certain actions could lead to other problems; therefore she wondered if these should be captured in every matrix.

Norm stated that perhaps what is needed is a site-wide EMP that would capture all of the repeat issues that arise from various mine activities.



Aboriginal Affairs and
Northern Development Canada

Affaires autochtones et
Développement du Nord Canada



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 20 June 2012

20 July 2012

Closure Criteria for Terrestrial Environment was then discussed. Todd suggested that the objective should be changed to something more meaningful and to remove "...without contamination". Lisa asked if there should be an objective and target for disposal; suggesting "dispose of.... in a secure manner." Lisa feels that there is a lack of logic flow and that things are not linked, for example leachate is under monitor but it is not under criteria.

Erika said that there is not yet a separate EMP for Waste Management yet.

Lisa asked with respect to habitat, are you going to look for foxes denning on site (for example)?

ACTION

- o. EMS Team to add numerical values in closure criteria (i.e. something to measure).**

Lisa asked the group if there are any other issues that the Parties would like to discuss.

Amy inquired as to which will have more detail, the matrix or the EMP. She also asked if the EMPs will have the criteria identified. Norm responded that yes the EMPs will have more detail than the matrices.

Vegetation and Wildlife were then discussed. Morag said that there seem to be a mix of objectives and criteria under the Closure Criteria. It was agreed that slope and grading need to be in there. Amy questioned the use of "consideration" in the Operational Controls for Wildlife. Further, it was noted that the removal of buildings and infrastructure do impact aquatic species and that it is important to include under aquatic environment.

Lisa asked of each of the Parties for their overall impressions of the process and progress of the EMS.

Gordon stated that it is all very complex and feels that the presentation and substance is good but would like to reserve the opportunity to read through all of the material. Morag said they she feels that the EMS is getting there. She sees that there is still a lot of work ahead to nail down the structure and terms. She feels it would benefit from being simplified and agrees that it is good to get input.

Todd thinks that it is a good first cut and that it is long overdue. He feels that there is a lot of information in there that complicates the initial stage. The terminologies and definitions need to be worked out. Todd said that the Buildings matrix and EMP are a good first step.

Amy agreed that what was presented today is a good start and there is still a lot of work to be done. We do want to see specific numbers. It needs to be reviewed by a number of people for much input.

Erika also stated the need for specialized input from the experts.



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 20 June 2012

20 July 2012

ACTION

- p. Parties to please provide comments and guidance by July 6, 2012 (more input now will make moving forward easier).

Norm requested that as the Parties read through, to please provide ideas and numbers in a note and send it along; this is how we'll populate the matrices. We can then use our meetings to validate the content. We really want to get this part right so the EMPs are sound.

6. SAMPLE BUILDINGS EMP

Following the sample Buildings Matrix, the group moved on to discuss the sample Buildings EMP.

Gordon suggested that the date be inserted somewhere on the document.

Norm reminded the group that there will be an overarching EMS Manual and that perhaps it'll be decided that some information in the EMPs will be moved to the EMS manual. Norm further stated that there may be the need for specific definitions over and above the overarching definitions that were discussed earlier.

Morag wanted to discuss the qualifications of the person(s) carrying out the monitoring and measuring. For example, what mechanisms will be in place that will prevent summer students or security personnel from conducting the water sampling?

Aaron said that these sorts of issues are covered off in the EMS Manual. ...auditor qualifications

Comment [KA12]: Aaron, I missed what you said here

Norm stated that in the EMPs, the specific requirements of the people conducting the sampling would be provided and these would have to be met.

Risks, such as technical and strategic risks, have been pulled from the EMPs and brought into the Manual. The Technical Risks is well developed and follows the ISO standard.

Lisa asked if there are any further questions regarding the presentation or the linkages with the matrix.

Amy stated concern with the seemingly numerous decisions and options left up to the Construction Manager. She feels it is risky to leave so many decisions up to the Construction Manager. Chris said that it only appears that way because much of this still needs to be filled in.

Morag suggested organizing the matrix after the EMP.



Aboriginal Affairs and
Northern Development Canada

Affaires autochtones et
Développement du Nord Canada



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 20 June 2012

20 July 2012

Todd sought clarification on part of the intent of the EMS Manual - is it to address much of the repetition in the EMPs?

Aaron said that the Manual provides high-level direction. Ideally, the EMS Manual would be fully developed first, then the EMPS, followed by the specifications, then the Environmental Protection Plans (EPPs). But we have to do things in reverse.

Todd asked what is in the Manual that we haven't already seen in the EMPs. Aaron responded that the Manual will have such things as roles and responsibilities, auditing, high-level instructions, administration stuff and templates. Some of this will get detailed out in the EMPs.

Norm said that Section 15 of the EMP is the core piece that transforms the matrix into the EMP.

Morag asked if the specific criteria from the matrix can be moved forward through the specifications and the EPPs. She cautioned that carrying through this kind of information can be tricky.

Norm re-iterated the EMS Team welcomes all input and comments on content. Is it a reasonable template? Is it a good format?

ACTION

- q. Parties to please provide prioritized list of matrices and EMPs by July 6, 2012.

Todd suggested that the EMS Team produce another iteration of the Buildings matrix and EMP with the clarified language and then the team can go through it all again. This should help with the rest of the matrices and EMPs.

Aaron expressed his hope that that the EMPs would be done in draft by December 31. He said that there will be an internal discussion on realistic dates. We want to work as a group and meet more frequently than every two months plus perhaps a teleconference more frequently.

ACTION

- r. Aaron to provide the revised EHSC Policy.
- s. Add Baker Creek to EMP list, as it is a large component of the remediation and should be a priority.
- t. EMS Team to prepare and distribute a short document for each of the components and how each EMPs relate to each of the matrix components

Comment [KA13]: Action item t. below was suggested by Norm but not sure if it is a confirmed action item?

Todd said that the EMPs are important but not really necessary before the Public Hearings. Norm asked what is the priority before the Public Hearings? Todd responded with "mine components, objectives, criteria and closure goals".



Aboriginal Affairs and
Northern Development Canada

Affaires autochtones et
Développement du Nord Canada



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 20 June 2012

20 July 2012

7. STATUS OF APRIL 25 ACTION ITEMS

April 25 Action	Complete	Notes
a. EMS Team to clarify EMP terminology.	✓	Comments by July 6 2012
b. EMS Team to rename Environmental Management Program such that it does not have the same acronym as Environmental Management Plan.	✓	Environmental Management Program is now Environmental Protection Plan (EPP)
c. EMS Team to circulate draft list of priority activities for input from the Parties.	✗	Will be sent out
d. Address comments and responses on the Policy at the next EMS Working Group of the Parties Meeting in May.	✓	
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.	✗	Still outstanding but and captured in June 20 th Action Item a.
g. GMRP Team to clearly identify in the plan when adaptive management is applicable and when it is not applicable.	✓	
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.	✓	
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.	✓	EMS Team to do more on this as identified by Todd
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	✓	



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment Meeting Summary

Giant Mine Meeting – EMS Working Group – 20 June 2012

20 July 2012

April 25 Action	Complete	Notes
date and time during the week of May 14th.		

8. NEXT STEPS

Aaron said that the EMS Team will go back and work on the mine components, objectives, criteria and goals. They will look at the schedule for the group to review EMPs and matrices. We will receive input from the Parties on today's stuff. The Gap Analysis is due the second week of July.

Todd said that for the next meeting, in addition to version 2 of the Buildings matrix, have a version 1 of another easy one (e.g. soils).

ACTION

- u. Prepare version 2 of Buildings Matrix and EMP.
- v. Prepare version 1 of Soils Matrix and EMP.

Morag said that we are getting there but the Parties want continuous updates. She wants to see one matrix and EMP fleshed out and she still wants to see Baker Creek, erosion/sediment control produced as their own EMPs. There still needs to be clarity on terminology and definitions. There is a lot of work that has been done and still a lot of work still to do.

9. CLOSING REMARKS

Lisa thanked everyone for coming and providing input, stating that once again a lot of very good information came out of the gathering and that further feedback regarding prioritization of EMPs and presentation and content of the matrix and EMP presented would be very beneficial. Meetings like this with input and feedback from Interested Parties will only inform and improve both content and process for the further development of the EMS.